

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 20 September 96 18:39
FROM Naplan, Steven J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT EID Fact Sheet [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bass, Peter E.
CARBON_COPY Naplan, Steven J.
TEXT_BODY
for Lake's review[[EID.DOC : 4633 in EID.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 20 September 96 18:39
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** EID.DOC

EMERGING INFECTIOUS DISEASES

"Emerging infectious diseases present one of the most significant health and security challenges facing the global community. Through President Clinton's leadership, we now have the first national policy to deal with this serious international problem."

Vice President Gore
Remarks to National Council for International Health
Crystal City, Virginia, June 12, 1996.

Emerging infectious diseases such as Ebola, drug-resistant tuberculosis, and HIV/AIDS present one of the most significant health and security challenges facing the global community. Deaths from infectious disease have risen sharply over the past decade in the United States and globally. In the United States alone, the death rate from infectious diseases, excluding HIV/AIDS, rose by 22 percent between 1980 and 1992. Contributing factors, such as climate change, ecosystem disturbance, increased movement of people and goods, and the deterioration of public health infrastructures, show no sign of abatement. Addressing this challenge requires a global

strategy as most cities in the United States are within a 36-hour commercial flight of any area of the world -- less time than the incubation period of many infectious diseases. Furthermore, the United States is vulnerable to a release of biological agents by rogue nations or terrorists, which could result in the spread of infectious diseases.

Our most effective means to protect the health of U.S. citizens against diseases from within our borders and beyond our shores is a strategy of surveillance, prevention, and response.

A RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:

The Clinton Administration has announced a new policy that will put into place a coordinated national response to the growing threat of infectious diseases including basic research, training, public health programs, foreign assistance, and security measures. Internationally, the U.S. will work with multilateral organizations and other countries to improve world-wide disease surveillance, reporting and response, while encouraging other countries to make infectious disease detection and control national priorities.

Surveillance, Response, and Prevention:

_ Reviewed the existing national and international mechanisms for surveillance, response, and prevention through the National Science and Technology Council Committee (NSTC) on International Science, Engineering and Technology (CISET). Published the findings as a widely released NSTC report, "Infectious Disease -- A Global Health Threat," which was widely released.

_ Released a Presidential Decision Directive, laying out a strategy for establishing a worldwide infectious disease surveillance and response system, expanding certain federal agency mandates to better protect U.S. citizens from emerging infectious diseases, strengthening research to improve diagnosis, treatment, and preventative measures.

EID Task Force:

_ Created a Task Force on Emerging Infectious Diseases, co-chaired by CDC and OSTP, which is responsible for the implementation of the Presidential Decision Directive.

International Cooperation:

_ Raised the visibility of emerging infectious diseases with our international partners through a number of bilateral and multilateral fora, such as the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission, the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission, the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda, and APEC.

_ Laid the groundwork for establishing a regional surveillance and response center in South Africa under the rubric of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission

THE CHALLENGES AHEAD:

The Clinton Administration is committed to protecting U.S. citizens from the threats posed by emerging infectious diseases. The President's FY97 budget reflects this commitment by calling for a \$26M increase in the Centers for Disease Control's budget for Emerging Infectious Diseases from \$18.4M to \$44.4M. Since the Vice President announced the President's new policy on June 12, the Task Force on Emerging Infectious Diseases has begun to implement the steps called for in the PDD, including:

- ù Enhance the surveillance and response components of our domestic public health infrastructure. Establish a national electronic network for surveillance and response in cooperation with State and local governments, international organizations, the private sector, and public health and medical communities.

- ù Enhance biomedical and biobehavioral research efforts on emerging infectious diseases.

- ù Encourage expanded formal training for health care providers in emerging infectious diseases.

ù Review and update regulations for screening and quarantine at ports of entry into the United States and make information about ill international travelers more accessible to domestic health authorities.

ù Encourage other nations and international organizations to assign higher priority to emerging infectious diseases and support the World Health Organization and other bodies in playing a stronger role in emerging infectious diseases.

ù Expand missions and mandates of relevant U.S. Government agencies to contribute to a worldwide infectious disease network.

ù Develop outreach program to State and local governments and the private sector, including domestic and international NGO's and industry groups.

Last Update: August 13, 1996

STATUS:

Jones drafted: 8/21

SN to Blinken: 8/21

SN made Blinken edits: 9/20

SN to Lake via Bass: 9/20

saved as:ffact/eid.doc

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 24 September 96 13:18

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

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

SUBJECT (Signing) SBTP re National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1997

TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
Albert, Ronda A.
Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Appel, Edward J.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bemisderfer, Dwight D.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Biernacki, Eileen V.
Birkland, Andrea L.
Black, Todd F.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boulton, Darrien D.
Boynton, Peter J.
Brennan, Steven A.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Brooks, Jennifer
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Bujold, Noelle D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Carter, Michael E.
Cicio, Kristen K.

Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davis, William K.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dobbins, James F.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dory, Amanda J.
Dowling, J. Nicholas
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Eggert, Tamara E.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Epstein, Gerald L.
Feeley, John F.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Dan
Florio, Elaine
Fort, Jane B.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gibney, James S.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grummon, Stephen R.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, James A.
Hall, Wilma G.
Hamel, Michael A.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.
Hasman, Thomas 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.
Johnson, David T.
Johnson, Natalie A.
Jones, Kerri-Ann D.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kinser-Kidane, Brenda J.
Koehler, Marc
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Lawrence, Cynthia
Leary, William H.
LeBaron, Richard B.
Lee, Malcolm R.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsay, James M.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
MacDonald, Bruce W.
Malley, Robert
Marshall, Betty A.
Marsh, Thomas S.
Martinez, Alejandro
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoaka, Lester H.
Moffett, Julia
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Motherway, Daniel J.
Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Naplan, Steven J.

Natoli, Kim M.
Neil, M. Elise
Norris, John J.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Orfini, Michael H.
Orr, Robert C.
O'Shaughnessy, Patrick
Panerali, Kristen E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Patmon, Matthew W.
Peggins, John W.
Peters, Mary A.
Piccone, Theodore J.
Pifer, Steven K.
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Pyatt, Geoffrey R.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ragan, Richard F.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Rice, Susan E.
Rice, Sean P.
Roach, Darren S.
Robinson, Wylma
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Rumer, Eugene B.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Saunders, John W.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simonalle, Eugene A.
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Smith, Michael P.
Snyder, Julie A.

Sparks, John E.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Styles, Kiwanis H.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Szasz, Nicholas J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Waller, Robert P.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Wechsler, William F.
Wetzel, M. Jeanne
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Willis, Robin M.
Wise, William M.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Wright, Jay
Yokum, Jeffrey G.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[AUTHSIGN.DOC : 3337 in AUTHSIGN.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 24 September 96 13:10

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** AUTHSIGN.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release September 24, 1996

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Today I have signed into law H.R. 3230, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997," legislation authorizing fiscal 1997 appropriations for military activities of the Department of Defense, military construction, and defense activities of the Department of Energy. While I have reservations about parts of this Act, it is a step in the right direction, authorizing much of what my Administration sought and omitting a number of provisions that we opposed.

First, the Act will improve the quality of life for military personnel by providing a 3 percent pay increase and better housing opportunities.

Second, the Act authorizes appropriations for important modernization programs requested in my budget. These programs, which are designed to provide our forces with the most modern equipment found anywhere on the globe, include the Army's Comanche helicopter, the Navy's Seawolf submarine, the Air Force's C-17 transport, and the V-22 Osprey for the Marine Corps.

Third, the Act authorizes additional appropriations for counter-narcotics programs, which my Administration sought in a FY 1996 supplemental appropriations request.

Fourth, the Act authorizes the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, which provides a highly effective means of enhancing U.S. security by eliminating nuclear weapons and preventing weapons proliferation in the states of the former Soviet Union. And the Act also establishes the Nunn-Lugar II program, which authorizes the Department of Defense to assist civilian law enforcement agencies in responding to emergencies involving biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons of mass destruction, and to provide funding to improve the security of U.S. and international borders.

Fifth, the Act creates a new National Imagery and Mapping Agency, which will provide a single focus within the Government for managing imagery and geospatial information.

Sixth, the Act advances my commitment to sound environmental management by fully funding my request for Defense environmental programs and authorizing solid waste management technologies for Navy ships.

Seventh, the Act authorizes my Administration's request to award the Medal of Honor to seven African American soldiers who demonstrated outstanding heroism in combat during World War II.

I am also gratified that the final version of this bill omitted certain provisions that my Administration staunchly opposed.

These include: provisions that would have interfered with our ability to control ballistic missiles by legislating the standards for demarcating theater from strategic ballistic missiles and preventing the President from adding states of the former Soviet Union to the ABM Treaty; and a discriminatory provision requiring discharge of HIV-positive service members.

And I am pleased as well that this Act includes an important nondefense measure, the Interstate Stalking Punishment and Prevention Act, which makes interstate stalking a Federal offense. Most States have strong anti-stalking laws against those who seek to threaten, harass, or intimidate others, especially women and girls. But, until now, stalkers could not be charged with violating restraining orders if they travelled to another State to pursue their victims. This new measure eliminates that loophole and will allow Federal law enforcement to crack down on stalkers wherever they go.

For all its strengths, though, I do have some reservations about this Act. Most important, the Act authorizes \$11.5 billion of appropriations above my 1997 budget request of \$254.2 billion. I firmly believe that my requested funding levels maintain a strong defense without sacrificing important domestic programs. Moreover, much of the increase authorized by this Act is for programs not in the Department of Defense's long-range plan and will require additional future funding, precluding successful completion of modernization programs more vital to our national defense.

Nevertheless, authorization legislation establishes spending ceilings and not floors. The actual spending levels will be set through the appropriations process. Without adjustments to the proposed Defense Appropriations funding levels, I am deeply concerned about the Congress' ability to fund critical domestic needs in education and other areas. These needs must be met before the Congress adjourns.

I am also disappointed in several other features of the Act. First, it reduces funding for the important Dual Use Applications Program, the successor to my Technology Reinvestment Project. And it also omits my Administration's proposals to broaden the Defense Department's authority to acquire commercial or industrial supplies by contract from the private sector and to outsource more depot maintenance.

Further, the Act fails to include a provision passed by the Senate that would have permitted overseas military medical facilities to provide the same essential medical services to military personnel and their dependents stationed abroad for privately financed abortions that are available in the United States. I supported the Senate provision because I think it is unfair to deny American women serving our country overseas the ability to choose to have a safe legal abortion.

Other provisions of the Act raise serious constitutional concerns. Provisions purporting to require the President to enter into or report on specified negotiations with foreign governments, as well as a provision that limits the information that could be revealed in negotiations, intrude on the President's constitutional authority to conduct the Nation's diplomacy and the President's role as Commander in Chief. I will interpret these provisions as precatory.

Further, the bill's method for appointing the National Ocean Leadership Council would violate the Appointments Clause of the Constitution. I urge the Congress to pass amendments at the earliest possible time to provide for a constitutional means of appointing

this Council. Until this correction is made, the Council should not exercise significant governmental authority.

Another provision of the Act could be read to require intra-branch consultations before the Secretary of Defense could make recommendations to me regarding certain appointments. This provision is constitutionally questionable, and I therefore will construe it consistent with my authorities under the Constitution. I anticipate implementing the intent of the provisions with an Executive order.

The Act would overturn organizational arrangements in the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons complex that have served the Nation well for over 50 years. Because this micromanagement provision would severely limit the Secretary's ability to determine and control the best way to manage the Department's personnel, budget, and procurement functions, I have directed the Secretary to study the provision's effects and to report to me and to the Congress on the study's results before implementing this provision. If reorganization is appropriate, the Secretary of Energy should use existing statutory authority to assure that the Department is organized in a way that is most efficient for carrying out the Department's business.

Finally, I note that the Act requires the Secretaries of Defense and Health and Human Services to submit a plan to the Congress to establish a Medicare subvention demonstration program. This program would allow Medicare-eligible beneficiaries to enroll in the Defense Department's TRICARE managed care program. These Departments recently reached agreement on a detailed plan to implement a 3-year Medicare subvention demonstration. Thus, I have directed the Departments to work with the Congress on bipartisan legislation that would initiate this demonstration.

On balance, this Act takes a number of important steps to advance our national security and the well-being of those who serve us with such loyalty and distinction in our Armed Forces. I look forward to working with the Congress to assure that the appropriated funding is consistent with my Administration's commitment both to

defend this Nation and to honor its values.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 23, 1996.

#

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 25 September 96 10:52
FROM Fuhrman, Thomas A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT stmt by the President on Defense Authorization [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Behring, Deanna M.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY
Deanna: Here is the statement by the President on signing the FY97
Defense Authorization Bill.
[[SBTPAUTH.DOC : 2566 in SBTPAUTH.DOC]]
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 25 September 96 10:50
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** SBTPAUTH.DOC

UNCLASSIFIEDPREC: RUSH CATEGORY: WASHINGTON DATELINE
NWSID:
U0113211SOURCE: AP/US s0109
^bc-WH-defense-bill 09-24
Statement by President Clinton on Defense Authorization Bill
To: National Desk
Contact: White House Press Office, 202-456-2100
WASHINGTON, Sept. 24 /U.S. Newswire/ -- The following
statement
by
President Clinton was released today:
Office of the Press Secretary
Today I have signed into law H.R. 3230, the ``National Defense
Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997," legislation authorizing
fiscal 1997 appropriations for military activities of the
Department
of Defense, military construction, and defense activities of the
Department of Energy. While I have reservations about parts of
this
Act, it is a step in the right direction, authorizing much of
what
my
Administration sought and omitting a number of provisions that we
opposed.
First, the Act will improve the quality of life for military
personnel by providing a 3 percent pay increase and better housing

opportunities.

Second, the Act authorizes appropriations for important modernization programs requested in my budget. These programs, which are designed to provide our forces with the most modern equipment found anywhere on the globe, include the Army's Comanche helicopter, the Navy's Seawolf submarine, the Air Force's C-17 transport, and the V-22 Osprey for the Marine Corps.

Third, the Act authorizes additional appropriations for counter-narcotics programs, which my Administration sought in a FY 1996 supplemental appropriations request.

Fourth, the Act authorizes the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, which provides a highly effective means of enhancing U.S. security by eliminating nuclear weapons and preventing weapons proliferation in the states of the former Soviet Union.

And

the Act also establishes the Nunn-Lugar II program, which authorizes

the Department of Defense to assist civilian law enforcement agencies

in responding to emergencies involving biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons of mass destruction, and to provide funding to improve

the security of U.S. and international borders.

Fifth, the Act creates a new National Imagery and Mapping Agency,

which will provide a single focus within the Government for managing imagery and geospatial information.

Sixth, the Act advances my commitment to sound environmental management by fully funding my request for Defense environmental programs and authorizing solid waste management technologies for Navy

ships.

Seventh, the Act authorizes my Administration's request to award

the Medal of Honor to seven African American soldiers who demonstrated

outstanding heroism in combat during World War II.

I am also gratified that the final version of this bill omitted certain provisions that my Administration staunchly opposed. These include: provisions that would have interfered with our ability to control ballistic missiles by legislating the standards for demarcating theater from strategic ballistic missiles and preventing

the President from adding states of the former Soviet Union to the

ABM

Treaty; and a discriminatory provision requiring discharge of HIV-positive service members.

And I am pleased as well that this Act includes an important nondefense measure, the Interstate Stalking Punishment and Prevention

Act, which makes interstate stalking a Federal offense. Most States

have strong anti-stalking laws against those who seek to threaten, harass, or intimidate others, especially women and girls. But, until

now, stalkers could not be charged with violating restraining orders

if they travelled to another State to pursue their victims. This new

measure eliminates that loophole and will allow Federal law enforcement to crack down on stalkers wherever they go.

For all its strengths, though, I do have some reservations about

this Act. Most important, the Act authorizes \$11.5 billion of appropriations above my 1997 budget request of \$254.2 billion. I firmly believe that my requested funding levels maintain a strong defense without sacrificing important domestic programs. Moreover, much of the increase authorized by this Act is for programs not in the

Department of Defense's long-range plan and will require additional

future funding, precluding successful completion of modernization programs more vital to our national defense.

Nevertheless, authorization legislation establishes spending ceilings and not floors. The actual spending levels will be set through the appropriations process. Without adjustments to the proposed Defense Appropriations funding levels, I am deeply concerned

about the Congress' ability to fund critical domestic needs in education and other areas. These needs must be met before the Congress adjourns.

I am also disappointed in several other features of the Act.

First,

it reduces funding for the important Dual Use Applications Program,

the successor to my Technology Reinvestment Project. And it also omits

my Administration's proposals to broaden the Defense Department's authority to acquire commercial or industrial supplies by contract from the private sector and to outsource more depot maintenance.

Further, the Act fails to include a provision passed by the Senate

that would have permitted overseas military medical facilities to provide the same essential medical services to military personnel and

their dependents stationed abroad for privately financed abortions that are available in the United States. I supported the Senate provision because I think it is unfair to deny American women serving

our country overseas the ability to choose to have a safe legal abortion.

Other provisions of the Act raise serious constitutional concerns.

Provisions purporting to require the President to enter into or report

on specified negotiations with foreign governments, as well as a provision that limits the information that could be revealed in negotiations, intrude on the President's constitutional authority to

conduct the Nation's diplomacy and the President's role as Commander

in Chief. I will interpret these provisions as precatory.

Further, the bill's method for appointing the National Ocean Leadership Council would violate the Appointments Clause of the Constitution. I urge the Congress to pass amendments at the earliest

possible time to provide for a constitutional means of appointing this

Council. Until this correction is made, the Council should not exercise significant governmental authority.

Another provision of the Act could be read to require intra-branch

consultations before the Secretary of Defense could make recommendations to me regarding certain appointments. This provision

is constitutionally questionable, and I therefore will construe it consistent with my authorities under the Constitution. I

anticipate

implementing the intent of the provisions with an Executive order.

<-END-OF-AUTOBREAK(1)-<

-AUTOBREAK(2)-FOLLOWS<

US-F 09/24/96 11:31:00

DIST:

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 27 September 96 17:51

FROM Patmon, Matthew W.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT (Signing) SBTP at VA/HUD Act [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
Albert, Ronda A.
Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Appel, Edward J.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bemisderfer, Dwight D.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Biernacki, Eileen V.
Birkland, Andrea L.
Black, Todd F.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boulton, Darrien D.
Boynton, Peter J.
Brennan, Steven A.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Brooks, Jennifer
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Bujold, Noelle D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Caravelli, John M.
Carter, Michael E.

Chen, Philip D.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davis, William K.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dobbins, James F.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dory, Amanda J.
Dowling, J. Nicholas
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Eggert, Tamara E.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Epstein, Gerald L.
Feeley, John F.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Dan
Florio, Elaine
Fort, Jane B.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gibney, James S.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grummon, Stephen R.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, James A.
Hall, Wilma G.
Hamel, Michael A.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.

Hasman, Thomas 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.
Johnson, David T.
Johnson, Natalie A.
Jones, Kerri-Ann D.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kinser-Kidane, Brenda J.
Koehler, Marc
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Lawrence, Cynthia
Leary, William H.
LeBaron, Richard B.
Lee, Malcolm R.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsay, James M.
Lindsey, Christine J.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
MacDonald, Bruce W.
Malley, Robert
Marshall, Betty A.
Marsh, Thomas S.
Martinez, Alejandro
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moffett, Julia
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Motherway, Daniel J.

Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Naplan, Steven J.
Natoli, Kim M.
Neil, M. Elise
Norris, John J.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Orfini, Michael H.
Orr, Robert C.
O'Shaughnessy, Patrick
Panerali, Kristen E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Patmon, Matthew W.
Peggins, John W.
Peters, Mary A.
Piccone, Theodore J.
Pifer, Steven K.
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Pyatt, Geoffrey R.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ragan, Richard F.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Rice, Susan E.
Rice, Sean P.
Roach, Darren S.
Robinson, Wylma
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Rumer, Eugene B.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Saunders, John W.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simonalle, Eugene A.
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.

Smith, Michael P.
Snyder, Julie A.
Sparks, John E.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Styles, Kiwanis H.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Szasz, Nicholas J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Waller, Robert P.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Wechsler, William F.
Wetzel, M. Jeanne
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Willis, Robin M.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Wright, Jay
Yokum, Jeffrey G.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[APPRO.DOC : 4427 in APPRO.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 27 September 96 17:50

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** APPRO.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release September 26, 1996

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Today I have signed into law H.R. 3666, the "Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, FY 1997."

The Act provides funding for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and several other agencies. This Act will fund vital environmental, veterans, housing, community development, science, and space programs.

I am pleased that the Congress has responded to my call to include three bipartisan provisions aimed at eliminating a range of health care crises that thousands of Americans face every year. These include: a mental health parity provision that prohibits health plans from establishing separate lifetime and annual limits for mental health; the Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act of 1996 that requires health insurers to let all new mothers and their babies stay in the hospital for at least 48 hours following normal deliveries; and my proposal to assist the children of Vietnam veterans who are born with the birth defect, spina bifida.

The Act provides funding for a number of my high-priority investment proposals, including the Corporation for National and Community Service and the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) fund. The National Service initiative gives young people an opportunity to obtain funding for a college education while serving the country in areas of great need, such as education, environment, public safety, and human services. If Congress had provided my request, an additional 6,000 young Americans would have had the opportunity to help their community through AmeriCorps. Funding for CDFI will increase the flow of capital to distressed neighborhoods and their currently underserved, low-income residents, and provide financing for neighborhood redevelopment and revitalization efforts.

The Act provides \$6.7 billion for the EPA, or 4.5 percent less than my request and will enable the EPA to adequately enforce our environmental laws and provide for the continued cleanup of hazardous waste sites.

I am, however, concerned about the levels provided for EPA's important implementation of the recently enacted safe drinking water and food quality legislation, continued progress on the U.S. global climate change Action Plan, Montreal Protocol efforts to prevent ozone layer depletion, and Boston Harbor clean-up. I will continue to press the Congress to provide more adequate funding levels for these and other important priorities as my Administration negotiates with the Congress over an omnibus appropriations bill to resolve remaining fiscal 1997 funding issues.

The Act extends several expiring provisions of last year's bill that are critical to HUD's ability to continue its activities, including demolishing and replacing the worst public housing, supporting movement from dependency to work, and streamlining low-income housing assistance and FHA mortgage insurance programs. The bill also provides the tools necessary to reduce the costs of section 8 renewals for FHA-insured properties, and fully funds my request for the Housing Opportunities for Persons With Aids program.

I am pleased that the bill continues to support States and cities through HUD's key economic development programs - Community Development Block Grants, and the Home Investment Partnerships program. Funding provided for the Youthbuild program will help at-risk youth learn valuable skills, that will enable them to gain employment and break the cycle of poverty. The bill also provides needed capital and operating funds to support the sound operation of over one million public housing apartments.

The Act fully funds my request for the medical care of this Nation's veterans and includes incremental funding for a VA hospital at Travis Air Force Base in Fairfield, California. I am, however, disappointed that the bill does not provide necessary funding for an additional hospital in Brevard County, Florida.

The bill fully funds the Space Station program, and includes needed buyout authority for NASA as it moves to restructure itself for the future.

I am concerned, however, that the bill does not provide funding for NASA's or EPA's contribution to the innovative GLOBE program. This unwarranted change of direction will adversely impact thousands of teachers and students in 2,000 U.S. schools and in 35 other countries who have invested their resources, time, and energy in this valuable program. I plan to press the Congress to include funding for GLOBE in the omnibus 1997 funding bill that my Administration is negotiating with the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

#

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 30 September 96 16:07

FROM Patmon, Matthew W.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Sept 30 Brief by Panetta, Rubin, Raines [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
Albert, Ronda A.
Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Appel, Edward J.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bemisderfer, Dwight D.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Biernacki, Eileen V.
Birkland, Andrea L.
Black, Todd F.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boulton, Darrien D.
Boynton, Peter J.
Brennan, Steven A.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Brooks, Jennifer
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Bujold, Noelle D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Caravelli, John M.
Carter, Michael E.

Chen, Philip D.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davis, William K.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dobbins, James F.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dory, Amanda J.
Dowling, J. Nicholas
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Eggert, Tamara E.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Epstein, Gerald L.
Feeley, John F.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Dan
Florio, Elaine
Fort, Jane B.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gibney, James S.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grummon, Stephen R.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, James A.
Hall, Wilma G.
Hamel, Michael A.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.

Hasman, Thomas 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.
Johnson, David T.
Johnson, Natalie A.
Jones, Kerri-Ann D.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kinser-Kidane, Brenda J.
Koehler, Marc
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Lawrence, Cynthia
Leary, William H.
LeBaron, Richard B.
Lee, Malcolm R.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsay, James M.
Lindsey, Christine J.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
MacDonald, Bruce W.
Malley, Robert
Marshall, Betty A.
Marsh, Thomas S.
Martinez, Alejandro
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moffett, Julia
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Motherway, Daniel J.

Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Naplan, Steven J.
Natoli, Kim M.
Neil, M. Elise
Norris, John J.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Orfini, Michael H.
Orr, Robert C.
O'Shaughnessy, Patrick
Panerali, Kristen E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Patmon, Matthew W.
Peggins, John W.
Peters, Mary A.
Piccone, Theodore J.
Pifer, Steven K.
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Pyatt, Geoffrey R.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ragan, Richard F.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Rice, Susan E.
Rice, Sean P.
Roach, Darren S.
Robinson, Wylma
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Rumer, Eugene B.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Saunders, John W.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simonalle, Eugene A.
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.

Smith, Michael P.
Snyder, Julie A.
Sparks, John E.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Styles, Kiwanis H.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Szasz, Nicholas J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Waller, Robert P.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Wechsler, William F.
Wetzel, M. Jeanne
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Willis, Robin M.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Wright, Jay
Yokum, Jeffrey G.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[BRIEF30.DOC : 4099 in BRIEF30.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 30 September 96 16:6

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** BRIEF30.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release September 30, 1996

BRIEFING BY
CHIEF OF STAFF LEON PANETTA,
SECRETARY OF TREASURY BOB RUBIN,
AND OMB DIRECTOR FRANKLIN RAINES

The Briefing Room

11:58 A.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: And a cheerful good morning to all of you. As you know, the United States Congress is expected to complete work on the omnibus appropriations bill for the Fiscal Year 1997 later today. The President is expected to sign said measure by midnight tonight. And to bring you all the highlights and the internal information that you need to understand this important piece of legislation, we are delighted to have the Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, here; the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Rubin; and Franklin Raines, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

I'll tell you also -- we'll go through the briefing now -
- some of our technical staff, if you've got specific questions on aspects of the bill, they'll be available outside the awning area at the conclusion of this briefing.

Q Will there be coverage of the President signing it?

MR. MCCURRY: I am anticipating a very late arrival of this tonight. Our goal is to have a statement out that will be embargoed until -- we'll alert you when he signs it, but to keep everyone from having to stay here all night long, we don't anticipate this until very late this evening, so we'll probably do it by paper very late tonight.

Q So you're saying no coverage.

MR. MCCURRY: No coverage. We'll maybe put out a photo

or something.

Leon.

MR. PANETTA: Good morning. What I wanted to do is to summarize some of the negotiations that occurred on the bill and then some of its key elements, and then have Bob Rubin, Secretary of Treasury, speak to some of the issues that were involved here, as well as Frank Raines, Director of OMB, who participated in the negotiating sessions.

As you all know, we reached agreement on this early Saturday morning, and it wraps up six of the Fiscal Year 1997 appropriations bills, as well as a number of other issues. The bill itself is what we term, instead of a CR, this is really an omnibus appropriations bill that funds all of these areas through the fiscal year. So this is not a short-term CR. This basically approves all of the appropriations bill through October 1 of next year.

It's been passed by the House, overwhelmingly passed by the House last Saturday evening. And we expect that it will be adopted by the Senate probably late today. When that happens, obviously, the President will sign it into law to ensure that the departments and agencies that are covered by this appropriations bill can continue to operate. Everyone anticipates that this will happen. So this is not a question of raising a concern, it's just a question of getting it done, and that should happen tonight.

The agreement was reached as a result of a lot of very tough negotiations that went on, as you know, for a period of about two and a half days really because we started in earnest Thursday, worked through Thursday night until about 4:00 a.m. on Thursday. I got back at it at 9:00 a.m. the next morning, continued to negotiate through Friday night and finally completed the agreement about 7:00 a.m. Saturday morning, at which time the staff obviously had to then put together all of the working documents and bring them all together and then, even at that point, we had a series of

problems
that had to be resolved through Saturday morning that were
finally
completed, I think, with one final solution that had to take
place
Saturday afternoon. But that was all done.

And I do want to take this moment to commend the team
that worked on this: Frank Raines as Director of OMB -- this was
his first budget negotiations under fire and it's probably a good
learning lesson for somebody that's got to take on that
responsibility; John Hilley who headed up the legislative shop
along
with Barbara Chow and Martha Foley on my staff who did tremendous
work; Jack Lew who was also involved as well as the entire -- all
of
the PADs from OMB and all of the team that worked on this. I
just
want to commend all of them because it was hard. We worked
through
the evening, through the night, and then ultimately had to put
2000
pages of a bill together.

In addition, I also want to commend both the House and
Senate leadership on both sides. We had a number of meetings
with
both the Democratic leadership as well as the Republican
leadership
to try to resolve these issues, and I want to commend them for
their
cooperation in this effort. These are tough negotiations. They
were tough going through them, not only because of the issues
that
had to be confronted here, but there was also the larger battle
that
was reflected in these budget negotiations, the battle that took
place over the last two years over the priorities for this
country
and what we wanted to do in terms of directing this country into
the
next century.

The President was very pleased with the outcome of this
negotiation, sent a letter to both the House and the Senate
asking
that the budget be approved and that he would sign it. The
budget,
I believe, reflects the priorities that the President has
established for this country to try to ensure that we move

towards a
balanced budget, continue to move towards a balanced budget, but
fund the key priorities that are important to this country in
education, in the environment, protecting the 100,000 cops, and
protecting the other priorities that were important to this
country,
and at the same time, not having to seriously cut or undermine
Medicare or Medicaid or education or any of these areas.

This is fundamentally an agreement that I think reflects
what the President has been fighting for the last four years, but
in
particular, the last two years to ensure that this country is
headed
in the right direction.

I have to tell you that there is no question that there
was some leverage here that I felt I had as we entered these
negotiations. The leverage was based really on three things.
First
of all, I think it was the fact that, number one, the President
had
fought the Republican budget successfully in terms of what
priorities were to be set for this country and that by basically
confronting the Republican in terms of their agenda, their budget
agenda. That confrontation, I think, clearly was in the minds of
those who were sitting down at the table. They did not want to
repeat the same mistakes that had been made. I think, in
addition
to that, the American people had obviously made their views known
particularly with regards to the issue of shutting down the
government and that this was not the way to go.

The Republicans obviously were very sensitive to that
issue as we are approaching another deadline here and no one
wanted
to repeat another shutdown. That also obviously helped provide
additional incentives.

And, lastly, I think it was a reflection that obviously
the Republicans in the Congress have been in a pattern of working
to
try to resolve some of these issues that they had confronted over
the last two years as part of the Contract. This was part of a
pattern that we saw developing with minimum wage, with Kennedy-
Kassebaum, with the welfare reform bill and now with this final
budget agreement -- that, in effect, they were interested in
trying
to resolve these issues, get them behind them as opposed to
confronting them and try to adjourn the Congress, get out of town

and get back to the campaign. I think all of those factors obviously helped provide leverage as we were negotiating this final agreement.

In the end, it is indeed, I think, a victory for the President, for the Congress, but most importantly for the American people. It's clearly a victory for the President and the priorities that he has been fighting for for four years, but in particular over these last two years to try to ensure that we implement fiscal responsibility, move towards a balanced budget, but ensure that our investments are protected.

It's a victory for the Congress. In the end, when you have a bipartisan agreement that brings together both the Democrats and Republicans working together to get this done and the resulting vote is a clear indication of that, it is what the American people most of all want in this country, which is for the parties to work together to do what's right for this country and for their children in the future. In the end, as I said, it's a victory for the American people because it does address the concerns that they care about -- educating their kids, protecting their families from crime and drugs, providing for a clean environment and combatting the threat of terrorism.

Let me just, if I can, summarize briefly -- and Frank and Bob Rubin will go into some of this -- but let me just summarize the highlights. First of all, as you should know, this budget is about \$15.3 billion. In terms of non-defense discretionary, the President's budget had reflected a budget that had requested about \$15.3 billion about what this budget reflects. But what we did was we restored about \$6.5 billion to \$7 billion by paying for it in the areas that we cared about. So we are still very clearly on a path toward a balanced budget. We have, indeed, achieved additional

savings here. But we also restored our priorities by basically paying for it and ensuring that we did not increase the deficit in that process.

The key areas that we restored in terms of our critical investments were clearly education. Of the \$6.5 billion that we were trying to restore, over \$3 billion of that was for education alone. Education, I think, is the most significant area of restoration in terms of investments. There is no question about it.

Head Start, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Goals 2000, national service, Pell Grant scholarships -- those were all increased in terms of the investment. And this was done, again, on a basis in which Democrats, Republicans, we almost immediately when we sat down

at the table concurred that we were going to, in fact, increase the investment in education. That was a very key element here.

We also protected, as I said, the 100,000 cops. There was an effort to continue to undermine the amount of money that goes specifically for 100,000 cops. We were able to keep that commitment. The drug money, which we also fought for to try to restore the full funding package that the President had asked for, was met. And we have restored those funds.

And we have, in addition, on terrorism, put about \$1 billion, a little over \$1 billion into antiterrorism efforts.

That combines both the Gore Commission recommendations for increased security with regards to air safety, as well as increasing the manpower within the different agencies on terrorism itself. In addition to that, as you may know, we have funds that will study taggants as part of both the black powder and smokeless powder issues which have always been an issue that has been opposed in the past. We now have that study to, in fact, determine if we can use taggants in that area. That's an important step as well.

There were other major achievements in the bill. On immigration, as you know, we were very concerned about the ability to do a strong bill on illegal immigration in this country without continuing to penalize legal immigrants. The bill that initially emerged raised concerns for us not only with regards to the

Gallegly

Amendment, which was ultimately pulled back, but with regards to other steps that would have targeted and penalized legal immigrants.

We were able, I think, as a result of this negotiation to be able to modify -- eliminate the large hits with regards to legal immigrants while keeping some very strong enforcement measures with regards to illegal immigration. I think the President and the Congress need to recognize -- the President in particular, recognizes that this is a nation of immigrants and that we need to be a nation of laws, but the most important thing is we should not -- we should not -- penalize those legal immigrants who come to this country.

The other point is with regards to the Brady Bill expansion. We were able to get the expansion of the Brady Bill to keep guns out of the hands of those who have abused their spouses and children. This was a proposal that passed on the Senate side. The NRA, at the last minute, came in to try to see if they could modify or weaken that provision. We were able to hold a very tough provision on that with regards to the expansion of the Brady Bill in this area.

In addition, for those of you who follow these things, we were able to privatize Sallie Mae which is that area -- we have been able to privatize, as you know, areas that through the reinventing government initiative -- this was one of the efforts to try to see if we could do it with regards to housing funds under Sally Mae. We also have the small business reauthorization that was included here.

There were two areas that we did not get -- I'll just mention to you briefly. We were trying to get the gag rule for HMOs enacted. We had a team that was working on that, but they couldn't

bring it together into a bipartisan agreement. So we will continue to work at that in the future to get that done.

On parks, there was an effort to try to put parks into this proposal. Our particular interest was to get the Presidio done, to get Sterling Forest done, to get the Tall Grass proposals done, plus some other initiatives that Ralph Regula was interested in. Unfortunately, that got bogged down in a larger parks bill debate as to whether or not other areas that the administration would oppose would be included. As you know, the parks bill -- a separate parks bill has now passed the House. We hope that it passes the Senate. If it does, the President would sign that bill that passed the House last Saturday.

In the end, this was, I think -- and I've participated in a number of these -- I think this was a successful effort to try to, in fact, protect our priorities, to complete negotiations on a proposal that I think represents a turning point in the national debate. The President has been very clear about what our priorities should be. This Congress came in with the Contract on America that tried to set a very different agenda for this country. In the end, what happened over the weekend is a reflection that, in fact, the President I think has stood firm for where this country needs to go and that the Congress has, in fact, recognized that the American people support those priorities. And that's why we were able to get this done and get it done, I think, successfully and in a bipartisan fashion.

Bob.

SECRETARY RUBIN: Thank you, Leon. My comments will be very brief and will be made in the context of what Leon said. First, let me say this was a very complicated situation. I think the resolve of the President clearly was critical and the enormous abilities of Leon and Frank and John Hilley and all the people who worked with them, in my judgment, led to an accomplishment, a

very
substantial accomplishment, not only with respect to the
budgetary
matters, but all of the related issues that Leon talked about.

Let me make a comment or two, if I may, about context.
This, in my view, having started this process -- well, I started
this process in December of 1992 with the transition -- and in my
view, this is one more step in the consistent and broad-based
economic strategy the President has had. And that strategy has
been
very successful, has led to the -- been the predominant factor,
in
my view, in the economy that we have enjoyed for the almost four
years now of this administration -- the 10.5 million new jobs,
unemployment falling from 7.3 percent when he took office to 5.1
percent today, inflation being low, investment being -- private
sector investment being at record levels, and the deficit being
down
60 percent.

In addition to seeing the effects here in this economy,
the economy we all live in, you see it when you go to
international
conferences. I hosted the G-7 finance ministers and Central Bank
governors for an all-day -- pretty much all-day Saturday meeting,
and it was very interesting. Four or five years ago at these
kinds
of meetings, the United States was severely criticized for not
doing
the kinds of things the world felt we needed to do.

At this meeting, and it's been true now pretty much
through this administration, the United States is regarded as the
world's leading economy, and the President is treated with
enormous
respect for the actions that he has taken and for doing the kinds
of
things that the rest of the world felt we needed to do to get our
country back on track. And, similarly, the markets, from the
very
beginning, or from almost the very beginning, have viewed our
economic program with respect and that's been reflected in how
they
have behaved.

So let me conclude by saying that I think this is a very
important accomplishment, both with respect to the budget and the
other matters that were dealt with, and it continues this economy
on

the right fiscal path for next year and because of the priorities that were emphasized, the right for the 21st century.

Frank.

MR. RAINES: Let me start by saying how much I enjoy doing an all-nighter with Leon Panetta. It was a very interesting process, but particularly to see how well I think the administration is prepared for what has become these end-of-session negotiations necessary to bring the public's businesses to a close. The most important thing I think I would say is that --how close we came not to achieving this goal. We had six appropriation bills that were not approved. We had -- if the bills that had been moving had gone forward, we would have had a very substantially different set of priorities reflected in the appropriations than what's in the bill before the Congress today. And that, I think, is the most important message here.

Let me give you just a few examples. The bill as it's being approved now will provide over \$4.2 billion in additional funds for the President's investments in education and training. What that means is that the Pell Grant program will now increase aid for over 126,000 students rather than a reduction, as was proposed in prior years. The direct college loan program, instead of being eliminated, will in fact be fully funded. We'll have additional funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools, 19-percent increase to help communities reduce drug abuse and prevent violence. Title I program, which would have denied 1.1 million children benefits in their last year, will now increase -- provide increased benefits for half a million. In Head Start, where last year the budget proposal would have cut funds for 50,000 young children, we'll have a 50,000-child increase this year.

We see the same thing in areas of law enforcement and drug programs. There is a full funding of the Community-Oriented Policy services program -- the COPS program. What this means that we'll have -- 64,000 of the 100,000 police the President called

for
will now be funded. And we will be on our track to getting to
the
full 100,000 police officers on the street. Substantial -- we've
got full support for the antiterrorism proposals of the President
that were put forward as well as in drug enforcement.

In EPA, we were in grave danger of failing to fund under
the proposals as they stood a week ago the initiatives in clean
water and clean drinking water. But we were able to provide the
funding necessary to ensure that those programs will, in fact, go
forward and that we will not have the kinds of water quality
problems that we've seen in various places around the country.

In the environmental cleanup, one example that's been
very highlighted -- it seems every four years it gets a lot of
attention and that is Boston Harbor. There was an effort to
substantially reduce the funding that was available to continue
the
cleanup of Boston Harbor. But, in fact, we're going to see an
increase of \$25 million or 50-percent increase in funding for
that
program.

In the health area, similar kinds of achievements have
been seen. We're going to have increases by 32 percent in the
Ryan
White AIDS treatment grants. NIH is going to see a substantial
improvement. We're going to see funding in the Centers for
Disease
Control so that it is able to move forward on major initiatives
that
the President has outlined. Our one disappointment in this area,
as
Leon mentioned, was on the antigag rule which we very much hoped
to
have been able to have had implemented in this area.

But this wasn't only about funding issues. We also have
a series of what might be considered good government issues.
Leon
mentioned the privatization of Sallie Mae. We also, after many
years of debate, are finally putting the S&L crisis behind us
with
the funding of the safe fund for the thrift industry -- an issue
that's been very contentious, was not going to be resolved, but
was
resolved as a part of these negotiations.

So across the board, this is an example of when a

President has priorities and sticks to those priorities, we can see how you can, in fact, have them implemented -- something that people have often scoffed that you couldn't do that. The President from the beginning set out his priorities, he's pursued his priorities.

Now, we do not have a complete congruence. There's still some disagreements. In the Defense budget for example, there's about \$2.5 billion of funds that the Defense Department didn't ask for and the Joint Chiefs didn't ask for, but still made it into the bill. We thought that that was something that we could have avoided and used to further reduce the deficit.

But overall, we're delighted that the President's priorities were reflected. We wish we didn't have to come down to the last minute to see the progress. But by moving \$6.5 billion of the President's priorities into the budget, we think that it was well worth the many hours of sleep that were given up by people here in the White House and the Departments and at OMB.

Q Mr. Panetta, what does this do -- two parts question. First of all, what does this do to the balancing the budget by the year 2000? Is there so much spending in this that you would miss that deadline?

MR. PANETTA: No, not at all. On the contrary, I think this keeps us very much on path towards where we wanted to go in terms of ultimately balancing the budget. The reason for that is as follows. The \$6.5 billion that we put back in to restore -- we fully paid for.

How did we fully pay for that? We paid for that in three areas. Number one, the provision on BIF-SAIF, which was the provision with regards to the Savings and Loan area that we've been trying to get through. That, in and of itself, produced over \$3 billion in savings that could be used.

Secondly, on Spectrum, we sold part of the Spectrum which also provides, I believe, somewhere between \$2 billion to

\$3

billion in savings, and then a billion of this came out of the Defense budget for paying for the terrorism piece of this.

So, when you look at the overall piece of increased investment that we have here with regards to our priorities, they are fully paid for. If you look at the big picture, the big picture

is that we're \$15.3 billion below what the President originally had

requested. So that for the point of view of savings in the appropriations area, there are still significant savings.

Combine

that with, hopefully, continued growth in the economy, I think we are very much going to be able to stick to this path of reducing the

deficit -- continuing to reduce the deficit, and ultimately arriving

at a balanced budget.

Q To follow on that, you mention a new willingness to work with this Congress. All the things that you listed, like minimum wage and Kennedy-Kassebaum, came after Bob Dole left the Senate. Are you saying that if Senator Dole were still Senate Majority Leader you never would have been able to come to this kind of agreement?

MR. PANETTA: Well, I'll let the American people make that judgment. It is pretty clear that when Bob Dole did leave we were able to make some very successful efforts, working with the new leadership on the Senate side as well as the House in trying to get minimum wage done, get Kennedy-Kassebaum done, getting welfare reform bill done, and now getting this large appropriations agreement enacted along with immigration reform along the lines that we had sought, as well as expansion of the Brady Bill. I think those facts speak for themselves in terms of our ability to work with the new leadership.

Q Mr. Panetta, you said that this is \$15.3 billion below what the President originally asked for, and so that's -- you're saying that if it wasn't for the Republican Congress we wouldn't have saved as much money?

MR. PANETTA: Understand that all of this -- understand that our proposal in discretionary spending was couched in our

balanced budget that we offered at the beginning of the year. We offered a way to get to a balanced budget and within that balanced budget we felt we could increase our investments and get that done.

And we have always said, we have always felt that this was not an issue about whether or not to balance the budget, this was a question of how do you balance the budget. And we felt you could do

it and still increase our investments in education, in the environment, in crime, and still do it without having to undermine

Medicare or Medicaid or the other programs that were important to people. We still believe that.

Obviously, in the absence of adopting an overall balanced budget agreement, with regards to non-defense discretionary

alone, there are clearly additional savings that are achieved here

with regards to non-defense discretionary. And we did have to come

up with ways to pay for our additional investments, and that's okay.

But in the end, I have to tell you that the reason this happened is

because we were, in fact, able to stop their overall budget and, in

the end, they felt that the American people wanted these investments

as well. And because of that I think we were able to get it done without obviously undermining our goals in terms of reaching a balanced budget.

Q Can I ask you a question on another subject, on the Middle East summit? If you could, could you just explain what the

President hopes to get out of this and if there isn't something concrete, some concrete progress made here this week, will that be a

setback for his foreign policy record in the Middle East?

MR. PANETTA: The President's interest is to do whatever he can do to try to put the peace process back on track. And does it

involve political risk? You bet it involves political risk. But he

believes that political risks ought to be taken in this situation if

in the end we can put the peace process back on track and bring

peace back to that part of the world.

So those are the goals, and we are working now to try to bring these major players together here and our hope and our prayer is that in the end we can, in fact, resolve that situation and at least try to move towards the ultimate peace that is the hope for everyone in that region, and should be the hope for everyone in that region.

Q We're hearing out of Cairo today that it's been postponed until Wednesday.

MR. MCCURRY: I can do all that.

MR. PANETTA: Mike can pick up the other pieces on that.

Q In terms of the immigration bill, now do legal immigrants, do they get all the benefits that would be accrued to a regular citizen, ordinary citizen?

MR. PANETTA: Well, again, you have to remember that in the welfare reform bill there were enacted in the welfare reform bill cuts on benefits for legal immigrants that flowed out of welfare reform, both with regards to SSI and food stamps and some other areas. Those still remain. But what happened in the immigration bill is that on top of these cuts, there were additional cuts that were added to legal immigrants in the bill that came through -- cuts in health care, cuts with regards to providing AIDS patients with any kind of medical treatment, increased deportation steps, thresholds that were increased in terms of bringing in family members. All of those have been knocked out of the final bill here. What we wanted to do is to make sure that we did not do an additional hit with regards to legal immigrants.

Q Well, why such a vengeance against legal immigrants?

MR. PANETTA: Well, Helen, I'll tell you, as the son of immigrants, I have a hell of a time understanding why they have such a problem with legal immigrants. I think immigrants are in fact what this country is all about.

Q Don't they pay their taxes and so forth?

MR. PANETTA: They pay their taxes, they work hard, they've made this country what it is. And it's a little strange to me why they have this kind of vengeance against those who are here legally. We all understand the problem of illegal immigrants. We're all trying to ensure that we have additional enforcement to protect against illegal immigrants. But I, for the life of me, do not understand why we need to penalize legal immigrants in that process.

Q Two questions, Leon. On legal immigrants, I'm told by some of the California people that some or a lot of the punitive provisions were taken out, but not all.

MR. PANETTA: That's correct, Leo.

Q Since the President, with regard to the welfare bill, said that if he were reelected he would try to fix that hits on legal immigrants in the welfare bill, would he also try to finish the job with regard to the immigration bill?

MR. PANETTA: I think that's a fair statement. We have made clear that we will come back with regards to repairing the elements of the welfare reform bill that the President disagreed with, and we will do that. And in line with that, those areas that we weren't able to clean up as part of the immigration bill will be part of that process.

Q The second question I have has to do with the line-item veto authority which kicks in for the next President in January. Whoever is President, will he be able to line-item-veto stuff out of the fiscal '97 bills, or his authority starts with FY'98?

MR. PANETTA: No -- I guess I should have mentioned that probably an additional leverage point for us in addition to the fact that -- with regards to the priorities, as well as the urgency of avoiding a shutdown, as well as the urgency of members wanting to complete the session and get back to their districts is the fact that there was the recognition that the ability to line-item-veto

goes into effect on January 1 of next year, and the President can exercise that. So if members, in fact, wanted to do an appropriations bill under the old rules, this was the last chance to get that done.

So the answer to your question is that the bills themselves that have been enacted now would not be subject to a line-item veto. But if there were to be, for example, a supplemental request or a supplemental appropriations bill that would go, then that would be the first -- that would be subject to a line-item veto.

Frank would like to add something.

MR. RAINES: Let me add something on the question of the overall impact of this on the balanced budget in the path of the balanced budget. As Leon mentioned, when we went into these negotiations, they were about \$15 billion below the President's proposal on non-defense discretionary spending. However, they were about 10 and a half billion dollars above the President's proposal on defense.

So that when all is said in done in the negotiations, and taking into account our pay-fors for our proposals, the actual appropriations bill that has come out will about equal the spending that the President had proposed last February. So that, in terms of the aggregate spending, there has not been a major difference between the Republicans and the President's proposals. The big difference has been on the priorities within that aggregate spending.

And what has been resolved in the last few days has been to make sure that those priorities are straightened out. So that, in terms of the path to a balanced budget, this is exactly the same path that the President proposed in February, with the exception that in Fiscal Year 1996 the revenue that has come in as a result of the economic program has far exceeded our expectations for revenue.

So we have been reporting, and I believe will continue to report, actual deficit numbers in Fiscal Year 1996 below those that the

President had projected in February. And if we see a continuation of that trend into Fiscal 1997, it will permit us to go below what our current estimates are for deficit in those years.

So, if anything, we are now ahead of schedule by the end of today on the President's deficit reduction program. Remember, he said -- his pledge was to reduce the deficit by 50 percent, and we're now at 60 percent as of today. Going forward, we hope that if we continue to see the good numbers coming out of the Treasury in terms of revenue, that we'll make even more progress than the President had promised in January.

Q To follow on that issue, Secretary Panetta, you talked about continuing to work for a balanced budget --

Q It's Governor Panetta. (Laughter.)

Q Sorry.

MR. PANETTA: Whatever works. (Laughter.)

Q You talked about continuing to work for a balanced budget and ultimately reaching it. Does that mean that the President's commitment to balance the budget by 2002 as scored by CBO is part of yesterday's failed compromise, or does he retain that commitment in the second term?

MR. PANETTA: No, the President very much retains that commitment. I think the President's goal, if reelected, would be -- his first priority would be to put a balanced budget agreement into place similar to what we did four years ago when we put our budget agreement into place. I think the President deeply believes that that is an essential ingredient to set the structure on which we can them make the kind of investments that he believes are also important for the country in education.

Q Mr. Panetta, you said you got most of what you wanted to stop the attacks on legal immigration. How would you rate what you got to combat illegal immigration? Did you get most of what you wanted, the extra money you wanted?

MR. PANETTA: We got much of what we wanted with regards to legal immigration. There was a section called Title V that was added to the bill that largely dealt with legal immigrants, and our proposal was basically to go back at Title V and try to remove those areas that involved legal immigrants.

As Leo pointed out, we did not get everything removed that we were after, but we certainly got the most egregious steps that would have penalized legal immigrants out. As to a percentage -
-

Q He's asking about illegal.

MR. PANETTA: I'm sorry. Oh, on the illegal, I'm sorry, we got I think all of the proposals that we were out to get for illegal immigration have been included and we fully support those.

Q Leon, just a minute ago you said that the talks this week involve a political risk for the President. I mean, what do you think that political risk is, and what is your reaction to the letter from the Republican leadership that implored the President not to undermine the U.S.-Israeli relationship? What do you think they're up to?

MR. PANETTA: Well, you'll have to ask them what they meant with their letter. With regards to -- I think the political risks involved here are obvious, because any time you bring the parties together in this kind of volatile situation it is an explosive situation and difficult to predict what ultimately can happen here. But the President felt that it's worth that risk if in fact we can ultimately bring these parties together. And so there is no question this is a tough issue and it's tough to do it at this point in time. But it's the right thing to do.

Q Is that letter helpful at this point?

MR. PANETTA: Not particularly.

Q Leon, quick question on the summit. What is the

President's criteria, marker for success of the summit. If the summit concludes with both parties saying we're ready to go back to negotiations, is that satisfactory as far as the White House is concerned?

MR. PANETTA: I'm going to let Mike cover that base because I think right now what we've got to do is work on making this happen and putting the pieces together to make it happen. I think if we can get the parties here, that will be a significant step in the right direction. As to how you measure success, I think that's something that parties and the President are going to have to work through.

Q This is directed to Secretary Rub. On the transportation tax, Chairman Archer just established a bipartisan commission to look into all the transportation taxes and --

SECRETARY RUBIN: Oh, transportation tax, I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. Yes.

Q -- and is looking into a way to replace the current system with a more comprehensive one. How does the administration weigh in on this?

SECRETARY RUBIN: Well, I saw Chairman Archer the other day and he said that after the election, when we see who is here and who is not here -- and I kind of think we sort of will be here -- in any event, he suggested we all sit down and rather get into that now let me just say that we'll work on these things once we get past the election.

Q Who is going to win?

SECRETARY RUBIN: You'll know November 5th.

END 12:34 P.M. EDT

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 02 October 96 11:53

FROM Patmon, Matthew W.

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

SUBJECT (Signing) SBTP Re: Omnibus Appropriations and Immigration Reform

TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
Albert, Ronda A.
Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Appel, Edward J.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bemisderfer, Dwight D.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Biernacki, Eileen V.
Birkland, Andrea L.
Black, Todd F.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boulton, Darrien D.
Boynton, Peter J.
Brennan, Steven A.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Brooks, Jennifer
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Bujold, Noelle D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Caravelli, John M.
Carter, Michael E.

Chen, Philip D.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davis, William K.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dobbins, James F.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dory, Amanda J.
Dowling, J. Nicholas
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Eggert, Tamara E.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Epstein, Gerald L.
Feeley, John F.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Dan
Florio, Elaine
Fort, Jane B.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gibney, James S.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grummon, Stephen R.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, James A.
Hall, Wilma G.
Hamel, Michael A.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.

Hasman, Thomas 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.
Johnson, David T.
Johnson, Natalie A.
Jones, Kerri-Ann D.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kinser-Kidane, Brenda J.
Koehler, Marc
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Lawrence, Cynthia
Leary, William H.
LeBaron, Richard B.
Lee, Malcolm R.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsay, James M.
Lindsey, Christine J.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
MacDonald, Bruce W.
Malley, Robert
Marshall, Betty A.
Marsh, Thomas S.
Martinez, Alejandro
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moffett, Julia
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Motherway, Daniel J.

Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Naplan, Steven J.
Natoli, Kim M.
Neil, M. Elise
Norris, John J.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Orfini, Michael H.
Orr, Robert C.
O'Shaughnessy, Patrick
Panerali, Kristen E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Patmon, Matthew W.
Peggins, John W.
Peters, Mary A.
Piccone, Theodore J.
Pifer, Steven K.
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Pyatt, Geoffrey R.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ragan, Richard F.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Rice, Susan E.
Rice, Sean P.
Roach, Darren S.
Robinson, Wylma
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Rumer, Eugene B.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Santarcangelo, Jason M.
Saunders, John W.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simonalle, Eugene A.
Simon, Steven N.

Simons, James R.
Smith, Michael P.
Snyder, Julie A.
Sparks, John E.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Styles, Kiwanis H.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Szasz, Nicholas J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Waller, Robert P.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Wechsler, William F.
Wetzel, M. Jeanne
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Willis, Robin M.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Wright, Jay
Yokum, Jeffrey G.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[OMNIBUS.DOC : 2881 in OMNIBUS.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 2 October 96 11:51

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** OMNIBUS.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release October 1, 1996

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have signed into law H.R. 3610, the fiscal year 1997 omnibus appropriations and immigration reform bill.

This bill is good for America, and I am pleased that my Administration could fashion it with the Congress on a bipartisan basis. It moves us further down the road toward our goal of a balanced budget while protecting, not violating, the values we share as Americans -- opportunity, responsibility, and community.

Specifically, the legislation restores needed funds for education and training, the environment, science and technology, and law enforcement; fully funds my anti-drug and counter-terrorism initiatives; extends the Brady Bill so that those who commit domestic violence cannot buy handguns; provides needed resources to respond to fires in the western part of the Nation and to the devastation brought by Hurricanes Fran and Hortense; and includes landmark immigration reform legislation that cracks down on illegal immigration without punishing legal immigrants.

The bill restores substantial sums for education and training, furthering my agenda of life-long education to help Americans acquire the skills they need to get good jobs in the new global economy.

It provides the funds through which Head Start can serve an additional 50,000 disadvantaged young children; fulfills my request for the Goals 2000 education reform program, enabling States to more quickly raise their academic standards and implement innovative reform; increases funding for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, helping States reduce violence and drug abuse in schools; provides most of my request for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund to help States leverage technology funds; fulfills my request for Title 1, education for the disadvantaged; and provides the funds to enable well over a half-million young people to participate in the Summer Jobs program.

For college students, I am pleased that the bill fulfills my request for the largest Pell Grant college scholarship awards in

history and expands the number of middle- and low-income students who receive aid by 126,000 -- to 3.8 million. I am also pleased that the bill fully funds my Direct Lending program, enabling more students to take advantage of cheaper and more efficient loans.

For the environment, the bill provides funds to support the Environmental Protection Agency's early implementation of two major new environmental laws that I signed this summer -- the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Pesticide and Food Safety Law. In addition, the bill provides additional funds for energy conservation and to help finish the cleanup of Boston Harbor and help prevent beach closures.

At the same time, the bill does not contain any of the riders that would have affected management of the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, national Native American tribal rights, the Interior Department's management of subsistence fishing in Alaska, long-term management of the Elwha Dam in Washington State, and the issuance of emergency-efficiency standards for appliances. I am, however, disappointed the Congress did not adopt my proposal to repeal the 1995 salvage timber rider and restore the application of environmental laws to salvage logging on Federal lands.

For research and technology, the bill promotes economic growth by continuing needed Federal support for advanced technology. It restores funding for the Commerce Department's Advanced Technology Program, providing resources for new grants to support innovative technology companies across the Nation.

It also provides a sizeable increase for the National Institutes of Health, which will enable NIH to expand its critical research into new ways to treat breast cancer, AIDS, and other diseases. I am also pleased that the bill provides nearly \$1 billion for Ryan White AIDS treatment grants, including funds to help States purchase a new class of AIDS drugs called "protease inhibitors" and other life-extending medications. And the Congress also fully funded my request for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's program that provides housing assistance for people with AIDS.

For law enforcement, the bill provides \$1.4 billion to ensure that my program to put 100,000 more police on the streets of America's communities by the year 2000 proceeds on schedule; with this bill, we will have provided funding for 64,000 of the 100,000

that I called for at the start of my Administration. The bill also

increases funds for Justice Department law enforcement programs, for the FBI's crime-fighting efforts, and for new Federal prisons.

As I had urged, the bill also extends the Brady Bill to ensure that

those who commit domestic violence cannot purchase guns.

Finally,

I am pleased that the Congress provided a modest increase for the Legal Services Corporation, which ensures that those who lack the means still have access to our legal system.

I am also pleased that the bill provides a \$1.4 billion increase in funding for anti-drug programs. It doubles funding for

Drug Courts, increases funds for drug interdiction efforts by the Defense, Transportation, and Treasury Departments, and provides the

resources to expand the Drug Enforcement Administration's domestic

efforts along the Southwest border and elsewhere. The bill also includes strong language about drug testing that my Administration

had proposed, requiring that localities have drug-testing programs

in place for their prisoners and parolees in order to qualify for State and local prison grants. And it includes funding for the drug testing of Federal, State, and local arrestees.

For counterterrorism, the bill funds my request for over \$1.1 billion to fight terrorism and to improve aviation security and safety. It enables the Justice and Treasury Departments to better investigate and prosecute terrorist acts, and it provides funds to implement the recommendations of Vice President Gore's Commission on Aviation Safety and Security and the Federal Aviation

Administration's recent 90-day safety review. These funds will enable us to hire 300 more aviation security personnel, deploy new

explosive detection teams, and buy high-technology bomb detection equipment to screen luggage. The bill also gives my Administration

Administration

the authority to study the use of taggants in black and smokeless powder; taggant technology holds the promise of allowing the

detection and identification of explosives material.

I hereby designate as an emergency requirement, as the Congress has already done, the \$122.6 million in fiscal 1996 funds and the \$230.68 million in fiscal 1997 funds for the Defense Department for antiterrorism, counterterrorism, and security enhancement programs in this Act, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(I) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

This bill also funds the Nation's defense program for another year; it fully funds my defense antiterrorism and counter-narcotics efforts as well as the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and at my insistence it provides a substantial amount of the funding for my dual-use technology program. But it also provides about \$9 billion more than I proposed for defense, including a substantial amount for weapons that are not even in the Defense Department's future plans and were not requested by the service chiefs. This bill is part of a plan by the majority in the Congress that adds funds for investments now and reduces them in the future. I continue to believe that my long-range plan is more rational. It provides sufficient funds now while increasing them at the turn of the century when new technologies will become available.

I am pleased that the Congress has provided the minimum acceptable levels for certain key international affairs programs, such as the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association and the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization and for international peacekeeping operations and arrears. I also commend the Congress for providing at least a modest increase in funding international family planning programs and for dropping misguided Mexico City restrictions, and for funding bilateral economic assistance without rescinding prior-year appropriations. In addition, the Congress has facilitated the Middle East peace process by authorizing U.S. participation in the Middle East Development Bank. Nevertheless, I must note that the overall funding level for international affairs programs is well below what we need to assure that we can achieve our foreign policy objectives.

This bill, however, does more than fund major portions of the Government for the next fiscal year. It also includes landmark immigration reform legislation that builds on our

progress of the last 3 years. It strengthens the rule of law by cracking down on illegal immigration at the border, in the workplace, and in the criminal justice system -- without punishing those living in the United States legally.

Specifically, the bill requires the sponsors of legal immigrants to take added responsibility for their well-being.

And

it does not include the so-called Gallegly amendment, which I strongly opposed and which would have allowed States to refuse to educate the children of illegal immigrants. At my insistence the bill does not include the proposed onerous provisions against legal immigrants, which would have gone beyond the welfare reform law.

I am pleased that the Congress provided 7 additional months of food assistance for needy immigrants, including benefits for many elderly and children. This step will provide some help to individuals and States in preparing for the dramatic restriction of access to benefits that legal immigrants will face under the welfare reform bill.

I am, however, extremely concerned about a provision in this bill that could lead to the Federal Government waiving the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act in

order to expeditiously construct physical barriers and roads on the

U.S. border. I know the Attorney General shares my commitment to those important environmental laws and will make every effort, in consultation with environmental agencies, to implement the immigration law in compliance with those environmental laws. I am

also concerned about a provision that imposes a new "intent requirement" in unfair immigration-related employment cases that could place hardships on some U.S. citizens and permanent residents. I have asked the Attorney General to take steps to alleviate any potential discrimination that this provision causes against U.S. citizens and authorized workers -- particularly Hispanics and Asian-Americans who, by their appearance or accent, may appear to be foreign. Finally, I will seek to correct provisions in this bill that are inconsistent with international principles of refugee protection, including the imposition of rigid deadlines for asylum applications.

The bill also makes important changes in the Nation's banking laws. It assures the continued soundness of the bank and thrift deposit insurance system, and it includes significant regulatory

relief for financial institutions. At my insistence, the bill does not erode the protection of consumers and communities.

I commend Senators Baucus and Bingaman for raising the awareness of the issue of the proper accounting of highway trust fund receipts. In next year's reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act, my Administration will rely on a baseline that treats all States fairly and equitably.

The bill includes a Government-wide program to enable agencies to offer buyouts, through December 31, 1997, of up to \$25,000 to employees eligible for early or regular retirement. Many of these workers stay on for years after they can retire, so buyouts will serve as an incentive for them to leave. Buyouts are an important tool to help Federal managers downsize their agencies as we continue to move toward a balanced budget -- without relying solely on reductions-in-force (RIFs).

I am disappointed that one of my priorities -- a ban on physician "gag rules" -- was not included. Several States have passed similar legislation to ensure that doctors have the freedom to inform their patients of the full range of medical treatment options, and I am disappointed that the Congress was not able to reach agreement on this measure.

Nevertheless, this bill is good for America. As I have said, it moves us down the path toward a balanced budget while protecting our values. It provides the needed resources to fight domestic and international terrorism. And it cracks down on illegal immigration while protecting legal immigrants.

I am pleased to sign it.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

#

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 02 October 96 13:52

FROM Malley, Robert

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

SUBJECT RE: SBTP Re: Omnibus Appropriations and Immigration Reform Bill

TO Schwartz, Eric P.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

You looked at wrong one:

[[OMNIBUS.DOC : 3332 in OMNIBUS.DOC]]

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: Malley, Robert
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: FW: SBTP Re: Omnibus Appropriations and Immigration Reform Bill
[UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, October 02, 1996 01:07 PM

<<Attached File: BUDGET.DOC>>

What happened?

Eric

From: Patmon, Matthew W.
To: @ALLNSC - NSC Staff; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: SBTP Re: Omnibus Appropriations and Immigration Reform Bill
[UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, October 01, 1996 06:55 PM

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 2 October 96 13:51

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** OMNIBUS.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release October 1, 1996

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have signed into law H.R. 3610, the fiscal year 1997 omnibus appropriations and immigration reform bill.

This bill is good for America, and I am pleased that my Administration could fashion it with the Congress on a bipartisan basis. It moves us further down the road toward our goal of a balanced budget while protecting, not violating, the values we share as Americans -- opportunity, responsibility, and community.

Specifically, the legislation restores needed funds for education and training, the environment, science and technology, and law enforcement; fully funds my anti-drug and counter-terrorism initiatives; extends the Brady Bill so that those who commit domestic violence cannot buy handguns; provides needed resources to respond to fires in the western part of the Nation and to the devastation brought by Hurricanes Fran and Hortense; and includes landmark immigration reform legislation that cracks down on illegal immigration without punishing legal immigrants.

The bill restores substantial sums for education and training, furthering my agenda of life-long education to help Americans acquire the skills they need to get good jobs in the new global economy.

It provides the funds through which Head Start can serve an additional 50,000 disadvantaged young children; fulfills my request for the Goals 2000 education reform program, enabling States to more quickly raise their academic standards and implement innovative reform; increases funding for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, helping States reduce violence and drug abuse in schools; provides most of my request for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund to help States leverage technology funds; fulfills

my request for Title 1, education for the disadvantaged; and provides the funds to enable well over a half-million young people to participate in the Summer Jobs program.

For college students, I am pleased that the bill fulfills my request for the largest Pell Grant college scholarship awards in history and expands the number of middle- and low-income students who receive aid by 126,000 -- to 3.8 million. I am also pleased that the bill fully funds my Direct Lending program, enabling more students to take advantage of cheaper and more efficient loans.

For the environment, the bill provides funds to support the Environmental Protection Agency's early implementation of two major new environmental laws that I signed this summer -- the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Pesticide and Food Safety Law. In addition, the bill provides additional funds for energy conservation and to help finish the cleanup of Boston Harbor and help prevent beach closures.

At the same time, the bill does not contain any of the riders that would have affected management of the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, national Native American tribal rights, the Interior Department's management of subsistence fishing in Alaska, long-term management of the Elwha Dam in Washington State, and the issuance of emergency-efficiency standards for appliances. I am, however, disappointed the Congress did not adopt my proposal to repeal the 1995 salvage timber rider and restore the application of environmental laws to salvage logging on Federal lands.

For research and technology, the bill promotes economic growth by continuing needed Federal support for advanced technology. It restores funding for the Commerce Department's Advanced Technology Program, providing resources for new grants to support innovative technology companies across the Nation.

It also provides a sizeable increase for the National Institutes of Health, which will enable NIH to expand its critical research into new ways to treat breast cancer, AIDS, and other diseases. I am also pleased that the bill provides nearly \$1 billion for Ryan White AIDS treatment grants, including funds to help States purchase a new class of AIDS drugs called

"protease inhibitors" and other life-extending medications. And the Congress also fully funded my request for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's program that provides housing assistance for people with AIDS.

For law enforcement, the bill provides \$1.4 billion to ensure that my program to put 100,000 more police on the streets of America's communities by the year 2000 proceeds on schedule; with this bill, we will have provided funding for 64,000 of the 100,000

that I called for at the start of my Administration. The bill also increases funds for Justice Department law enforcement programs, for the FBI's crime-fighting efforts, and for new Federal prisons.

As I had urged, the bill also extends the Brady Bill to ensure that those who commit domestic violence cannot purchase guns. Finally,

I am pleased that the Congress provided a modest increase for the Legal Services Corporation, which ensures that those who lack the means still have access to our legal system.

I am also pleased that the bill provides a \$1.4 billion increase in funding for anti-drug programs. It doubles funding for Drug Courts, increases funds for drug interdiction efforts by the Defense, Transportation, and Treasury Departments, and provides the resources to expand the Drug Enforcement Administration's domestic efforts along the Southwest border and elsewhere. The bill also includes strong language about drug testing that my Administration had proposed, requiring that localities have drug-testing programs in place for their prisoners and parolees in order to qualify for State and local prison grants. And it includes funding for the drug testing of Federal, State, and local arrestees.

For counterterrorism, the bill funds my request for over \$1.1 billion to fight terrorism and to improve aviation security and safety. It enables the Justice and Treasury Departments to better investigate and prosecute terrorist acts, and it provides funds to implement the recommendations of Vice President Gore's Commission on Aviation Safety and Security and the Federal Aviation Administration's recent 90-day safety review. These funds will

enable us to hire 300 more aviation security personnel, deploy new explosive detection teams, and buy high-technology bomb detection equipment to screen luggage. The bill also gives my Administration the authority to study the use of taggants in black and smokeless powder; taggant technology holds the promise of allowing the detection and identification of explosives material.

I hereby designate as an emergency requirement, as the Congress has already done, the \$122.6 million in fiscal 1996 funds and the \$230.68 million in fiscal 1997 funds for the Defense Department for antiterrorism, counterterrorism, and security enhancement programs in this Act, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(I) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

This bill also funds the Nation's defense program for another year; it fully funds my defense antiterrorism and counter-narcotics efforts as well as the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and at my insistence it provides a substantial amount of the funding for my dual-use technology program. But it also provides about \$9 billion more than I proposed for defense, including a substantial amount for weapons that are not even in the Defense Department's future plans and were not requested by the service chiefs. This bill is part of a plan by the majority in the Congress that adds funds for investments now and reduces them in the future. I continue to believe that my long-range plan is more rational. It provides sufficient funds now while increasing them at the turn of the century when new technologies will become available.

I am pleased that the Congress has provided the minimum acceptable levels for certain key international affairs programs, such as the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association and the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization and for international peacekeeping operations and arrears. I also commend the Congress for providing at least a modest increase in funding international family planning programs and for dropping misguided Mexico City restrictions, and for funding bilateral economic assistance without rescinding prior-year appropriations. In addition, the Congress has facilitated the Middle East peace process by authorizing U.S. participation in the Middle East Development Bank. Nevertheless, I must note that the overall funding level for international affairs programs is well

below what we need to assure that we can achieve our foreign policy objectives.

This bill, however, does more than fund major portions of the Government for the next fiscal year. It also includes landmark immigration reform legislation that builds on our progress of the last 3 years. It strengthens the rule of law by cracking down on illegal immigration at the border, in the workplace, and in the criminal justice system -- without punishing those living in the United States legally.

Specifically, the bill requires the sponsors of legal immigrants to take added responsibility for their well-being.

And

it does not include the so-called Gallegly amendment, which I strongly opposed and which would have allowed States to refuse to educate the children of illegal immigrants. At my insistence the bill does not include the proposed onerous provisions against legal immigrants, which would have gone beyond the welfare reform law.

I am pleased that the Congress provided 7 additional months of food assistance for needy immigrants, including benefits for many elderly and children. This step will provide some help to individuals and States in preparing for the dramatic restriction of access to benefits that legal immigrants will face under the welfare reform bill.

I am, however, extremely concerned about a provision in this bill that could lead to the Federal Government waiving the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act in

order to expeditiously construct physical barriers and roads on the

U.S. border. I know the Attorney General shares my commitment to those important environmental laws and will make every effort, in consultation with environmental agencies, to implement the immigration law in compliance with those environmental laws. I am

also concerned about a provision that imposes a new "intent requirement" in unfair immigration-related employment cases that could place hardships on some U.S. citizens and permanent residents. I have asked the Attorney General to take steps to alleviate any potential discrimination that this provision causes against U.S. citizens and authorized workers -- particularly Hispanics and Asian-Americans who, by their appearance or accent, may appear to be foreign. Finally, I will seek to correct provisions in this bill that are inconsistent with international

principles of refugee protection, including the imposition of rigid deadlines for asylum applications.

The bill also makes important changes in the Nation's banking laws. It assures the continued soundness of the bank and thrift deposit insurance system, and it includes significant regulatory relief for financial institutions. At my insistence, the bill does not erode the protection of consumers and communities.

I commend Senators Baucus and Bingaman for raising the awareness of the issue of the proper accounting of highway trust fund receipts. In next year's reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act, my Administration will rely on a baseline that treats all States fairly and equitably.

The bill includes a Government-wide program to enable agencies to offer buyouts, through December 31, 1997, of up to \$25,000 to employees eligible for early or regular retirement. Many of these workers stay on for years after they can retire, so buyouts will serve as an incentive for them to leave. Buyouts are an important tool to help Federal managers downsize their agencies as we continue to move toward a balanced budget -- without relying solely on reductions-in-force (RIFs).

I am disappointed that one of my priorities -- a ban on physician "gag rules" -- was not included. Several States have passed similar legislation to ensure that doctors have the freedom to inform their patients of the full range of medical treatment options, and I am disappointed that the Congress was not able to reach agreement on this measure.

Nevertheless, this bill is good for America. As I have said, it moves us down the path toward a balanced budget while protecting our values. It provides the needed resources to fight domestic and international terrorism. And it cracks down on illegal immigration while protecting legal immigrants.

I am pleased to sign it.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

#

MS Mail

DATE-TIME 16 October 96 12:00
FROM Patmon, Matthew W.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT October 16 Press Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Black, Todd F.
Brennan, Steven A.
Brooks, Jennifer
Dragone, Karen D.
Flessas, Dan
Florio, Elaine
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harrison, Lyle M.
Hofmann, Stephan D.
Huggins, Peter
Johnson, Natalie A.
Koehler, Marc
Lawrence, Cynthia
Martinez, Alejandro
Mueller, William (Doug) D.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
O'Shaughnessy, Patrick
Rice, Sean P.
Robinson, Wylma
Sigler, Ralph
Simonalle, Eugene A.
Weber, Paul A.
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wright, Jay

CARBON_COPY

Bass, Peter E.
Biernacki, Eileen V.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Fetig, James L.
Friedrich, M. K.
Hall, Wilma G.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Johnson, David T.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.

Patmon, Matthew W.
Veit, Katherine M.
Wetzel, M. Jeanne
Wiley, Mary C.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

TEXT_BODY

To WHSR: Please pass to McCurry, Sens, Glynn on trip. Thank you.

[[OCT16GUI.DOC : 3117 in OCT16GUI.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE

16 October 96 11:58

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME

OCT16GUI.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

- October 16, 1996
- China
- Middle East
- Iraq
- Gulf War Illness
- Bosnia
- Turkey
- Russia
- Detargeting
- Northern Ireland
- Latin America
- Haiti
- Immigration and HIV
- North Korea
- Indonesia
- Nigeria

CHINA

Background:

In the past few days, China has taken steps that could signal a new crackdown on dissidents.

Democracy activist Liu Xiaobo was sentenced to three years in a labor camp and this weekend

China announced it would try another activist, Wang Den, for conspiracy against the government.

Wang Xizhe granted asylum this week in the U.S. after departing China without GOC approval.

Human Rights in China

□ Condemn repressive measures against democracy activists. China's intolerance for free speech and pluralism has long been a concern to Administration.

□ As we have in past, will continue to pursue active efforts to promote respect for human rights and the rule of law in China.

□ In particular, will:

-- continue to raise human rights concerns in all high-level meeting with Chinese officials;

-- maintain "Tiannanmen Square" sanctions against China;

-- vigorously enforce U.S. laws on prison labor exports;

-- strongly urge an end to abusive family planning practices.

Last month, President signed into law bill that provides asylum protection to victims of abusive family planning.

-- took decision on Wang Xizhe case based on merits and U.S. law. He is now in the U.S.; because this is an asylum case, will have no further comment.

Q: Hasn't the Administration abandoned human rights?

A: No. We have continued to press for respect for human rights in bilateral and multi-lateral settings. While China's human rights record remains unsatisfactory in many areas, our efforts have helped push these issues onto the agenda for Chinese policy

makers and have supported the work of those in China seeking to encourage change.

Q: Will U.S. continue to sponsor China resolution at United Nations Human Rights Commission?

A: As in the past, we will determine our position based on human rights situation in China.

Q: Will events affect plans for high-level meetings with Chinese?

A: Believe that policy of dialogue coupled with strong pressure for human rights is one most likely to lead to progress for Chinese people. Our dialogue with China also will help make progress on range of other important issues.

MIDDLE EAST

Lebanon

☐ The President will meet at the White House with the Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri of Lebanon on October 18.

☐ The two leaders will discuss Lebanon's economic reconstruction and developments in the Middle East.

Erez Negotiations:

☐ Talks on Hebron redeployment began on Sunday, October 6.

☐ Those talks are continuing.

☐ US Special Middle East Coordinator Ross is working actively with the parties in their negotiations.

☐ It wouldn't be helpful for us to comment on the substance of the negotiations.

☐ We understand that the talks will convene in Taba on Wednesday the 16th.

Q: Is there any consideration at all being given to sending U.S. troops to Hebron to monitor the situation there?

A: It's not under consideration. The solution to the issues in Hebron lies in the Palestinians and Israelis working together, devising practical solutions to the unresolved issues.

-- Our role is to help them work through their differences. That's why the President asked the leaders to come to Washington earlier this month.

-- That meeting ended a cycle of violence, got the leaders talking to each other again, and moved the process away from violent confrontation and back to quiet negotiation.

-- Peace in the Middle East is critical to our strategic interests and American leadership is crucial to make it happen.

Settlements

Q: Any reaction to press reports regarding Israeli plans on the settlements?

A: It has long been our view that settlement activity creates tensions and is a complicating factor in negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians.

[If asked about US policy toward Israeli settlements]:

☐ Our policy on settlements has not changed. Israel and the Palestinians agreed in the 1993 Declaration of Principles that settlements are an issue that will be covered in permanent status negotiations.

☐ We support that agreement. It is important that all sides avoid taking positions which could make the negotiation process more difficult.

☐ Settlements clearly are a problem. We believe they complicate the negotiations. They are certainly not the only problem, but without question they do have a negative impact on the process.

Jerusalem

Q: What is your reaction to Prime Minister Netanyahu's statement

that Israel will not negotiate over the status of Jerusalem?

A: Our views have not changed. Israel and the Palestinians have agreed that Jerusalem is one of the issues for permanent status negotiations.

-- (If pressed) Our position on the status of Jerusalem is well-known.

-- Jerusalem is one of the most sensitive and volatile issues in the peace process. We remain convinced that it is unwise for the United States to take actions that could be interpreted as prejudicing these sensitive matters, such as Jerusalem, which Israel and the Palestinians themselves have formally agreed to discuss only in the context of direct, permanent status negotiations.

Peace Process

□ There has been no change in the U.S. position on land-for-peace or anything else as a result of the Israeli elections. We have supported this principle and will continue to do so. At the same time, our experience makes clear that agreements are reached not through recitation of abstract principles, but through the hard work of direct negotiation.

□ Obviously, if progress is to be made, if differences are to be overcome, each side must take into account the needs and interests of the other.

□ Peace is not an abstraction. Peace is closely tied to security and only the parties directly concerned can make the critical decisions which affect their future. The United States can't make these decisions for them. We will not try to impose decisions upon Israel or any other party to the peace process.

□ That doesn't mean that the US, as the facilitator of the peace process, does not have views. It has been and remains our view that the land-for-peace formula offers the most promise for a workable solution to the problems of war and peace in the Middle East. But agreements will come not as a result of our views, but as a result of

negotiations between the parties.

Closure of Palestinian Areas

☐ We believe that easing the closure represents a positive development in relations between Israel and the Palestinians.

Palestinian Compliance on Security and Revocation of Palestinian Covenant

☐ We believe that Chairman Arafat and the Palestinian security forces are now making serious and substantive efforts to confront and dismantle the infrastructure of terror which he has labeled "a betrayal of the Palestinian people." We agree that these efforts, including cooperation and coordination between Palestinian and Israeli security forces, must be sustained.

☐ We have welcomed the decision taken by the Palestinian National Council to cancel the provisions of the Covenant which contradict the formal undertakings made between the PLO and the Israeli government.

U.S. Embassy in Tel Aviv

☐ Recognize what is required by the law passed by Congress requiring that the U.S. Embassy be transferred to Jerusalem. But President has made clear he will exercise the waiver provisions of the Jerusalem bill as necessary or appropriate to ensure that no steps are taken that could preempt or jeopardize the peace process.

Orient House

☐ Our position regarding U.S. contacts at Orient House has not changed. We do business with the Palestinian Authority only in Gaza and Jericho, not in Jerusalem. Would encourage all parties to concentrate on the negotiations, not on issues that may polarize the situation.

Syria

☐ We believe that a comprehensive peace requires negotiations and agreements on all tracks,

including with Syria and Lebanon. But we recognize that -- as in the past -- some negotiations will move at a faster pace than others.

- ☐ Prime Minister Netanyahu told me that he agrees on the importance of talks with Syria.
- ☐ We have never had any illusions about Syrian associations with groups involved in terrorism.
- ☐ We consider this a serious issue, and we have made that clear both in our diplomatic contacts at the highest levels and in our annual report on terrorism.
- ☐ We would like to see Syria's ties to terrorist groups definitively broken.
- ☐ But it is important to distinguish between states that work to subvert the peace process -- like Iran -- and those willing to engage in it actively and seriously -- like Syria.

Israel and Syria Land-for-Peace

- ☐ There will be no agreement if each side does not make an effort to respond to the needs and interests of the other. Syria has its views and positions, as does Israel. They agreed at Madrid to negotiate on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338. They should resume these negotiations to overcome their differences.

IRAQ

Q: What can you tell us about the situation on the ground in northern Iraq?

A: We continue to watch the situation there very closely. What is clear, however, is that neither side can dictate the outcome militarily.

-- What is needed is a prompt cease fire, meaningful negotiations between the parties, and for others to avoid complicating the situation.

Q: What can you tell us about your talks with the parties?

A: Assistant Secretary of State Pelletreau spoke yesterday with both the KDP and the PUK by telephone.

-- Both parties have agreed to meet with him within the next week. The exact time and venue of their meeting is being arranged.

In his conversation with PUK leader Jalal Talabani, Talabani confirmed that the PUK does not intend to attack Irbil.

Q: Have we warned Iraq and Iran not to get involved in the current fighting?

A: There are no indications that Iran or Iraq played a militarily significant role in this weekend's events. We urge both Iraq and Iran to stay out of the conflict.

No-Fly Zone

Q: What will you do now that Saddam has said he won't challenge the No-fly zone?

A: We'll have to see what he actually does. Actions speak louder than words.

-- We've made clear that we will do what we have to do to protect our pilots.

Q: How long will you maintain the forces you have deployed to the region?

A: That is an issue we keep under constant review. Force re-deployments from the region will take place when we believe they are no longer required to maintain pilot safety and the integrity of the expanded no-fly zone.

Q: Has Saddam Hussein reconstituted his air defense system to the same capability it had before the U.S. cruise missile attack?

A: The goal we set when we took our action was to impose a strategic cost on Saddam, permanently for his adventurism in the North. We did that by permanently expanding the southern no-fly zone to 33 degrees North.

-- In order to make that response as safe as practical for our pilots and those of our coalition partners, we attacked certain components of Saddam's air defense system.

-- Saddam's conduct since we took that action is what we have been watching most closely:

- ☐ he has ceased "painting" our aircraft patrolling the expanded no-fly zone

- ☐ it is clear that his air defense systems have been significantly degraded; his mobile missiles have been withdrawn to their garrisons and his fixed sites are less capable than they were.

-- We continue to monitor this closely. If we need to take further action to protect our pilots, we have significant forces in the area to do so.

GULF WAR ILLNESS

Q: What has your Administration done to help Gulf War veterans who are ill?

A: The President is committed to determining the causes of Gulf War Illnesses and to providing the best possible care for those who are ill.

-- That is why last year, he asked our nation's best doctors and scientists as well as Gulf War veterans themselves to serve on an independent Presidential Advisory Committee charged with reviewing the full range of government activities related to the health consequences of military service in the Gulf.

-- We have also provided free medical exams to more than 80,000 Gulf War veterans, initiated more than 70 research projects on Gulf War illnesses, approved more than 26,000 disability compensation claims for Gulf War veterans with diagnosed and undiagnosed illnesses, and declassified more than 27,000 pages of information from the Gulf War that may help determine the possible causes of these illnesses.

-- No one is more committed than President Clinton in getting to the bottom of this problem. We will leave no stone unturned both in our efforts to learn what happened and in restoring these veterans to full health.

Q: Isn't the Pentagon covering up evidence that U.S. troops were accidentally exposed to Iraqi chemical weapons at the end of the Gulf War?

A: The President has charged the Pentagon and other government agencies to leave no stone unturned in their efforts to determine the causes of Gulf War illnesses and to provide medical care to those who are ill.

-- Information that U.S. troops may have been exposed to low levels of chemical agents from post-war demolition of Iraqi chemical weapons came to light as part of our effort to learn all that we can. We are using complex computer models to help determine the extent to which our troops may have been exposed. This work is ongoing, and we will make the results public as soon as they become available.

-- In the meantime, the President wants to reassure the American public and especially Gulf War veterans that this problem is being worked at the most senior levels of the Pentagon and other agencies. We are also reaching outside the Government -- asking the distinguished National Academy of Sciences to assist us in this effort. And we are launching new research aimed at better understanding the possible medical consequences of exposure to low levels of chemical agents.

-- More than five years ago we relied on the courageous men and women who served in the Gulf. They must now be able to rely on us to determine what happened and to restore them to good health.

BOSNIA

Jusici

□ The situation in Jusici is calm but tense. We continue to

support the efforts of IFOR and the U.N. to resolve this situation.

Bosnian Serb Cooperation

- ☐ A U.S. delegation met separately with all three members of the Bosnian Presidency in Sarajevo Saturday for further work on the establishment of joint governmental structures in Bosnia.
- ☐ There has been some forward movement toward this goal, but much remains to be accomplished.
- ☐ It is essential that progress is made on practical matters so that joint institutions can be launched promptly. The Bosnian parties need to agree on a regular schedule of meetings of the Presidency and National Assembly and move on to establishing the general structure of their government, including the Council of Ministers.
- ☐ We remain insistent that Krajisnik live up to his agreement to cooperate in the development of national institutions and that he and the Bosnian Serb Representatives to the Parliamentary Assembly must sign the Oath of Office pledging to defend the Bosnian Constitution.
- ☐ We also expect the Bosnian Serbs to stand behind their agreement that OSCE will supervise the Bosnian Municipal elections in November.

Karadzic Influence

- ☐ We have no information to confirm reports that former Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic is influencing decision-making by senior Bosnian Serb officials.
- ☐ We continue to press and expect the Bosnian Serbs to live up to their agreement that Karadzic stay out of political life and that the Bosnian Serb leadership participate fully in the formation of national institutions. We are monitoring the situation closely to ensure they comply with this agreement.

Covering Force

☐ The deployment order for a covering force was signed on October 3rd. The first elements of the 1st Infantry division arrived in Bosnia over the weekend. Additional troops arrived in Bosnia yesterday.

☐ IFOR will complete its successful mission as scheduled on December 20. As we have said before, IFOR will complete its withdrawal in the early part of 1997.

☐ There has been no decision on any follow-on force. The covering force mission is an operational part of the existing IFOR mission and is not related to any potential future mission.

☐ This covering force will facilitate the withdrawal from Bosnia of U.S. units in IFOR. This trained and ready force will relieve one of the U.S. Brigades.

☐ The purpose of this force is fourfold:

-- to maintain a mission capable force in Bosnia until December 20, 1996, in order to complete Task Force Eagle's primary tasks as outlined in SACEUR's Operational Plan 10405 and the Dayton Peace Agreement;

-- to conduct the withdrawal operation in a manner which ensures a stable environment for the municipal elections;

-- to provide security for Task Force Eagle forces during their withdrawal from Bosnia;

☐ The 5,000 person force entering into theater will consist of a brigade as well as other units and headquarters elements of the 1st Infantry Division. The covering force will have sufficient combat, combat support and combat service support units to accomplish the tasks outlined above.

☐ The 5,000 troops deploying from Germany will join with 2,500 troops already in Bosnia to form a total covering force of 7,500 troops.

☐ The covering force has completed mandatory training in Germany

and will be in place to relieve selected Task Force Eagle units prior to the November municipal elections.

☐ After the elections, the covering force will conduct security and close-out operations in support of the withdrawal of the remaining original Task Force Eagle units. Upon completion, the covering force will begin its own withdrawal with an expected completion date sometime in March 1997.

☐ As is currently the case, force protection will be the paramount operational concern and will dictate the need for maintaining the same capabilities and flexible ROE resident in today's IFOR.

Planning for post-IFOR military Engagement in Bosnia

☐ IFOR's mission has been a success and IFOR will complete its mission as scheduled one year after it began last December.

☐ The elections created a new environment in Bosnia that we are continuing to assess.

☐ We have asked NATO Military Authorities to begin looking at the anticipated security situation in Bosnia next year and to develop a range of possible security options.

☐ A key goal will be to strengthen the capabilities and mandate of the International Police Task Force and to complete ongoing efforts to establish a military balance among the parties at reduced levels.

☐ There will be no decisions on whether a continued international security presence in the region is needed or, if so, what forces NATO might need to provide until the options developed by NATO planners have been reviewed by members of the Alliance, including, of course, the United States.

☐ We will consult with Congress as the process moves forward.

☐ We will also want to consult with the Russians and other countries outside NATO who are participating in IFOR.

☐ We will decide the appropriate U.S. role based upon the NATO study. We are prepared to consider U.S. participation if the study shows it is appropriate and necessary.

If Asked whether we support possible continuation of IFOR

☐ We have repeatedly said that IFOR's mission could be completed in about one year. IFOR's mission -- including enforcing the cease-fire, separating forces, supervising the transfer of territory, and providing a secure environment for the launch of civilian implementation, including the recent elections -- has been a success and it will be completed within the one-year time-frame.

☐ We do not see any need to continue IFOR's mission beyond December 20.

If asked about NATO Study/Options

☐ Defense Ministers have recommended that NATO Military Authorities begin looking at the security situation in Bosnia next year and to develop a range of options. Four options are being considered:

1. a complete withdrawal of the NATO military effort after completion of the IFOR mission on December 20 (this is the current plan);

2. a war prevention mission, which would focus only on deterring and dealing with an outbreak of large scale fighting;

3. a war prevention and stabilizing approach, which would include war prevention and efforts to maintain a generally secure and stable environment; and

4. a continuation of the current IFOR mission, including war prevention, stabilization, and secondary tasks in support of civilian implementation efforts.

☐ As Secretary Perry noted recently, our focus is on the first three options.

Return of Refugees--Germany

- ☐ We are working with the UN High Commissioner on Refugees, IFOR, the High Representative and others to promote refugee return and resettlement.
- ☐ We have seen encouraging signs including the return of about 100,000 refugees. This will be a long term process and we will continue to encourage the parties and assist international agencies to ensure the expeditious return of refugees to their former homes.
- ☐ Of course the process must be a voluntary one, which requires that conditions be appropriate before people can return.
- ☐ We hope that the Government of Germany and UNHCR will work together to ensure that repatriation is conducted in accordance with international norms.
- ☐ The German record on refugee return is excellent and very humane. Germany does not expect a large-scale repatriation until next year, which will then take place as a gradual, phased process.

Train and Equip Program

- ☐ The Train and Equip program, which the President approved and announced in July, is now fully operational. The first shipment of equipment arrived in Bosnia on August 29 and trainers are now working with Federation military officials to build a capable and integrated Federation defense force. The purpose of this program is to assist Bosnia in self-defense and promote military stability in the region.
- ☐ The remainder of the U.S. equipment from our \$100 million draw down for Bosnia is expected to arrive in November.

Municipal Elections

- ☐ We support the recent OSCE decision to schedule municipal elections in Bosnia on November

22-24.

☐ The OSCE, IFOR and others in the international community that organized the successful elections on September 14 will continue their work through the municipal elections and we will continue to provide extensive support for their efforts.

Merger of the Bosnian Muslim and Croat Armies

☐ We welcome the October 2 agreement by the Bosnian Federation on the organizational structure of an integrated Federation Ministry of Defense and the appointment of the Commander and Deputy Commander of the Joint Command of the Federation Armed Forces.

☐ These actions represent significant progress toward full implementation of the Defense Law and pave the way for the Federation Armed Forces to become the key institutions envisioned in the Dayton Agreement.

War Criminals- Vukovar (NYT)

☐ We have heard reports that a newspaper sympathetic to the Serbian government published an article confirming that Serb forces committed atrocities in the Croatian city of Vukovar in 1991.

☐ We will continue to press all parties to meet their commitments to turn over war criminals to The Hague.

TURKEY

Killing of Greek-Cypriot Civilian by Turkish-Cypriot Forces

☐ We deeply regret and condemn the use of deadly force in an October 13 incident in Cyprus that led to the killing of a Greek-Cypriot Civilian by Turkish-Cypriot forces.

☐ Although the Greek-Cypriot civilian had crossed the 1974 cease-fire line into the area controlled by the Turkish-Cypriots, the use of deadly force under the circumstances was unwarranted, unnecessary and deplorable.

☐ We urge all sides in Cyprus to avoid violence, work closely with the UN to establish mechanisms for dealing peacefully with events along the buffer zone, and to support ongoing efforts to promote direct negotiations aimed at a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem.

Prime Minister Erbakan's Trip to Libya

☐ Of course the Turkish Prime Minister is free to travel wherever he wants. Nevertheless, we remain troubled by any trip that can be seen as benefiting the Qadhafi regime, which has violated a variety of international norms.

☐ We are fully committed to enforcing the existing UN Sanctions on Libya, which resulted from its connection with terrorist activities, including the Pan Am 103 and UTA Flight 772 Bombings.

☐ In order to resume its place in the international community, Libya must refrain from terrorism and development of chemical and biological weapons, and halt efforts to obtain offensive missile capability.

Erbakan's Comments about Libya

☐ We have seen press reports of this and similar statements but are seeking more information before commenting further.

☐ It is our view--and that of the UN Security Council--that Libya has been a supporter of international terrorism and that it remains out of compliance with UNSC resolutions which were imposed on the basis of the Libyan Government's support of terrorist activities.

Erbakan's Trade Proposal with Qadhafi

☐ A determination of whether a violation of sanctions has occurred would have to be made on the basis of the nature of the trade that actually takes place.

☐ Obviously, we would be concerned if the Prime Minister's trip resulted in any infraction or

weakening of the sanctions regime imposed by the UN.

Erbakan's threat to leave Libya after Qadhafi's Comment about his Crackdown on Kurds

☐ We have seen press reporting about Qadhafi's comments but cannot vouch for their accuracy. I would say that these self-serving statements only confirm our view that it is impossible to deal with Qadhafi as a normal interlocutor.

RUSSIA/NIS

Current Items

If asked about reports Lebed planning coup:

☐ Have seen press reports that Interior Minister Kulikov alleged National Security Council Secretary Lebed planning some sort of illegal intervention.

☐ We have checked with Embassy Moscow; so far, absolutely nothing to substantiate allegations. They appear to be groundless.

☐ Would note that interior minister has frequently criticized Lebed publicly of late; two have had open disagreements over policy in Chechnya.

If asked about NYTimes story on deportations of Moscow's homeless

☐ Issue of homeless serious social problem in many countries; not surprising it's problem in Russia today --society in transition.

☐ Would hope that any measures taken by authorities in accord with constitution, Russian laws; understand Human Rights Commission studying situation.

If asked about op-ed in WashPost on U.S.-Russian missile detargeting

☐ Article speculative, discusses hypothetical "what if;" we're satisfied agreement with Russian government is in effect - our missiles not aimed at each other.

Russian prospects to START II Treaty ratification

☐ Treaty does face ratification vote in Duma; parliamentary prerogative to debate its merits; while some may oppose treaty, Russian government committed to ratification.

☐ Very much hope that Russia will ratify -- we're convinced in all our best interests.

☐ Secretary Perry to discuss Treaty in session with Duma on Thursday. He met today with the Russian Minister of Defense.

Armenia's Elections

☐ Armenia's Central Election Commission, which included opposition groups, ruled President Ter-Petrosian winner, with 51.7% of vote. Main opposition candidate received 41%.

☐ Concerned about OSCE reports of irregularities.

☐ Call on all political parties to respect political process to address grievances through democratic means, consistent with laws of Armenia.

☐ Urge all parties to exercise restraint and take positive steps toward reconciliation.

General Issues

Yeltsin's Health

☐ As noted previously, we have absolutely no information on any change in Yeltsin's health.

Understand he continues to rest, prepare for surgery (at Barvikha resort near Moscow.)

☐ Obviously, wish Yeltsin well.

☐ As to timing of surgery, up to Yeltsin and doctors to decide best course of treatment. (Latest press report quotes doctor as saying operation to be mid-November; not officially confirmed.)

☐ Russian officials report that, while preparing for surgery, Yeltsin continues to carry out light workload, meet with senior officials, clearly engaged, involved in business of governing.

☐ Yeltsin and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin have taken steps to keep Russian government on steady, sound course during this time.

NATO Enlargement and Russia

☐ NATO enlargement process moving ahead; not conditioned on Russian assent. At same time, we are discussing with Russia how -- in parallel with enlargement -- to broaden and deepen NATO-Russia relationship.

☐ Understand enlargement difficult issue for Russia, but both NATO and Russia have interests in assuring it does not affect broader cooperation between us.

☐ U.S. determined to proceed with NATO enlargement. Believe that is in interests of European security and stability. Equally determined to manage enlargement process in manner that does not threaten Russia and to do all that we can to build strong NATO-Russia relationship.

DETARGETING

Background

☐ In January 1994, President Clinton and President Yeltsin agreed that "they would direct the detargeting of strategic nuclear missiles under their respective commands so that by not later than 30 May (1994) those missiles will not be targeted." The agreement applies to both ICBMs and SLBMs.

☐ U.S. detargeting involved reconfiguring ICBM launch control and SLBM fire control systems from their day-to-day alert settings on preplanned operational targets to new configurations in which ocean aim points are designated as "primary" targets.

☐ Russian military officials have informed us that, for detargeted ICBMs, "flying missions in the operative memory of the missile guidance system would be zeroized by erasing information on hitting any targets," and that for detargeted

SLBMs, "flying missions would not be entered in the missiles."

□ While Russian commanders could reverse these instructions very quickly, the normal day-to-day detargeted status does afford an extra measure of protection against an accidental launch of a Russian missile, and vice versa. U.S. crews could also quickly reconfigure equipment to prepare to launch missiles against operational targets if directed.

Q: What is your response to those who argue that "detracting" is a charade?

A: The detracting agreement is an important achievement. First, it sends a strong political message that the Cold War is over and reflects the improving relationship between the United States and Russia.

-- Second, detracting does involve changes in operational practices on our side, and we believe, on the Russian side that provide an additional safeguard against an accidental launch.

-- Specifically, we do not believe that the United States can be struck by a detracting Russian missile due to an accidental launch.

-- Detracting is, therefore, a concrete step that has helped improve stability and build confidence.

-- Finally, detracting is only one of a number of recent initiatives taken to reduce the nuclear threat, including the START I and START II Treaties, which will reduce deployed nuclear forces by two-thirds, and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

If asked:

Q: Is it true Russian missiles would automatically "retarget" if accidentally launched (as Bruce Blair claims in a 10/15 Washington Post Op-Ed)?

A: As I said, we do not believe that the United States can be struck due to an accidental

launch by a Russian missile that is in a "detargeted" status.

Q: Does that mean Bruce Blair is wrong?

A: Yes. We do not believe that what he claims is the case.

Q: What about Chinese nuclear missiles -- are they still targeted on the United States?

A: As of yet, we do not have a "detargeting" agreement with China, although we continue to discuss this issue with the Chinese.

-- China does have a limited number of missiles that could be targeted against the United States.

NORTHERN IRELAND

October 7 Bombing

Background: On October 7, two bombs exploded in the compound of the British Army HQ at Lisburn, Northern Ireland, injuring 20 soldiers and 11 civilians, several seriously.

- ☐ Responsibility has now been claimed by splinter republican group calling itself Continuity Army Council.
- ☐ Extend sympathy to victims, families and the community.
- ☐ U.S. joins other nations in condemning this cowardly act of terrorism. Hope those guilty of this crime will be brought to justice.
- ☐ Urge loyalists not to respond to this provocation, to continue to show courage and restraint.
- ☐ Way forward in Northern Ireland lies through the talks going on in Belfast, not through spiralling cycle of violence.

Economic Boycotts

Background: The "Post" reported on boycotts of Protestant firms by Catholics and vice versa in some villages in Northern Ireland that are exacerbating ethnic tensions.

- Want to see people overcome bitterness of summer's marching season, recommit to reconciliation and peace process.
- Economic confidence important part of underpinning peace process for long term. That is why Commerce sponsoring trade and investment conference for Northern Ireland and the border counties next week in Pittsburgh.

Decommissioning and the Belfast Talks

Background:

Last week the British and Irish governments proposed a way to allow the talks to move from the plenary session into substantive negotiations. The issue that has been holding up that move is how much progress has to be made on the mechanics of decommissioning (not decommissioning itself) before the unionists will agree to substantive talks. Today the David Trimble's UUP released a paper that insists on a hardline approach to decommissioning.

- Fully endorse Belfast talks, agree with British and Irish governments that they represent historic opportunity and best hope in decades for achieving lasting settlement.
- Also agree with two governments that talks need to move into substantive negotiations as rapidly as possible.
- Decommissioning important issue. Mitchell Report of last January suggested consideration of some decommissioning in parallel with political progress. British and Irish governments have made statements (in response to the UUP paper) that make clear they see Mitchell Report as basis for progress. Urge all parties to work constructively on that basis.
- Encourage parties to consider how best actually to achieve decommissioning. Most promising way is through substantive talks process.
- Must not squander progress of last months. Urge all political leaders to take responsibility for

making these talks work.

☐ If raised: Agree that Sinn Fein needs to be at talks to give them best chance of success; that can only happen with cease-fire.

Loyalist Prisoners

☐ Hope anyone who is giving up on peace process will reconsider. Can be frustrating but have come long way already.

☐ Much credit due to courage and restraint shown by loyalists in maintaining their cease-fire. Urge them to continue to do so.

LATIN AMERICA

ARMS TRANSFERS TO LATIN AMERICA

Q: What is your position on the sale of advanced fighter aircraft to Latin America, a growing market that expects to modernize its aircraft in the near future?

A: For many years, the United States has exercised a policy of restraint related to arms transfers to Latin America, particularly of advanced weapons systems. This policy of restraint was imposed at a time when military governments dominated Latin America and reflected U.S. concerns of an arms race in the region. Now democracy is taking hold in all but one country in the hemisphere, a remarkable achievement.

-- Our main goals in Latin America are to promote and strengthen these democracies and to support the economic and social development of the hemisphere's citizens.

-- In light of the changes underway in Latin America, my administration is taking a very careful look at our policy on advanced arms transfers to Latin America. Ultimately, the outcome will depend on what is in the best interest of our national security.

Q: Would you support the sale of advanced U.S. airplanes like

the F-16s made here in Fort Worth at Lockheed Martin?

A: Any sale of advanced aircraft to Latin America requires very close scrutiny. My administration will be considering that question in the context of the overall policy toward the region.

HAITI

Administration Efforts to Deal with Political Violence in Haiti

Broad Context

- ☐ From its first days in 1993, the Clinton Administration has sought to end political violence and restore democracy in Haiti.
- ☐ Political violence was a horrifying, frequent occurrence during the de facto regime; according to local and international human rights groups, thousands of people were killed, tortured, beaten or imprisoned.
- ☐ When international political and economic pressure failed to dislodge the de facto regime, the President decided to intervene militarily.
- ☐ As part of the preparatory effort, the President ordered a broad-gauged plan to support the restoration of democracy by helping to create a new security/public safety structure, supporting a renewal of democratic political institutions and elections, and assisting with the establishment of the foundation for a viable economy.
- ☐ Two years later, while many challenges remain, real progress has been made toward these goals. Former President Aristide returned peacefully. He abolished the repressive Armed Forces and worked to establish Haiti's first professional and apolitical police force. Three national elections occurred and were judged generally free and fair by international monitors (although logistical problems marred the first legislative contest). A new parliament is in place, and a democratically elected president succeeded another for the first time in Haitian

history. Efforts to stabilize the economy continue with widespread international economic support.

Aggressively Targeting Political Violence

□ Throughout this period, the Administration has pursued a diplomatic and intelligence effort to identify threats to democracy and stability in Haiti. While the primary threat to democracy immediately after the military intervention was deemed to be from the right, the Administration was alert to the possibility of continued official involvement in political violence.

□ One important objective of this multi-faceted effort was to urge the Government of Haiti to investigate and remove individuals in the government reportedly involved in political violence or corruption.

□ As a result of its efforts, the US was able to identify a number of individuals associated with political violence and corruption, and senior US officials effectively pressed the Government of Haiti to remove the personnel identified.

□ President Clinton, Vice President Gore and other senior members of the Administration, including Secretary of State Christopher, US Permanent Representative to the UN Albright, National Security Advisor Lake, Deputy Secretary of State Talbott and others traveled to Haiti and raised these issues with senior levels of the Haitian Government.

□ By March 1996, most of those then identified within the government as having been implicated in political violence were removed from official positions.

Building Law Enforcement Institutions

□ The US has also played a major role in helping the Haitian Government create and train a wholly new police force, for the first time in Haiti's history. Although it still has a long way to go and requires much additional training and equipment, the new force's deployment

represents a major departure from past practices.

□ Initially, the Administration took the lead in organizing and overseeing an interim security force and in creating and training a new Haitian National Police mostly from raw recruits.

Both units were carefully screened by the US and UN to keep out known human rights abusers and criminals. Despite these efforts, some problems persist with the force.

□ By June 1996, 5200 new police were trained and deployed through the ICITAP program of the US Department of Justice. UN civilian police advisers provide on-the-job training.

□ With strong Administration encouragement, President Aristide established, and President Preval has strengthened, a Special Investigative Unit, with US and UN police advisors, to investigate possible political killings. This unit, while limited in effectiveness to date, provides an institutional mechanism to tackle the problem of official impunity.

□ Preval has also appointed, and the Haitian Senate has confirmed, a new Director-General of Haitian Police, Pierre Denize, who is untainted by charges of human rights abuses or corruption. Denize, in turn, has reappointed a tough-minded Inspector General, Eucher Joseph, who has recommended severe disciplinary measures on police officials involved in the abuse of authority.

□ The Government has adopted a new set of standards for apolitical and merit-based recruitment of mid-level supervisors. Requirements include appearance before an examinations board that include US and UN police representatives, passing a battery of tests and successful completion of a supervisory course at the Police Academy, which emphasizes respect for the due process of law and support for human rights. At present, 54 mid-level supervisors have completed this training.

□ As is to be expected with a brand-new civilian police force in a country which has never had one before, the Haitian Police face many problems. The Police

Inspector General has been actively investigating reports of police misbehavior, such as a March 6 incident in a Port-au-Prince slum in which a shootout with gang members left a number of civilians dead. The Director General of the Police has given strong support to the Inspector General.

The Bertin Assassination

- The US tried to prevent the tragic assassination of Madame Mireille Bertin in March 1995 and immediately after it launched a comprehensive effort to identify and bring the perpetrators to justice.
- When the Multinational Force(MNF) received information of a plot to kill Madame Bertin, US forces arrested and interrogated the alleged conspirators, and the MNF and Embassy asked Aristide and Justice Minister Exume to warn her of the threat, and we were subsequently assured that they had done so.
- Mrs. Bertin acknowledged to others that she had been warned by Justice Minister Exume, although she said that he had warned her to leave the country lest she be arrested.
- After Mrs. Bertin was assassinated, the Administration offered an FBI team to aid in the investigation and dispatched it within hours following a request by Aristide.
- Due to a proliferation of threat reports reaching US officials, the State Department sent instructions to the Embassy in Port-au-Prince to ensure that individuals be warned in the future when there is credible information of a specific threat of physical violence against them.

Responded Rapidly to The Leroy and Florival Murders

- Based on the circumstances in which opposition leaders Leroy and Florival were murdered on August 20, and given the public allegations of official involvement, we felt strongly that there had to be a rapid and credible investigation.

□ APNSA Lake and Deputy Secretary Talbott delivered exactly that message when they traveled to Port-au-Prince on August 30 to meet with President Preval. Preval made clear his conviction there could be no room in his security force for those linked to crime, corruption or violation of human rights.

□ President Preval also agreed that in order for an investigation to be credible, those individuals perhaps linked to the murders of August 20 would have to be suspended.

□ At the same time, Preval undertook a reorganization of his Presidential security force in order to bring it up to the same standards of professionalism that apply to the Haitian National Police.

□ To help President Preval carry out the vetting, reorganization and retraining of his security unit, we dispatched a team of 20 State Department Diplomatic Security officers and 12 DoD civilian security personnel to augment the State Department's existing advisory unit.

□ The training and reorganization mission of the augmented DS team should be finished in just a few months.

Results

□ Political violence has been much reduced since the restoration of democracy. Despite the inadequacy of the legal system and the inexperience of its police, violence in Haiti remains far below levels experienced during de facto military rule and the Duvalier era.

□ According to both local and international human rights organizations, Haiti suffered several thousand political murders during the three years of the de facto regime and countless additional beatings and other abuses. In contrast, a 1995 report by the UN/OAS human rights observer mission in Haiti estimated that the total number of killings with possible political or retributive motivation stood at about 24 since Aristide's return.

A Familiar Task

□ The U.S. experience in El Salvador, where we confronted a much more serious problem of official human rights abuse, provides an instructive point of reference. There, as in Haiti, a fundamental objective of U.S. policy was strengthening democracy and supporting the rule of law. In El Salvador, the principles of democracy often ran up against the habits of violence and distrust bred by a long experience with dictatorship.

□ It took repeated interventions by the most senior officials of the Reagan and Bush administrations to convince the Salvadoran government to put an end to officially-sponsored political violence.

□ In 1984, Vice-President Bush visited San Salvador personally to inform the government that aid would be cut off if the abuses did not stop. In response, the Salvadoran government established a new investigative unit and quietly dismissed or transferred abroad the military officers whom we had identified as possibly linked to political violence.

□ Five years later, amid an apparent resurgence of death squad activity, it was Vice-President Quayle who traveled to San Salvador to deliver the message that the U.S. government would not tolerate such abuses.

□ We have profited from these experiences, and thanks to those lessons, have been able to come to grips with the problem of political violence in Haiti quickly and decisively.

□ We have also been fortunate that the government of Haiti itself has been more quick to respond to indications that its officials might be involved in political violence.

Points

□ Although problems remain, Haiti today is a much more stable and hopeful place than it has been at almost any time in its recent history. We need to remember how far Haiti has come since the arrival of the U.S.-led multinational force in

September 1994.

- Since that time, the human tide of refugees has stopped, the terror of the de facto regime has ended and, last February, Haiti experienced its first peaceful transition from one elected civilian government to another in 192 years of independence.
- U.S. combat troops left Haiti in April when we passed leadership of the UN force to Canada. We all should be proud of the role that our military played in giving Haitians the chance reestablish their democracy.
- Since his inauguration in February, President Preval has courageously lead his country in implementing the economic reforms that will put Haiti on the path to long-term economic growth.
- At the same time, Preval has bolstered Haiti's new civilian police force. In so doing, he has helped to break the tradition of military abuse and impunity that for so long marred Haiti's political landscape.
- Last week, President Preval launched a parallel effort to reorganize and professionalize his Presidential security services. We are assisting that effort.
- The United Nations, with the strong support of the United States, is committed to seeing that Haiti's democratic course is not reversed by a violent minority wedded to the methods of the past.
- The success of our effort in Haiti is an excellent example of American leadership and international burdensharing.

IMMIGRATION AND HIV

Background: Over the weekend, Speaker Gingrich accused the Administration of allowing illegal immigrants with HIV into the United States, granting them asylum, and then putting them on welfare rolls. In fact, Gingrich was confusing several issues, the Administration's policy being as follows:

☐ If an alien faces persecution in his country of origin, the fact that he has AIDS or HIV will not constitute a bar to asylum. In other words, we will not return to persecution a person simply on the ground that he has AIDS.

☐ A person granted asylum can apply one year later for lawful permanent residence. HIV infection is generally a bar to adjustment to permanent resident status, but the Attorney General can waive the bar. Relevant factors include whether granting permanent resident status would impose costs on a government agency, at any level, without that agency's consent.

☐ Having HIV infection does not automatically entitle a person to asylum. However, a person with AIDS or HIV who establishes that s/he has a well-founded fear of being persecuted on the basis of HIV status and who meets other legal requirements can qualify for asylum.

Points

☐ Administration policy is consistent with existing law: A person may qualify for asylum by proving that he or she has been persecuted or has a well-founded fear of persecution if returned.

☐ An alien in the United States who meets the legal requirements can be granted asylum, subject to exceptions based mainly on security or criminal activity.

☐ Asylum status is not unavailable simply on the basis of medical conditions, including HIV. In other words, the United States will not return a person to death, torture, or some other form of persecution simply on the ground that he or she is HIV positive.

☐ Believe this policy enjoys bipartisan support. For example, believe there would be consensus not to return to Cuba a human rights activist if who would face torture at the hands of the Castro regime, even if he were infected with HIV.

[IF ASKED WHETHER HIV INFECTION IS GROUNDS FOR ASYLUM]

- ☐ Asylum is not automatic.
- ☐ An alien with a well-founded fear of persecution on the because s/he was HIV positive and who satisfies other legal requirements would be eligible for asylum. Determination is on case-by-case basis.

NORTH KOREA

Evan Carl Hunziker Arrest

- ☐ Koreans say he was arrested 24 Aug. (Have not said our cables say 21 Aug.)
- ☐ The Swedes visited him 16-17 Sept. and again on October 12 at the Amrokgang Hotel, Sinuiju where he was being held.
- ☐ He was in good condition and apparently being treated properly.
- ☐ DPRK informed the USG by Dip Note on 30 Sept. that they intended to put him on trial.
- ☐ Confirmed he is an AMCIT. (Did not address spelling of name.)
- ☐ USG does not know why he entered the DPRK.

Q: What is your reaction to the North Korean warning about serious consequences, made against South Korea at Panmunjom today in connection with the submarine incident?

A: The UN Command representative today at the Military Armistice Commission at Panmunjom rejected the North Korean statement, stressing that such statements would make a resolution of the situation more difficult.

-- We urge North Korea to refrain from any further recourse to provocative acts or statements and to work with the Military Armistice Commission and the Republic of Korea to settle this issue by peaceful means.

-- There should be no misunderstanding, however, that the United States stands with its ally, the Republic of Korea, in the face of threats to its

security. Together, we and the Republic of Korea are confident that we are prepared to deal with any contingencies on the peninsula.

Congressman Richardson Trip

Q: Was Congressman Richardson planning to travel to North Korea? Why did he cancel his trip?

A: I would refer you to Congressman Richardson's office for detailed information.

-- However, the Congressman was planning to visit North Korea to continue discussions on a range of issues, including MIA recovery operations.

-- Under current circumstances, such a trip would not be appropriate.

INDONESIA

Human Rights in Indonesia, and East Timor

- ☐ Claim that we have been soft on human rights is nonsense.
- ☐ In fact, in pursuit of our human rights objectives, we have undertaken new initiatives that altered policies of the two previous Administrations.
- ☐ In 1993, we reversed policy of the prior Administration and co-sponsored a UN Human Rights Commission resolution on the situation in East Timor.
- ☐ The Clinton Administration also adopted a policy to restrict transfer to Indonesia of the kinds of small arms and equipment that could be used to perpetrate human rights abuses.
- ☐ On several occasions, the President raised human rights issues personally with President Soeharto, including detentions and mistreatment of opponents in East Timor and restrictions on fundamental freedoms in the rest of Indonesia.
- ☐ Well before he received the Nobel Peace Prize, Bishop Belo was received in the White House by National Security Advisor Lake on two occasions, in 1993 and

1995, as a demonstration of our support for human rights and political reconciliation in East Timor.

NIGERIA

Visa For Foreign Minister's Wife

(IF ASKED ONLY:)

Q: Is it true that the USG granted a U.S. visa to the wife of Nigeria's Foreign Minister, even though she normally would not be eligible for a U.S. visa?

A: In December 1993, following the palace coup by General Sani Abacha, the United States imposed visa restrictions prohibiting travel to the United States by individuals who formulate, implement or benefit from policies which impede Nigeria's transition to democracy, and their immediate family members. Accordingly, Mrs. Ikimi would normally be ineligible for a U.S. visa as the immediate family member of the Nigerian Foreign Minister. However, Nigerian Government requested that we waive Mrs. Ikimi's ineligibility for humanitarian medical reasons.

-- On October 10, Theresa Ikimi (ee-key'-me), wife of Nigerian Foreign Minister Tom Ikimi, was issued a visa. She arrived on October 11.

-- Our policy toward Nigeria has not changed. We continue to press the Nigerian Government to respect the human rights of its people and implement a credible transition to civilian, democratic rule.

Q: Was there some confusion over the issuance of the visa?

A: The visa was issued while the question was still being reviewed in Washington.

Q: What would have been the result?

A: The issue is moot at this point.

Q: Will you allow her to remain in the U.S.?

A: So long as she abides by the terms of the visa, which is a 90 day medical humanitarian visa, no further action is expected.

Q: Will you let her/others in?

A: Our policy remains the same; we will review any further requests on a case by case basis.

(IF ASKED ONLY:)

Q: Were there conflicting instructions to Bonn on this? Did the Amembassy make a mistake?

A: The issue was still being reviewed in Washington at the time the visa was issued.

Q: In granting the visa, was there any linkage to the humanitarian conditions of political prisoners in Nigeria?

A: It would not be appropriate to go into detail about the specifics of our diplomatic exchanges on this subject, but the USG has consistently raised with the GON our continuing concern about the human rights situation in Nigeria, including the access of prisoners in Nigeria to medical and other compassionate treatment, as well as the need for a credible transition to civilian, democratic governance.