

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: Funeral (3 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)
002. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: Funeral (4 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)
003. email	Mary Peters to John Feeley, re: Mitterand Funeral (4 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)
004. email	Mary Peters to Alexander Vershbow, re: Briefer for VP's Chirac Meeting (7 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)
005. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: [Meeting with President Chirac] (4 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)
006. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: [Points to be made for meeting with French President Chirac] (4 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)
007. email	Nancy Maxfield to Susan Rice, re: [papers for Chirac briefing book] (4 pages)	01/25/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/10/1996 - 01/26/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2061

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: Funeral (3 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/10/1996 - 01/26/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2061

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: Funeral (4 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/10/1996 - 01/26/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2061

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Mary Peters to John Feeley, re: Mitterand Funeral (4 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/10/1996 - 01/26/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2061

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. email	Mary Peters to Alexander Vershbow, re: Briefer for VP's Chirac Meeting (7 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/10/1996 - 01/26/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2061

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
005. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: [Meeting with President Chirac] (4 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/10/1996 - 01/26/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2061

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
006. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: [Points to be made for meeting with French President Chirac] (4 pages)	01/10/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/10/1996 - 01/26/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2061

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]

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 19 January 96 19:49
FROM Danvers, William C.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Baker, Jane E.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bass, Peter E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Dohse, Fred J.
Gray, Wendy
Hall, Wilma G.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.
Sens, Andrew D.
Veit, Katherine M.
Wiley, Mary C.

CARBON_COPY Andricos, George M.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Burrell, Christina L.
Danvers, William C.
Davis, William K.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Wise, William M.

TEXT_BODY

Note for Tony, Sandy and Nancy:

BOSNIA: Briefings next week with House on Wed. Senate has still not taken us up on a briefing. Dole's office wants three briefings next week for staff: equip and train, overall update-- military and political; and Kosovo.

You received two E-Mails earlier today on Bosnia funding and how we think that will proceed-- i.e. how the DoD transfer will take place.

DOD AUTH CONFERENCE BILL: The Conferees finished the Conference today.

They fixed the 3 major items that we objected to - ABM/TMD, Contingency Ops and UN C2. The Conferees' tentative schedule is to file their report on Monday, House Rules Cmte meet and go to floor on Tuesday, House floor action on Wednesday and Senate could go Thursday. Submarines were addressed

but not changed. HIV remains as before. DOD says that Perry will recommend that this Bill be signed. Sen Nunn has said he will support this Bill.

START II: John Roots , Sen Stevens' Arms control staffer, has said that Stevens will bring this issue up at the Repub Caucus next Tuesday when the schedule is discussed with Dole. Dole's staff is saying it is possible that START II could come to the floor next week, if there are sufficient Members present for a Roll Call vote. Stevens would like to get START II done next week. John will also call Smith and Inhofe staff to ensure that neither Senator will hold up the treaty if it gets to the floor next week.

ENCRYPTION BRIEF: HCONS briefed by NSA today on NSA encryption study.

Reaction is that we are doing a good job and the Hill needs to better educated in our rationale for our encryption policy. Briefs to HIRC and House Intel next week.

CIA BRIEF: Sen Levin will receive a brief on Jan 25 focusing on Bosnia war crimes

FOREIGN OPS: House and Senate staff are working on a plan to attach the Foreign Ops Conference Report to the next Continuing Resolution. Senate Dem. staff have proposed compromise language on the family planning/abortion issue that should be acceptable to us. House Foreign Ops staff have also tentatively accepted the compromise, but they need to run it by House leadership. Since the compromise would allow international family planning organizations to perform abortions, garnering the support of the House leadership is questionable at best, but this is the best shot at getting a bill we have seen in a long time. We should know the outcome by mid next week.

JORDAN: We will work with State and DoD regarding a briefing schedule. Christopher and Perry will be contacting members early next week.

B2: I understand that the Chief of Staff will have the B2 meeting next week instead of the President.

UN REFORM: Had our initial Senate staff meeting. They are more hostile to the idea of a grand bargain. They don't like the UN and are skeptical about the commitment by USUN to reform. We have a lot of work to do in the Senate. Senate staff will regroup to consider how they want to proceed.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

007. email	Nancy Maxfield to Susan Rice, re: [papers for Chirac briefing book] (4 pages)	01/25/1996	P1/b(1)
------------	--	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/10/1996 - 01/26/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2061

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 25 January 96 19:57

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT January 25 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bassett, Leslie A.
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Birkland, Andrea L.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boynton, Peter J.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Kevin J. Cadieux
Canty, Mary T.
Carter, Michael E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya

Clarke, Richard A.
Claussen, Eileen B.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davis, William K.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Dymersky, Debra L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Eisenhower, James J.
Fairfax, Kenneth J.
Feeley, John F.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Florio, Elaine
Frias, Angela M.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
Gates, Brian K.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grimes, Richard J.
Grummon, Stephen R.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.
Hawes, David J.

Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephan D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Huggins, Peter
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Jensen, Noelle B.
Johnson, David T.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Leary, William H.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Martinez, Alejandro
Mauzy, Stefan T.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Munson, Robert A.
Naplan, Steven J.
Neil, M. Elise
Noetzel, Jon C.
Norman, Marcia G.
Norris, John J.
Nuccio, Richard A.

O'loughlin, Kathrine
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Petchel, Beverly L.
Peters, Mary A.
Pifer, Steven K.
Kenneth M. Pollack
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Reade, Evan G.
Realuyo, Celina
Reed, George
Reznik, Victoria (NMI)
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schuker, Jill A.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.
Marcel T. Thomas

Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Willis, Robin M.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, 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 [[MIKE0125.DOC : 4870 in MIKE0125.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 25 January 96 19:49

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** MIKE0125.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release January 25, 1996

Fo

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:35 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. You're looking very sharp today.

Q Have you got a deal?

MR. MCCURRY: Do you want some news?

Q Yes.

MR. MCCURRY: We need to get the news out because some of the news out is wrong.

Q We're supposed to ask you questions.

Q Which door -- behind which door?

MR. MCCURRY: Congressman Solomon is, unfortunately, not correct. He is either not in agreement between the White House and congressional leaders on a continuing resolution -- let me review --

Q To be fair, I understand he may have been misquoted by some wire stories.

MR. MCCURRY: He may have been misquoted by some of the wires.

Q Ohhhh.

MR. MCCURRY: Oh. I hate that when it happens. (Laughter.) All right, let me tell you where we are today, because I need to -- the order of business today has changed a little bit from when I met with some of you earlier today. White House staff has had good and productive discussions by phone today with congressional leadership staff and others. Based on that, they decided to set aside for today the issue of the debt ceiling and how they might

structure it and extension of the debt ceiling measure. I'll come back to that in a minute. But given the expiration of the current

continuing resolution tomorrow, everyone seemed to believe it was advisable for them to work hard on the continuing resolution today.

The White House received it about 11:30 a.m. from House staff, 52-page draft, a continuing resolution measure. The Office of Management and Budget is now analyzing that measure. I cannot say with any confidence at this point that that is a measure acceptable to the White House.

The President continues to believe that a clean extension of the continuing resolution is the very best way to temporarily fund the activities of the government that do not have an appropriations measure passed. We'll continue to work hard to reach an accommodation with congressional staff, but I don't rule out the prospects of attachments to that current continuing resolution that the President finds unacceptable. As we've made repeatedly clear to the congressional leadership, we want them to pass a measure that keeps the orderly functions of the federal government moving forward, and we don't want to see a lot of measures put on there that they know the President will have to veto. That's not a good way to do business. By now you'd think they'd have learned that lesson.

Q Is there something specific on there that you --

Q -- what you object to?

MR. MCCURRY: There are a number of measures; the OMB is looking at it now. And we are going to look at each of them carefully, but we have made it very clear that we don't want a tree built to which ornaments are attached willy-nilly by the Congress.

Q Why does it take 52 pages?

MR. MCCURRY: Now, let me back for a second to a couple of other things today. Mr. Panetta has gone to the Hill today and had a very productive meeting with about nine or 10 senators, both Republican and Democrat, to talk about the overall budget situation. And his message to them was very clear. He encouraged the Republican leadership not to wave the white flag and not to give up on the search for a historic balanced budget agreement that in seven years time can give this nation a balanced budget.

And again, the White House suggest to Republican leaders that there are elements in common in both plans that are currently before the Congress and the President that could result in the savings necessary to balance the budget. And the President is certainly willing, as he said yesterday, to consider the idea of taking whatever package of savings we can get in the interim. But the best of all worlds would be to enact those savings that are

common in both plans so that we can make sure that we are moving on a defined track towards a balanced budget.

So the President still holds out the possibility that

the Republican leadership will want to achieve that kind of measure. And as to a debt ceiling, the President believes that the best thing to do is what we suggested in the State of the Union address; that they ought to pass a simple, straightforward, clean extension of the debt ceiling for a year's time so that we don't run any risk of having the world doubt the full faith and credit of the United States government. We don't need to hear from Moody's again, and the President doesn't want to. He wants to see a very straightforward measure; he believes that can be enacted. And we hope that those discussions will lead to a measure that is acceptable.

Now, what is acceptable, what would the President be willing to consider attached to either one of these measures, the continuing resolution or the debt ceiling extension? That's something that we hope will be worked out in discussions between staffs here at the White House and on the Hill. But they, by now, know fully well what the President finds unacceptable and knows that it's best not to attach unacceptable measures to very necessary provisions that must be passed if the nation is to conduct its business in an orderly way.

Q You've said several times from that podium that during the budget negotiations nothing was agreed to until everything is agreed to. Are you saying now there are elements you would take and let the rest wait?

MR. MCCURRY: No, we are saying we are very sensitive to the Republicans, we're sensitive to their sensitivity. They are sensitive about us saying that there is an agreement there.

Q Awww.

Q Kumbaya, my Lord, Kumbaya. (Laughter.)

Q A '90s kind of --

MR. MCCURRY: We're all going to get together and hold hands in a circle and agree on a balanced budget plan. What the President suggested, and he stated this very directly both Tuesday night in the State of the Union and yesterday in Louisville -- he said there are elements in both plans that both plans have in common where you can see easily the pathway towards a balanced budget in seven years as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

There are savings estimated at close to \$700 billion, in excess of \$700 billion, over a seven-year period in which you could make sure that we are on a track towards a balanced budget with the deficit reductions that the President and the Congress believes are necessary. The President wants to see that work done and has not given up hope that we will be able to achieve that type of an agreement.

Now, at the same time, everybody knows we need to move

forward with business, we need to make sure that we get this work done. And the best way to do it, as the President suggested, is just go ahead, let's adopt these savings that are on the table, and get a balanced budget for the American people, and, simultaneously, let's extend the debt limit so we don't run any risk of questions about the creditworthiness of the United States government.

Q Mike, are these actual negotiations between staffs, or are Republicans just crafting packages, sending them to see if you'll accept them?

MR. MCCURRY: These are not negotiations in the formal sense of people sitting across the table and swapping numbers back and forth. But there have been good, productive conversations, mostly involving our Congressional Affairs staff. I believe Pat Griffin, our chief lobbyist, is up on the Hill now. And we will continue to work with their staffs in trying to make clear what the President finds acceptable and also hope that they made clear to us in what they are attempting to do in these various measures.

Part of the problem is, this is a moving target. A good question earlier, why does it take 52 pages to write a simple measure that extends in a temporary way funding for the federal government? It doesn't, unless it's loaded up with a lot of things that we suspect might not be acceptable to the President, which is why we are right now looking very carefully at that proposal. And we hope, certainly, that either later today or tomorrow we'll be able to come to an agreement with the Congress on a measure that would extend funding so we don't face any prospect of a government shutdown Saturday.

Q Is the length subject to negotiation? Are you willing to accept one that would only go for another month?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we would prefer to have some measure that extends as long as possible, necessary funding for government programs that are important to the American people. But the key thing is that the President does not want to see this government shut down again. He made it clear Tuesday night, never, ever again

should we put the American people in that position. And we don't believe, given what the congressional majority must by now understand is the risk of doing that and the anger that is aroused by the American people when they employ that tactic, we don't believe that they are really going to do that again. So we hope that sometime today or tomorrow we come to an agreement on a continuing resolution that gets the job done.

Q Do you have a sense of what issues the President objects to, what riders?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't want to do that now because I don't want to necessarily rule out things that we haven't found in the text yet that it might be concerning. And I don't want people on the Hill to mistakenly believe that we've agreed to some things

and not other things. So we are going to be doing a very thoughtful analysis. We will certainly let the Republican leadership on the Hill know our views on the bill and see if we can attempt to arrange a satisfactory measure that can quickly achieve passage.

Now, another point I'll make -- this is originating on the House. The Senate is in a situation right now, my understanding, where they have to operate under unanimous consent, so it's quite clear that they need to make sure that there is widespread agreement on any kind of measure crafted if we're going to get this measure passed by the necessary time.

Q Are two of the issues embryo research and population control?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, those are the kinds of things that you might imagine would cause concern here that we would want to look at very carefully. And I'm not even clear myself at this point whether there have been discussions throughout the day of whether or not that type of language would be in this bill. It may very well be, and that's what they're looking for now.

Q And, finally, the President in the State of the Union, as you said, the federal government should never be shut down again. But if he vetoes the bill, doesn't he, in effect, shut down the federal government?

MR. MCCURRY: I think the American people understand what's going on here. This has happened twice now. They understand what is going on here instead of just doing the business of funding the federal government and getting on with work, that somehow or other, through the back door, Republicans are trying to do things that the President finds unacceptable.

The President's made very clear what his priorities are, what we need to do, and the Congress knows they should not play games with the funding of the federal government. They can tell in the reaction they've seen to some of their tactics and to some of their, shall we say, lack of response during the State of the Union address the other evening that the American people don't like it when they spurn an outreached hand that says we can work on these things together and resolve these matters in a bipartisan way. So we hope they're not going to employ these tactics and we hope they won't try to do something they know the President won't find acceptable.

Q If that is really the lesson they've drawn, then why do they at this late date continue to put things like this on these simple measures?

MR. MCCURRY: That elephant can be thick-headed sometimes. It takes a little while to get the message through.

Q Oooh.

Q The President appears to be demanding a clean CR;

why would he accept one that zeros out a dozen programs or so that he doesn't --

MR. MCCURRY: Look, the whole circumstance of operating in the environment of a continuing resolution is not a happy one to begin with. When the President had a Democratic Congress we used to get our business done on time and had full appropriations bills and did things the way it's supposed to be done. But it doesn't work that way under a Republican Congress. And so, we hope they will think about this and make sure that they get things done in a timely manner and do that later today.

Q I guess the point I'm trying to make is there are two sides of priorities to take into account. Is that not the case?

MR. MCCURRY: Not when it -- we believe that is true in the larger sense of their fundamental issues in the budget debate. We all understand those. The President addressed those on Tuesday night. But the continuing resolution to fund the government is not the place to resolve those two different points of view. The continuing resolution is simply so we don't go through the horror of another government shutdown.

And that's what the President is urging congressional leaders to develop for him an acceptable continuing resolution, get

that piece of business done and get it done before tomorrow. And then move on to the issue of the debt ceiling and hopefully do that just as quickly if we can -- one that extends for at least a year the debt ceiling so that we will not have anyone anywhere in the world doubting the full faith and credit of the United States government.

Q Some Republicans say they would like to see a version of the capital gains tax cut included in this package. What would be the President's view of that?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he would take a dim view of that. Trying to resolve issues that have been very divisive in the context of his budget negotiations with the Congress is just automatically going to make it far harder to do the necessary work of getting a debt ceiling extension. It makes it much harder for the President to accept it, it makes it far harder for Democrats and others in the Senate and in the House to accept it, but especially in the Senate where there needs to be an agreement across the board for the important business to proceed.

So we just -- the message is simple from our part: Don't wave the white flag on budget savings. The President is going to work with the Congress to get a balanced budget in seven years scored by the CBO. Don't give up on \$700 billion plus of savings for the American taxpayer, and at the same time, don't use these tactics that threaten the President with the unacceptable. They don't work. The American people don't like those tactics.

And it's time to get off that route and get on to the business of doing the nation's business in a very orderly way.

Q Mike, was this presented to the White House as sort of a take-it-or-leave-it thing from the House Republican point of view?

MR. MCCURRY: No --

Q -- or do you get a sense that they are more trying to see what they can get away with at this point?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. But it's a little curious when someone rushes out breathlessly to announce there's an agreement when everyone knows there isn't.

Q Mike, should the Republicans take from your urging that they not wave the white flag that there's a willingness on the part of the administration to compromise further and accommodate some more of what the Republicans want in a balanced budget plan?

MR. MCCURRY: They don't need to take anything. They have the direct word of the President in the negotiations they've had that we remain committed to a good-faith dialogue on how to reach such an agreement. They know what the parameters of these discussions are. They know where the President and the Vice President and the Democratic leaders have shown some flexibility, and they know that there still is a deal there that could be made in the interests of the American people.

Q Isn't it true that that apparently hasn't gotten through to the Speaker when he would say that he doesn't think that an agreement is possible with this President?

MR. MCCURRY: The President is much more optimistic than the Speaker, and we don't want the Speaker to be so pessimistic.

Q Do you have any idea what percentage of the 52 pages is items that they may have both agreed on?

MR. MCCURRY: It was hard for me to tell -- I only thumbed through it very quickly and, in any event, I'm not the expert authority on that. And that's why we have our budget experts looking at the package now.

Q The idea of putting extra items on to a continuing resolution or a debt ceiling bill is hardly one that originated in this particular Congress. Why is this, what the Republicans are doing here, any more terrible than anything the Democrats might have done with Republican Presidents?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we're not suggesting -- I mean, obviously, it has happened before and Christmas trees have been adorned appropriately for many years running, but never under

circumstances like this. These are extraordinary circumstances. The approach of a debt ceiling that is already beginning to cause concern in the markets, to the extraordinary circumstances that we're in with the federal government in which we've had two shutdowns -- this is just not the time to start putting ornaments on a tree, because that becomes intoxicating and it becomes hard to stop once that happens. And then that's bound to wind up -- we're bound to wind up in a situation where someone who needs to agree, either the President or those in the Senate who need to consider the measure will find it unacceptable. It's just harder to do the work; we need to get the work done now.

Q Are we going to hear the President say anything about this?

MR. MCCURRY: He will make this point probably about two-thirds -- well, he's still working on his Conference of Mayors speech, but he most likely will have something to say about the budget picture in the Conference of Mayors.

Q How about an advance text to the mayors speech, okay?

Q About which point? About the Republicans?

MR. MCCURRY: You guys -- you know, one advanced text, and you think it's going to become -- (laughter.) That is not setting a precedent. That is not unprecedented, but not setting a precedent.

Q Why these senators particularly that Mr. Panetta went to see?

MR. MCCURRY: It's the Breaux-Chafee group, the one that worked on the bipartisan proposal, became an element in the budget discussions that occurred, and the President and the Chief of Staff thought it was important to keep good lines of communication open with them so they understand where the administration has gone the extra mile in providing ideas to the Republican leadership that could help break the impasse and result in an agreement. We wanted to give them a full briefing on our last proposal, discuss the current environment, and then see what ideas they had about breaking the impasse.

Q On the Christmas tree, does the President have a decision on the Elizabeth Morgan bill, if that's part of the Christmas tree -- the one that the three congressmen are introducing?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not familiar with that provision and I'll have to await some further guidance from OMB on that.

Q One more thing, on Mrs. Clinton's testimony

tomorrow. What are the White House's expectations of her appearance tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, that she will go there and satisfy 23 real Americans that she's telling the truth.

Q Are you going to --

Q Excuse me, what does that mean -- "real Americans"?

MR. MCCURRY: Members of the grand jury.

Q As opposed to what?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I mean, they're there. I mean, they're real people.

Q Do you have any plans for either her or someone else to explain afterwards what she was asked about and what she answered?

MR. MCCURRY: I can't speak for her, but I don't believe it's customary, nor do I believe it is legal to provide a briefing on grand jury --

Q Witnesses can do it, just not prosecutors.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, she -- I'll leave it to the First Lady to decide if she has anything to say. As you know, she's most likely saying things today. She's out on the road campaigning for her husband.

Q Do you know if the President has any kind of participation in the discussions between and among the First Lady and her counsel as they prepare for tomorrow, if he sat in on any of them with her, discussed them with her?

MR. MCCURRY: Not to my knowledge. I can check that, but not to my knowledge. You might want to ask Mark Fabiani that question.

Q Any reaction to reports that Susan MacDougal's lawyer might want to subpoena the President to appear in a criminal proceeding?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't have a reaction to that, but again, I think our legal counsel who's helping on that matter might be able to let you know if there's any reaction?

Q Has anyone asked President Clinton for information, whether he knew how the documents got to the book room?

MR. MCCURRY: Not to my knowledge.

Q Has there been any assessment that you've heard

from either the President or the First Lady regarding her appearance tomorrow, personal assessment?

MR. MCCURRY: Only that I know that the First Lady is looking forward to again having an opportunity to cooperate with

the legitimate inquiry under way, and she again will answer questions completely and truthfully. She feels that that's a necessary part of bringing this process to an end, even though it's about as welcome as a trip to dentist's office, as she said recently.

Q Mike, now that the President has got the State of the Union out of the way, and maybe he's had some more time to think about it, what's his mind-set as she heads to the grand jury tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, very supportive of his wife, and very confident in her and in the testimony she will give.

Q Mike, Senator Dole has indicated that the Senate's not going to do any debt bill probably till the 26th of February, and the House looks like they want to go out and put the debt part aside. What makes you think that it can be dealt with --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President suggested to the Speaker that that is not a good idea, because social security checks need to be cut on the 26th in order to be made in time for the March 1 benefit checks that many elderly people are expecting to receive. So that's cutting it awfully close. And the President suggested to the Speaker they might want to try to resolve that issue sooner. And the best way to do that is just to pass a straightforward extension for at least a year and get on with it. And we hope that that's the course that the Congress will choose.

Q But hasn't the Speaker indicated to the President that he doesn't believe he can get through the House a clean --

MR. MCCURRY: Well you should more properly ask the Speaker that question, but I don't believe that's an accurate read of his sentiment.

Q Some of the wires are reporting the President is going to sign the Defense authorization bill if it passes through the Senate.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President has received a recommendation from the Secretary of Defense. They were pleased -- there were three issues that we have concern in the original bill that led to the President's earlier veto, and they have now been corrected by the conferees. But were disappointed that a number of other issues that we raised, particularly designated areas for ship-building, denying use of DOD to perform abortions. There are some "buy American" restrictions that we find of concern. There's a lot of micromanaging of the Defense Department itself that we think is

unwarranted, given the very impressive record of management that this administration has of the Defense Department -- and most importantly, the restrictions on our ability to achieve ratification of the START II Treaty which is, as the President said Tuesday night, a very high administration priority. Those are all a source of great concern to us, and I think of particular concern is a provision that requires the discharge of military personnel diagnosed as HIV positive.

Those are all concerns. But on the other hand, and on balance, this bill does a lot of very important things, including the full increases in military pay that the President called for that he was able to some of with his executive order. We get the full increase that's been recommended and approved by the President in this bill. Secretary Perry's family and troop housing improvement initiative is included now in this bill. They've got some reforms and acquisition that are very important to the administration because they'll help hold down the costs of defense expenditures for the U.S. taxpayer. That's certainly welcome. For all those reasons, as Secretary Perry looked at the bill, he recommended that the President sign it, and I believe the President will accept that recommendation.

Q And aren't Democratic leaders telling him not to?

MR. MCCURRY: Democratic leaders are very concerned about a provision I just restated, and that's ratification of the START II Treaty. They are quite properly, in the view of the White House, looking for a way to achieve early ratification of the START II Treaty, and they see this as perhaps one vehicle that might accomplish that purpose, and we understand that that's an internal matter for the Senate. It has to do with how they're trying to move their business forward, but as the President suggested Tuesday night, ratification of START II is a key foreign policy objective for the administration. We could easily understand why Senate Democrats are pressing the case for that.

Q Mike, forgive me, but it seems that the President's central objection last time was about the missile defense requirement. Is that still in the bill?

MR. MCCURRY: No. My understanding is, they have resolved the language on theater ballistic missile defenses and a 50-state protection, and that's been resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

Q Mike, there's a story in The Washington Post filed from Colombia saying that the U.S. government will refuse visas to six high military officers because of connections with narco-trafficking.

MR. MCCURRY: Those were cancellations were made, in my understanding, in accordance with the U.S. law. U.S. immigration law has very strict requirements with respect to individuals that

we suspect of certain types of activity, including narcotics trafficking, the specific cases I'd have to refer you to the State Department because, of course, they're the ones that issue visas, but I think you can check with them and find out the specific concerns we had about some of the named individuals. But we were just following the law as we properly should.

Q Any comments on reports of Mrs. Dole's financial dealings?

MR. MCCURRY: No.

Q Did the President finally speak to Senator Dole when he was trying --

MR. MCCURRY: I forgot to check with the President whether he had. Not to my knowledge. In all my conversations with Mr. Panetta and others, I haven't heard anyone suggest that he did, and I think I would have been told about such a call, but I have not checked with the President to see if he did. He may have been able to reach him late at night. In any event, I would stress that the White House has had very good, cooperative discussions back and forth with the Majority Leader's office.

Q Is anybody going to -- is a lawyer going to accompany Mrs. Clinton on the visit to the Grand Jury tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know the answer. Mr. Fabiani can tell you what Grand Jury proceedings are. She probably appears without counsel present, although she would have the right to consult counsel. So I imagine counsel will be in the vicinity.

Q Mike, has the White House been advised either directly or indirectly that the Chinese may launch limited strikes on Taiwan?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we -- no. We monitor, as you well know, very carefully activities involving exercises involving activities in the Strait. But we see nothing that would indicate a build-up of offensive military capacity directed against Taiwan by the People's Republic.

Q What about the build-up on the north South Korean border? Are you troubled by that at all?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not sure that I'm aware of any build-up. We monitor a lot of activity there from time to time that reflects the types of training exercises that the North does at this time of year. This is a winter period in which their military is normally quite active in training, but I'm not aware of any particular build-up that has caused concern to our military planners.

Q What kind of communications has the United States had with the Chinese government about these threats?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe we've had consultations through Embassy Beijing.

Q And? Good consultations?

MR. MCCURRY: We've expressed our repeated concern that anything that escalates tensions in the Straits is unnecessary and not in furtherance of productive relations in the region.

Q -- ask about the President --

MR. MCCURRY: I am reasonably confident -- Nick Burns had a long session on this yesterday and was going to do more at the State Department today.

Q Were there not talks yesterday in Hawaii -- U.S., South Korea, Japan --

MR. MCCURRY: Ambassador Lord was in Honolulu for consultations with the Japanese and Republic of Korea officials about the questions of humanitarian assistance given what we think are substantial food shortages in the DPRK in North Korea. And I don't have a readout on Ambassador Lord's conversations yet, but we are in consultations with our allies to develop any appropriate humanitarian response.

Q But no change in our plans to contribute through the U.N. agency rather than to --

MR. MCCURRY: We were looking at the possibility of participating through the World Food Bank in any humanitarian relief but we would do so only in consultation with the Republic of Korea and Japan. Both governments, we have very excellent procedures currently for consulting on a matter of this nature.

Q Is the President thinking of going to Seoul on this April trip, or is he going to Japan --

MR. MCCURRY: There have been suggestions in news reports about that from the region. I haven't seen anything here that confirms that that's on his itinerary. Was that artfully said enough --

Q Speaking of travel, is there anything coming up for the near future -- next week?

MR. MCCURRY: I think we're still on track. We're planning the political trips in February that involve Iowa and New Hampshire. And I'm not aware of any other stops. Do you guys know of any?

Q No State of the Union pushing stuff?

MR. MCCURRY: No. We'll be doing, as, obviously, with the U.S. Conference of Mayors speech today and in a variety of events next week, we'll see the President pull out specific elements of his State of the Union address and put a little more focus on some of the things we're doing. He's got -- he had a lot of ideas. I think the American people right now are saying, hey, your great speech. Now, what are you going to do? Are you going to follow up on this?

And the President wants to assure them that he will, and he's going to have some ways of talking specifically about some of the initiatives that we're pursuing. Today, for example, he'll say, look, in New York City areas, where we've got areas that have been abandoned because they pose a potential environmental threat to a neighborhood, we've got ways that we can build on that type of -- we've got ways that we can use investments and use federal regulations and relief from regulations in order to encourage investment in economic activity in those areas. So he'll kind of pull that out and look at it more carefully.

Q Is there going to be a fact sheet on that?

MR. MCCURRY: Did we get something together on that? There will be, yes.

Q Mike, that's something that Congress has to approve, right?

MR. MCCURRY: Some of these are --

Q The tax credit for --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm reading what Mary Ellen just handed

me. I don't know. Why don't you -- you got the answer?

MS. GLYNN: He's talking about the Brownfield initiative, which is an offer to new purchasers of other businesses to redevelop Brownfields, which are basically abandoned industrial sites in urban areas, with a targeted tax incentive to recover the cost of cleanup. And the NEC is currently working with DOT on a final proposal with the President, and we should have that shortly.

MR. MCCURRY: -- happening in the Congress?

MS. GLYNN: Not to my knowledge.

Q Mary Ellen, as of last night, my understanding was that the mechanics of the tax incentive haven't been decided on, but how would the President introduce it? You're assuming there will be a separate tax bill later this year?

MS. GLYNN: Well, that's what they're trying to decide right now.

Q Well, that's the only way you could do it, right?

MS. GLYNN: Presumably.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, maybe not.

MS. GLYNN: Why don't you -- we'll update you when there is a final proposal on the President's desk.

Q Do you have a cost estimate for this?

MS. GLYNN: No, not yet.

MR. MCCURRY: What we're doing is working to develop whatever combination of regulatory relief and then legislation, and we'll check in more after the event in a half an hour and tell you more.

Q In general, I mean, there's some of the things that you propose that he can do on his own, but a lot of them do need congressional approval and, I mean, given that you yourself have said he has next to no chance of getting anything passed, I mean, what is he going to do?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. There was -- our judgment -- people were fairly enthusiastic about some of the ideas the President presented on Tuesday night, and there might be a willingness to move on some of these. It goes without saying that

we can't do anything that would run into significant opposition among the Republican majority in the Congress. But I suspect there are going to be some ways that we can take the things the President advanced the other night and turn those into, if not legislative proposals, in some cases administrative action. And again, remind you that some of these things the President is simply doing because it is right and because his own personal advocacy using the bully pulpit will help achieve the desired result.

A great example is his call on Tuesday night to allow public schools, as a way of minimizing violence, to require children to wear uniforms to school. It wouldn't have been popular in my day in school, but --

Q Why would it be any more popular in this day?

MR. MCCURRY: Because it's a result of --

Q Why should it be any less fascist?

MR. MCCURRY: It's probably not going to be popular with kids, but it's had the result of reducing violence. I'll cite as an example the Long Beach Unified School District in California, where they've seen a marked decrease in on-campus violence because kids aren't fighting each other for jackets or designer shoes or clothes, so it's got a very positive effect.

Q Do you see a school uniform event being scheduled for the President?

Q Does Chelsea wear a uniform at school?

Q Where will these uniforms be manufactured?

Q China?

Q Arkansas maybe?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sure you can find good, US made,

amalgamated clothing and textile workers union made uniforms that you can go to school in.

Q Did you read Safire today?

MR. MCCURRY: I did indeed. He had some choice words, didn't he, as he usually does. Choice words chosen carefully.

Q This focus next week on all the things in the State of the Union; will it be in town?

MR. MCCURRY: Most of what I've seen on the schedule for next week is here in town, or mostly in Washington. I haven't seen anything, in fact, outside of Washington.

Q Are you going for the jocular? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Not today. Kinder and gentler.

Q Does he plan to do something tomorrow on the budget?

MR. MCCURRY: We have, as we have this entire week, held blocks of time available if we need the President's time to meet with people here or to have additional conversations related to the budget. But I don't believe he's planning that, and we've got that time available tomorrow. But I don't think we have an event related directly to the budget tomorrow.

Q Is it safe to assume the radio address will be on the closing down of the government, or lack?

MR. MCCURRY: It's safe to say that will be the subject if we're in the unhappy position Saturday of going through another government shutdown.

Q You make like he's not involved in all of this stuff going on right now.

MR. MCCURRY: Au contraire.

Q But he has to give the go-ahead, doesn't he?

MR. MCCURRY: He's been working very carefully with Mr. Panetta to fashion the right response to some of these measures. He will be fully briefed on the OMB analysis of the draft continuing resolution. My guess is he'll have to make some decisions on specific elements and whether or not they will be acceptable to him. So he's fully engaged in these conversations, because it couldn't have been clearer from his State of the Union Address he puts a very high priority in keeping the government open, continuing to provide the services that need to be provided to the American people, and he's very concerned about the approach of the debt ceiling and wants to make sure we get the necessary

extension, and he's working on that as he did yesterday when he talked to the Speaker.

Q Would a fetal research ban be a deal-breaker?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have to look at that very, very carefully. That would be a very great concern to the President, and we've indicated to staff that that's not the type of measure that advances prospects that we can accept the draft continuing resolution.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:10
P.M. EST

#172-1/25

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 26 January 96 12:02

FROM Harris, Elisa D.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT RE: DAILY GUIDANCE UPDATE [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bassett, Leslie A.
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Birkland, Andrea L.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boynton, Peter J.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Kevin J. Cadieux
Canty, Mary T.
Carter, Michael E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.

Claussen, Eileen B.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davis, William K.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Dymersky, Debra L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Eisenhower, James J.
Fairfax, Kenneth J.
Feeley, John F.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Florio, Elaine
Frias, Angela M.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
Gates, Brian K.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grimes, Richard J.
Grummon, Stephen R.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.
Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Heslin, Sheila N.

Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hofmann, Stephan D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Huggins, Peter
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Johnson, David T.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Leary, William H.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Martinez, Alejandro
Mauzy, Stefan T.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Munson, Robert A.
Naplan, Steven J.
Neil, M. Elise
Noetzel, Jon C.
Norman, Marcia G.
Nuccio, Richard A.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Pease, Bruce E.

Peggins, John W.
Petchel, Beverly L.
Peters, Mary A.
Pifer, Steven K.
Kenneth M. Pollack
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Reade, Evan G.
Realuyo, Celina
Reznik, Victoria (NMI)
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schuker, Jill A.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.

Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Willis, Robin M.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Yorkdale, Glenn H.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

a few changes:

[[JAN25GUI.DOC : 3146 in JAN25GUI.DOC]]

From: Wozniak, Natalie S.
To: @NSC - NSC Staff
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: DAILY GUIDANCE UPDATE [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, January 25, 1996 06:42 PM

<<Attached File: JAN25GUI.DOC>>

Please review and forward your updates IN BOLD to @PRESS by 10:00 a.m.
Friday, January 26. Thanks.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

26 January 96 12:1

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

JAN25GUI.DOC
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

January 25, 1996

EUROPE

Bosnia/Croatia

Russia

Poland

Northern Ireland

LATIN AMERICA

Cuba

Colombia

AFRICA

Burundi

MIDDLE EAST

Syria-Israel

Bahrain

ASIA

Taiwan

North Korea

MISCELLANEOUS

Revised Defense Authorization Bill

Smallpox Destruction

BOSNIA/CROATIA

HEIGHTENED ALERT FOR TERRORIST ATTACK

ù The U.S. troops in Bosnia are always on alert and it is standard operating procedure to increase alertness when there are reports of a security threat. This is only prudent and is not unique.

ù The present increased alertness is a reflection of common sense situational awareness.

ù Regarding Holt, commanders sent a notice to troops urging caution and

alertness, but specifically stated that IFOR had no authority to arrest Holt.

Holt would be "detained" if he "penetrated IFOR defense perimeters," then "turned over to appropriate authorities."

FUNDING FOR BOSNIA

Monday, the Administration sent to Congress a \$991 million reprogramming request to fund a major portion of Bosnia operations. It will also send an additional supplemental/recission request to the Congress in the next few days, as well as an additional reprogramming request at a later date, to fund the remainder of these operations through September 30, 1996.

We do not plan for any of the funds for U.S. Bosnia peace implementation operations (IFOR) to come from recission of the unrequested funds for weapons programs added to the Defense Appropriations Bill by the Congress.

Q: Where will funds come from? How much?

A: Monday's reprogramming action is financed by inflation savings resulting from revised economic assumptions. The supplemental/recission action will be financed from classified intelligence programs, while the source of the second reprogramming request is not yet identified. The total amount required for U.S. Bosnia military operations in FY 1996 is just under \$2 billion.

BOSNIA WAR CRIMES AND IFOR MISSION

We are pleased that the IFOR Commander, Admiral Smith, and the head of the War Crimes Tribunal, Justice Goldstone, have agreed on coordination of their respective missions under the Dayton peace agreement.

ù Goldstone stated that he is satisfied with the level of support that IFOR will provide to the Tribunal's efforts, and Smith said he was satisfied that IFOR will be able to provide appropriate assistance to ensure area security for Tribunal teams carrying out investigations and activities at mass grave sites.

ù The U.S. has consistently supported the efforts by the International War Crimes Tribunal and the ICRC to investigate war crimes, including through the sharing of intelligence. We will continue these efforts.

ù IFOR's principal task is to enforce the separation of forces called for in the Dayton Accords and implement other military aspects of the agreement. IFOR is required to provide freedom of movement for its own units.

ù IFOR Commanders also have the authority for supporting tasks, including provision of assistance to the War Crimes Tribunal and other international organizations in their humanitarian missions.

ù Monday's statement by Smith and Goldstone confirms our understanding that the IFOR commanders will assist the Tribunal's investigations to the maximum degree possible.

ù In their meeting, Admiral Smith made clear to Justice Goldstone that IFOR has already taken steps to assure security in areas of war crimes sites and to monitor the sites.

COMPLIANCE

ù Implementation reached an important milestone on January 19. Overall, things have been going well and, with minor exceptions, all parties are cooperating with IFOR.

ù NATO Secretary General Solana announced Friday that the withdrawal to Zones of Separation

ation has been
completed on time. IFOR military commanders also report that the parties have,
as a
greed, voluntarily

withdrawn to the Zones of Separation.

ù The Parties are cooperating in marking and removing mines and obstacles.
Weather
has hampered their
completion of this important task.

ù While we were pleased that the parties began releasing and transferring
prisoners
on Friday, we are concerned
at the lack of follow-up to release all remaining prisoners. This is a serious brea
ch of an important Dayton
provision, and we have made our concern clear to the Bosnian Government.

ù Our position is that all the prisoners should be released without further delay, a
nd that all Dayton deadlines
should be respected, without exception.

ù We are approaching government and ICRC officials in Sarajevo, Geneva and
Belgrade
to ensure that valid
Bosnian concerns about missing persons are addressed, but do not believe this
shoul
d be linked to the
prisoner exchange requirements of the peace agreement.

ù We expect all foreign forces to depart the country. Foreign forces were required
to leave by January 13.

ù IFOR commanders are still in the process of assessing compliance. Many
Mujahedin
and other foreign forces
have been withdrawn from the country. However, we will await the commanders'
final
report to determine
compliance.

If asked about Equip and Train

ù Our planning and consultations are proceeding.

ù But we have made clear to Bosnians that the actual provision of equipment and
trai
ning will not be able to go

forward if they have not complied with Dayton requirements on foreign forces and with other Dayton obligations.

- ù The United States will take a leadership role in coordinating an international effort to ensure that the Bosnian Federation receives the assistance necessary to achieve an adequate military balance when IFOR leaves.

- ù Training programs and provision of non-lethal assistance can begin now. Provision of small arms can begin three months after the agreement was signed. We will do nothing that will endanger the safety of American troops on the ground in Bosnia.

- ù The program will be totally transparent and we have briefed leaders in Zagreb and Belgrade.

- ù We want to promote unity in the Federation and create an effective Federation civilian structure capable of command management of the Federation military.

- ù U.S. civilian companies, under contract to the Federation, will assist the Federation in developing its equipment and training requirements and plans. Many retired military have been hired by these companies because of their experience and expertise.

- ù The program will be consistent with the Peace Agreement and arms control agreements which result from the Dayton Accords.

Overview of Civilian Implementation

- ù In addition to providing authority for a robust military implementation force, the Dayton peace agreement establishes the foundation for a broad range of civilian implementation tasks that will be critical to rebuilding civil society in Bosnia and making the peace irreversible.

ù While planning for these civilian tasks did not begin as early as planning for IFO R, civilian implementation efforts are now getting underway across a broad front.

ù Our senior coordinator for civilian implementation, Ambassador Robert Gallucci, has just completed a one-week swing through the region to review the situation and meet with Carl Bildt, the "High Representative" established by the peace agreement to coordinate implementation.

ù The President met with Bildt and Gallucci in Zagreb on Saturday to underscore the importance we attach to civilian implementation.

Structure

ù The December 8 London Conference formally appointed Bildt as High Representative and established an international steering board, comprised of the G-7 countries plus Russia, Turkey, and the Chairman of the OIC, to oversee civilian implementation efforts.

ù A number of organizations were given formal responsibility for different aspects of civilian implementation: OSCE, World Bank, EU, UNHCR, UNCIVPOL, etc.

ù Bildt's role is to coordinate all these efforts and to serve as a troubleshooter on the scene when incidents of a non-military nature occur.

ù Bildt established a presence in Sarajevo two weeks ago, supported by senior deputies from the U.S. and Germany.

Economic Reconstruction

ù Economic reconstruction efforts are off to good start. Brussels conference last month, co-chaired by World Bank and EU Commission, produced pledges of over \$500 million in assistance

for first
quarter of 1996.

ù U.S. pledged over \$60 million for this period, subject to Congressional consultation. This follows up on our bilateral \$85 million "quick impact" assistance package announced by the President in Paris.

ù U.S. plans to contribute a total of about \$600 million over next 3 years, as part of international effort whose total cost is estimated by World Bank at about \$6 billion.

ù World Bank is establishing a mission in Bosnia to coordinate efforts of international contributors. AID has established a field mission in Sarajevo headed by a top professional, Craig Buck.

OSCE: Human Rights, Elections, Arms Control

ù OSCE has already set up a mission in Sarajevo under leadership of former U.S. diplomat Robert Frowick. Frowick is assembling team of 400-500 human rights and elections monitors, which will be reinforced by additional personnel and NGOs in run-up to elections

ù Sweden is hosting a conference this week (January 15-16) to prepare for elections at the national and entity level, which Dayton mandates must be held within 6-9 months. Gallucci and Frowick are attending to galvanize international attention and resources.

ù By the end of the month, Frowick aims to establish a Joint Election Commission composed of representatives of all three ethnic groups.

ù Negotiations on arms control and confidence-building measures were launched last month in Bonn and further

rounds were held two weeks ago in Vienna under OSCE auspices. All parties taking a business-like approach. CBMs inside Bosnia need to be finalized this month; regional arms reductions by

6-m
onth mark

International Police Task Force

ù Efforts going well to recruit 1700 personnel for the International Police Task Force, which will be a UN Civil Police operation to monitor and train indigenous police. UN has just appointed an experienced Irish policeman to head the IPTF.

ù We are trying to expedite arrival of IPTF in Sarajevo to help promote smooth transition in Serb neighborhoods even before force is fully deployed country-wide.

Refugees

ù UNHCR is developing strategy for refugee resettlement. Expect major movements to begin in spring, when weather improves, beginning with DPs and refugees within Bosnia.

Conclusion

ù In sum, civilian implementation is gaining momentum. While we expect lion's share of burden to be shouldered by Europeans, U.S. intends to play an active part in ensuring success of civilian efforts.

RUSSIA/NIS

General Items

Personnel Changes Mean End of Reform/Cooperation?

ù Will have to see impact of recent personnel changes, but fully expect Yeltsin to set policy. At this point, in our

best interest to continue to engage Russia to sustain momentum on reform; not time to
 o disengage, which
 would strengthen hand of regressive forces.

ù Have worked hard with Yeltsin to support political, economic reform in Russia. He
 has made clear his support
 for reform and that there is no turning back. Will continue to encourage Russia to
 pursue sound reform
 policies and integration with global market-place.

ù Also worked to advance common interests: nuclear disarmament; detargeting;
 new trade and investment
 opportunities. Strategy of engagement remains in strong interests of both nations.

Chechnya and Hostage-Taking Incidents

ù Hostage-takings by Chechens, Chechen sympathizers do not contribute to
 search for
 peace. Hostage-taking is
 act of terror. Condemn it.

ù Welcome reports that 45 hostages released by Chechen rebels. Call for
 immediate release of all other
 hostages.

ù As for broader Chechnya dispute, only reliable path to peace is negotiated
 settlement
 that takes interests of all
 parties into account. Cycle of violence must be broken.

Yeltsin's Political Future

ù Have seen reports that Yeltsin likely to run, but no official declaration yet. Has
 said will announce decision
 between February 13 and 15. Then it's up to Russian people to decide, exercising
 their
 democratic habits that
 are increasingly taking hold in their country.

Russian Concerns about NATO Enlargement

ù Intend to manage enlargement process in deliberate, transparent manner that
 strengthens
 security, stability of
 Europe as a whole. Russia a key player in building stable, undivided Europe. Our

goal is to develop strong, cooperative NATO-Russia relationship in parallel with NATO's process of taking in new members.

(If asked about Rodman assertion that President agreed to slow enlargement at Hyde Park) Assertion utterly without foundation. As Russians understand, NATO enlargement process continues in same steady, measured and transparent manner as before.
POLAND

Resignation of Polish Prime Minister Oleksy

ù Prime Minister Oleksy's resignation is of course an internal Polish matter.

ù We anticipate that the allegations of spying will be investigated thoroughly, credibly and in a manner consistent with the rule of law and democracy.

ù We hope and believe that Mr. Oleksy's successor will continue to support Poland's democratic and free market transformation underway since 1989.

ù On this basis, the United States will continue to work closely with Poland and to support Poland's integration with the West and Western institutions.

NORTHERN IRELAND

Report of International Body on Decommissioning

Background: International body, chaired by Senator George Mitchell, submitted its report on decommissioning to the British and Irish governments January 22 . Report was made public January 24.
Essence of it is idea that

acceptance of set of principles, all related to renunciation of violence, would allow talks to take place in atmosphere free of intimidation. Report finds that Washington 3 (prior decommissioning), though desirable, is not feasible. It suggests possible compromise of having decommissioning take place during talks rather than before or after them.

ù The British and Irish governments have welcomed the report and expressed their gratitude to Senator Mitchell and his colleagues, General de Chastelain of Canada and Mr. Holkeri of Finland, for their contribution to the peace process.

ù U.S. very pleased that a distinguished American like Senator Mitchell has been able to play such an important role in the Northern Ireland peace process.

ù Important that the report be used to advance the process. Hope that parties will consider its recommendations seriously and with an open mind.

ù Administration intends to remain in touch with the two governments and the parties and do whatever we can to support their efforts.

Does the fact that the report does not mention Washington 3 (prior decommissioning) mean it is dead?

ù That is an issue only the parties can decide. The report offers recommendations and suggestions that could be helpful in moving the process forward to the goal of all-party talks.

Reaction to Major's Statement?

ù Prime Minister Major has said that the British Government is ready to introduce legislation to allow an elective process to go ahead as soon as practicable. His remarks were in the context of the Mitchell report, which said that an elective process that is broadly acceptable, with an appropriate mandate

and
within the three-strand
structure could help build confidence.

ù We continue to believe that all proposals for getting to all-party talks should be seriously discussed and considered. We have urged that the proposal for elections be discussed as part of the twin track.

ù Appreciate British Government's willingness to give weight to the finding of the international body that the paramilitary organizations will not decommission weapons prior to talks, and to open another route to all-party talks.

Does Major's statement mean that talks will not place by the end of February as anticipated when the twin track process was launched?

ù Expect the two governments to continue to international body's report as well as progress on the political track. Will be up to them to determine whether original timetable can be met.

Do recommended principles amount to new pre-conditions?

ù No, the report provides way to move the process forward. Hope all parties will look at it in that light.

Punishment" Murders

Background. Reports of five murders of suspected drug dealers in NI in the past month -- a total of 7 such murders this year. Everyone (Hume, Bruton, Major etc) has condemned the killings, except Adams, who has said he does "not condone" them. The killings have increased pressure for decommissioning.

ù We condemn these killings. There is no justification for murdering people, regardless of what they are suspected of having done.

If asked whether they constitute a breach of the cease-fire (as some unionists, including Paisley, have claimed)

ù In spite of deplorable killings, no reason to believe that the peace process is in jeopardy. Two governments

and the parties of Northern Ireland, including Sinn Fein, remain actively engaged in the twin track process.

CUBA

Q: What about Congressman Bill Richardson's trip to Cuba this past weekend?

A: He was traveling as a Member of Congress, not as a representative of the USG or of the Administration.

We understand that Richardson reached agreement with the Cuban Government on the reduction of migration fees from \$600 to \$300 for 1,000 Cubans. We regard any reduction of fees as a positive step.

Richardson also discussed the issue of political prisoners. We have repeatedly urged the release of political prisoners in Cuba. We welcome the Congressman's efforts to advance that goal.

He also discussed fugitives from U.S. justice. We would refer you to the Congressman's office for comment.

COLOMBIA

Background: President Samper's former campaign manager, Fernando Botero in a lengthy

y television interview last night accused him of accepting \$ millions from the Cali Cartel. These accusations are not new, but this was the first time Botero made such a detailed challenge on national TV.

Points

-- We are aware of these allegations and are watching them closely.

-- They are and will remain an internal matter for the government and people of Colombia to resolve.

If asked about certification:

-- We will make and announce our decision on certification in March.

If asked about visa cancellations:

-- These matters are confidential under U.S. law.

-- U.S. immigration law has very strict requirements with respect to individuals involved in narcotics trafficking. With respect to any specific allegations, I would refer you to State.

[NOTE: Do not confirm/deny that any visas have/have not been cancelled.]

BURUNDI

THEMES: 1) Extremists vs. Moderates: U.S. will stand by those who are seeking compromise and reconciliation

2) Coup: U.S. will cut off all assistance and oppose all support in IFIs if a coup occurs

3) Broad Appeal: Burundi has a rich history and tremendous potential that is not being realized due to the current crisis.

Q: What is the U.S. doing about the deteriorating situation in Burundi?

A: The United States is deeply concerned about the situation in Burundi. President Clinton and others in the administration are following developments there very closely. We have, together with our friends in the international community, taken a number of actions to help end the cycle of violence and impunity.

- ù The U.S. has provided \$110 million in humanitarian and developmental assistance to Burundi since April 1994.

- ù Co-authored a UNSC resolution establishing the Commission of Inquiry to investigate the 1993 attempted coup.

- ù Assisted the OAU in deploying an observer force.

- ù President Clinton sent our Ambassador to the United Nations Madeleine Albright to Bujumbura last Saturday to underscore that the United States supports the Convention of Government and flatly rejects the actions of extremist forces working to undermine President Ntibantunganyana.

We care about Burundi because it is a nation rich with history and tremendous potential that is not being realized due to the current crisis. When I visited Burundi in December 1994, I met many leaders, both Tutsi and Hutu, who were valiantly trying to move their country forward. These are the true leaders of Burundi, the ones who reject extremism and are trying to build a constructive future.

Q: Ambassador Albright was carrying a letter from President Clinton to President Ntibantunganya.

Can you share its contents with us?

A: The letter said that the United States will not support any group which comes to power by force in Burundi. We will cut off all assistance to such a government and will oppose all economic grants and loans by international organizations. We also might look at employing even stronger measures to isolate those seeking to undermine the Convention of Government.

Q: The U.S. has committed troops to Bosnia, would the U.S. contribute troops to a force for Burundi?

A: We committed troops to the effort in Bosnia because we are part of NATO which is serving to guarantee the peace. I don't anticipate that U.S. troops will be sent to Burundi. We have pledged to provide limited logistical support to such a mission if other countries, including those in the region, will partner with us.

Q: What advice do you have for the people of Burundi?

A: Burundi is at a historic fork in the road. You can go back to 1972 and have happen in your country what happened in Rwanda two years ago. But this would cause you to be totally isolated from the world. We don't want to see this happen. We are supporting those people and institutions in Burundi who want reconciliation, justice and a constructive future. What path you choose is ultimately your decision, but President Clinton and I say move forward; reject extremism in favor of compromise and achieve the great potential that only you, the people of Burundi, can bring about.

SYRIA-ISRAEL TALKS

Q. What's happening at the Wye talks? Are the Israelis and Syrians close to reaching an agreement on a peace treaty?

A. There are definitely encouraging signs from the Wye talks.

The atmosphere has been very optimistic. Both sides seem committed to reaching an

agreement.

We're heartened by the inclusion of military officials from all sides (including the US) in this round of talks. This indicates that both sides want to get down to substantive issues.

There is still a long way to go, but the process is promising. Secretary Christopher plans to go to Wye tonight to have dinner and to meet with the delegations.

But I don't want to say much more about it. One of the reasons the talks have been productive so far is that we have kept things quiet and let the two sides discuss their differences in private, and I want to keep it that way.

Q: Do you think it will be possible to conclude an Israeli-Syrian peace treaty this year? Will early Israeli elections prevent that? What will the U.S. be prepared to do to support an agreement in economic terms or in terms of sending U.S. forces to the Golan?

A: President's conversation January 22 with Israeli F.M. Barak focused on the peace process and the work that Israel and Syria will do at Wye Plantation to move that Process forward.

We are convinced that agreement is possible this year, but we also know that one can't impose artificial timetables. The pace of the talks will depend on the progress the parties are able to make.

NSA Lake's discussion with the Foreign Minister also focused on the Peace Process, but included a review of regional issues, especially Iraq and Iran.

BAHRAIN

Q: What is your reaction to the unrest in Bahrain?

A: The United States has a long-standing relationship of friendship and cooperation with Bahrain. Bahrain's security and stability remain of strong concern to us.

We are concerned by the incidents in Manama, especially the recent spate of bombings.

The United States condemns these acts, as it does all acts of terrorism.

(If asked)

Q: Is it true that the US believes Iran is behind the unrest?

A: We have seen the reports of foreign support for Bahraini oppositionists. We continue to monitor the situation closely and to watch for hard evidence of foreign involvement.

TAIWAN

ù We are aware of the New York Times report. We are now and have been carefully and closely watching the situation.

ù We have seen no evidence of a build-up of offensive military capability in China.

hat would indicate an intent to initiate hostilities against Taiwan.

ù We will, as always, continue to watch the situation closely.

NORTH KOREA

Q: Are you providing food assistance to the North Korean government?

A: Not at this time.

We are, however, considering providing humanitarian assistance to the World Food Program, which may distribute food assistance through its channels in North Korea.

We will make a decision only after we have consulted fully with Japan and South Korea. We will be meeting with them next week to discuss this and other issues.

We provided approximately \$225,000 in disaster relief assistance to the North last year.

A/S Lord is meeting in Honolulu today with his ROK and Japanese counterparts to consult on North Korean issues. Among the topics to be discussed will be the food situation.

Q: Do you believe that there is a famine in North Korea?

A: We believe there are serious food shortages, although we cannot quantify or verify how serious that shortage is or may become. Reliable economic statistics about North Korean food production and distribution are not available.

We note, however, that North Korea has requested international assistance in recovering from natural disasters that have occurred this past year. We note also that South Korea and Japan provided

significant direct food assistance to the North last year.

Q: Is there a major disagreement between the U.S. and South Korea on this issue?

A: No. We are consulting with the ROK on this issue, as on all other issues relating to North Korea, to ensure we have a common understanding of the objective situation and each others' policies.

Q: Will you condition food aid on military draw-downs or a guarantee that the food won't be distributed to the North Korean military?

A: We are considering some assistance to the World Food Program, an arm of the United Nations. It distributes available supplies through its own channels, based on its estimation of where it is most needed. It has the ability to monitor distribution to ensure it goes where it is most needed, and not to military organizations.

REVISED DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Background: Last week, the conferees on the FY 1996 defense authorization bill completed their renegotiation of the bill in the wake of the President's December 28th veto. The revised bill satisfactorily corrected three of the issues that led to the veto: (1) the section that would have mandated the deployment of a 50-state missile defense by 2003 was deleted; (2) the section that would have required a Presidential certification/waiver to assign US Armed Forces to UN command was deleted; and (3) the section that would have mandated supplemental budget requests to fund overseas military contingency operations was changed to a non-binding, sense of the Congress provision. There are a number of additional issues about which the administration

h
ad expressed concern, but
which were not revised. However, the revised bill also contains a number of
initiat
ives of importance to the
Administration, including the full military pay and allowances increases,
Secretary
Perry's family and troop
housing improvement initiative, and acquisition reform. For these reasons,
Secretar
y Perry on balance has
decided to recommend the President sign the revised bill.

Q: Will the President sign the revised FY 1996 defense authorization bill?

A: We are pleased that the three main issues that had led to the President's earlier
veto have been
corrected by the conferees.

We are disappointed that a number of other issues on which we had raised
concerns w
ere not
revised, including provisions directing the procurement of unrequested ships at
spec
ific shipyards,
denying use of DoD funds to perform abortions, imposing "Buy American"
restrictions,
micromanaging
the organization of the Defense Department, and restricting our ability to
implement
the START II Treaty
should it enter into force before September 30.

Of particular concern is the provision requiring the discharge of military personne
l diagnosed as
HIV-positive.

On the other hand, the bill contains a number of provisions of great importance to

the
Administration, including the full increases in military pay and allowances
proposed
by the President,
Secretary Perry's family and troop housing improvement initiative, and
acquisition r
eform.

For these reasons, Secretary Perry has recommended that the President sign the
bill
and seek

other legislative means to redress the remaining objectionable provisions. The President will sign the bill.

SMALLPOX

Background: On Wednesday, the World Health Organization's Executive Board recommended that destruction of the world's remaining, known smallpox virus stocks be delayed until June 30, 1999. The New York Times carried a front-page story on the issue, noting that a dispute between DOD and other agencies was resolved by the President in favor of destruction.

Q: What is your reaction to the WHO Board recommendation to delay destruction of the smallpox virus stocks until June 1999?

A: We supported the WHO Executive Board's decision on this issue.

Q: Was there a division within the U.S. government on this issue? Did the President make the final decision?

A: I am not going to comment on our internal decision-making process, except to say that this issue was thoroughly reviewed within the government. While we supported proceeding with destruction of the virus, we were comfortable supporting a delay if others felt strongly about it. We are pleased that the WHO Board reached a consensus decision on how to handle this complex issue.

Q: Do you think that some countries might be hiding smallpox virus stocks to use for biological warfare purposes?

A: We are, of course, deeply concerned about the dangers of BW proliferation

• "

and use

. We

believe that destruction of the virus will reinforce our BW nonproliferation efforts

.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 26 January 96 18:28
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT January 26 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bassett, Leslie A.
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Birkland, Andrea L.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boynton, Peter J.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Kevin J. Cadieux
Canty, Mary T.
Carter, Michael E.
Cicio, Kristen K.

Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Claussen, Eileen B.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davis, William K.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Dymersky, Debra L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Eisenhower, James J.
Fairfax, Kenneth J.
Feeley, John F.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Florio, Elaine
Frias, Angela M.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
Gates, Brian K.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grimes, Richard J.
Grummon, Stephen R.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.

Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephan D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Huggins, Peter
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Jensen, Noelle B.
Johnson, David T.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Leary, William H.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Martinez, Alejandro
Mauzy, Stefan T.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Munson, Robert A.
Naplan, Steven J.
Neil, M. Elise
Noetzel, Jon C.
Norman, Marcia G.
Norris, John J.

Nuccio, Richard A.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Petchel, Beverly L.
Peters, Mary A.
Pifer, Steven K.
Kenneth M. Pollack
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Reade, Evan G.
Realuyo, Celina
Reed, George
Reznik, Victoria (NMI)
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schuker, Jill A.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.

Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Willis, Robin M.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, 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 [[MIKE0126.DOC : 4698 in MIKE0126.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 26 January 96 18:21

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** MIKE0126.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release January 26, 1996

Fo1

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:27 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the White House Press Briefing Room for our last daily briefing of this week.

Q Are you sure? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I'm positive because if someone briefs on Saturday it won't be me. I guess it's my last one.

Let me start with the following: The President of the United States had a very cordial 40-minute conversation with President Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation earlier today. It's clear that both Presidents continue their very close working relationship that began when they first met in Vancouver in 1993. It's also clear that President Yeltsin is fully back at work, in charge, and as he told President Clinton, "in good shape."

The President began the conversation by congratulating President Yeltsin on his return to work, noted his strengths, that he sounded good. President Yeltsin congratulated President Clinton on his State of the Union address. Thanks to you, it was all apparently covered in Moscow and beyond. President Yeltsin told President Clinton, in fact, the address had been well received by the Russian people. (Laughter.)

Q What did he think of Dole? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I'll have to find out whether the Republican response was carried live there. (Laughter.) Certainly we're interested --

Q Who initiated the call?

MR. MCCURRY: President Clinton had initiated this call. He had wanted an opportunity to touch base with President Yeltsin when he was back at work and has been looking for a time -- proper time

when they could touch base. The proximate call, one of the

subjects -- proximate reason for the call and one of the subjects they discussed is the upcoming meeting of the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission. Vice-President Gore and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin will continue their regular series -- working series of meetings, beginning next week, right?

He arrives -- the Prime Minister arrives on Sunday, and then they will be meeting next week. They discussed -- I won't do the full readout unless there's some particular subject. They obviously discussed the direction of reform in Russia. President Clinton welcomed President Yeltsin's recent public statements that asserted that the Russian commitment to progress on reform is irreversible. President Yeltsin did assure President Clinton that he was not only firmly committed to economic reform, but also to a continuing strong U.S.-Russian partnership and relationship.

President Yeltsin noted that while the new Duma has changed the antireform forces elected to the Duma do not have a majority and would not dictate policy. They review START II, which, as you know, is pending in the Senate now. The President briefed President Yeltsin on the prospects for ratification of START II, certainly said we hoped that would happen. And, as you know, we've been encouraging the Senate to take that up and ratify START II promptly. The President suggested that that should help further action in the Duma for approval of the START II Treaty.

President Yeltsin assured President Clinton that they would work hard in Russia to secure approval of the START II Treaty prior to the meeting in April that President Clinton will attend, the meeting, the summit meeting on nuclear safety issues. And they reviewed the situation in Chechnya and they talked about Bosnia. The President noted that the Russian brigade which is attached to Task Force Eagle, the U.S. component of the International Force, has been working very well with U.S. forces in Bosnia.

And they reviewed, as I said earlier, both the upcoming meetings of the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission, where the Vice President will lead a discussion with the Prime Minister about economic issues, reform, technology, all the things that have been in the basket and that the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission has reviewed.

They also reviewed -- actually, President Clinton responded to a suggestion by President Yeltsin that they remain in closer contact by phone and also exchange meetings by foreign ministers. And some of you probably know that the State Department has announced that Secretary Christopher will be meeting with Foreign Minister Primakov in Helsinki the 10th and 11th of February, right?

That's it.

Q Did the conversation include an explanation on the

part of President Yeltsin as to why economic reformers are biting the dust when he's assuring the President of the United States that the economic reforms are well?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, they reviewed the progress towards reform; they did not discuss specifically any personnel changes, either the change in foreign ministers or the change in the Deputy Prime Minister for Economics position, the appointment of Mr. Kadannikov, which was announced, I believe, yesterday. But they did generally review the subject of both Russia's foreign policy and its domestic policy related to economic and political reform. And as I said, President Clinton was encouraged that in both cases President Yeltsin pledged continuity and maintenance of the direction of Russian policy aimed at market economic reforms and political reforms, and commitment to democracy. And the President was satisfied that President Yeltsin's commitment remains the same.

It's clear at the same time that we understand that there is a very complex political environment in Russia, that President Yeltsin is dealing with all the many forces that exist in his political culture, and that there will be different turns and twists along the pathway towards reform. The direction towards reform, however, as President Yeltsin indicated, is irreversible.

Q Has the President spent any time with the First Lady in advance of her grand jury testimony?

MR. MCCURRY: The President has. The President, Chelsea, and Mrs. Clinton had time together this morning, and then I believe the President is over in the Residence now with her before she departs for her testimony.

Q Was he briefing --

Q Was that breakfast?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, they had -- they usually have -- they often have breakfast early in the morning before they all start up on their schedules.

Q Was he discussing her testimony?

MR. MCCURRY: No, they don't have any need to discuss the testimony. The President knows what her answers are and they're the same answers she's been giving to the American people.

Q Well, what was he doing? Holding hands?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it's not likely to be a very pleasant encounter. It's not a picnic. And so the President was there just to reassure her and tell her that he loves her and that she'll do a good job and the grand jury will see that she is telling the truth, just as she has been telling the truth.

Q What did she say?

Q That's all we need.

Q Yes, right.

MR. MCCURRY: Anything else?

Q Do you have any plans to have Kendall or anyone run through what she was asked and what she might have said?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't -- can't speak for the First Lady or her attorney's plan, but I have heard that she plans to make a statement herself either before or after the testimony. So you may want to direct your many, many, many colleagues who are already very interested in this event.

Q Do you have a reading for the Senate as to when they might finish and, therefore, when the President might sign the CR?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the Senate is fully engaged in the debate on the continuing resolution now. Our understanding from the Democratic caucus that just broke up a shot while ago is that they will be concentrating on two amendments; one that Senator Kennedy is offering that would restore education funding.

There's a great deal of concern both in the House and Senate among Democrats about the level of education funding. There are a lot of school districts depending on allocations of federal resources, and they're right now in a very real bind because they are not certain what level of funding they're going to get. And Senator Kennedy is going to make a good effort to try to restore, I believe, FY'95 levels of funding at their full funding levels, rather than taking the hit that they would otherwise take in this continuing resolution.

And then they also expect to debate an amendment by Senator Moynihan which would provide a straightforward, one-year extension of the debt ceiling, which is something the

administration strongly favors, as you know. That debate will go on during the day and we'll see where we are.

The President, on his part, he's monitoring the debate carefully and getting reports from our folks who are talking to various people in the Senate. We certainly hope that by the end of the day today, one way or another, both Houses have passed the satisfactory continuing resolution so we avoid any necessity to begin shutting down parts of our government tomorrow. We don't believe that's going to happen. We think they will --

Q He doesn't approve of this upsetting the apple cart, the deal he made, does he?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've got -- we reached an agreement with the House on a continuing resolution, but by no means was it a perfect piece of legislation, and by no means, is it unwarranted that some senators would try to fix aspects that they think is wrong. They're going to debate it, and at the end of the day, by the time midnight rolls around tonight, we hope that action has been complete and the President's been in a position to sign a continuing resolution. We expect that will happen, one way or

another. But we understand the desire of Senate Democrats to address two critical issues -- levels of funding for education, which is one of the President's priorities, and extending the debt ceiling, which is a necessary piece of business that has to be done right away. And it's good that they're making that attempt to do it right away.

Q Does he feel abandoned by the -- I mean, don't the Democrats feel abandoned by the President?

MR. MCCURRY: We've had no indication of that in my own contacts and contacts others have had. We can certainly understand why Senate Democrats are pressing those two issues.

Q If these amendments are adopted, the CR will have to go back to the House for further action. Doesn't that risk complicating the situation?

MR. MCCURRY: I certainly would not believe that it should. The White House believes that in both cases there would be reasons why the House might want to accept those measures. Certainly, on the question of the debt ceiling, adoption of that debt ceiling motion would likely be a pretty persuasive argument to the House that they should do likewise and provide the clean, straightforward one-year extension that's necessary.

The education funding, admittedly, might raise a more

difficult debate, but we'll just have to see. Senator Daschle has given an assessment of what they think the likelihood of passage are of the two amendments; we'll just have to see how the day develops.

Q If and when he does sign this, Mike, what --

Q When did he say that?

MR. MCCURRY: He had a press conference, a while back.

Q Will there be any ceremony, or what are your plans?

MR. MCCURRY: That will depend on the time of the day. If it's late in the day, as I expect, I think it's more likely that the President will either say something in his remarks this evening at the Hispanic National Convention, or alternatively, we'll have some written statement available depending on what time final action occurs and what time the enrolled bill actually arrives here at the White House.

Q Does the President think that the dismissal of these people who have positively -- been advised of having HIV positive -- does he think the dismissal of all those people from the military will cripple the Defense Department?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he doesn't believe that that will

jeopardize our national security. At the same time, the President thinks that's a very unfortunate decision by the Congress to discharge those who are HIV-positive.

I'd like to correct one thing because there have been some erroneous reporting on this. Those who are discharged will receive their full medical and dental benefits. They won't face any lack of support. They'll be in a situation similar to other military retirees. And our Director of AIDS Policy, Patsy Fleming, is meeting with people from the Department of Defense and the Department of Veteran Affairs today to talk about how they can protect those who might otherwise have their medical care in jeopardy.

Q Following up, does the President think that the fact we have not insisted on testing people before we sell blood at these blood points over the years -- does he think that's increased the number of people who have HIV?

MR. MCCURRY: I would have to check into that. I'm not aware -- I don't know, myself, here what policies for blood-testing that we've got.

Q On the other hand, we recently had a general, a very prominent general die here of AIDS. And I wonder how that category of people listed in the paper today who have HIV-positive in the Pentagon, I wonder if that was an influence on the President in asking for inclusion of people who are gays and lesbians in the service.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President's concern, as he stated in his initial veto message on this, that it would be particularly cruel to deny those who are suffering from this disease access to adequate health care. There's at least some improvement in this bill that they've addressed that situation by making sure health care is available to those who are HIV-positive. At the same time, the administration had very deep reservations about the provision of the bill itself which discharged those who were HIV-positive.

Q Well, Mike, what was the extent of the debate within the White House on this issue? I mean, was there a serious debate about whether or not the President would veto it just on the basis of the HIV provision alone?

MR. MCCURRY: There was strong consideration given to that issue, but it had to be weighed -- there are other aspects of the bill that, frankly, we were not wild about either, but we had to weigh that against the very important advances in national security, the need to have a defense authorization bill that would fund military programs for the year, all the different programs and activities of the Department of Defense which are covered under this authorization act.

They had to be weighed in the balance and, as you might

expect, with a Republican Congress, there are times when we just have to, on balance, accept some things that otherwise we wouldn't want to do, but are necessary if we are going to have a strong Defense Authorization Act, which is what we did in this case. But the reservations we had about the provision which I stated yesterday stand. The one thing I am intent on correcting today is the fact that people do have access to medical and dental care.

Q Just as a follow-up, is the White House going to try to push any legislation or try to correct that aspect later on in this congressional term? I mean, is there any --

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. One of the things we do intend to do is work closely with a group of House and Senate members that we are already in contact with to pursue legislation that would reverse this policy and do so, we hope, within the six-month period

before it takes effect.

Q Mike, on another subject, what's the White House analysis of Farrakhan's meeting with Gadhafi?

MR. MCCURRY: I didn't -- I actually forgot to look at that, Peter. I mean, we continue to feel very strongly that Mr. Gadhafi needs to abide by U.N. Security Council resolutions. He very often uses the opportunity of visiting foreign visitors to advance his own views about Libya's role in the world, but they remain repugnant because of their support of violence and terrorism, and they remain repugnant because he has still failed in fundamental obligation he has to the international community, which is to turn over the two Pan AM 103 terrorist suspects for proper justice in either Scotland or the United States.

He can have as many foreign visitors as he wants. That doesn't change the equation when it comes to his obligation to comply with those U.N. Security Council resolutions that he is clearly in violation of.

Q Mike, assuming the Congress today will not solve the debt limit problem and you'll have to work on separate legislation on that, where are you with regard to the Speaker's down payment idea? And has the Speaker or the Republican leadership responded to your contention which is go well beyond the down payment; you can do the whole ball of wax, the \$700 billion in savings? Where is all this in --

MR. MCCURRY: The response that we've gotten -- the President continues to believe firmly we can get over \$700 billion of savings based on the proposals that are now on the table and we ought to do that, and we ought to balance the budget and get it done now.

Increasingly we hear folks on the Hill express skepticism about the prospects for doing it piecemeal over time. The initial idea, which looked like it might be a way to move

towards savings, has begun to erode somewhat as we learn that Republicans really intend to use this device as a way to do a tax cut and then take the money in funding from programs that are very necessary for the poor. So it doesn't look like it's coming together.

In any event, we haven't had any authoritative description from the Republican side and what they intend. It's not clear they even know how they would accomplish this down payment package that they are talking about. The work that has been opportunity to share information with them at the staff level

which we will do because much of the same staff working on the continuing resolution is fully occupied on that subject, as well they should be today. But we'll try to continue to see if we can explore and see if there's any common ground on this.

But the fact remains that the best thing to do when it comes to the debt ceiling is not to get bogged down in some type of ornamental exercise, dressing up a bill with new adornments. The best thing is just to pass a straight, clean, straightforward extension of the debt limit and, indeed, the Senate will apparently have an opportunity to do that very shortly.

Q Does the White House have any understanding at this point, after all the contacts you've had at various levels with the Republicans, as to why they haven't responded favorably to the notion of going for the seven-year balanced --

MR. MCCURRY: No. It is an utter mystery to the White House why the Republicans don't declare a victory, join with the President in celebrating a balanced budget agreement that will get us to the goal that they have professed over and over this year that they want -- a seven-year balanced budget agreement as evaluated by the economists of the Congressional Budget Office. It's there. The President told them on Tuesday night, let's do it; let's get it done. And it just doesn't seem to happen. And it's unfortunate. It's a mystery why they haven't taken the President up on his offer.

Q It isn't a mystery.

MR. MCCURRY: It's not a mystery? Why? Because they want the big tax cut. They keep going for the big tax cut. And then they get the big tax cut, they've got to go and take the savings out of Medicare by unwarranted cuts in the rate of spending for Medicare.

Q Mike, were senior White House economic team -- they were meeting on this very topic this noontide, as we speak, sort of, aren't they? And was there any plan, anything happening this weekend about it, or are they just reviewing the bidding, kind of talking about what's going on?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we continue to have contacts both

with moderate and sensible members on the Hill who want to get this work done, with their staffs, and we continue to work the issues here to see if we can develop approaches that would inject some energy into the discussions. But there has to be a willingness on the part of the Republican leadership to balance the budget. And they've apparently just given up on that. That's unfortunate.

Q Is the President going to say something tomorrow in his radio address about this, try to move the ball forward?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't seen it. I think he will be very concerned if Congress leaves town without completing work on the debt ceiling. I imagine he'll have something to say about that, and I think he will continue to press the case for a balanced budget agreement now. We can do it. We should get on with it.

Q Mike, Senator Domenici said this morning the key offer was not cheered by the House GOP approach, and that he had had a talk with Gingrich last night about it, and that he was eager to move with moderate Democrats as well as Republicans in the Senate to try to get a balanced budget overall package on track. I was wondering if Domenici had talked with Panetta and whether there's an effort now to try to get some higher level talks going.

MR. MCCURRY: Hurray for Senator Domenici. I'm not certain that they have talked. I'm not -- Leon hasn't mentioned anything to me about having conversation with Senator Domenici, but that comment -- I haven't seen his full comment, but it sounds like it's a response to the President's admonition that we ought to get on with it and do it.

And our understanding, based on just informal staff-level contacts, is there's a great deal of sentiment, both among Republicans and Democrats, to take the President up on the offer and get the balanced budget done. It's a little hard to understand why we can't do it.

Q So why don't you send up a package and try to do it?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've got -- they've got one. We stood here -- the President stood here and talked to you about it, and we've got --

Q Michael, that is the broadest possible outline. I mean, it barely even justifies the word "package." I'm saying, why don't you send them something in legislative language and try to get the votes?

MR. MCCURRY: We will. We'll send a -- as the Office of Management and Budget has indicated, we'll send a detailed outline of a bill on February 5th, and then during the course of February and early March, as OMB has indicated, they'll present a budget.

It will be consistent with what -- seven-year balanced budget, CBO,

based on our last offer during the discussions, as Mr. Panetta indicated the other day.

Q When you say hurray for Domenici, does your hurray embrace his contention that your balanced budget will only bring about a balanced budget for about a second in the year 2002?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, look, he knows that we've got our little letter that we can wave around from the Congressional Budget Office that says it gets you to balance. Now, his plan is open to the same charge because at the end of the seven years, the year eight, nine and ten, under the Republican budget the deficits balloon because of the giant size of their tax cut. And everyone knows that, and so there's no secret there, nothing new.

Q Did the President get to Dole, speak to Dole?

MR. MCCURRY: I forgot to ask him. I meant to ask him, and I don't believe they did it. No one here at the White House believes that they've had contact, and Senator Dole's been out on the campaign trail, obviously.

Q Mike, back on defense reauthorization just for a moment, some within the gay community who were greatly disappointed when the President reversed himself on gays in the military, and they're expressing some of those same concerns now. They feel that, going into the election year, that the President of the White House just is not as concerned with their issue.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President is very concerned if their issue -- and I think it would be unfortunate for anyone to suggest the only thing the gay community cares about is HIV medical treatment for medical retirees. They also care about a strong national defense; they also want to make sure that we've got the ability to protect ourselves and to lead in the world as we need to, and I think many in the gay community will say, look, on balance, the President had to take this bill because it's a very large piece of our nation's business every year -- the defense authorization bill. They will understand that the President finds this an objectionable portion of that bill, they'll understand that the President improved the bill from its original draft, which would have denied medical benefits to those who are suffering from HIV, and they'll say, all right, he couldn't get everything he wanted, but he did try to improve the bill.

Now, if some people find that unsatisfactory -- and I've seen some folks from ACT UP and others that say that they are dissatisfied, you know, we'll just have to take the lump.

Q What about this -- I mean, coming after gays in the

military? Has the military been thrown into --

MR. MCCURRY: Gays in the military was a long time ago,

and the administration has done an enormous amount of work, has reached out to the gay and lesbian community and has had a very successful record, I think, of addressing concerns of that community. But I'd like to say again, it is not a monochromatic community; they have a lot of concerns and they are concerned about our national defense and they're concerned about the balanced budget, and they know that the President has been fighting a good fight.

Q I'm curious about something that arose this morning earlier -- the story on the Speaker and the Iranian operation, alleged. You were reluctant to discuss that. My curiosity is whether, in your experience, it's been common for any Speaker of the House to direct a federal intelligence agency to conduct any particular mission.

MR. MCCURRY: I, a, don't know the answer; b, if I knew the answer would not comment on, because it would require me to break the law and comment on things that are properly classified by our government. Intelligence matters are matters that we don't discuss either here or at an open microphone, or even, hopefully, in private, because it's against the law to do so.

Obviously, as is suggested in this article, if, in fact, there is any aspect of this article that borders anywhere near truth, the one thing that is true is that any such program is no longer covert. And I'm concerned and others are concerned about suggestions in this article that there may have been people punished by death as the result of the occurrence of some of these rumors, stories, allegations, whatever you want to call them. But in any event, I'm not commenting because I can't.

Q Is there any sort of curiosity in the administration as to how these things became overt in the first place? This is supposed to be the secret part of a piece of legislation.

MR. MCCURRY: We are not curious when federal laws violating classified material appears when it's not supposed to appear, and that becomes a law enforcement matter.

Q Is it now a law enforcement matter, Mike?

MR. MCCURRY: I would refer you to the proper law enforcement authorities to answer that question.

Q To the best of your knowledge, is anybody looking into that?

MR. MCCURRY: I'd prefer that you refer that to proper law enforcement authorities.

Q In this case, who would that be?

MR. MCCURRY: You can find out very quickly when it comes to national security issues or classification issues, you can contact the FBI and find out who has jurisdiction for looking at issues like that.

Q Gadhafi again has said that he would put \$1 billion into trying to influence American elections. Does the White House take that seriously? Would that be legal if he did it?

MR. MCCURRY: Given his judgment on matters and the skill he has demonstrated, I doubt that he would find that money well spent. It would be better for him to use that money, to, a, deliver two terrorist suspects to justice, and, b, do something about the miserable condition that his people face as the result of his leadership in that country.

Q Mike, a question about the conversation with Yeltsin. What did the President say to Mr. Yeltsin about Chechnya? Did he express concern --

MR. MCCURRY: He obviously restated our strong views that we need to find a peaceful negotiated in Chechnya. The President did condemn the recent taking of terrorists in Dagestan. President Yeltsin told President Clinton that they would push forward to a peaceful solution to the Chechen crisis based on peaceful dialogue. Certainly that was taken as a hopeful suggestion by President Clinton. The thrust of the conversation was that President Yeltsin hoped there would be a peaceful solution to the crisis.

Q The President didn't tell Yeltsin what a hard time he was having in getting START II ratified?

MR. MCCURRY: No, they reviewed -- as I said, they reviewed arms control issues and START II in particular. And we remain confident that the Senate will ratify the START II Treaty. If we're lucky, it might even happen today. And they talked then about what the situation would be in the Duma and how they could move forward on their arms control agenda, which is an impressive one, and the benefits of START II the President talks about often, and the arms reductions that would occur, and the reduction of the

threat while maintaining our national security is very impressive. The level of reduction -- I think there are a total of 14,000 warheads that would be put out of commission as a result of ratification and coming into a force of START II. That would be a very impressive achievement, something very important to leave behind for our children.

Q Did Yeltsin discuss his own political plans with the President, whether he's going to seek reelection?

MR. MCCURRY: He did not make a request to send James Carville to Moscow in the coming year. No, they did -- I don't believe -- they didn't have a direct discussion of that. They discussed a little bit about State of the Union. It was clear

there was some familiarity on the part of President Yeltsin for the politics here just as there was vice versa.

Q Is it fair to assume that the reason President Clinton placed the call is that he was concerned with some of the recent personnel changes in Moscow?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe you can accurately say the President wanted to review the direction of reform, the progress towards market economics and democracy in Russia. We certainly have noted some of the changes, and the President felt it was important to both reaffirm our interest and the progress the Russian Federation makes towards economic reform and political reform and also to hear from President Yeltsin the commitment that he gave President Clinton that that pathway is irreversible.

Q Did the President at all tell President Yeltsin that the Russian handling of the hostage situation in Dagestan too harsh, too brutal?

MR. MCCURRY: The President, nor anyone in our government, attempts to second-guess the actions of a foreign government in an incident like that. We've regretted the loss of life and said that it was unfortunate and certainly lent our voice to those around the world that encourage a peaceful solution.

Q What time was that call, Mike?

MR. MCCURRY: About 10:45 a.m., just before 11:00 a.m. Late morning.

Do you guys want to do week ahead now?

Q Yes.

MR. MCCURRY: Ms. Glynn, you're on.

Hey, Brit, I'll come down, sit down with you.

MS. GLYNN: Tomorrow the President will do his weekly radio address at 10:06 a.m., and then he'll attend the Alfalfa Club Dinner at 7:45 p.m.. That's closed press. On Sunday he'll make a call to the Super Bowl winners, whoever they are.

Q Do you know what the radio address is about?

MS. GLYNN: Not yet. We'll keep you informed on that.

Q Do you know who won the Super Bowl?

MS. GLYNN: Who's going to win the Super Bowl? I don't know.

Q Who is he rooting for?

MS. GLYNN: I don't know.

Q He's rooting for all of America's --

Q She might not want to give this by the time we get through it. (Laughter.)

MS. GLYNN: Monday, Monday. At 11:00 a.m., he has a meeting with the Organizers of the National Campaign to Reduce Teen Pregnancy. As you know he mentioned this in his State of the Union address, and he will announce the names of some of the people who will serve on the board. And then at 12:15 p.m. -- that's in-house pool coverage. At 12:15 p.m., he will have another meeting with a group of women to release a report on the status of women entrepreneurs. That's stills only. And then there is a DNC reception that evening.

Q Where is that?

MS. GLYNN: The Hay Adams, closed press.

At 2:00 p.m., he meets with Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin as part of the ongoing Gore-Chernomyrdin talks. And we'll let you know what the coverage of that is on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, he doesn't have a public schedule, but that evening he'll have dinner with the Commander in Chiefs. He meets with them regularly, as you know, a couple of times a year. And this is one of those dinners.

On Thursday morning, he goes to the National Prayer Breakfast at 7:30 a.m.; pool coverage. And then he comes back here to prepare for the arrival of President Chirac of France. At 10:30 a.m., there's the state arrival ceremony; open press. At 3:15 p.m. is his bilateral meeting. And then, at 5:00 p.m. there will be a joint press conference with President Chirac over in the OEOB, and at 7:00 p.m. a state dinner.

On Friday morning, the President goes to my favorite state, the Granite State. And I'll let you know later in the week exactly what he's going to be doing, but his stops include Concord, Nashua, Salem, and then overnight at the Sheraton Wayfarer -- "Concerd," sorry. Concord, the Sheraton Wayfarer in Manchester.

On Saturday morning, he'll probably have an event in Manchester and then be home by mid-day.

Q When does he leave in the morning? Do you have the time?

MS. GLYNN: I don't yet. I think it will be mid-morning on Friday.

Q Is he supposed to meet with the National Governors Association Tuesday?

MS. GLYNN: I'll check on it. We don't have it on our public schedule at this point.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:03

P.M. EST