Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	John Tyler to William Danvers, re: Gilman Bill Fact Sheet (4 pages)	05/23/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/16/1995 - 05/30/1995]

2007-1550-F
ke2057

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]

MSMail

DATE-TIME	16 May 95 16:50
FROM	Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	May 16 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
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
Birkland, Andrea L.
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

Kevin J. Cadieux
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.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Emery, Mary C.
Evans, Paul A.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
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.
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.
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
Lorin, Matthew E.
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.
McCormick, Shawn H.
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
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.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Sherman, David J.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Stauffer, Helen L.

Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Sterns, Crayton L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sullivan, Kathryn
Sulser, Jack 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.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Yorkdale, Glenn H.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

[[5-16MCBF.DOC : 4099 in 5-16MCBF.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 16 May 95 16:39

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME 5-16MCBF.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

____Foı

Immediate Release May 16, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

2:03 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: I would like to start the remainder of the briefing on a note of personal privilege. Yesterday Helen Thomas accused me of dishing out baloney. So my view is --

MS. THOMAS: The charge stands. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: My view is why should you get something fake when you can get the real McCoy, Helen? (Laughter.) So, for you, catch. (Laughter.) A nice baloney sandwich. This is also to make up for the fact that the press pool in Kiev was not properly fed and nourished during a long day of work.

Q We were? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: You were not. Little did you know. All right, other issues that anyone would like to deal with today?

Terry Hunt of the Associated Press.

Q House and Senate negotiators have passed a $16 billion rescission bill that cuts heavily into education and job programs -- job training programs. Will the President sign that bill?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that is correct, the news that you impart to us. We've said several times on the rescissions bill that we have very deep concerns about, first, the action of the House in passing a bill that was manifestly unacceptable to the President. There were some improvements made in the legislation as it was considered by the Senate. Unfortunately, the work in the Conference Committee of the two Houses of Congress have done nothing to improve the bill -- if anything, probably made it worse.

The President is determined to work with the Congress to meet deficit reduction targets, but he is deeply troubled by the cuts that they have made in education -- nearly $98 million worth

of cuts in adult job training; $272 million in youth job training; practically gutting the Summer Youth Employment Program; cutting almost $100 million out of the education reform effort, the Goals 2000 effort. All of these things deeply concern the President.

The Conference Committee has just completed its work within the last hour or so. The President and others here at the White House will be reviewing the work of the Conference Committee very carefully, and the President will advise you of his disposition on the final legislation at the appropriate time.

Q That sounds like a no.

MR. MCCURRY: It sounds like a long answer.

Q Will the President expect Secretary Brown to step aside if the Attorney General recommends the appointment of a special counsel?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't want to speculate on what he might say or not say until the Attorney General has something further to say herself.

Q Do you have any comments on the binational Mexico-U.S. meeting that's occurring right now?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. The President understands that it has been going very well. This is -- for those of you who are not familiar with the binational commission between the United States and Mexico, it is in our -- in terms of our international diplomacy a rather unique mechanism by which the two countries can do business. This is an annual meeting of a lot of the top Cabinet officials from both the Mexican government and the U.S. government, and an excellent opportunity to explore issues on the bilateral agenda.

The President will be meeting with both sides of the binational commission today. In fact, that's going on now most likely. And he intends to congratulate the administration of President Zedillo on the economic reforms now in place, talk about the importance of Mexico's economic recovery, because it is very directly related to the issue of illegal immigration, which troubles the President very greatly as you know.

But these issues, including immigration, are among those that can be explored within the context of the binational commission. And as always, we hear good reports from all the participating Cabinet agencies from the State Department to the Attorney General, to the Commerce Department to HUD and EPA. This is a broad-ranging exchange of views with the Mexican government. And from the reports we've heard from the Cabinet agencies participating, this has been an especially excellent meeting of the commission, reflecting the very close and warm relationship that the United States enjoys with Mexico.

Q Mike, who's the top-ranking Mexican official?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe it's the Foreign Secretary Gurria,

probably. I'm pretty sure that's correct. He might actually have equal rank in protocol with Finance Minister Ortiz. I'm not exactly sure of that. Calvin can check that out for you.

Q Mike, is the President aware there have been an ongoing series of demonstrations for the past 10 days in Miami by Cuban exiles and that, in fact, at this hour several thousand Cuban exiles are demonstrating in Miami, holding a work stoppage and protesting the repatriation of Cuban exiles picked up on the high seas?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, the President is aware of that.

Q And is there any reconsideration of repatriation of Cuban exiles?

MR. MCCURRY: No -- I mean, the President is aware of the concern being expressed within the Cuban American community. But I'd suggest you take a look at yesterday's Miami Herald to see the diversity of opinion that exists within the Cuban American community itself. They had a very interesting survey yesterday that reflected some of the opinions within the community, and there is a surprising degree of support for the President's point of view related to immigration expressed by the Cuban American community in South Florida.

Obviously, the President is concerned about the situation there. Our Office of Public Liaison here at the White House has been in contact with local officials. So we are monitoring the situation.

Q Mike, on another topic, Senator Specter and other senators are still keen to have -- carry out congressional hearings reexamining the FBI's handling of Waco and Ruby Ridge? Is the administration's position that these hearings would be inappropriate while the Oklahoma investigation is active --

MR. MCCURRY: The administration's view and the President's view is that many of the matters that they wish to address in these hearings have been properly vetted and discussed publicly as a result of the exhaustive analysis that was done of the Waco incident. But the administration has no objection to further hearings as long as they are presented well and given -- as long as the administration has an ample opportunity to reflect its point of view.

What the President insisted upon yesterday, and we have made very clear, is we do not believe this should be used as some impediment to passage of our antiterrorism legislation. And it's the view of the White House that Congress ought to first pass that legislation, deliver it to the President by Memorial Day as the leadership of Congress pledged it would do. Then the question of Waco hearings or whatever issues they wish to discuss can properly be dealt with at that time. But those committees with jurisdiction

for the antiterrorism legislation ought to concentrate on giving the administration the law enforcement tools necessary to ensure the American people that there won't be any repetition of the tragedy that occurred in Oklahoma City.

Q What, he doesn't think they're going to be able to keep that promise of Memorial Day?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we remain hopeful that the Congress will see the importance of that legislation and understand how deeply the American people expect this government to protect them and protect the safety of the American family from future terrorist incidents by passage of legislation that will give us law enforcement tools that will allow us to deal with international terrorism.

Q And he does feel that all the civil liberties aspects have been taken care of and are not --

MR. MCCURRY: He believes they have been carefully examined and properly addressed in the legislation.

Q -- come all the way from London, England --

MR. MCCURRY: Hello. Nice to have you here.

Q Thank you very much, indeed. My question is, we're doing a documentary on the Nation of Islam and Louis Farrakhan. And in the course of our discussions with them they've raised some issues which they suggest is a policy of the American government to try and decimate what they say is the black race by introducing AIDS into the community and introducing crack. Because this is a report that's going out to millions of people around the world, it's important to us that we get some sort of response to that from you.

MR. MCCURRY: Those allegations are nonsense. And I'd suggest that perhaps the BBC has better things to do with its time than to promulgate further accusations which are without merit and foundation.

Q The Iraqi Foreign Minister, Mr. Muhammad Said al-Sahhaf, has just said publicly that if President Saddam Hussein gets an adequate letter from President Clinton asking that the two American prisoners be released on a humanitarian basis, the Iraqi President would be able to practice his constitutional authority and take steps to facilitate that. Would President Clinton be amenable to writing a letter to President Saddam Hussein asking on a humanitarian basis for the release of the two American prisoners?

MR. MCCURRY: The President has on prior occasion asked for the release of the two Americans on humanitarian grounds. I am unaware of that report, but I will look carefully at it. Given that the fate of two Americans being incarcerated is at stake, I

don't want to make a response to that without checking a little bit further into it. And we'll get some help with that.

Q Mike, the Russian Defense Minister, General Grachev, has proposed declaration of a system of regional security for the Asia Pacific area which would link the U.S., Russia, the two Koreas, Japan and China. Do you have any comment from the White House?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sorry, the proposal coming from --

Q General Grachev, Pavel Grachev -- for the regional security for the Asia Pacific area. Is there any comment from the White House?

MR. MCCURRY: That is the first I have heard of that. There may be others here within the administration who have worked on it.

Q It was today from Beijing.

MR. MCCURRY: We'll check at Defense and State and see if they've got anything further on it. That's the first I've heard of it.

Q Mike, the House this afternoon is going to be dealing with the wetlands bill, the Clean Water Act amendments. The administration had indicated earlier that they would recommend, or senior advisors would recommend a veto. Does that still apply? And are there any reliefs and regulations in this regard that the administration would accept?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it is still the position, as I understand it, of both the EPA, the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of OMB that if Congressman Shuster's bill as it is currently drafted and moving through the House, if it remains in that form, their recommendation would be a veto. The legislation in question would remove about 50 to 80 percent of critical wetlands from protection, including the Florida Everglades, including, I think, if I'm not mistaken, the San Francisco Bay Marshes I used to tromp around in as a kid.

And this action follows -- there was a scientific study done by the National Academy of Sciences to look at the science behind the administration's approach to wetlands protection and found that there was a great deal of support within the scientific community, in fact, unanimous support on this study for the steps that we have taken. So we believe that we have been doing an adequate job and a sensible job using common sense practices in regulating protection of the wetlands, and we fail to see why the House is now embarked on that course.

We will look carefully at the legislation. I'm not waving a veto pen right now since I don't get to use a veto pen anyhow,

but we'll look at the legislation as it comes to the President.

Q Two on foreign policy. The question yesterday -- will the President meet with the New Zealand team? Apparently, they'll be here on Friday.

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not aware of any plans to have them here.

Q Isn't that usually traditional to meet with the winning team?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think there's a tradition because I don't think there's a tradition, because I don't think there's a tradition of the America's Cup being won by non-Americans. (Laughter.) It did happen when Australia won the cup; President Reagan had the team here. I'm just not aware that they're going to be able to accommodate that on the schedule. I'd point out, as a note of personal privilege, we haven't even had the San Francisco 49ers here yet, something that irks several of the California-connected people here on the staff. (Laughter.)

Q Yesterday, you said the President was sending congratulations. Was he, personally, or was that through --

MR. MCCURRY: I believe that there will be an appropriate congratulations message sent.

Calvin, go send it. (Laughter.)

Q On the trade sanctions with Japan, the President has said in the past that disagreements have consequences, and there's a lot of talk here as well as in Japan that if this thing is not resolved, that it could put at risk other elements of this relationship, including the security aspects. Is there concern in the White House that if this thing goes into effect, with all of those consequences, that eventually, the security relations might be affected?

MR. MCCURRY: I won't belabor everybody with this; I gave a real long treatment of that yesterday, so you may want to get the transcript from yesterday. In a nutshell, I'd say up until now, we have successfully been able to deal with the trade issues, isolate it from the other broad-ranging aspects of our bilateral relationship, and we think it's important to do that.

We have very good cooperation between the United States and the government of Japan on a range of security issues, not only security issues, but global political issues as well, from U.N. peacekeeping to environmental protection to support of the Middle East peace process, where the Japanese have been instrumental in providing resources to nurture the developing peace in the region. All of these things we think are important to proceed with, and we

have tried to keep our disagreements on trade isolated, and we have, as you know, found over a dozen cases where we can reach agreement with the government of Japan on some of our trade issues.

The auto and auto parts basket has been not availing of that type of agreement and cooperation, and it does need to be resolved, because, over time, those types of disagreements can have an effect on other aspects of the bilateral relationship. But up to now, they haven't; we would hope that they wouldn't; we would hope that, as the President suggested today, that these issues can be resolved amicably through negotiation.

Q You're not excluding, then, the possibility that there could be adverse consequences beyond trade?

MR. MCCURRY: I sort of explained yesterday that, over time, hypothetically, you can have that type of impact, and that is of concern to us.

Q You may have addressed this in Moscow, but is there a timetable for the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission to take up the reactor sales to Iran issue?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't recall that there was a specific timetable. There was a general understanding not between the two presidents, between some discussion at the delegation level, that this issue would be revisited when the delegations had an opportunity to encounter each other in Halifax. I don't know whether it would be revisited at that time by the two Presidents, but there was some sense that we would try to move promptly into an examination of those sales.

Q I thought there was a meeting before Halifax.

MR. MCCURRY: There may be. I think there is some follow-up work of Gore-Chernomyrdin, and I can't remember the exact date, but they were scheduled to -- some time in June, I'm reporting, but we can double-check that.

Q Mike, if Republicans drop their tax cut, will the President be amenable to dropping his?

MR. MCCURRY: The President suggested today -- and I would just restate -- there are several things that the Republican Majority could do to give us more clarity on what direction they intend to move with their budget, and then make more possible the type of negotiation that might lead to a consensus approach on the budget. It's not only dropping the idea of tax cuts, which are large, are contributing to budget deficit pressures and which go disproportionately to the wealthiest Americans, but it's also dealing with the important problem of Medicare in the overall context of health care reform, and preserving at the same time investments that will grow the economy over the long-term.

The fundamental philosophical dispute here is a Republican

majority that seems -- at least half of it seems wedded to the idea of tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, versus the President, who is determined to see this economy grow and to seeing the incomes of Americans rise.

We would rather put our program of raising the incomes of Americans up against tax cuts, which we think only go to -- it would go disproportionately to the wealthiest Americans with no clear measurable prediction about what would happen to the economy as a result of that action. So we would rather put our program up, encouraging investments in education, the kind of tax relief that the President has offered through the Middle Class Bill of Rights, which is aimed at education and training, and move the Congress in that direction. And we think, over time, that argument will be persuasive. That's what you heard a lot of the members of Congress from the Democratic side saying today with, what we hope, was a fairly -- speaking fairly much in unison.

Q Mike, when the Chief of Staff came out today, he said that the Republican budget would bring about a lot of pain and what you guys were trying to do was to bring about hope. In '92, when the President was running for election, he talked about sacrifices that the American people needed to make. I mean, don't they -- is it your position that there are no more sacrifices that you need to make in order to get -- to deal with the budget?

MR. MCCURRY: No, not at all. The President put forward a program that did require hard choices from the Congress and from the American people in 1993 and it resulted in $600 billion worth of deficit reduction. There were a lot programs that were cut. There were a lot of trims that were made. And more importantly, as you heard today in our discussion of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, we are cutting government by reforming government, by reinventing government. So we are making those hard choices that are reducing expenditures. They do involve some sacrifice on behalf of those who previously benefitted from programs.

The President had the courage to go and ask the American people to do that and got not one bit of support from the Republican Party. And the President has this year put forward a proposal that calls for additional sacrifice in the form of additional budget deficit reduction. So we are willing to do that work, but it requires honesty on the other side to come clean about what their plan is and what their program will be.

And right now, we've got a very confused set of mixed signals coming from the Republicans on Capitol Hill about what they're going to do. Half of them in the Senate, they seem to be moving towards a package of cuts that are going to be painful to be sure, and on the House side they seem to be taking those painful cuts and using it as a bank to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. And the President has made it clear that's not acceptable.

Q Is American rice going to be exempted from the

Iranian boycott?

MR. MCCURRY: Second day in a row. Calvin. What's the answer.

MR. MITCHELL: We answered it before -- yes.

MR. MCCURRY: Yes -- for reasons that Calvin can explain to you.

Q In the long and pretentious history of U.S.-Japan trade relations there has never been a spillover. But now you seem to think that there's a risk that it will. What is so different about this time?

MR. MCCURRY: I said that there is not a proximate threat of that type of spillover. In fact, as I've said just a minute ago, we've been able to deal with these trade issues in separate fora and we have, in fact, successfully in other sectors been able to reach agreement with the Japanese. There has been no spillover, and we would hope there would be no spillover. I simply suggest over time, if you don't resolve those, they can have an impact on some other aspects of cooperation.

Q But why talk that way about Japan? I mean, usually, even on Russia, you guys always say, look, we have some problems but the full relationship should not be judged on one problem. Why is there a different tone on Japan now?

MR. MCCURRY: There is not a different tone. That is equally true of Japan. Given the enormous breadth of that relationship, given the very warm relationship that we have the Japanese government in the areas in which we cooperate, we would expect the bilateral relationship to be judged in its totality. It is not defined solely by these trade issues. But these trade issues have persisted for a long time, and the American people expect something to be done about it. And that's what we are now attempting to do, hoping, of course, that we can resolve the differences through negotiation.

Q Just out of curiosity, anticipating the announcement on Japan and the fact that the President will see Murayama in a couple weeks, did the President offer Murayama any kind of letter or any kind of communication to make sure that just what you just articulated is the case, that it remains just an issue about trade?

MR. MCCURRY: There have been exchanges with the government of Japan; I don't know whether any of them have been at highest levels. I'd have to check.

Q Is there any comment from the White House on the capture of the leader of the Aum Shinrikyo or the raids?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we applaud the steps the government of

Japan has taken to combat terrorism and we do believe that governments that face terrorism need to act swiftly and sometimes they need to act boldly in order to protect law-abiding citizens. In the United States we are doing exactly that with our own efforts to seek antiterrorism legislation that would give us tools necessary to combat terrorism, and we certainly understand the attitude of the Japanese government to do everything within its power to protect citizens from terrorist attack.

Q What particular point, if any, does the President want to make at this school-to-work event tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've talked a lot about the importance of -- the point that I was just making a minute ago -- that is one avenue by which people meld the world of education with job experience, so they prepare themselves for the challenges they will face as they go out into the workplace. That is a fundamental goal of this President, to prepare this country for the challenges of the 21st century economy. And it's one reason among many why many of the budget cuts that are now being proposed by the Republican majority seem to him to be so ill-founded in concept. They go right at the heart of our ability over time to grow the economy and to see the incomes of Americans rise.

The single most important thing the President would like to do in the coming years is to do something about the stagnation in rise of incomes for most Americans. The economic recovery has been well and good, but many people, as you've heard the President say from time to time, have not felt it. So taking those steps to raise incomes is exactly what the School to Work program is about, and talking about the importance of that program in an environment in which some people would like to come along and cut programs like that is something you can expect for him to address tomorrow.

Q Just to make sure -- I'm sorry to be ignorant -- is that on the list of things to cover tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: We covered a little bit earlier some of the things that are in the rescissions package. I'm not -- I'll look specifically on school-to-work and see how that's affected by the rescissions language.

Q How about '96 with the next budget in the House and Senate? Have they mentioned cutting school-to-work?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe so, but I don't have a number in front of me.

Q Does the President think the Bosnian war crimes tribunal has been compromised by the --

MR. MCCURRY: I don't have any prepared answer to that, but I believe they were going to address that over at the State Department.

Q Is there any confirmation that the body of Mr.

Cuny has been found?

MR. MCCURRY: No. There is none -- none that I am aware of at this point.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:28 P.M.
EDT

#59-05/16

MSMail

DATE-TIME	16 May 95 18:35
FROM	Danvers, William C.
CLASSIFICATION	******** CLASSIFICATION NOT FOUND ********
SUBJECT	FW: Information Memo for Tony and Sandy from Steve Simon
TO	Andricos, George M. Danvers, William C. Funches, Christina L.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

From: Norman, Marcia G.
To: @UP - APNSA Special Assistants
CC: /R, Record at A1; Danvers, William C.; Halperin, Morton H.; Schifter, Richard; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs
Subject: Information Memo for Tony and Sandy from Steve Simon [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, May 16, 1995 06:31 PM

[[HORROR.DOC : 4686 in HORROR.DOC]]

The attached is forwarded to Tony and Sandy on behalf of Steve Simon through Richard Clarke

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	16 May 95 18:29
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	HORROR.DOC

May 16, 1994

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE/SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: RICHARD CLARKE

FROM: STEVEN SIMON

SUBJECT: Implications of Congressional Budget Action on the 150 Account

You asked for examples of implications of budget action on the 150 account. The following examples are derived from the Domenici-Kasich marks and the Gilman HIRC mark.

Development Assistance. Domenici would cut $3.9 billion from AID over 5 years; assuming ESF to Israel and Egypt is held harmless, this will leave virtually no money for development assistance. Gilman would cut $1.43 over two years. In either case:

ù 4 million children would not be inoculated against infectious disease. Many of these will die.

ù 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.

ù Widespread death from consumption of contaminated water will result from cuts in environmental programs. The Ebola virus was unleashed in part as a result of environmental devastation.

ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV will be eliminated.

ù Market reform and democratization programs that create markets for American products will wither. We will lose jobs.

PL 480 Food Aid. This program helps U.S. farmers, feeds the overseas poor, and strengthens private sector reform in recipient countries. Under Domenici, all PL 480 is cut about 12 percent. Gilman zeroes out PL 480 Title III over two years.

Multilateral Lending. Domenici would cut MDB funding by 40-50 percent, or about $760 million per year. For every dollar cut from IDA, (which would be eliminated entirely by Kasich), IDA loses $4.00 from other donors. These donors would use the money they save to set up bilateral tied aid programs that would ultimately crowd out U.S. sales in emerging markets. The overall decrease in economic growth among former recipients would also lead to a decrease in U.S. sales opportunities overseas.

Cuts will also undermine rapid MDB support for large scale needs that are important to us, e.g., Haiti, and will destroy our ability to set the agenda of MDBs, where we have been pressing for greater stress on environment, private sector development, and governance.

Export Promotion. Domenici proposes $755 million cut to trade promotion programs (OPIC, TDA, and Eximbank) over 5 years. (Gilman's mark does not hit Exim and OPIC until FY 97, and even then the reduction is relatively small.) Using current program to budget ratios and assuming that Exim help is decisive in all cases,

the Domenici cut would lead to an $18.5 billion drop in exports. Thus, for a near term saving of less than one billion, we would forego trade worth nearly twenty times more.

These cuts would hit small businesses disproportionately hard. 65 percent of Exim support goes to smaller firms that have no alternative way to capture sales. Daihatsu tractors would replace John Deere tractors.

U.S. firms vying for the oil and gas development market in the FSU will also get punished severely. Half of oil Exim subsidies go to American firms in this rapidly growing sector. U.S. firms trying to break into the energy development market in Asia, especially Indonesia, will be undercut.

Debt Restructuring. Gilman cuts this by 75 percent, even though it is the cheapest way to help the very poorest countries. More significant, this virtually eliminates debt-for-nature swaps, which are the only tool we have to maintain Latin American rain forests.

Refugee Assistance. Gilman cuts ERMA $100 million over two years. The U.S. will have no way to deal with new refugee crises, just when reductions in development assistance make them more likely. Cuba, Haiti, Rwanda showed that we eventually pay for this whether or not we plan to do so.

Aid to NIS and Eastern Europe. Kasich intends to phase this out entirely. Domenici would cut it by 75 percent over 5 years. Gilman, less Draconian, would cut FSU aid 15 percent over two years and EE aid 40 percent over two years. This will undercut reformers and put U.S. strategic interests at risk.

Economic Support Funds. Most ESF (about $2.0 billion) is earmarked for Israel and Egypt. Of the $494 million remaining, Gilman cuts $148 million in FY 96 and $221 million in FY 97.

ù Thus, either Turkey is cut sharply, or

ù A large number of smaller programs designed to achieve our counternarcotics goals are cut sharply.

IMET. Gilman cuts IMET by almost 25 percent in both FY 96 and 97. This forces a choice between facilitating NATO expansion and fostering professionalization and military ties with forces in other regions.

Voluntary Contributions to International Organizations. Domenici would cut this by nearly half ($200 million per year vice $374 million). Gilman cuts it by about 13 percent.

ù Domenici's cuts would zero out money for the Korea Framework Agreement at the risk of instability in northeast Asia.

Voluntary Peacekeeping. Domenici would retain funding only for MOO. Gilman would cut it by 50 percent. Kasich would "phase it out."

ù Under Domenici, we could not continue to monitor Serbia;

ù Under Gilman, we could do Serbian monitoring, but there would be no emergency money for other contingencies at all.

ù Nevertheless, there will be new crises (a la Rwanda or Angola) and without voluntary peacekeeping funds, DoD will have to pay out of its budget.

Contributions to International Peacekeeping. Domenici would cut $1.3 billion over 5 years ($260 million per year out of a notional $445 million per year, the FY 96 Administration request). Gilman cuts $190 over two years.

ù Domenici would cause the U.S. renege on its treaty commitment to pay assessed peacekeeping cost;

ù Gilman would eliminate funding for UNPROFOR, with serious consequences for U.S.-NATO ties and European security, while setting the stage for financial crisis when the next peacekeeping requirement arose. Gilman could, in effect, end UN operations in Haiti and Rwanda.

ACDA. Gilman would undercut arms control and non-proliferation eliminate funding for Cobra Dane radar required for START verification and for implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	23 May 95 15:02
FROM	Tyler, John T.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Final Fact Sheet [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Baker, Jane E. Boorstin, Robert O. Clarke, Richard A. Danvers, William C. Darby, Melanie B. Fetig, James L. Gray, Wendy Halperin, Morton H. Hawkins, Ardenia R. Joshi, M. Kay Millison, Cathy L. Schwartz, Eric P.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[LASTFAK.DOC : 3913 in LASTFAK.DOC]] This is version as OK'd by OMB et al. Hard copy on Nancy's desk for final clearance. Cheers!
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	23 May 95 14:51
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	LASTFAK.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many
programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities t

o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Gilman Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished
, short-sighted and dangerous. If
it were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and the Ambassador to the
United Nations would all recommend its veto.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would frustrate the implementing and funding of the framework agreement
with North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive
Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be des
tabilizing. U.S.
relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which will cause the U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join

other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing humanitarian assistance to Nicaragua.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In
ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,

creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Ad
ministration is already
proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--i

ncluding a 4700 staff reductions
and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Adminis
tration request levels.
ù

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	John Tyler to William Danvers, re: Gilman Bill Fact Sheet (4 pages)	05/23/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/16/1995 - 05/30/1995]

2007-1550-F
kc2057

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]

MSMail

DATE-TIME	23 May 95 15:37
FROM	Halperin, Morton H.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	FACT SHEET ON GILMAN BILL [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Fuerth, Leon S. Wise, William M.
CARBON_COPY	Tyler, John T.
TEXT_BODY	

Attached is a fact sheet that the White House press office wants to put out soon. May we have comments or clearance to me or to Nancy who has the text. Sorry that the statement did not get cleared with you.[[FACT.DOC : 3845 in FACT.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	23 May 95 15:34
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	FACT.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many
programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities t
o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Gilman Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished
, short-sighted and dangerous. If

it were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and the Ambassador to the
United Nations would all recommend its veto.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would frustrate the implementing and funding of the framework agreement
with North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive
Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be des
tabilizing. U.S.
relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which will cause the U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join
other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing humanitarian assistance to Nicaragua.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international

organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In
ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,

creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Ad
ministration is already
proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--i
ncluding a 4700 staff reductions
and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Adminis
tration request levels.

ù

MSMail

DATE-TIME 23 May 95 15:51

FROM Tyler, John T.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Final Fact Sheet Fix [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Baker, Jane E.
Boorstin, Robert O.
Clarke, Richard A.
Danvers, William C.
Darby, Melanie B.
Fetig, James L.
Gray, Wendy
Halperin, Morton H.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Joshi, M. Kay
Millison, Cathy L.
Wise, William M.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Nancy, Bill Danvers would like to take out the direct reference to Gilman that was in the veto bullet -- logically, we have to work with the man and he's not a bad guy. The attached version of the Fact Sheet refers to the"Bill" rather than the "Gilman Bill." V/r Tim Tyler[[LASTFAK.DOC : 3898 in LASTFAK.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 23 May 95 15:46

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME LASTFAK.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many
programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities t
o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished, short
-sighted and dangerous. If it
were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and
the Ambassador to the
United Nations would all recommend its veto.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would frustrate the implementing and funding of the framework agreement
with North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive
Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be des
tabilizing. U.S.
relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which will cause the U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join
other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing humanitarian assistance to Nicaragua.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In
ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,

creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The

Ad
ministration is already
proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--i
ncluding a 4700 staff reductions
and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Adminis
tration request levels.
ù

MSMail

DATE-TIME 23 May 95 15:59

FROM Danvers, William C.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Fact sheet [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Baker, Jane E.
Bass, Peter E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Darby, Melanie B.
Dohse, Fred J.
Emery, Mary C.
Gray, Wendy
Hall, Wilma G.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Joshi, M. Kay
Millison, Cathy L.
Sens, Andrew D.
Veit, Katherine M.

CARBON_COPY Andricos, George M.
Danvers, William C.
Funches, Christina L.

TEXT_BODY

Note for Tony, Sandy and Nancy:

Attached is a fact sheet prepared by Mort's office on the 150 account.
Sandy and Tony have asked about it several times today.

[[FACTSHT.DOC : 3932 in FACTSHT.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 23 May 95 15:56

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME FACTSHT.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many

programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which
wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the
world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and
authorities t
o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise
leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished,
short
-sighted and dangerous. If it
were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense,
and
the Ambassador to the
United Nations would all recommend its veto.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would frustrate the implementing and funding of the framework
agreement
with North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would
inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive
Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy
wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be
des
tabilizing. U.S.
relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term
securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right

of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which will cause the U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join
other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing humanitarian assistance to Nicaragua.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In

ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,

creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Ad
ministration is already
proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--i
ncluding a 4700 staff reductions
and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Adminis
tration request levels.
ù

MSMail

DATE-TIME	23 May 95 16:23
FROM	Tyler, John T.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	The President's Remarks[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Baker, Jane E. Boorstin, Robert O. Clarke, Richard A. Danvers, William C. Darby, Melanie B. Fetig, James L. Gray, Wendy Halperin, Morton H. Hawkins, Ardenia R. Joshi, M. Kay Millison, Cathy L. Wise, William M.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

During the session in the Rose GArden according to the transcript, the POTUS said that he would veto H.R. 1561. To make the fact sheet conform with that remark, I have changed the third bullet. This should be the last fix...Tim Tyler[[LASTFAK.DOC : 4134 in LASTFAK.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	23 May 95 16:19
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	LASTFAK.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many
programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and

authorities t
o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise
leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished,
short
-sighted and dangerous. If it
were presented to the President, upon the recommendation of the Secretaries of
State
, Treasury and Defense, and
the Ambassador to the United Nations, he would veto it.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would frustrate the implementing and funding of the framework
agreement
with North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would
inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive
Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy
wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be
des
tabilizing. U.S.
relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term
securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right
of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm
relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which will cause the

U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join
other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing humanitarian assistance to Nicaragua.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In
ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,

creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Ad

ministration is already
proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--i
ncluding a 4700 staff reductions
and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Adminis
tration request levels.
ù

MSMail

DATE-TIME	23 May 95 18:28
FROM	Hawkins, Ardenia R.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	HR1561 [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Mitchell, Calvin A.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

hopefully this is what you need in the right format as well.

[[LASTFAK.DOC : 4632 in LASTFAK.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	23 May 95 18:25
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	LASTFAK.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many
programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities t
o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Gilman Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished
, short-sighted and dangerous. If
it were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and the Ambassador to the

United Nations would all recommend its veto. And he has said that he would do so.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would impede the implementing and funding of the framework agreement wit
h North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive
Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be des
tabilizing. U.S.
relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which would cause the U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join
other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In
ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,
creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Ad
ministration is already

proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--in
cluding a 4700 staff reductions
and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Adminis
tration request levels.

# # #

MSMail

DATE-TIME 24 May 95 08:47

FROM Danvers, William C.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Schifter, Richard

CARBON_COPY Andricos, George M.
Danvers, William C.
Funches, Christina L.

TEXT_BODY

Dick,

First of all thank you. Secondly, I think it would be great for you to call Cardin and Sam. I hope and believe that Sam is OK on this, but it doesn't hurt to make sure he stays with us and to thank him for his support.

On Lantos, I think that is a very important call. It would be very useful if Tony could do it under the circumstances. If not, then it is important that you or Sandy call him. I will verify this morning if Sandy will be able to make the call.

AIPAC's arguments:

-- Bill protects funding for Camp David countries.

-- Protects fair pricing provision for Israel's purchase of defense articles.

-- Tradition of AIPAC to support all legislation that takes care of its interests.

Points to make:

-- My understanding that AIPAC will be understanding if a member votes against the bill.

-- This bill is the antithesis of what AIPAC stands for: robust internationalism.

-- The "glide path" down which this bill takes us, is toward isolationism and more and more draconian cuts to resources important to our national interest. This includes helping friends like Israel.

-- President needs your support, needs your vocal support against the bill. This bill is blatant isolationism, not a thoughtful rethinking of how to construct our foreign policy apparatus in the post-Cold War era. Our responsibility to fight this isolationist tendency by voting against bill.

-- Can we count on your support?

Dick, I am also attaching a fact sheet that was prepared on the bill for you to have on hand.

[[HR15612.DOC : 2079 in HR15612.DOC]]

From: Schifter, Richard
To: Danvers, William C.
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1
Subject: RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, May 24, 1995 08:19 AM

Bill: Sandy has asked me to call Ben Cardin on HR 1561. Could you get talking points to me ASAP. Also, can you let me know what AIPAC's arguments are, so that I can rebut them? -- I note your reference to Tom Lantos. I have a very good relationship with him. Do you want me to call. -- I also have a good relationship with Gejdenson (he is a close friend of my son's), in case you see value to my being in touch with him. Dick

---

From: Danvers, William C.
To: @UP - APNSA Special Assistants; @NSC - NSC Staff
CC: /R, Record at A1; Fuerth, Leon S.; Wise, William M.; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
Subject: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, May 23, 1995 07:49 PM

Note for Tony, Sandy and Nancy:

SFRC continued its mark up today on the FAA. Sen. Brown offered an amend that would allow some assistance for Pakistan including IMET, counternarcotics, counterterrorism and OPIC, EXIM, etc to Pakistan. It passed. There is still concern that Biden will offer an amendment that would require the Pakistanis to have a verifiable freeze before these programs could go forward. A Kassebaum amendment passed on a voice vote that transferred $108 million from the antinarcotics program to development assistance. Finally, a Snowe Sense of the Congress amendment on Russia and Iran, stating that if they go forward with the deal, then Russia would be ineligible for assistance under the Freedom Support Act-- while it is Sense of Congress, it would still put us in a difficult position should the bill be signed into law and the deal go forward. There will be other amendments tomorrow, unclear just what, although we can be fairly certain that Sen. Helms will introduce one on Serbian sanctions.

In the House, debate began on HR 1561. Still unclear where Dems stand on the bill. There was a meeting among Democrats this afternoon about what the caucus position should be on the bill. President's statement this afternoon helped-- Lee Hamilton quoted from on the floor shortly after the President made it. AIPAC remains a big concern. Calls to Lantos, Schumer and Cardin will help. Need to know where we stand on Gejdenson Sense of Congress on Iran secondary boycott. House goes back into session tomorrow will finish the bill on Thursday. Christopher and Slocombe are speaking before the House Dem Caucus tomorrow. The House did pass a Brownback amendment that

would cut foreign aid by another approximately $470 million.

SAP went up yesterday with veto message from 4 cabinet members.

Rivilin letter that went last week on rescission bill contained language on Jordan debt. OMB knows of your concern to make certain that all communiques on this issue refer to Jordan debt.

I understand that Lorraine Miller meets with Rep. Menendez tomorrow on Cuba. I further understand that you suggested that Rick Nuccio go with her. Menendez's staffer this afternoon asked me what Rick's role will be regarding Cuba policy. Since Menendez is so touchy about this issue, if Sandy could call him to talk about Rick tomorrow, get his sense of where things stand, tell him that we have asked Rick to meet with him and keep him looped into the process a little more. He will certainly be hostile, but this should help ease his anger a little bit. If you do call him, you might also thank him for his floor statement against the bill today.

Senate continues to consider the Budget Resolution. A Thurmond amendment adding money to defense was defeated 40-60. An Exon amendment on add-backs

was defeated 47-53, and a Gramm amendment on tax cuts was defeated on a budget point of order 32-68. I think this bodes ill for any effort McConnell and others to plus up the 150.

Senate could take up terrorism bill tomorrow. Outstanding issues remain on granting visas for those belonging on terrorist organizations and on foreign sovereign immunity. We are working with State and Alan.

(If possible, could Nancy call McNulty and Manton about their letter on Ireland-- i.e. asking members to vote for HR 1561 because of money for Ireland. They said they won't work the bill, but we need them to vote against it. Thanks.)

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 24 May 95 8:45

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME HR15612.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many
programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities t
o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished, short
-sighted and dangerous. If it
were presented to the President, upon the recommendation of the Secretaries of State
, Treasury and Defense, and
the Ambassador to the United Nations, he would veto it.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would frustrate the implementing and funding of the framework agreement
with North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive
Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be des
tabilizing. U.S.

relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which will cause the U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join
other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing humanitarian assistance to Nicaragua.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In
ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,

creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Ad
ministration is already
proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--i
ncluding a 4700 staff reductions
and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Adminis
tration request levels.
ù

MSMail

DATE-TIME	24 May 95 14:55
FROM	Danvers, William C.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Calls on Ireland [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Baker, Jane E. Darby, Melanie B. Gray, Wendy Hawkins, Ardenia R. Hilliard, Brenda I. Joshi, M. Kay Marmol, Madelyn P. Millison, Cathy L.
CARBON_COPY	Andricos, George M. Danvers, William C. Funches, Christina L.
TEXT_BODY	

Note for Nancy:

Points for your calls to Manton, Neal and McNulty:

-- Calling to ask you to vote against final passage of HR 1561.

-- Understand your support for funds for Ireland. Administration is committed to working for adequate funding for the International Fund for Ireland.

-- But this is a bad bill. Makes deep cuts to resources for international programs, making funds for the IFI a potential target. Need to defeat the bill and send a strong signal to those who would gut programs important to our national interest. Maybe funds for Ireland are safe for now but these deep cuts make the IFI vulnerable in the future.

-- President needs your help. Bill undermines his prerogatives. Number of onerous provisions in the bill that works against our national interest. (See fact sheet)

--Can the President count on your support to vote no on final passage of HR 1561?

Nancy: I have also attached the final version of the fact sheet for you to have on hand when you make the calls. I have just found out that Manton may

actually be working the bill, so the calls need to be made right away.
Thanks very much.

[[HR15612.DOC : 3683 in HR15612.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 24 May 95 8:45

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME HR15612.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many
programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities t
o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished, short
-sighted and dangerous. If it
were presented to the President, upon the recommendation of the Secretaries of State
, Treasury and Defense, and
the Ambassador to the United Nations, he would veto it.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would frustrate the implementing and funding of the framework agreement
with North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive

Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be des
tabilizing. U.S.
relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which will cause the U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join
other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing humanitarian assistance to Nicaragua.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in

dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In
ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,

creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Ad
ministration is already
proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--i
ncluding a 4700 staff reductions
and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Adminis
tration request levels.
ù

MSMail

DATE-TIME	24 May 95 19:11
FROM	Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Gilman Bill [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
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
Birkland, Andrea L.
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

Kevin J. Cadieux
Canty, Mary T.
Carter, Michael E.
Chyba, Christopher F.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Claussen, Eileen B.
Cleveland, Carolyn E.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darby, Melanie B.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Drew, Samuel N.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Dymersky, Debra L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Emery, Mary C.
Evans, Paul A.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
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.
Gray, Wendy
Guekel, Kathi A.
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.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
Lorin, Matthew E.
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.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Neil, M. Elise
Niemerski, Stephen
Norman, Marcia G.

O'Loughlin, Katherine
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
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Reed, George
Rice, Susan E.
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
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.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Sterns, Crayton L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sullivan, Kathryn
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.
Tenet, George J.
Marcel T. Thomas

Turner, Joe T.
Tyler, John 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.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Yorkdale, Glenn H.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

[[GILMAN.DOC : 4901 in GILMAN.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 24 May 95 19:10

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME GILMAN.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release May 23, 1995

FACT SHEET

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

oThe FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spen
ding. H.R. 1561 authorizes many programs at
significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which would damage t
he President's ability to protect United States' security,
economic and other interests around the world.

oH.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities
to carry out U.S. foreign policy and would
deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadership in addre
ssing the complex challenges of the post-Cold War world.

oThe Gilman Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminish
ed, short-sighted and dangerous. If it were
presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and the

Ambassador of the United Nations would all recommend its
veto. And he has said that he would do so.

SPECIFICALLY:

oH.R. 1561 would impede the implementing and funding of the framework agreement w
ith North Korea and possibly send that nation
back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

oH.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inh
ibit implementing the Comprehensive Plan of
Action for Indochinese refugees.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy
with Russia and promoting free market and
democratic reform in Russia.

2

oH.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be destabilizing. U.S. relations with
China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term security.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to mandate
recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations with Chin
a without enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping

the Tibetan people.

oH.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which would cause the U.S.
to renege on its pledge to join other developed
countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most indebted countries
--many of them in Africa.

oH.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizat ions and meeting certain international treaty
obligations.

oH.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President'
s FY 1996 request and would cut the Development
Fund for Africa by 21%.

oH.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended
pipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in developing countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of ac tivities aimed at reducing infant
mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and promo
ting economic growth.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency

for
International Development, the United States
Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the State Depart
ment, creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy,
costly and ineffective. The Administration is already proceeding
3

vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--including a 4700 staff reduction and cutting bureaucratic layers--not
creating them.

oThe bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as Int
ernational Military Education and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Administration request levels.

# # #

MSMail

DATE-TIME 25 May 95 13:33

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

CLASSIFICATION ******** CLASSIFICATION NOT FOUND ********

SUBJECT FW: Fact Sheet to Support POTUS Rose Garden Statement

TO Tyler, John T.

CARBON_COPY Fetig, James L.

TEXT_BODY

E-mailed to staff at 7:11 Wednesday evening entitled Gilman Bill, but here it is again:

[[GILMAN.DOC : 3334 in GILMAN.DOC]]

From: Fetig, James L.
To: Wozniak, Natalie S.
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1
Subject: FW: Fact Sheet to Support POTUS Rose Garden Statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, May 24, 1995 07:41 PM

[[LASTFAK.DOC : 3333 in LASTFAK.DOC]]

Please E-mail him the one that we release.

From: Tyler, John T.
To: Fetig, James L.
CC: /R, Record at A1; Boorstin, Robert O.; Clarke, Richard A.; Danvers, William C.; Darby, M. Brooke; Halperin, Morton H.; Soderberg, Nancy E.
Subject: Fact Sheet to Support POTUS Rose Garden Statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, May 24, 1995 06:11 PM

I understand that the attached version of the Fact Sheet isthe same as the one on the disk you received from Nancy's office yesterday. Sandy has asked us to annotate the fact sheet, and I would prefer to do it on the released or to-be-released version. Can you help?

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 24 May 95 18:4

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME LASTFAK.DOC

Fact Sheet

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

ù The FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spendi
ng. H.R. 1561 authorizes many
programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which wo
uld damage the President's
ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

ù H.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities t
o carry out U.S. foreign policy
and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadershi
p in addressing the complex
challenges of the post-Cold War world.

ù The Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminished, short
-sighted and dangerous. If it
were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and
the Ambassador to the
United Nations would all recommend its veto.

SPECIFICALLY:

ù H.R. 1561 would impede the implementing and funding of the framework agreement wit
h North Korea and
possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

ù H.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inhib
it implementing the Comprehensive
Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy wi
th Russia and promoting free
market and democratic reform in Russia.

ù H.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be des
tabilizing. U.S.
relations with China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term securi
ty.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to
mandate recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations
with China without
enhancing the status of the Dalai Lama or helping the Tibetan people.

ù H.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which would cause the U.S. to
renege on its pledge to join
other developed countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most in
debted countries--many of
them in Africa.

ù H.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizatio
ns and meeting certain international
treaty obligations.

ù H.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President's
FY 1996 request and
would cut the Development Fund for Africa by 21%.

ù H.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended p
ipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in dev
eloping countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of activit
ies aimed at reducing
infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and
promoting
economic growth.

ù H.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for In
ternational Development, the
United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with th
e State Department,
creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Ad
ministration is already
proceeding vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--in
cluding a 4700 staff reduction

and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

ù The bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as In
ternational Military Education
and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Admini
stration request levels.
ù

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 24 May 95 19:12

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME GILMAN.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release May 23, 1995

FACT SHEET

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

oThe FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spen ding. H.R. 1561 authorizes many programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which would damage t he President's ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

oH.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities to carry out U.S. foreign policy and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadership in addre ssing the complex challenges of the post-Cold War world.

oThe Gilman Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminish ed, short-sighted and dangerous. If it were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and the

Ambassador of the United Nations would all recommend its veto. And he has said that he would do so.

SPECIFICALLY:

oH.R. 1561 would impede the implementing and funding of the framework agreement w ith North Korea and possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

oH.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inh ibit implementing the Comprehensive Plan of Action for Indochinese refugees.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy with Russia and promoting free market and democratic reform in Russia.

2

oH.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be destabilizing. U.S. relations with
China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term security.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to mandate
recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations with Chin
a without enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping

the Tibetan people.

oH.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which would cause the U.S.
to renege on its pledge to join other developed
countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most indebted countries
--many of them in Africa.

oH.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizat ions and meeting certain international treaty
obligations.

oH.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President'
s FY 1996 request and would cut the Development
Fund for Africa by 21%.

oH.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended
pipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in developing countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of ac tivities aimed at reducing infant
mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and promo
ting economic growth.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for
International Development, the United States

Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the State Depart
ment, creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy,
costly and ineffective. The Administration is already proceeding
3

vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--including a 4700 staff reduction and cutting bureaucratic layers--not
creating them.

oThe bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as Int
ernational Military Education and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Administration request levels.

# # #

MSMail

DATE-TIME	25 May 95 18:23
FROM	Tyler, John T.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Halperin, Morton H.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[BERGFAK.DOC : 4614 in BERGFAK.DOC]]Here is an annotated version. OK?
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	25 May 95 18:22
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	BERGFAK.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release May 23, 1995

FACT SHEET

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

oThe FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spen ding. H.R. 1561 authorizes many programs at

significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which would damage t
he President's ability to protect United States' security,
economic and other interests around the world.

oH.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities
to carry out U.S. foreign policy and would
deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadership in addre
ssing the complex challenges of the post-Cold War world.

oThe Gilman Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminish ed, short-sighted and dangerous. If it were
presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and the

Ambassador of the United Nations would all recommend its
veto. And he has said that he would do so.

SPECIFICALLY:

oH.R. 1561 would impede the implementing and funding of the framework agreement w
ith North Korea and possibly send that nation
back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

Prohibits the funding for or the implementation of the agreement under --any law-- w
ithout cumbersome and unnecessary Presidential Determinations and advance notifications to numerous congressional committees.

oH.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inh ibit implementing the Comprehensive Plan of
Action for Indochinese refugees.

According to State Department lawyers, the expanded grounds for asylum based on fear
of coercive population practices risks seriously exacerbating the illegal
smuggling of aliens into the US. The prohibition on support for involuntary repatri
ation of refugees could fundamentally affect the President's ability to
respond to boat migration and could even precipitate a mass migration to the US.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy with Russia and promoting free market and
democratic reform in Russia.

There are numerous conditions imposed on our ability to implement Russia and NIS pro

grams--which we do not want in permanent law--even though they
have been carried in appropriations bill language. The Chechniya provisions are new
and interfering.

oH.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be destabilizing. U.S. relations with
China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term security.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to mandate
recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations with Chin
a without enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping
the Tibetan people.

oH.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which would cause the U.S.
to renege on its pledge to join other developed
countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most indebted countries
--many of them in Africa.

Self explanatory--there is a G-7 summit coming in June.

oH.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizat ions and meeting certain international treaty
obligations.

Prevents our meeting treaty obligations and attenuates our influence with UNICEF and
the UNDP--which needs some reform.

oH.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President'
s FY 1996 request and would cut the Development
Fund for Africa by 21%.

Development Assistance is a critical component of our national security strategy and

we simply cannot accept a 30% cut. A cut of this magnitude is
disruptive to our national security programs. As Secretary Perry--the Secretary of

Defense--just wrote in a letter to Speaker Gingrich,
"Underfunding the International Affairs budget, in my opinion, runs the risk that th
e United States will be unable to protect its interests
except with military force." Secretary Christopher has been eloquent on not creatin
g a division of labor--where the Japanese and the West Europeans reap
the benefits of providing development assistance and we to the costly military inter
ventions.

oH.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended
pipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in developing countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of ac tivities aimed at reducing infant
mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and promot
ing economic growth.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for
International Development, the United States
Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the State Depart
ment, creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy,
costly and ineffective. The Administration is already proceeding

vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--including a 4700 staff reduction and cutting bureaucratic layers--not
creating them.

The editorials and OP-ED pieces have been pretty good on this point. The Administra
tion is willing to work in a bipartisan spirit on this problem with
the Congress--but we are not willing to have them dictate the shape and structure of
the Executive Branch.

oThe bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as Int
ernational Military Education and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Administration request levels.

# # #

MSMail

DATE-TIME	25 May 95 19:11
FROM	Halperin, Morton H.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	ANNOTATION OF FACT SHEET ON GILMAN BILL [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Baker, Jane E. Bass, Peter E. Cicio, Kristen K. Darby, Melanie B. Emery, Mary C. Gray, Wendy Hall, Wilma G. Hawkins, Ardenia R. Hilliard, Brenda I. Joshi, M. Kay Marmol, Madelyn P. Millison, Cathy L. Veit, Katherine M.
CARBON_COPY	Andricos, George M. Atkin, Timothy J. Beers, Rand R. Brown, Dallas Clarke, Richard A. Danvers, William C. Eddy, Randolph P. Funches, Christina L. Lindsey, Wanda Norman, Marcia G. Rice, Susan E. Roundtree, Beverly J. Schwartz, Eric P. Sheehan, Michael A. Simon, Steven N.
TEXT_BODY	NOTE FOR SANDY BERGER Attached as requested is an annotation of the fact sheet to explain more fully the harm which would result from the provisions cited.[[BERGFAK.DOC : 4957 in BERGFAK.DOC]] cc: Nancy Soderberg
ATTACHMENT	25 May 95 18:22

FILE DATE

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME BERGFAK.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release May 23, 1995

FACT SHEET

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

oThe FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spen ding. H.R. 1561 authorizes many programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which would damage t he President's ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

oH.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities to carry out U.S. foreign policy and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadership in addre ssing the complex challenges of the post-Cold War world.

oThe Gilman Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminish ed, short-sighted and dangerous. If it were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and the

Ambassador of the United Nations would all recommend its veto. And he has said that he would do so.

SPECIFICALLY:

oH.R. 1561 would impede the implementing and funding of the framework agreement w
ith North Korea and possibly send that nation
back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

Prohibits the funding for or the implementation of the agreement under --any law-- w
ithout cumbersome and unnecessary Presidential Determinations and advance notifications to numerous congressional committees.

oH.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inh
ibit implementing the Comprehensive Plan of
Action for Indochinese refugees.

According to State Department lawyers, the expanded grounds for asylum based on fear
of coercive population practices risks seriously exacerbating the illegal smuggling of aliens into the US. The prohibition on support for involuntary repatri
ation of refugees could fundamentally affect the President's ability to respond to boat migration and could even precipitate a mass migration to the US.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy with Russia and promoting free market and
democratic reform in Russia.

There are numerous conditions imposed on our ability to implement Russia and NIS pro
grams--which we do not want in permanent law--even though they
have been carried in appropriations bill language. The Chechniya provisions are new
and interfering.

2

oH.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could be destabilizing. U.S. relations with
China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term security.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the right of the Congress to mandate
recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations with Chin
a without enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping
the Tibetan people.

oH.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which would cause the U.S.
to renege on its pledge to join other developed
countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most indebted countries
--many of them in Africa.

Self explanatory--there is a G-7 summit coming in June.

oH.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizat ions and meeting certain international treaty
obligations.

Prevents our meeting treaty obligations and attenuates our influence with UNICEF and
the UNDP--which needs some reform.

oH.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President'
s FY 1996 request and would cut the Development
Fund for Africa by 21%.

Development Assistance is a critical component of our national security strategy and
we simply cannot accept a 30% cut. A cut of this magnitude is
disruptive to our national security programs. As Secretary Perry--the Secretary of

Defense--just wrote in a letter to Speaker Gingrich,
"Underfunding the International Affairs budget, in my opinion, runs the risk that th
e United States will be unable to protect its interests
except with military force." Secretary Christopher has been eloquent on not creatin
g a division of labor--where the Japanese and the West Europeans reap
the benefits of providing development assistance and we to the costly military inter
ventions.

oH.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended
pipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations in developing countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of ac tivities aimed at reducing infant mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and promot ing economic growth.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency for International Development, the United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the State Depart ment, creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy, costly and ineffective. The Administration is already proceeding
3

vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--including a 4700 staff reduction and cutting bureaucratic layers--not creating them.

The editorials and OP-ED pieces have been pretty good on this point. The Administra tion is willing to work in a bipartisan spirit on this problem with the Congress--but we are not willing to have them dictate the shape and structure of the Executive Branch.

oThe bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as Int ernational Military Education and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Administration request levels.

# # #

MSMail

DATE-TIME	30 May 95 18:13
FROM	Danvers, William C.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Gilman facts [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Baker, Jane E. Bass, Peter E. Cicio, Kristen K. Darby, Melanie B. Dohse, Fred J. Emery, Mary C. Gray, Wendy Hall, Wilma G. Harmon, Joyce A. Hawkins, Ardenia R. Joshi, M. Kay Millison, Cathy L. Sens, Andrew D. Veit, Katherine M.
CARBON_COPY	Andricos, George M. Danvers, William C. Funches, Christina L.
TEXT_BODY	

Note for Peter Bass:

Attached is the longer version of the fact sheet on the Gilman bill. Please let me know if you need more.

[[HR1561FK.DOC : 4677 in HR1561FK.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	30 May 95 18:11
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	HR1561FK.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release May 23, 1995

FACT SHEET

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

oThe FY 1996 request for International Affairs is only 1.3% of total Federal spen ding. H.R. 1561 authorizes many programs at significantly reduced levels and with earmarks and limitations, which would damage t he President's ability to protect United States' security, economic and other interests around the world.

oH.R. 1561 would seriously undermine the President's prerogatives and authorities to carry out U.S. foreign policy and would deprive the United States of the resources necessary to exercise leadership in addre ssing the complex challenges of the post-Cold War world.

oThe Gilman Bill endorses a view of U.S. leadership in the world that is diminish ed, short-sighted and dangerous. If it were presented to the President, the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Defense, and the

Ambassador of the United Nations would all recommend its veto. And he has said that he would do so.

SPECIFICALLY:

oH.R. 1561 would impede the implementing and funding of the framework agreement w ith North Korea and possibly send that nation back down the road of developing nuclear arms.

Prohibits the funding for or the implementation of the agreement under --any law-- w ithout cumbersome and unnecessary Presidential Determinations and advance notifications to numerous congressional committees.

oH.R. 1561 would inhibit efforts to prevent entry of illegal aliens and would inh
ibit implementing the Comprehensive Plan of
Action for Indochinese refugees.

According to State Department lawyers, the expanded grounds for asylum based on fear
of coercive population practices risks seriously exacerbating the illegal
smuggling of aliens into the US. The prohibition on support for involuntary repatri
ation of refugees could fundamentally affect the President's ability to
respond to boat migration and could even precipitate a mass migration to the US.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates Presidential flexibility in conducting U.S. foreign policy
with Russia and promoting free market and
democratic reform in Russia.

There are numerous conditions imposed on our ability to implement Russia and NIS pro
grams--which we do not want in permanent law--even though they
have been carried in appropriations bill language. The Chechniya provisions are new
and interfering.

2

oH.R. 1561 would be detrimental to overall U.S. interests with regard to China:

- It would remove the current restraint on arms sales to Taiwan, which could
be destabilizing. U.S. relations with
China would be undermined without enhancing Taiwan's long-term security.

- It would require the appointment of a Special Envoy to Tibet and claim the
right of the Congress to mandate
recognition of the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This would harm relations with Chin
a without enhancing the status of the Dali Lama or helping
the Tibetan people.

oH.R. 1561 reduces funding for debt reduction by 75%, which would cause the U.S.
to renege on its pledge to join other developed
countries to do a two-thirds debt reduction for the poorest, most indebted

countries
--many of them in Africa.

Self explanatory--there is a G-7 summit coming in June.

oH.R. 1561 places restrictions on providing assistance to international organizat
ions and meeting certain international treaty
obligations.

Prevents our meeting treaty obligations and attenuates our influence with UNICEF and
the UNDP--which needs some reform.

oH.R. 1561 would reduce Development Assistance funding by 34% from the President'
s FY 1996 request and would cut the Development
Fund for Africa by 21%.

Development Assistance is a critical component of our national security strategy and
we simply cannot accept a 30% cut. A cut of this magnitude is
disruptive to our national security programs. As Secretary Perry--the Secretary of

Defense--just wrote in a letter to Speaker Gingrich,
"Underfunding the International Affairs budget, in my opinion, runs the risk that th
e United States will be unable to protect its interests
except with military force." Secretary Christopher has been eloquent on not creatin
g a division of labor--where the Japanese and the West Europeans reap
the benefits of providing development assistance and we to the costly military inter
ventions.

oH.R. 1561 contains an amendment that requires the deobligation of all unexpended
pipeline funds after three years.

- This measure could hinder our efforts to work through private organizations
in developing countries.

- This provision would force a cut off of $2.1 billion in aid world-wide.

- In Africa alone, $250 million would have to be withdrawn from a range of ac
tivities aimed at reducing infant
mortality, improving basic education for girls, slowing the AIDS pandemic and promot
ing economic growth.

oH.R. 1561 eliminates three foreign affairs agencies by combining the Agency

for
International Development, the United States
Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the State Depart
ment, creating a megabaureaucracy that would be unwieldy,
costly and ineffective. The Administration is already proceeding
3

vigorously with it efforts to streamline the foreign affairs agencies--including a 4700 staff reduction and cutting bureaucratic layers--not
creating them.

The editorials and OP-ED pieces have been pretty good on this point. The Administra
tion is willing to work in a bipartisan spirit on this problem with
the Congress--but we are not willing to have them dictate the shape and structure of
the Executive Branch.

oThe bill does, however, support important security assistance programs, such as Int
ernational Military Education and Training (IMET) and Foreign Military Financing (FMF), though not at full Administration request levels.

# # #