

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Macarthur Deshazer to Peter Bass, et al., re: Africa Update (10 pages)	02/01/1996	P1/b(1)
002. email	Macarthur Deshazer to Peter Bass, et al., re: Revised Africa Update (10 pages)	02/01/1996	P1/b(1)
003. email	Michael Sheehan to Dallas Brown and Richard Clarke, re: Legislative Update (3 pages)	02/05/1996	P1/b(1)
004. email	William Danvers to Kristen Cicio, re: Legislative Update (4 pages)	02/05/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/01/1996 - 02/09/1996]

2007-1550-F
 ke2065

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.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Macarthur Deshazer to Peter Bass, et al., re: Africa Update (10 pages)	02/01/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/01/1996 - 02/09/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2065

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	Macarthur Deshazer to Peter Bass, et al., re: Revised Africa Update (10 pages)	02/01/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/01/1996 - 02/09/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2065

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Michael Sheehan to Dallas Brown and Richard Clarke, re: Legislative Update (3 pages)	02/05/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/01/1996 - 02/09/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2065

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
004. email	William Danvers to Kristen Cicio, re: Legislative Update (4 pages)	02/05/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/01/1996 - 02/09/1996]

2007-1550-F
ke2065

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 07 February 96 18:48

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT February 7 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
Barnes, Shirley E.
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.
Black, Todd F.
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.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
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.
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 [[MIKE0207.DOC : 4642 in MIKE0207.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 7 February 96 18:45

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** MIKE0207.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release February 7, 1996

PRESS BRIEFING

F01

BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:45 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: I don't have any good excuse. I'm sorry I'm late. But now that I'm here I'm sure we'll have a very entertaining session here at the White House daily briefing.

Q What's your response to all these -- the 20 subpoenas? And how come we haven't gotten the statement from Jack Quinn or Fabiani yet that you promised -- or you didn't, but it was promised yesterday?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I can check on Mr. Fabiani's been up to. But, look, Mr. Clinger, I think, saw that it was a slow news day and decided that he'd go to make a headline with some warmed over fish wrappings from three months ago. This White House has produced 26,000 pages worth of documents. They have hashed this, rehashed this, refried it, reboiled it, and there's nothing much new to say. Most of the requests that they've got are for material that has, frankly, already been provided. These mostly are duplicative requests that go back before.

Now, Mr. Fabiani can enlighten you further on it, but it's an attempt, I believe, by Mr. Clinger to keep alive an issue that, frankly, is hard to keep alive.

Q Well, he says, on the other hand, Mike, that he hasn't gotten these and that's why he's subpoenaing these individuals as opposed to the blanket subpoena on the Office of the Executive Office of the President. And that there are 129 on a privileged list that he wants.

MR. MCCURRY: He saw some list and immediately ran out and waved it around and tried to commit news when, in fact, my understanding is, in November most of these documents had been provided. The White House had indicated a willingness to sit down and go through that. So what's happening here is Mr. Clinger is now more interested in making news than in getting at any truth here that would further the public's understanding of these matters.

Q Are you saying he actually has these documents?

MR. MCCURRY: He's had -- my understanding is most of the material has been covered under prior requests and is available to him. In any event, any of these documents that they want they will make available for review to the committee, is my understanding, talking to our legal counsel folks.

Q Mike, the committee says, however, that the Counsel's Office has told them that they don't have all these 129, and the reason that they did the individual search is because when they've done personals to people like Watkins and Thomason, those folks have turned over documents the White House claims didn't exist.

MR. MCCURRY: I know that you follow this matter much more closely than I do, but my understanding is most of the material they are after is available. They can have it, they can go through individually what they need to find. There are some -- any concerns about particular documents a long time ago White House legal counsel indicated to the committee they would sit down and work out any arrangements that they need for these -- review of any documents they have in mind.

Q Did they take advantage of it in terms of seeing the privileged --

MR. MCCURRY: No. They're out running around trying to keep this alive as a political issue. That's what they've been doing for a long time.

Q But Mr. Clinger is retiring, he doesn't --

MR. MCCURRY: I know. He's retiring so he can spend all this time on this and not worry about his constituents. That's his right. (Laughter.)

Q Oooh.

MR. MCCURRY: Okay. What else?

Q One final question. Considering the way documents have mysteriously appeared in this White House, why is it not legitimate for them to suspect that they may mysteriously appear again?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, because they know that the White House has gone to extraordinary lengths to cooperate with the committee, turning over documents, answering questions, having people testify voluntarily, and they're more interested in making political hay around these issues than they are in shedding any further light on the truth. That's the bottom line. It's

politics. It's a campaign year. That's what this is all about.

Okay, what else?

Q Have you told that to Clinger? I mean, has there been enough time to contact --

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, in a very respectful way, our lawyers, who are paid to be respectful, go up to him and say, listen, let's sit down, let's work this out. We have been very cooperative, but at some point you've got to say enough is enough. And what's the purpose of all this at this point?

Q And what does he say in return?

MR. MCCURRY: He just figures out some other news angle and tries to con you guys into writing news stories about it -- (laughter.)

Q The signing of the telecommunications bill -- we've got the ACLU that's planning on filing a suit as soon as it's signed, and you've got Pat Schroeder who's got legislation that she's going to introduce --

MR. MCCURRY: Those are two separate concerns, is my understanding.

Q They are, indeed, but given the problems, why is the President signing this?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, this is an extraordinarily important piece of legislation that will further competition in the telecommunications industry, make a wider choice of information sources available to the American people, cut rates for them, make it cheaper and more efficient for them to get access to information and entertainment programming, and it's basically a good deal for the American people in balance.

Now, there will be specific concerns. I'm not going to comment on suits that haven't been filed yet or issues that others might raise on this. But, on balance, I think most of those issues can be addressed in the context of the President signing the bill tomorrow.

But let's remember, this is historic legislation that really brings more deregulation, market competition and a better deal for consumers into the provision of telecommunication services at a time when that is one of the most fast-evolving portions of the American economy, or sectors in the American economy, and so, in

that sense, an extraordinary piece of legislation that the President, the Vice President, others here in the administration take great pride in having produced working in cooperation with Congress, proving that when the Congress and the White House work together they can do things that help the American people.

Q Is the President aware of Congresswoman Schroeder's legislation?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't asked -- this is the issue of

what would be available on the Internet related to the choice that women might want to have for their own reproductive health. I'm not -- I don't know what level of conversations there have been within the White House on that particular issue. I can check on that and we'll get into that tomorrow, I'm sure.

Q In light of Dick Morris's financial disclosure statements, would it be correct to say that the President is still behind him 1,000 percent?

MR. MCCURRY: He's got a financial disclosure that presents information about his private clients and some of his work for Republican candidates. I don't know that the President has studied that in any great detail, but I know that the President obviously was aware that he's worked with Republicans and he's had representation in the private sector in the past. That was not news to the President.

Q What about the question, though; does he still have confidence in him, or not?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, absolutely. He provides very keen insights, and like most of us around here, he has his good days and his bad days and he has his good ideas and his bad ideas, and the President is smart enough to figure out how to take the right kind of advice and act accordingly.

Q He was here at the White House today. Could you tell us what he was doing here?

MR. MCCURRY: He was here today?

Q Yes.

MR. MCCURRY: I talked to him a little while earlier and he was not here at the White House.

Q He was here this morning.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he's here from time to time for meetings with people at the White House.

Q Is he going to get fired?

MR. MCCURRY: -- meeting with him yesterday about some planning so we can make life easier for all of you and know what's coming down the pike and what kind of news we're going to make.

Q But you don't think he's working for any Republicans now?

MR. MCCURRY: He has indicated to us -- my understanding is that he is not planning to take on an additional client load in this election year with, I think, one or two exceptions that relate more to friendships he has in New York.

Q Republicans or Democrats?

MR. MCCURRY: Democrats is my understanding.

Q Has he given up his relationship with Huckabee in Arkansas?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe so. I did not ask him that question.

Q Were you aware that he was actually being paid at the same time -- that money was coming in from Republican clients at the same time he was working for Clinton?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he had -- sure, because he was a consultant during the 1994 campaign cycle and some of the payments for his services came in during 1995. We knew who he worked for in 1994, and that those payments were reflected.

Q Mike, what's the White House's strategy in getting the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill voted on before the 15th of April?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, our strategy is to continue to press the case for a very important piece of legislation. It will make it easier for Americans to retain access to health insurance when they change jobs, especially because of the portability provisions and the dealing with preexisting conditions; making sure that we don't change the structure of employer-provided health insurance in America at a time when we need to think about how to expand coverage rather than diminish coverage.

The President pressed this very forcefully in the State

of the Union address. That clearly had an impact because, for whatever reason, the mysterious holds that were placed on this legislation in the Senate seemed to evaporate. And it's now quite clear that there's more than a majority of senators in support of the legislation. We certainly hope the legislation will be taken up as soon as possible. If it's April, it's April, but passage of that would represent a very important step forward in the effort to reform the health insurance sector, consistent with what the President told the Speaker and the Majority Leader back in December of 1994, that we needed to move ahead on an incremental reform of the health care sector.

Q Will he be making any phone calls here at the White House to try and speed up the schedule?

MR. MCCURRY: We've really been in consultation with staff on the Hill and others on the Hill. We'll see how that develops. There will no doubt be some vigorous opposition raised against the legislation by the same special interests that have fought health care reform in the past, and we're prepared for that,

and we will work with the majority of senators who want to see this kind of legislation passed.

Q Has the President decided how he will deliver his testimony in the --

MR. MCCURRY: No, I don't have anything more on that.

Q How do you feel about Mr. Spring's suggestion about a Dayton-like approach to the Northern Ireland peace process?

MR. MCCURRY: Let's see. Let me go -- I have to review because Tony has been having some meetings in connection with that, and what's new -- he will be here, the Irish Deputy Prime Minister will be here next week. We expect David Trimble to be here this week. That will present an opportunity for the National Security Advisor, who's been closely engaged in conversations with the parties, to pursue that idea.

We credit Senator Mitchell and the international body that dealt with the decommissioning issue of having given the parties a pretty good road map of how to proceed in the goal of reaching all-party talks. We believe all these conversations we're having with the parties now can confer to that. As you know, Mr. Adams was here not too long ago himself, met with the President.

Q Is Spring here tomorrow morning?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, tomorrow. Okay. I'm looking at

something here that says next week. He'll be here tomorrow then. And we do plan to have David do a little readout on that afterwards.

Q But, specifically, Mike, a venue outside of Washington that might get the parties together -- is that something that you would encourage?

MR. MCCURRY: Our view is that something that moves the parties to all-party talks is something that would be encouraged because that's where ultimately all parties would have a venue for raising the issues that they have and concerns, that they can make good on the Downing Street Declaration, the peace process could mean so much to the people of Northern Ireland.

Q How does the President feel the fact that Aristide's last act as President was to renew diplomatic relations with Cuba?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it is -- other governments in the region do have their relations with Cuba. It's contrary to our view that it's a government that has not given indication that it wants to move in the direction of democracy and market economics. But it's perfectly in within the right of the Haitian government to establish diplomatic relations with Cuba.

Q Do you have a strategy yet for dealing with the defense bill's treatment of HIV Positive military?

MR. MCCURRY: There has been considerable work on that issue. The President himself has instructed the White House to treat that as a matter of very high priority, and I expect that we'll be able to say in a very short while how we will deal with that issue.

Q Today or --

MR. MCCURRY: I can't guarantee today. I saw Walter Dellinger from the Justice Department earlier working away furiously. And they would all like to try to bring that to a conclusion prior to the President's signing the bill. But I don't have any guarantee that it will be today.

Q That's Friday, right? I mean, the signing is Friday.

MR. MCCURRY: It has to be signed by Friday.

Q What will the President be talking about in Iowa

this weekend, and will it be further development of the themes of the State of the Union address?

MR. MCCURRY: Do you want to do a little rundown on Iowa? They're still doing some work on that. It will stress themes that were raised in the State of the Union address -- certainly education, stronger economy. It will also touch on those issues that are very important in a state with a large rural economy. The President's proud of the work we've been doing to promote agricultural exports around the world and the very strong performance of the agriculture sector in the economy. Farm prices have been good. That's why we need to get this farm bill locked in and done, and we hope that happens.

Q Just to follow up, Mike, the President barely -- never mentioned the Republican field on that day in New Hampshire, on Friday at least. Is it likely that he will continue to not talk about them in Iowa as well?

MR. MCCURRY: It's very likely the President will continue to leave the Republicans to their own festivities in the primary season. He's had some concerns about -- I mean, he's been more than happy to contrast his vision of where this country needs to go in the 21st century with that offered by the Republican majority, but at this point the Republicans are in their own process of selecting a candidate and the President has been very reluctant to engage in any particular commentary on any of those seeking the job because, frankly, the Republican party has to decide who they wish to nominate to run against him.

Q So he would not be likely then to contrast his position and the situation within the Democratic Party with the brawl or race, or whatever you want to call it in the other party.

MR. MCCURRY: No. I mean, he enjoys the support of the party. He's gratified that the Democrats have rallied to his candidacy and that he faces no opponent. But the Democratic Party itself has had some fairly bloody primary fights, so we know what it's like to go through the process they're going through now. It's agonizing.

Q Let me just ask one more question on this. Is there some -- is there any quick way to sum up why he's going?

MR. MCCURRY: There is. First of all, Iowa is a state that he carried in 1992, you'll recall. It's a state in which he feels that the benefits of the economic program that he has put forward since 1993 have been felt and have been seen and are real, the investments. And it's a state that puts a very keen focus on

education, a high percentage of kids who go to college. That's something the President's talking about this week. He wants to revisit those issues when he sees the people of Iowa. And he thinks -- he is on the ballot there, in a sense. He will be before the caucuses -- will be before Democratic caucuses and he believes he should go and ask for their support.

Q Well, would it be fair to say that this is a chance to do a little work looking ahead to November in a state which at this time, perhaps more than it would be if it weren't for the caucuses, is paying attention?

MR. MCCURRY: The President going throughout this year to states where he believes he wants to make the argument about where this country needs to go, what he needs to do, and whether it's in a primary context or a general election context, his vision is something he cares about deeply and he wants to put before the voters.

Q Just about the timing is all I'm asking.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the timing is obviously related to the caucus Monday night.

Q He's unopposed, so --

MR. MCCURRY: He's unopposed, but Democrats will be gathering all across Iowa, probably not in the same percentages or numbers since it's an uncontested caucus. But that is important. It's an important element of the party's effort in that state every year to build up to the national convention. And the President wants to go thank the people, the Democrats in Iowa for their support; frankly, thank the people of Iowa for the support they've given him, and then also ask those Democrats going to caucuses to support him. He thinks it's his right to ask for their support.

Q Mike, I just wanted to follow up on what is the

White House reaction to the Pat Buchanan win in Louisiana over Senator Phil Gramm?

MR. MCCURRY: We didn't have any reaction.

Q Could you make up one?

MR. MCCURRY: Could I make one up? (Laughter.)

Q Somebody's dead, you said.

MR. MCCURRY: If Inside Politics at 4:00 p.m. is so hard

up that they have to have me comment on the Buchanan race -- you must have more than enough Republicans commenting on that list.

Q I'm interested in the White House comment.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think we've spent a lot of time on it. Our political director --

Q Once you say hi to Judy -- (laughter).

MR. MCCURRY: I am sure that on Inside Politics today at 4:00 p.m. on CNN this issue will be thoroughly reviewed and you'll see more than you want to see on the Louisiana caucus. As near as I can tell, most people in Louisiana didn't even know they had a caucus. Amongst a certain portion of the Republican Party, way on the far right they had a little contest and skirmish way on the far right, and one guy won and one guy lost and one guy finished nowhere.

Q How far right were they? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: They were way on out there -- way on out there.

Q I want to clarify something you said earlier this morning. You said that you didn't expect budget talks to start again until after the primaries. Specifically, you meant New Hampshire and Iowa, or do you mean after the primary season?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President has been looking for ways to move forward on a balanced budget agreement has indicated that his door is open. But we detect right now a certain hiatus in the ability to have those types of negotiations while certain things happen in places like Louisiana and Iowa and New Hampshire. Perhaps after those events have happened, there will be a little more clarity and that those that we have been dealing with will be in a better position to move forward and work hard on a balanced budget agreement; the President hopes so. He certainly would be available sooner than that, but I imagine that's fairly unlikely.

Now, if Senator Dole would like to come and spend 50 hours here this week, next week, we welcome him here and would look

forward to that occasion. I rather suspect he'll be otherwise occupied.

Q Did Aristide inform the U.S. before he recognized Cuba? I mean, as a courtesy?

MR. MCCURRY: We're saying we don't

believe so, but we should really check on that. The President will be calling President Preval later today, and maybe in the context of handling that call later we can get the answer to that.

Q But did you get any more information on the Serbian soldiers who have been arrested on suspicion of war crimes?

MR. MCCURRY: The information I got, which I would direct you to is a statement that Richard Goldstone, the chief prosecutor of the International War Crimes Tribunal has issued, and then also the statement that the commanders of the International Implementation Force have now put out related to that issue. Judge Goldstone is suggesting that those two military officers should be delivered to the War Crimes Tribunal. That's been reflected now in the comments of the IFOR commanders have made. So there's been a breaking development on that in the theater.

Q Mike, do you have a date for the President's next trip to California?

MR. MCCURRY: We do.

Q Twenty-third and twenty-fourth.

MS. TERZANO: It's the end of the month. I don't know the date.

MR. MCCURRY: We'll try to handle some schedule stuff at the end as best as we know it.

Q It's at the end?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes.

Q To get back to Bill's question on the telecommunications bill -- the concern among this coalition is not just abortion, they fear they can be prosecuted if they put on the Internet information about how to avoid AIDS, if they write about the Holocaust, if they quote in detail contemporary political prisoners who have been tortured. Is there any concern here about the impact --

MR. MCCURRY: As with any major rewrite of an important piece of legislation as you accustom yourself to a new environment in which some aspects of regulation are disappearing and a new environment persists, there will be a transition period as these things are implemented. We would hope that common sense prevails.

Those types of concerns, if people allow common sense to rule and the 1st Amendment and an environment in which Americans are going

to have greater access to information and ideas and technology, we believe that could -- those concerns could be resolved. But we will certainly address as necessary any particular features of the legislation as we go into the implementation of the act itself.

Q Beyond the rhetoric, will we get something more definitive on the response to the Clinger on the 20 subpoenas?

MR. MCCURRY: I think I just gave you a more than satisfactory response. We will continue to cooperate and individuals who are no longer at the White House have to speak for themselves, but they have cooperated.

Q How many are there who have --

MR. MCCURRY: The committee has indicated that it's 128. But it's their subpoena, so you really should ask the committee.

Q I mean, how many are still at the White House? Do you know that?

MR. MCCURRY: You should really ask the committee who they direct subpoenas to.

Q But you're saying -- just to make sure, you're saying all of these things that Mr. Clinger has on his list of 128, 129 documents have been turned over, or are you --

MR. MCCURRY: I said -- it is our judgment, based on what we have learned from his request, that most of the material that he wants is available and has been available, and there's no reason it wouldn't be available. But he's not interested in working with us to kind of get at the documents; he's interested in grandstanding. That's what I'm saying.

Q And what about the remainder of the stuff beyond "most"? You say most of the --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there's some stuff -- there are apparently some work product issues that they need to look at. But they a long time ago indicated a willingness to sit down and work through those issues, and they have not had that opportunity.

Q So what's a work product issue?

MR. MCCURRY: Questions about what is -- not final work product, but preparation work for other documents that may have been produced under other requires.

Look, I'm not -- I would readily admit that I'm not the

person who has gone through this file by file, but you can talk to Mr. Fabiani and get more on that. But they're pretty clear that

most of what they've pronounced with great fanfare today is duplicative of the requests that have already been either satisfied or have been discussed with the committee. So they're basically rehashing things.

Q Mike, I wonder whether the President is still concerned about the continuing tensions between Greece and Turkey, and whether he plans any new initiative in -- Cyprus now that the Holbrooke mission has been cancelled.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President, by communicating his own concern directly to leaders in both countries, certainly indicated it was a matter that he would follow. These are two very important and close allies of the United States, two valued members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and we will do everything we can, and continue to do everything we can to encourage them to resolve any difficulties or disagreements they have in a peaceful fashion. I'm sure there will be opportunities to do that through our diplomacy. And I'm sure that even though Assistant Secretary Holbrooke's mission has not gone forward, they'll be other opportunities in which we can have that type of positive exchange with two countries with whom we enjoy very close and very beneficial relations.

Q Mike, back on Haiti, one more question. Are you satisfied with the role that Aristide is playing -- the high profile political role he's playing there? Would you like to see more background behind the scenes?

MR. MCCURRY: It would be better to say that we're very encouraged by the performance of President-elect and soon-to-be President Preval. He has clearly moved into this very important role and shows every indication of wanting to govern Haiti, take up the mantle of leadership and continue the progress toward democracy and economic restoration of Haiti, which is obviously key to the long-term success of this very important effort that has been launched by the international community to support democracy in Haiti.

On the other hand, President Aristide is clearly a beloved figure within his own political movement, indeed within the country. There are many who are reluctant to see him go because of what he's been able to accomplish for the people. And he will continue to be on the scene, no doubt, as a senior statesman. I believe Deputy National Security Advisor Berger addressed that issue just yesterday and gave our views. He's someone who has meant an enormous amount in the political life of that nation, and that will not likely be eroded any time soon. At the same time,

President Preval will now assume the duties and the responsibilities and he gives every indication he intends to govern effectively.

Q Do we have any reason to believe that President Preval will reverse or not go ahead with establishing of relations with Cuba?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't believe it's been an issue that's

been raised, and we will check with our delegation after they return to see if it's an issue that arises.

Q Do you have a time for the telecommunications signing tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: Do we have a time yet on telecom? No? It won't be here, I think as many of you know. It's probably going to be on Capitol Hill. We'll check. You can check back here.

Thank you.

END 2:12
P.M. EST

#179-02/07

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 08 February 96 16:15
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT February 8 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
Barnes, Shirley E.
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.
Black, Todd F.
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.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
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.
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.
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.
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 [[MIKE0208.DOC : 4153 in MIKE0208.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 8 February 96 16:15

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** MIKE0208.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release February 8, 1996

Fo

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:55 P.M. EST

Q Were politics part of the National Security Council review of the B-2 decision?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, Mr. Bell just laid out the decisive criteria used. It was quite clear from his presentation that you just heard that this was a decision made on the merits.

Q Mike, the Secretary of State has announced that he's sending Holbrooke and Carlucci and other U.S. officials back to Bosnia on Sunday, fearing that the Dayton Peace Agreement could unravel because of the holding of prisoners by the Bosnian government of Bosnian Serbs, whom the U.S. believes should be released who are not necessarily war criminals. Is there a fear in the Clinton administration now that the Dayton Agreements are on the verge of unraveling?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I think -- you've jumbled a lot of things together. I doubt very much that Secretary Christopher said what you just indicated. I believe that he wants to make sure that the parties continue to make progress towards implementation. And they continue to gain confidence that all sides are carrying out their obligations under the Dayton Accords, and that with respect to obligations that exist related to war crimes that they religiously follow both the text of the agreement and the obligations they have as members of the international community to make good on the commitments to see that those who are responsible for these crimes are prosecuted.

Now, there's been a great deal of discussion in Bosnia amongst both representatives of the tribunal, Chief Prosecutor Goldstone and commanders from the international force, about what they can do to keep the joint military commissions meeting. There's no reason in our view that parties should not participate in those activities that will help build confidence in the peace process itself; and we encourage all parties, whatever their objections to certain developments, to continue to use the process

to resolve differences that exist. And we, of course, will, through our diplomacy continue to press the governments to make

good on the commitments that they've already signed that we believe are central in giving them the confidence that, in the long term, this peace will work. And it's no surprise at all that we will follow up, we will continue to follow up in urging the parties to meet their obligations, just as we've continue to follow up on the issue of war crimes.

The Assistant Secretary for Human Rights has been in Bosnia, has been looking at individual sites and collecting information and will continue to do that type of work as well.

Q Well, there is a special concern, isn't there, if they're going back and -- what can they actually do?

MR. MCCURRY: There is concern about all aspects of the agreement and a determination on our part to encourage the parties to meet their obligations. That's what we will continue to do. And we believe in the long term the parties, themselves, knowing that their people want peace, will continue to make good on the commitments that they've rendered before the governments that they signed the agreements in front of.

Q Are you calling on the Bosnian government to release these prisoners?

MR. MCCURRY: The statements that we've made about that are clear, they've come from IFOR. I don't have anything, really, to add to what they have said regarding the two military officers that are now being -- you're aware of what Chief Prosecutor Goldstone said yesterday and also aware of what international force commanders have said in response to that.

Q How about the insurance now?

MR. MCCURRY: Insurance?

Q Business liability insurance?

MR. MCCURRY: My understanding is that Mr. Bennett has been available and has answered questions on that, and I'm not sure --

Q We haven't been able to reach him.

Q Does the President still have insurance, and why did he get it in the first place?

MR. MCCURRY: My understanding, from what Mr. Bennett has been telling people, is that the President, as do many people

in professional life, particularly attorneys, have that type of liability coverage and had it for some time -- I believe, dating back to when he was serving back in public office in Arkansas.

Q When were the policies purchased?

MR. MCCURRY: That's a question that I'm referring to Mr. Bennett, because he's most knowledgeable about the policies and about the coverage under those policies and about any payments that have been made pursuant to those policies.

Q Did you have a chance to ask the President, though, what was on his mind when he bought the policies?

MR. MCCURRY: I did not. Those who have talked to him indicate that he bought these policies, as did many people in professional life who are more susceptible to facing lawsuits. That happens to a lot of people who are prominent, both in private sector and in public sector. As to the specifics on the policies, again, I refer you to Mr. Bennett.

Q Can you tell us to what extent the President was involved in the discussions between Bob Bennett and the insurance company?

MR. MCCURRY: Mr. Bennett's happy to answer that question.

Q At the time of the East Room press conference where the President said these legal bills were breaking him, did he know that he had this insurance --

MR. MCCURRY: He knew it at the time of his press conference, January 11th, he knew that he had policies that had that type of liability coverage. He understood that there might be some payments that would come pursuant to those policies. But he also knew that his legal bills would, far and away, exceed any coverage that those policies would render so that he would face additional millions-plus in legal fees that would still put him in the situation that he was asked about -- you're facing the possibility of a very dire financial picture, financial insolvency; that would still be the same situation. And as he correctly indicated, he feels very confident that he'll be able to meet his obligations and pay those bills.

Q Well, Mike, is he relieved by these payments? Do they really help --

MR. MCCURRY: It's better than not having that type of

payment. But at the same time he's still going to face enormous bills, and so will the First Lady, and they will continue to face that financial burden well after the President and the First Lady leave the White House in the next century.

Q Mike, when you said the President was aware they had these insurance policies with that kind of coverage, what are you talking about, "that kind of coverage"? Personal liabilities, specifically sexual harassment coverage --

MR. MCCURRY: No, the umbrella liability provision that relates to tort claims.

Q I talked to Bennett for about \$200 worth of minutes today. He didn't have much information on whether or not the President still has it, why he got it in the first place and why these years, '91 and '92, '94 to '95? Did he have it in between? Is there any way to get, at least to find out, if he still has it, or why he bought it or what he --

MR. MCCURRY: He's the most knowledgeable about the policies and I'm sure if he's in a position to follow up with you, he will.

Q Well, wouldn't the President even know if he had insurance, and when he got it, for goodness sake?

MR. MCCURRY: I think, as do many -- I mean, I have a homeowners insurance policy, I can't tell you, as I stand here, what it covers. I think most people in this country have got insurance policies, but as to what it specifically covers they probably don't know, unless you have a reason to have a claim, and you go to the insurance company to see if something is covered. I mean, I think most people --

Q But one of these was taken out while he was President, or could have been taken out while he was President.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that's not clear and I suggest, again, that you refer that type of question to Mr. Bennett.

Q Well, Bob Bennett doesn't seem to be answering --

Q Mike, on one hand you say the President, like many professionals, has this kind of insurance policy. And on the other hand, you say that he didn't know what kind of policy he had. I mean, it's either one or the other.

MR. MCCURRY: No, that's not what I said. I said he knew

he had an insurance policy that had umbrella liability coverage that might cover a tort claim of this nature, but he didn't know to what degree it would cover or what amounts would be paid as a result of it.

Q So he wasn't sure the insurance would cover it and he referred these policies to Bob Bennett and said, check into this to see if they'll cover --

MR. MCCURRY: Mr. Bennett had been pursuing it, but the President hadn't been spending a lot of time on the issue. In fact, I don't have any information that indicates to me that he had any discussions with Mr. Bennett as Mr. Bennett was pursuing the issue of coverage.

Q Has the Clinton administration concluded that China did sell nuclear technology to Pakistan?

MR. MCCURRY: No, the administration has not.

Q Is the intelligence community convinced that that sale did occur?

MR. MCCURRY: That's something that you know I would not be so brave as to talk about here in a public setting.

Q So where does it stand right now in terms of assessing whether that sale was, in fact, a violation of the U.S. law?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have very real concerns, and we are evaluating the information that is available. We haven't made any determination that China has taken actions that would trigger the imposition of sanctions. Remember, if we make a determination based on the facts that that type of transfer has occurred, there are legal requirements that apply, but we've not made that determination. As a result, we've not made a decision to impose sanctions.

Q Will the President involve himself in that determination, in that decision?

MR. MCCURRY: He will if that is needed or if his foreign policy advisor suggests that he needs to make that decision.

Q Mike, are you ready to ask for a waiver in this case, a waiver of sanctions?

MR. MCCURRY: It's far premature to even speculate on that, even though there are some who do. They're just wrong to do so.

Q Are we trying to find out?

Q You're not turning it down?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there are -- we have sanctions, we have a waiver process defined in law. Those are applicable if a determination is made. But not of that is applicable unless there's a determination made that triggers legal requirements that we have under our law.

Q You said it's "far premature." Does that mean that any decision on this is weeks away?

MR. MCCURRY: In this area, information that is available has to be assessed, and information gathering is a rather constant business. There will continue to be efforts to evaluate the information that they have and to see how that applies to the legal responsibilities we have to carefully execute the laws.

Q Actually, I was looking for some clue as to timing. You probably didn't get that.

MR. MCCURRY: I can't give you a hint.

Q Is it days away or weeks away?

MR. MCCURRY: I can't give you a hint. When they make that determination, they then have to proceed according to our law, and I'm not going to speculate on when that might happen.

Q Are they investigating? I mean, is it an active investigation?

MR. MCCURRY: As I said, they are actively evaluating

the information they have available. That is ongoing, they do that all the time. And when it comes to a point they need to make a recommendation to the President via the principals, if they need to do that, or when others who look at these issues make recommendations to the foreign policy principals who meet on the President's behalf, they act accordingly.

Q Let me ask you this question, Mike. If there is this active evaluation under way now on such a sensitive subject, why, in the middle of this, would the White House approve the sale of these four satellites, this very sensitive technology, to China

at a time when there is an active evaluation of another very sensitive issue, namely, alleged Chinese sale of nuclear technology to Pakistan?

MR. MCCURRY: You're trying to mix apples and oranges in a brew that I don't think I would want to drink. Those are two different types of issues. And the applicable issues, when it came to the commercial satellite launches, involved civilian technology, not military technology. They are evaluated under separate provisions and the issues that -- I think they're even evaluated under separate statutes, if I'm not mistaken. So there are different types of issues. We have a commercial trade relationship with China. We have done previous -- we have authorized previous commercial transactions in the satellite launch area, and there's no change in our view that that is part of our very active and very broad economic engagement with China.

But the specific issue that we're dealing with when it comes to allegations that there's been a transfer of nuclear technology have to be evaluated differently, and that is a source of very real concern to this administration. We spend a great deal of time and effort evaluating that type of information because it relates very directly to our very strong concerns about proliferation

Q If you do conclude that there was a violation and you decide not to issue a waiver, how would that impact on U.S.-Chinese relations?

MR. MCCURRY: That is so wildly speculative a question, I'm not even going to attempt to answer it.

Q Well, let me ask you this. The sale of those commercial satellites, are they being funded, financed by the Ex-Im Bank? Would that kind of a sale be eliminated if --

MR. MCCURRY: We have, I think -- I believe there is about \$10 billion worth of economic trade activity that is Ex-Im Bank-financed that would be affected by the imposition of any type of sanctions under the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act. But I don't know whether that is applicable to these, to the commercial satellite launches. We'll have the NSC folks check on that.

Q Has the President softened his position on the farm bill in light of the Senate vote yesterday?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I think as you saw in the Secretary of Agriculture Glickman's statement last night, the President obviously wants to see new farm legislation enacted quickly, with

the 1996 Spring planting season coming up and we need to resolve this for the sake of farmers around the country. He doesn't want to be in a position where he has to veto any farm legislation, and that's why we will continue to work with Congress to address some of our concerns.

As Secretary Glickman said last night, they made some progress when the measure was considered in the Senate. They added \$300 million for the rural economic development program and they've taken some other steps. We are encouraged to think that maybe there could be additional movement. We certainly hope there will be in the conference committee, and we hope that the bill is satisfactory as the action is completed by the Congress.

Q Do you have any reaction to the lawsuits filed against the telecommunications law in New York and Philadelphia today?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we don't. We know that there's -- we've got many of the exact same concerns that families around this country would have about protecting their children from pornography and obscenity. In fact, a large part of what the President talked about today was the violence chip and how we can protect families from material that they don't want their kids to see. That's what -- that's what was the purpose of the Exon Amendment but, obviously, the fact is that the court challenge will have to be decided in court, and meanwhile we will do what we can through this legislation and through other efforts to help protect children from obscene material.

Q -- just for one second. Does the First Lady have any such coverage?

MR. MCCURRY: I do not know.

Q Do you have any better guidance on the signing the defense appropriations bill? You said Saturday is the outer limit.

MR. MCCURRY: The authorization bill. The defense authorization bill action must be taken by the President by February 10th, which is, I guess, during the day on Saturday, and he will be here on Saturday prior to departure for Iowa, obviously.

Q Well, what does it mean? Why don't you just say it?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, because I don't want to rule out the possibility we might do it tomorrow, okay? Is that all right?

Q Yes. And has he decided on the HIV --

MR. MCCURRY: They're working very hard on that issue

and we will obviously have something in connection with the bill, because that's the provision of the bill that most concerns the administration. We'll have something further to say on how we'll handle that objectionable provision.

Q You don't think he'd do it on the road, though, in Iowa?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I do not think that.

Q Who forged the Gearan memo? He wouldn't use language like that.

MR. MCCURRY: Okay. What else? (Laughter.) Thank you.

END 2:12

P.M. EST

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 09 February 96 07:58
FROM Bell, Robert G.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: DAILY GUIDANCE UPDATE [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Sestak, Joseph A.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Is the HIV item up to date?

From: Wozniak, Natalie S.
To: @NSC - NSC Staff
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: DAILY GUIDANCE UPDATE [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, February 08, 1996 06:56 PM

[[FEB8GUI.DOC : 1845 in FEB8GUI.DOC]]

Please review and forward your updates IN BOLD to @PRESS by 10:00 a.m.
Friday, February 9. Thank you.

**ATTACHMENT FILE
DATE**

8 February 96 18:50

**ATTACHMENT FILE
NAME**

FEB8GUI.DOC
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

February 8, 1996

EUROPE

Bosnia/Croatia

Russia

Ukraine

Ireland

Greece-Turkey

ASIA

China

North Korea

LATIN AMERICA

Haiti

Colombia

AFRICA

Nigeria

Burundi

MISCELLANEOUS

Czech and Slovak Fund

UN

Landmines

B-2 Bomber Review

Defense Authorization Bill and HIV-Positive Servicemembers

BOSNIA/CROATIA

On the Detention of the Serb Soldiers

ù The War crimes investigators from the Tribunal are investigating the matter and are to meet with the detainees today.

ù This is a Tribunal matter and, as we have said in the past, the United States is fully committed to the work of the Tribunal.

ù All the parties have responsibilities to the Tribunal, both legally and under the Dayton Agreement. We expect all the parties to continue to honor their commitments to not only the Tribunal but also all agreements in the Dayton Accords.

ù NATO's IFOR personnel are urging all sides to exercise restraint.

ù We continue to believe that war crimes suspects should be investigated, indicted, and prosecuted. But this must take place with respect for due process and in accordance with procedures set forth by the war crimes tribunal.

(If raised)

ù NATO officials have denied that the individuals that have been detained were en route to a NATO meeting.

Russian Defense Minister's Visit

ù Russian Defense Minister Grachev was in Bosnia yesterday meeting with Russian troops.

ù General Joulwan (SACEUR) flew to Tuzla to meet with him.

ù We continue to be pleased with the progress of the Russian deployment and the work we are doing together.

On the Death of SFC Dugan

ù The circumstances of SFC Dugan's death are still being investigated. It would be inappropriate to speculate on the circumstances until the final investigation is submitted. The investigation is still ongoing.

ù We do know that SFC Dugan died of massive head injuries that were caused by an explosion. The death was not self-inflicted nor caused by hostile action.

ù Whatever the circumstances, the military will use the lessons learned to improve their tactics and techniques.

ù As we have said before, Operation Joint Endeavor entails real risks. But our commanders have provided our troops with the finest training and equipment to confront the challenges in Bosnia.

ù We will continue to take every precaution to protect American troops as they continue to perform this critical mission of securing an enduring peace.

ù SFC Donald Dugan was deployed to Bosnia from Germany with the First Armored Division. He was a Platoon Sergeant in A Troop, 1st Bn., 1st Cavalry Regiment.

ù Our deepest sympathies go out to his family.

Mines

ù The parties have continued to cooperate with the IFOR in identifying minefields and clearing. Mines are the IFOR commanders' greatest concern regarding the safety of the troops. Our soldiers have gone through intensive training on mine awareness.

ù Over 6200 minefields are known. 30% have been cleared; 25% have been marked for clearing; and 45% remain unmarked.

ù Unfortunately, the location of all minefields are not known, even by the parties.

Delays in Deployment of International Police Task Force

ù The IPTF is designed to monitor and advise the police forces in Bosnia.

ù To date, about 203 police are in Bosnia: 119 in Sarajevo, 34 in Tuzla, 50 in Banja Luka. 81 police monitors from 4 nations are in training in Zagreb.

ù They will be deployed in the region at the discretion of the new IPTF Commissioner, Peter Fitzgerald. We expect a French contingent of 100 police monitors will be deployed to Sarajevo soon.

ù Even with the continued deployment of the IPTF, we will look to the parties themselves to perform law enforcement functions in the areas under their control. In addition, IFOR will be present in the Serb-held areas at least until March 20 --D+90.

ù An agreement was worked out with the High Representative Bildt that permits the Serbian civilian police to remain in Serb-held areas of Sarajevo as a confidence building measure for an additional 45 days provided they honor the laws of the Federation.

ù The Federation government will assume control of the Serbian suburbs in Sarajevo on March 19 as called for by the Dayton Accords.

DEMOBILIZATION

ù All parties are in the process of demobilizing units. Reports are encouraging.

ù General Joulwan, SACEUR and the NATO Secretary General reported over the weekend that compliance with the D+45 day transfer of territory by the parties is good. We are awaiting the final report on compliance in this area.

ELECTIONS

Background: The first significant step toward holding elections in Bosnia was taken January 30 with the naming of the members of the Provisional Election Commission (PEC). The PEC will be responsible for ensuring that free and fair elections take place in a timely fashion. Also on the civilian implementation front, the OSCE mission in Bosnia, headed by Amb. Frowick, circulated an election plan to all Parties and hosted the first meeting on Bosnian soil of Serb and Federation political parties since the outbreak of the war.

ù Members of Bosnia's Provisional Election Commission were named last week in Sarajevo by the OSCE.

ù The seven-person commission includes representatives of the international community as well as representatives from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska.

ù Under the Dayton accords, the PEC is the organization responsible for ensuring that

t free and fair elections can
take place in a timely fashion.

ù This is an important step in the implementation of the civilian commitments of the Dayton agreement and serves as a symbol of the Parties' willingness to establish stable democratic institutions.

ù Holding free and fair elections is critical to the success of our mission in Bosnia. Ultimately, the Parties themselves will determine whether strong democratic institutions are built. The U.S. stands ready to assist them in this process.

POWs AND WAR CRIMES

ù President Milosevic has agreed to allow the Tribunal to open an office in Belgrade. He also agreed to cooperate with the additional investigations that Assistant Secretary Shattuck will be carrying out.

ù According to the Dayton agreement, each party must detain persons reasonably suspected of violations within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal for a period of time sufficient to permit appropriate consultation with the Tribunal authorities.

ù Prisoners can be detained under these circumstances. However, we expect the parties not to abuse this proviso for political reasons.

ù Disappointed that Bosnian Government failed prior to January 19 deadline to register and release 88 prisoners in Tuzla that were discovered by ICRC February 2.

ù We expect all parties to comply with the exchange of POWs without conditions.

FUNDING FOR BOSNIA

ù Last week, 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.

ù 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: This 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

ù 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, Mr. Goldstone reiterated this point when he met with Mr. Lake last Thursday. 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 Overall, things have been going well and, with minor exceptions, all parties are cooperating with IFOR.

ù Most recent deadline was February 3 (D+45), when parties were required to remove their forces from territory that is changing hands under the agreement.

ù Early indications are that parties complied.

ù The Parties continue to cooperate in marking and removing mines and obstacles. Weather has hampered their completion of this important task.

ù While we were pleased with the release of prisoners last weekend, some prisoners continue to be held in violation of the peace agreement.

ù Disappointed that Bosnian Government failed prior to January 19 deadline to register and release 88 prisoners in Tuzla that were discovered by ICRC February 2.

ù Our position is that all the prisoners should be released without further delay, and that all Dayton deadlines

should be respected, without exception.

ù We are working closely with 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 should be linked to the prisoner release 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 training 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.

RUSSIA/NIS

General Items

Personnel Changes Mean End of Reform/Cooperation?

ù Will have to see impact of overall personnel changes on domestic, foreign policy. Expect Yeltsin to set policy. He has made clear his support for reform and that there is no turning back. Our best interest to continue to engage Russia to sustain momentum on reform; not time to disengage, which would strengthen hand of regressive forces.

ù U.S. policy unchanged: support political reform and reform to promote market economy. Not matter of personalities but implementation of sound policies. Our assistance and IFI investments make sense only in this context.

ù Also working to advance common interests: nuclear disarmament; detargetting; new trade, investment opportunities. Strategy of engagement remains in strong interests of both nations.

Yeltsin's Political Future

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

(If asked only) Russian Guns

ù No agreement reached during Gore-Chernomyrdin on Russian guns. Rather, both sides have agreed in principle to remove Russia from International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) list, an increasingly anachronistic Cold War trade restriction.

ù Before removing Russia from ITAR, sides agreed that new arrangement needs to replace current ITAR restrictions on gun imports. Negotiations this week.

Russia and NATO

ù U.S. and Russia have different views on logic of NATO enlargement. Have ongoing dialogue with Russians on this issue.

ù For our part, we 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.

Chechnya

ù Understand pro-Dudayev rally in central Grozny continues (began February 4). No violence reported. Urge all to avoid actions that could lead to violence.

ù Our consistent position that only reliable path to peace is negotiated settlement that takes interests of all parties into account. Cycle of violence must be broken.

UKRAINE

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release February 8, 1996

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

Visit by President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine

President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine will visit the United States on February 20-22, 1996 to receive the "Freedom Award" from the non-profit institution, Freedom House. President Clinton and Vice President Gore will meet with President Kuchma in the White House on February 21 during his visit to Washington. The "Freedom Award" recognizes President Kuchma's leadership in promoting a democratic and independent Ukraine.

###

IRELAND

U.S. Position on Dayton-Like Proximity Talks

ù View is that any proposal designed to move the process rapidly to all-party talks should be seriously discussed.

U.S. Position on Elective Process Idea?

ù We believe, and have for some time that the idea of an elective process should be discussed in the political track of the twin track process, in the context of moving rapidly to all-party talks.

Meetings

ù Mr. Lake met with Minister of State for Northern Ireland Michael Ancram on January 30. Part of continuing series of contacts with two governments and parties to do what we can to advance the peace process in Northern Ireland.

ù Saw Gerry Adams February 1st. President dropped in on the meeting. Expressed his continuing support for peace progress, urged rapid progress toward all-party talks.

ù Irish Deputy Prime Minister Dick Spring met with Vice President this morning. President dropped by meeting. We expect UUP leader David Trimble the following week. Other leaders and officials may also come in the next few weeks.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release February 8, 1996

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

This morning Irish Deputy Prime Minister Dick Spring met for half an hour with the Vice President for a discussion of Northern Ireland and European issues. The President participated in part of the meeting.

The President and the Vice President discussed the status of the Northern Ireland peace process with the Deputy Prime Minister. They underscored their strong support for the efforts of the Irish and British Governments, the parties, and the people of Northern Ireland to achieve a just and lasting settlement to the conflict there. The President reiterated his long-standing view that the path to such a settlement is through an inclusive dialogue, and he emphasized the importance of rapid progress to all-party talks.

The President and the Deputy Prime Minister discussed the recommendations for advancing the peace process made in the report of the international body on decommissioning chaired by Senator Mitchell. The President, the Vice President and Deputy Prime Minister Spring praised the contribution that Senator Mitchell and his colleagues have made to the process. Now that the international body has made its recommendations on decommissioning, the President and Vice President encouraged all parties to focus on the political track of the twin track process in order to move rapidly to all-party talks.

The President and the Vice President thanked the Deputy Prime Minister for Ireland's contribution to implementing the Bosnia settlement. The Vice President and the Deputy Prime Minister also discussed Ireland's upcoming EU presidency and other issues.

#

Sinn Fein Statement that Peace Process Has "Collapsed"?

ù We remain convinced that the peace process can and should go forward rapidly to all-party talks.

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 Senator Mitchell met with President January 29 for about 20 minutes.

ù Senator provided President with a copy of his report, briefed him on the work that he and his colleagues had

done.

ù President told Mitchell he intended to remain engaged in the search for peace in Ireland.

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.

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 Hope and urge the two governments to engage urgently in the political track. Believe this process will lead to all party talks in the near future.

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.

GREECE-TURKEY

Cancellation of Holbrooke Visit

Q: Why did Holbrooke cancel his trip?

A: The trip of the joint State Department and Defense Department team, led by Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke and Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

y Jan Lodal, has been postponed to a later date. The delay is due to the ongoing efforts to form a new government in Turkey, the continuing concern over the situation in the Aegean, and pressing business for Assistant Secretary Holbrooke in Central Europe.

The trip will be rescheduled at a later date.

Q: Did the announcement by the Greek Prime Minister that Holbrooke's visit would be incompatible with Greek schedules have anything to do with this decision?

A: I understand that the Greek Prime Minister and Foreign Minister will be traveling during the next few weeks to European capitals to discuss the situation in the Aegean. We look forward, however, to discussions with the Greeks in Washington during the State Visit of President Stephanopoulos, if not earlier.

(If asked)

Q: Does this mean the planned U.S. Cyprus initiative is off?

A: Not at all. There were no plans for Assistant Secretary Holbrooke to launch a Cyprus initiative during this trip, due in large part to the fact that one of the key parties in the dispute--Turkey--only has a caretaker government at this time.

Holbrooke had intended his visit as part of a farewell trip to the region. Given the Imia islet crisis, which subsequently intervened, he also hoped to help further calm the waters between Greece and Turkey.

Although the Imia crisis has clearly increased tensions in the region, we are still planning a Cyprus initiative this year.

Indeed, we believe a Cyprus solution could play a key role in reducing the tensions between Greece and Turkey that were on display in the Imia crisis.

Ownership of Imia/Kardak Islet

Q: What is the U.S. position on ownership of the islet?

A: Let me make clear first of all that the United States reaffirms its commitment to the principle of respect for international treaties, the territorial integrity of Greece and Turkey and of internationally recognized borders. We call on both sides to resolve their disagreements by peaceful means, without force or the threat of force.

The U.S. has not taken a position on who owns the islet. There are apparently a number of international agreements relevant to the ownership question, some dating back many decades and involving Italy, which formerly owned the Dodecanese Islands of which the Greeks claim the islet is part.

There is also some dispute over the validity of one of the documents in question.

We believe that the best venue for addressing such questions of ownership is the International Court of Justice or some other consensual body.

Such a tribunal would be well-suited to gather and evaluate all the necessary information.

mation, weigh
impartially the legal arguments of both sides, and explain the basis for its rulings

Presidential Letters

Q: Did the President send letters to the leaders of Greece and Turkey on the islet issue?

A: The President sent letters to President Demirel, Prime Minister Ciller, and Prime Minister Simitis
thanking them for working with us to help resolve the conflict peacefully.

CHINA -- IPR TRADE, TAIWAN, AND PROLIFERATION

NON-PROLIFERATION

-- Non-proliferation -- nuclear as well as missile -- is part of our continuing dialogue with China.

We are closely monitoring any arms or technology transfers that might violate U.S. law.

-- We have concerns and are evaluating the information available. At this point, we have not made
any determination that China has taken actions that would trigger the imposition of sanctions.

-- I am not going to comment on any allegations concerning information that may have been
gathered through intelligence means.

-- We are not avoiding sanctions. We will make a determination based on the facts a

nd legal
requirements. At this point, no decision has been made.

SATELLITE WAIVERS

-- Announced Tuesday three waivers of Foreign Relations Authorization Act (Public Law 101-246) with respect to three satellite launch projects: CHINASAT, MABUHAY, and COSAT.

-- Each waiver removes the otherwise applicable sanctions that were imposed by the United States following Tiananmen Square.

-- All waivers involve civilian commercial satellite technology that would not contribute to Chinese military capabilities.

-- Allowing these projects to proceed also helps maintain the competitiveness of U.S. satellite manufacturers in one of the world's most important markets.

-- Also reinforces continued U.S. commitment to the 1995 U.S.-China commercial space launch agreement.

-- The COSAT project involves two Lockheed-Martin satellites to be used for voice, data, and television transmission to China.

-- CHINASAT involves one Hughes satellite for the same purpose.

-- MABUHAY involves a Loral-manufactured satellite for voice and data communication in the Philippines and neighboring countries. It will be owned by Philippine Satellite Corporation.

-- All satellites will be launched from China using Chinese launch vehicles.

Q: Why now? Is this connected to the Li visit?

A: These waivers were granted to further our normal, commercial trading relationship. They are additional evidence to our commitment to a policy of engagement with China.

They were not discussed with Li nor was the Chinese government given advance notice of the announcement. As I said, this is part of our normal trading relationship with China.

IPR TRADE

-- Our trade relationship with China is part of our overall relationship. We are determined to base it on a policy of engagement; but we are also determined to see that commitments made are commitments kept.

-- Our Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) agreement with China was a significant step forward. But to be effective it has to be complied with.

-- China knows what needs to be done. We intend to work closely with them to clear up any possible ambiguities.

-- USTR officials are in China this week for meetings with Chinese officials on pirated CDs.

Deputy USTR Charlene Barshefsky will meet for more formal discussions in mid-February.

-- We have already made some progress on compliance. But China has some real responsibilities

that it must meet. China has been asked to take some specific steps to stem IPR violations; if China fails does not fulfill its commitments, we will have no choice but to enforce the law.

OVERALL RELATIONSHIP

-- We have made clear to the Chinese and, indeed to the world, that we want our relationship with China to be based on engagement. It is not in our interest to try to "contain" China.

-- Part of that engagement is the talks we are having this week with Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Li. Minister Li is meeting with Under Secretary of State Tarnoff this week. Will also meet with Under Secretary of Defense Slocombe and Deputy National Security Advisor Samuel Berger.

-- We have had a number of sub-cabinet meetings over the last several weeks on a range of foreign policy issues. Among the topics on which we have focused has been China.

-- On January 26, the President's Principal Foreign Policy Advisors met for an hour to talk about our relations with China as we entered the new year. As we said at the time, this was not a decision-making meeting, nor a policy review, but a stock-taking opportunity to take a look at the relationship -- and the issues each cabinet agency would have to deal with -- as we entered the new year.

TAIWAN

-- We are carefully monitoring the situation in the Taiwan Strait over the last several months. We will continue to do so.

-- As we've made clear in the past, the future of Taiwan is a question for the Chinese -- on both sides of the Strait -- to define. Our interest is for any resolution to be a peaceful one. We have urged, and will continue to urge, both parties to avoid provocative acts.

-- (If asked.) The Chinese have not announced any Military Exercises in the Taiwan Straits.

NORTH KOREA FOOD AID

ù Administration has decided to provide \$2 million of flood related assistance to North Korea.

ù This modest assistance would be in the form of a grant from USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance to the World Food Program for procurement of food and related costs.

ù We have made this decision to respond to a genuine humanitarian need and to continue encouraging North Korea's engagement in the international community.

ù We have coordinated this decision with South Korea, which understands and supports us and the WFP. We are confident the WFP can monitor effectively the distribution of the aid.

HAITI

Presidential Call

ù The President was unable to attend the inauguration of President Preval.

ù He sent a delegation of distinguished Americans, including Congressional representatives, led by Ambassador Albright.

ù He called President Preval yesterday afternoon to congratulate him.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release February 6, 1996

PRESIDENTIAL DELEGATION TO THE INAUGURATION OF HIS EXCELLENCY RENE PREVAL, PRESIDENT OF HAITI

President Clinton has appointed Ambassador Madeleine Albright, United States Permanent Representative, to head the Presidential Delegation to the inauguration of His Excellency Rene Preval, President of Haiti. The inauguration, organized by the Haitian Government, will take place February 7 in Port-au-Prince.

The Presidential Delegation also will include William Swing, U.S. Ambassador to Haiti; Strobe Talbott, Deputy Secretary of State; Nancy Soderberg, Deputy Assistant to the President; Harriett Babbitt, Permanent Representative of the United States to the Organization of American States; James Dobbin, Special Adviser on Haiti to the Secretary of State; General John Sheehan, Supreme Allied Commander A

atlantic, Commander in
 Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command; Michael Sheehan, National Security Council Staff; Brooke Shearer, Director,
 White House Fellowships; Mark Schneider, Assistant Administrator for the Bureau for Latin American and the
 Caribbean, Agency for International Development; Senator Christopher Dodd; Representatives John Conyers, Jr.,
 Donald Payne, Carrie P. Meek and Major Owens; Peggy Lewis, Director of Specialty Press, Office of White House
 Press Secretary; Taylor Branch, Writer; Raymond Kelly, President, The Investigative Group, Inc.; Randall
 Robinson, President, TransAfrica and Josephus Eggelleton, Jr., State Representative from Florida.

#

FRAPH

Background: Yesterday's NYT alleges that during the early portion of the U.S. intervention in Haiti, the U.S.
 deliberately told soldiers that FRAPH is a democratic entity rather than a violent terrorist organization.

Points

ù The U.S. military, over time, dismantled the FRAPH in a systematic and resolute manner -- with a minimum of
 violence and no loss of life to US soldiers.

ù The US military was cautious but determined in its approach. The Fadh, the FRAPH, and the attaches have
 been disbanded peacefully nation wide.

ù Part of the reason for the Pentagon's early posture with the FRAPH was their desire to avoid provoking
 violence in the initial period of the intervention. They were sending a message to

FRAPH that they should behave. Their focus was not on past behavior -- but on how people responded during the intervention. The FRAPH continued to break the law -- and it was dismantled.

ù Moreover, when called upon to dismantle FRAPH facilities -- the military responded decisively with minimum injury and loss of life for Haitians -- and with no loss of American life. (One U. S. soldier was killed in an isolated incident later in the intervention, at a checkpoint near Gonaives, in the northern part of Haiti.)

COLOMBIA

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

NIGERIA

Background: We have gotten a number of inquiries about Nigeria and whether/when we will announce sanctions.

Rumors abound about an impending sanctions decision.

Q: There are rumors that the Administration will soon announce sanctions against Nigeria. Is this true?

A: No decisions have been made on unilateral or multilateral sanctions for Nigeria. An in-depth policy review which began late last year continues. All measures, including oil sanctions, remain under consideration.

Q: What are our policy objectives in Nigeria?

A: Our overriding policy objectives in Nigeria remain the early and peaceful establishment of a

stable, democratic, prosperous Nigeria that respects human rights.

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 Ntibantunganya.

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.

CZECH AND SLOVAK FUND, ENTERPRISE FUNDS IN GENERAL A DISASTER?

ù In general, Funds provide crucial support for emerging entrepreneurs that demonstrate that capitalism can work as CEE, NIS countries build new economic systems from ground up. Hard to put a price tag on demonstration effect. Can say that Poland, Hungary and Czech Republic are firmly rooted in capitalism and Funds were key contributors.

ù Funds have influenced changes in laws, regulations and attitudes affecting private business. In Poland, for example, the Fund's small business program became a national model and introduced sm

all business lending to
Polish banking.

ù Problems in the Czech and Slovak Fund were unique. Failure to separate the board chairman and CEO functions eroded internal checks and balances, led to management, procurement and performance problems. Need to ensure this doesn't recur.

ù Congress initially limited USG oversight role to "writing the check." Have been working with Congress to allow prudent oversight while respecting independent nature of the Funds.

ù (If asked about misallocation of taxpayer dollars) Both USAID's Inspector General and Department of Justice have reviewed situation, determined legal actions could not be taken. Even so, management lessons being built into dialogue with Congress on appropriate oversight.

UN BANKRUPTCY

Regarding UN's response to growing financial problems:

ù We urge the United Nations to give serious attention to the proposal by UN Undersecretary for Management Joseph Connor to reduce UN personnel by some 10 percent. The United Nations should begin the difficult process of streamlining and reducing its bloated bureaucracy. As we have done in our own federal government, personnel reductions are a necessary part of reinventing government and making required adjustments to an austere budget situation.

ù The President is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that our current arrears of about \$1 billion are paid in full.

ù The United Nations must intensify reform efforts, abolish out-dated agencies and activities, and reduce a bloated bureaucracy.

LANDMINES

ù The U.S. has taken a number of steps to try to address the global humanitarian crisis caused by the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of landmines.

ù In his September, 1994 address to the UN General Assembly, President Clinton called for the eventual elimination of anti-personnel landmines.

ù As a first step toward that ultimate goal, he proposed the negotiation of a multilateral landmine control regime. Through a combination of transfer, stockpiling, and production restrictions, the regime is aimed at reducing the availability and use of "long-lived" anti-personnel mines in particular -- those APL that can remain in the ground decades after they are emplaced.

-- That regime remains under negotiation today.

ù The U.S. is also leading the effort to strengthen the restrictions on landmine use in the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) Review Conference.

-- We are pressing for restrictions such as: using long-lived anti-personnel mines only in marked and monitored fields, ensuring that mines have a minimum metallic content (to facilitate detection in mine-clearing), and requiring a reliability standard of 99.9% for self-destructing anti-personnel mines (whose use would be permitted outside of marked areas).

Leahy legislation on banning APL use for one year (if asked):

ù The use of anti-personnel mines are an integral part of U.S. military doctrine. We will have to look at the impact of the Leahy legislation on our defense capabilities.

B-2 BOMBER REVIEW

Q: Does this mean that you are no longer considering the purchase of additional B-2's?

A: The Administration has no plans to buy additional B-2's.

Q: Then why are you going to study the issue further?

A: The President, taking into consideration concerns expressed by members of Congress, directed the Department of Defense, as part of its Deep Attack Weapons Mix Study (DAWMS), to look at various tradeoffs between land-based and sea-based aviation, between shorter-range tactical aircraft and longer-range bombers, between air-to-surface and surface-to-surface missiles, and between precision-guided munitions and platforms to launch them. The B-2 will be included i

n this study.

Q: Is this a new study?

A: This is not a new study but rather an extension of an existing study. The ongoing DAWMS study will include a phase that explicitly considers force structure tradeoffs, such as between precision-guided munitions and platforms to launch them.

Q: Hasn't the Pentagon already done several studies that addressed the issue of bombers?

A: Yes, in 1995, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, completed the Heavy Bombers Force Study (HBFS). This effort found that additional B-2's did not materially change the conflict outcome for the most likely scenarios. There are better, more cost-effective ways to improve our deep attack capability than buying additional B-2 aircraft. One is investing in common, interoperable, precision weapons and integrating delivery capability on the full-range of platforms. The HBFS did not, however, examine tradeoffs between bomber and non-bomber deep-strike platforms. There was also the Bomber Industrial Capabilities Study (BICS) completed in July, 1995, that concluded there is not a unique bomber industrial base. We previously have experienced significant gaps in bomber production, and a different manufacturer produced each of our current bombers.

Q: Will the new study explicitly look at buying more than 20 B-2 bombers?

A: That is not the focus of the new study. Instead, the study will look at a whole

range of force structure options, including larger -- and smaller -- bomber force structures. It will also examine changes in the size of our aircraft carrier force, land-based tactical air force, surface-to-surface missile force and precision-guided munitions programs.

Q: Why look at buying more B-2 bombers if you just decided not to procure more than the original 20 bombers in your Fiscal Year 1997-2001 defense program?

A: The study will use the Fiscal Year 1997-2001 program as a baseline and then look at options that both add to and subtract from that program. Building a defense program is a dynamic process that does not stop when we submit a budget. We are continually evaluating and reevaluating our programs.

Q: Dr. Perry stated as recently as two weeks ago that the Department was firmly opposed to additional B-2 bombers. What has changed?

A: The Administration's position on additional B-2 bombers remains the same. We cannot afford the \$30 billion that 20 additional B-2's would cost because we have higher priorities in our modernization program. We will, however, continue to study the deep strike issue. In particular, we will be doing some force structure tradeoff studies that some members of Congress have requested.

Q: So additional B-2's are still a possibility?

A: Although nothing is being ruled out in this study, the Administration does not believe additional B-2's are a necessary or cost-effective investment.

Q: Aren't the conclusions of this study pre-ordained? The Pentagon is studying its

own previous study.

A: DOD stands by the results of its earlier study. We are not repeating the previous study, since it did not examine non-bomber tradeoff options, but rather extending it to assess the best mix of munitions and platforms and, in particular, to assess possible force structure tradeoffs.

Q: What is the role of the Defense Science Board in this study?

A: The DSB will be asked to provide an independent assessment of the analytic tools and models and make any recommendations for improvement in the study's analytic approach. The DSB will undertake this review at the conclusion of the first part of the study next summer and will be briefed periodically. The goal is to ensure that the study's overall approach is validated before the work on force structure tradeoffs is conducted.

Q: You are talking about force structure reductions. Does this mean you may alter the Bottom-Up Review force structure?

A: We have no plans to change the Bottom-Up Review force structure. But when you look as far out as 2014, it makes sense to examine potential force structure tradeoffs.

Q: What was the recommendation of the NSC review?

A: The NSC provided the President with its evaluation of the pros and cons of a range of options concerning the B-2. The review did not make a specific recommendation.

Q: What were the options?

A: I am not going to get into detail, but you can assume they covered a range of possibilities to respond to the new situation presented in the Fiscal Year 1996 authorization bill.

Q: Well, what then did Tony Lake recommend to the President with regard to the options identified in the NSC review?

A: We do not comment on the confidential advice the President receives from his senior advisors on national security matters. I am sure you appreciate that is privileged.

Q: Is there a rift between the NSC and the Pentagon on this issue?

A: No. The NSC and the Defense Department both fully support and agree with the President's decision.

Q: Do the Joint Chiefs agree?

A: Yes, unanimously, as do the CINCs.

Q: Why did the NSC conduct its review then?

A: Once it was clear Congress was going to revise the vetoed Fiscal Year 1996 defense authorization bill, which included provisions lifting the cap on 20 bombers and authorizing the additional \$493 million, in a way that would permit the President to sign it, we thought it wise to take a fresh look at the program.

Q: How many B-2's have been delivered to the Air Force?

A: Eight.

Q: When will the B-2 force become operational?

A: The first squadron of eight will be declared operational in Fiscal Year 1997.

Q: How much would 20 additional B-2's have cost?

A: Over 20 years, \$30 billion in life-cycle costs in year dollars.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL AND HIV-POSITIVE SERVICEMEMBERS

Background: The Washington Post reported that the President will sign the Defense Authorization bill which has a provision mandating the discharge of HIV-positive service personnel. The article reports that these personnel will lose their medical benefits when they are discharged, and that they will not be eligible for tax-free disability pay.

The article is, at best, misleading. HIV-positive servicemembers who are discharged will qualify for the same medical and dental benefits as a military retiree. With regard to disability, HIV-positive personnel currently do not qualify for disability pay until their condition progresses to AIDS and they become disabled. The servicemember is then treated the same as any other member who is disabled by a service-related medical condition, and is discharged with disability compensation. If the HIV-positive servicemember had not developed AIDS until after he left the service, he would also qualify for disability compensation under the Veterans Administration. Now,

when the DoD Authorization bill becomes law, those HIV-personnel who are discharged will also qualify for disability compensation if they later develop AIDS after leaving the service, just as they would have before.

Points

- ù The President is very concerned about the unfairness of the HIV-provision in the DoD Authorization bill.

However, he will reluctantly sign the bill because of the number of provisions in it which are of great importance to the Administration.

- ù The Administration will seek to repeal the HIV provision through subsequent legislation, including the FY 1997 Defense Authorization bill.

- ù Contrary to the story in the Washington Post, HIV-positive servicemembers who are discharged will receive medical and dental benefits, the same as those of a military retiree. This includes access to the military health care system, as well as to civilian medical care through the CHAMPUS program where military facilities are not available.

- ù Also, HIV-positive personnel who are discharged and later develop AIDS will qualify for disability compensation, just as any other veteran who later becomes disabled from a service-related medical condition after discharge.

- ù (if asked: Separation of HIV-positive servicemembers will be made on a date to be determined by the Secretary concerned, which is to be as soon as practicable after the date on which the determination is made that a member is HIV-positive and not later than the last day of the sixth month beginning after such a date. For

those who already have been identified as HIV-positive, they are to be discharged within six months after the bill becomes law.

ù If such a person is within two years of retirement on the date of scheduled discharge, that person may be retained on active duty until qualified for retirement.)

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 09 February 96 09:46
FROM Sestak, Joseph A.
CLASSIFICATION ***** CLASSIFICATION NOT FOUND *****
SUBJECT DoD Auth Bill

TO Baker, Jane E.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Friedrich, M. K.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

As Nancy requested, attached is background/TPs on positive aspects of DoD auth bill. r, Joe

[[DODAUTH7.DOC : 2394 in DODAUTH7.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 9 February 96 9:45

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** DODAUTH7.DOC

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Background: 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 the three major 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 other issues about which the administration had expressed concern, but which were not revised. However, the revised bill also contains a number of initiatives 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, the President decided to sign the revised bill.

Consideration for vetoing the bill on the basis of the HIV provision had to be weighed against these and other aspects of the bill which provided for very important advances in national security and the need to have a defense authorization bill that would fund certain military programs for the year. While preferring not to accept an objectionable provision we otherwise would not, the provision needed to be weighed in the balance with the need for a strong and effective national defense.

Points

ù The bill contains a number of provisions of great importance to the Administration which authorize the Department to continue critical important defense programs and activities and to initiate a number of new reforms. The Act also provides, extends or amends various authorities relating to national defense programs and activities that the Department needs to function effectively and efficiently. Among them are:

ù The Act contains significant acquisition reform measures which will produce cost savings on which the Defense Department is counting to maintain the integrity of its budget. Sought by the Administration and undertaken with bipartisan support, these measures will

further s
 implify and
 facilitate the purchase of commercially-available goods and services, streamline
 and
 clarify
 procurement integrity laws, and substantially improve how bid protests for
 informati
 on technology
 are resolved

ù The Military Housing Privatization Initiative, which provides new authority to
 acq
 uire and improve
 military housing and supporting facilities by using private expertise and capital.
 This is very
 important to maintaining quality of life in our military and high retention levels a
 mong service
 personnel.

ù Authorization for the full increase in pay and allowances for our military
 personn
 el proposed by the
 President.

ù Authorization for necessary military construction and NATO infrastructure
 programs
 , of special
 importance to current work in Bosnia.

ù Continuation of the Department of Energy's science-based Stockpile
 Stewardship pro
 gram, which is
 absolutely crucial if we are to sign and observe a zero yield Comprehensive Test
 Ban
 Treaty.

ù The Administration's proposal to allow the United States to extradite indicted
 war
 criminals and
 provide evidence directly to the International War Crimes Tribunals for the
 Former Y
 ugoslavia and
 Rwanda, encouraging others to fully cooperate with the War Crimes Tribunal.

ù In response to serious concerns about the outmoded approach to the acquisition
 and
 management of
 information technology in the Federal government, the Act simplifies and
 strengthens
 the way

agencies use and acquire computers and telecommunications, giving them authority and flexibility, but insisting on accountability for results. Consistent with the Administration's efforts under the National Performance review to create a government that works better and costs less, the Act encourages agencies to adopt the best practices of successful companies in the private sector.

ù