

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Press Secretary

Series/Staff Member: General Files

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 10858

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Daily Press Guidance - June 17, 1997

Stack:

S

Row:

93

Section:

1

Shelf:

1

Position:

1

Daily Press Guidance

Tuesday
June 17, 1997

(For internal use only.)

updated to
G-drive on 7/9/97

Press Guidance
Tuesday, June 17, 1997

Domestic

1. Children's Health - Health
2. Budget - ~~Public~~ Tax Reform
3. Ozone and Air Quality Standards - Air Pollution
4. FCC Liquor Ads - FCC
5. TV Ratings - TV
6. Airbags - Transportation
7. NEA - NEA
8. Flag Burning - Flag Burning

Events

1. Title IX event - Sports
2. African Trade - Foreign
3. VP grant for the Everglades - Environment

Foreign

1. Africa
2. Denver Summit
3. UN
4. Sierra Leone
5. DROC (Ex-Zaire)
6. Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville)
7. Nigeria
8. Japan
9. Indonesia
10. Taiwan
11. China
12. Latin America
13. Cuba
14. Haiti
15. NATO
16. Landmines
17. Turkey
18. Jordan
19. Middle East
20. Kazakstan/Iran
21. Russia/NIS
22. Iran
23. Korea
24. Saudi Arabia
25. Fast Track
26. Trips and Visitors
27. Burma
28. Bosnia
29. Ireland
30. Northern Ireland
31. Gulf War Illness
32. Gingrich and Nicaraguans
33. USEC

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 17, 1997

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I urge the Senate Finance Committee to adopt the bipartisan children's health amendment proposed by Senators Chafee, Rockefeller, Jeffords, and Hatch. As you know, I am extremely committed to using the \$16 billion for children's health to provide meaningful coverage for as many uninsured children as possible. The bipartisan amendment offers an opportunity to do just that.

It is critical that we continue to work together in this Congress to find ways to provide health care coverage for millions of uninsured children. As you know, over ten million children lack health care coverage -- and the impact on their families is profound. A recent study showed that nearly 40 percent of uninsured children go without the annual check-ups that all children need. One in four uninsured children do not have a regular doctor. And throughout the country, too many parents are living in fear that they may be forced to make the impossible choice between buying medicine for a sick child or food for an entire family.

Because of the importance of this problem, we need to work together to design the most effective way to invest the \$16 billion. The bipartisan amendment takes a major step toward this goal. This plan rationalizes Medicaid so that children in the same family are eligible for the same coverage. Children under 6 years old and under 133% of poverty -- about \$21,000 for a family of four -- are already eligible for Medicaid. The bipartisan plan provides incentives for states to cover older children up to this same income level. The plan also gives states the option of choosing Medicaid or a more flexible grant approach for uninsured, middle-class children. Resources and flexibility are needed because, unlike low-income children, middle class uninsured children are difficult to target with a single program. In addition, this bipartisan plan offers meaningful coverage that protects vulnerable children from excessive costs.

The bipartisan initiative -- which balances protections for vulnerable children with flexibility to target middle-class children -- stands in sharp contrast to the Commerce Committee's proposal. The plan to simply put out a block grant, with few rules and no benefits requirements, will not result in meaningful coverage for many uninsured children. While your proposal improves

PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES SUPPORT FOR BIPARTISAN CHILDREN'S PLAN

Today, the President announced his support for the Senate bipartisan amendment to provide meaningful health coverage to uninsured children. Senators Chafee, Rockefeller, Jeffords and Hatch have designed a consensus proposal on how to invest the \$16 billion in the Balanced Budget Agreement. This proposal is consistent with the President's commitment to extending meaningful health coverage through the most cost-effective approach. This important legislation would result in the largest investment in children's health coverage since the enactment of Medicaid in 1965.

The bipartisan amendment protects vulnerable children while offering states flexibility. It:

- **Gives states incentives to rationalize Medicaid.** Today, Medicaid covers children under 6 years old with incomes up to 133% of poverty, or \$21,000 for a family of four. The bipartisan plan provides incentives for states to cover all children, regardless of age, up to this income level.
- **Funds innovative state programs to target middle-class uninsured children.** Unlike low-income children, middle-class uninsured children are difficult to target with a single program. A grant program gives states the resources and flexibility to find and cover these children.
- **Offers meaningful coverage that protects vulnerable children from excessive costs.** Children have a wide range of health needs. The bipartisan amendment assures that children covered through the initiative receive meaningful benefits without unaffordable cost sharing.

The Roth proposal, in contrast, does not balance protection for vulnerable children with state flexibility.

- **False choice.** The Roth proposal asserts that states have the choice of expanding coverage to children through a block grant or Medicaid. However, it is a false choice. The rules for the block grant are designed so that no rational state would chose Medicaid, regardless of its merits.
- **Splits families.** The Roth proposal allows states to use the block grant for older, low-income children and Medicaid for younger children. It makes no sense to give a child below 6 years old one type of coverage and a child above 6 years old different coverage.

The President encourages the Senate Finance Committee and the full Congress to support this bipartisan approach. We should take full advantage of this opportunity to provide meaningful health coverage to a significant number of uninsured children.

Questions and Answers

Q: In Robert Pear's *New York Times* story today, the Governors -- who you applaud for their innovative efforts in this area -- are claiming that states will never expand coverage under a proposal with so many strings attached. How do you respond to this letter?

A: As a former Governor, the President well understands that states need flexibility to design programs that best meet the needs of their populations. However, if the taxpayers are going to invest \$16 billion in children's health care, there needs to be some accountability for these dollars. We believe that this proposal contains important administrative and financial incentives that will help states expand their programs.

Q: Why don't you support Republican proposals that allow states to use all of the funding for grants?

A: We believe that we should build on the Medicaid program and encourage states to cover all children under 133 percent of poverty so that children in the same family -- whatever age -- are eligible for the same coverage. This approach offers meaningful coverage that protects vulnerable children from excessive costs. The Chafee-Rockefeller-Jeffords-Hatch amendment also gives states the option of choosing Medicaid or a more flexible grant approach for uninsured, middle-class children. We believe that resources and flexibility are needed because, unlike low-income children, middle class uninsured children are difficult to target with a single program.

Q: How can you criticize the Roth grant proposal when your benefit package is less prescriptive than his?

A: Our approach always assumes a strong Medicaid base program. The Roth proposal establishes incentives for states to allocate the entire \$16 billion children's health investment to block grants, which would allow for less meaningful health insurance coverage. In so doing, it children 6 years of age and older at income levels less than 133 percent of poverty -- about \$21,000 for a family of four -- would not have the same benefit as their younger siblings.

Q: Are you saying that you will veto any proposal that is less prescriptive than the Chafee-Rockefeller Amendment?

A: We will have to evaluate all proposals that come up. There may strengthening provisions that make some sense. But there is no question that relative to all proposals on the table, that the Chafee-Rockefeller-Jeffords-Hatch amendment is far preferable.

Roth Tax Plan

Press Guidance

June 17, 1997

- * The Clinton Administration's goal is to increase the amount of tax relief into the pockets of working families in America, While Chairman Roth's plan offers some improvements to Rep. Archer, it still provides too little tax relief for working families and larger tax cuts to those who least need them:

Two thirds of the tax cut in the Roth plan go to twenty percent of families with the highest incomes.

By contrast, sixty percent of families, families in the middle and below, would receive less than fifteen percent of the Roth tax cut.

- * Roth plan is improved over Archer because it:
 - a)excludes the component of the Archer child credit that, by reducing their tax cut, penalizes 6 million families who pay for child care.
 - B)no indexing of capital gains, which would explode in cost down the road
 - c)does not gut the corporate alternative minimum tax.
- * Despite these improvements, the Roth plan falls short in a number of other areas in line with Archer's proposal:
 - Denies the child tax credit to 4 million working families
 - Fails to honor the budget agreement's \$35 billion commitment to education. The Roth plan falls short in both the size of the education investment and design. The plan offers no tuition tax deduction and reduces the Hope scholarship credit to 50% of cost up to \$1500.

Talking Points

Ozone and Particulate Matter Air Standards

June 16, 1997

- We are pleased with the progress we are making with the air standards.
 - As with every important decision, we are consulting broadly within the Administration in order to have the benefit of everyone's expertise so we can make the best decision to improve air quality and protect public health.
- EPA's final ozone and particulate matter (PM) air standards have not yet arrived at OMB.
 - EPA intends to keep the two standards tied together as part of one package that will be submitted to OMB for final review.
- There is a July 19 court-ordered deadline for the final rule on the PM standards.
- When the final standards arrive at OMB, they will be treated in the same manner as all other items under regulatory review.
 - We will confirm: (1) the date upon which the standards arrived at OMB, and (2) the date upon which OMB completed its review.

Gathering Input From Agencies

- To ensure that all interested agencies had the opportunity to comment on the proposed standards, in late February/early March OMB started an extensive interagency process for gathering agency views.
 - OMB specifically sought the assistance of CEQ (as coordinator of environmental agencies) and NEC (as coordinator of economic agencies) to help ensure that all interested agencies have an opportunity to provide input on the standards.
 - There have been numerous meetings at the technical, policy and senior policy levels.
 - These meetings will enable us to meet the tight court-ordered deadline with the full benefit of all of the agencies expertise.

Press Guidance
June 17, 1997

LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Background: On April 1, 1997 President Clinton sent a letter to Chairman Reed Hundt requesting that he explore the effects on children of the distilled liquor industry's decision to end its 50-year voluntary ban on broadcast advertising and to determine what action the FCC can take in response to the lifting of the ban. Yesterday, Commissioner Rachel Chong took this issue off of the agenda (any Commissioner is allowed to take an item off the agenda once), thus postponing an FCC investigation into liquor advertising on television until it can be brought up again in the July agenda meeting.

- The President strongly believes that the FCC should look into the prevalence of broadcast liquor advertising and its effects, particularly on children. This is imperative to determine what actions are appropriate for the FCC to take.
- The decision by one Commissioner to delay the discussion of this issue is unfortunate and the President believes that the FCC to look into this issue as soon as possible.

Silverman
per Kohlenberg/OVP

Press Guidance

June 17, 1997

TV RATINGS UPDATE

BACKGROUND: News accounts this week have indicated that a potential TV ratings deal is about to be struck. Senator McCain and other hill leaders are holding a meeting today with broadcasters (he may make some progress but won't complete the deal).

Q: Has the Administration been involved?

A: The Vice President is actively engaged in trying to persuade industry and family groups to reach a consensus that is good for parents and doesn't require government involvement. Last week he met with nearly a dozen family groups and also met with Jack Valenti representing industry.

Q: Do you have any sense of how the discussions are progressing?

A: While details of the agreement are still being finalized, the makings of the agreement will likely include more specific content ratings like V, S and L for violence, Sex and language that would be added to the current ratings now on television and the involvement of parents.

Silverman
per Kohlenberger/OVP

Press Guidance

June 17, 1997

AIR BAG RULEMAKING

Background: Today's Washington Post reports that a draft NHTSA rule being reviewed by OMB includes a proposal to allow on-demand air bag deactivation.

- Air bags are working well, but need to be improved to enhance the safety of children and ~~small~~ adults. Therefore in November, NHTSA announced a comprehensive approach to preserve the important safety features of air bags while minimizing their danger to children and at-risk adults (ie. Smart Air Bags).

Q: Does the Administration believe that motorists should be able to turn off their air bags?

A: We cannot comment on or during the rulemaking process.

Silverman
per Aikey/DOT

Press Guidance

June 17, 1997

NEA

Q: What does the President think about House Republican efforts to shut down NEA?

A: The President demonstrated his strong commitment to the Arts Endowment in his 1997 State of the Union Address, and his FY98 budget request of \$136 million for the agency, a 37% increase over current levels.

At the present time, the National Endowment for the Arts enjoys growing bipartisan support among members of both the full House and the Senate. However, once again ignoring the will of the American people, the House Leadership and conservative House members continue their efforts to eliminate the agency. The Senate remains strongly supportive of the Arts Endowment.

Silverman
per Steve Silverman

Press Guidance
May 19, 1997

Flag Burning

- The President abhors those who burn the flag and thereby show disrespect to our national symbol.
- The President has a long and vocal record in support of protecting the flag.

As governor, he supported legislation that would have outlawed all intentional desecration of the flag.

He also initiated a state-wide flag respect program designed to encourage a better understanding and appreciation of flag.

- The President cannot however support a flag-burning amendment to the Constitution. Such an amendment would change that part of our Constitution, the first amendment, which expressed the nation's best and deepest values. It would change the part of the Constitution that we should, at all costs, protect and preserve.

The freedom of speech protected by the first amendment is the freedom that has made this nation great and has earned the respect of all other nations aspiring to liberty.

The ability of Americans to speak their mind -- however reprehensible their views, however abhorrent their ways of expressing them -- is the defining freedom of this country. It is the freedom that protects all others.

We entertain changes to this Amendment at our peril. We should do so only in cases of real emergency. This is not such a case. Flag-burning is reprehensible, but it is also uncommon. We can deal with people who engage in such speech by disparaging them and their actions. We should not change the very foundation of this nation's greatness, to deal with these sad individuals.

How can you reconcile this with your support of the Victim's Rights Amendment?

First of all, Victims' Rights does not alter the First Amendment. The President believes that victims' rights is an issue which needed to be addressed and the most appropriate way to do this is through a constitutional amendment. As we said at the time, victim's of violent crime are the most deserving of protection in the criminal justice system and yet have no Constitutional rights.

Mellody per past guidance
approved by Bill Marshall, Counsel



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

June 11, 1997
(House)

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN COORDINATED BY OMB WITH THE CONCERNED AGENCIES.)

H.J.Res. 54 - Constitutional Amendment Against Flag Desecration (Solomon (R) New York and 284 cosponsors)

The President is deeply committed to protection of the United States flag and will continue to condemn those who show it any form of disrespect. The Administration believes, however, that efforts to limit the First Amendment to make a narrow exception for flag desecration are misguided. The Congress should be deeply reluctant to tamper with the First Amendment, which has never been amended since it was adopted more than 200 years ago.

A CELEBRATION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX

Today, the U.S. Department of Education is releasing “Title IX: 25 Years of Progress,” a report which summarizes the status and accomplishments of women and girls due to Title IX initiatives and programs. The following are highlights from the report.

Monday, June 23, 1997 marks the 25th anniversary of the signing of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Title IX, one of the nation's landmark civil rights laws, was enacted by Congress to eliminate sex discrimination in all aspects of American education – in the classroom, in course offerings, in the school workplace, and on the athletic fields.

Title IX has brought down many barriers that once prevented girls and women from choosing the educational opportunities and adult careers they would have liked to pursue. Indeed, the barriers were so ingrained, they affected all women, regardless of who they were. For instance, in 1966, Luci Baines Johnson, the daughter of President Lyndon Johnson, was refused readmission to Georgetown University's school of nursing after her marriage because the school did not permit married women to be students.

Twenty-five years after its passage, Title IX has helped bring about profound changes in American education, resulting in improvements in educational and related job opportunities for millions of young Americans.

PROGRESS IN ACADEMICS

- In 1994, 27 percent of both men and women had earned a bachelor's degree. In 1971, about 18 percent of young women and 27 percent of young men had completed 4 or more years of college.
- In 1992, women earned the majority of master's degrees (191,000), whereas the majority of master's degrees were conferred to men in 1977 (161,800).
- In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees and 43 percent of law degrees. In 1972, women earned only 9 percent of medical degrees and 7 percent of law degrees.

PROGRESS IN ATHLETICS

- Today, over 100,000 women participate in intercollegiate athletics, a four-fold increase since 1971.
- In 1996, 2.4 million high school girls represented 39 percent of all high school athletes, compared to only 300,000 or 7.5 percent in 1971.
- American women won a record 19 Olympic medals in the 1996 Summer Olympic Games.

In athletics, Title IX compliance is governed by a three part test. Colleges and universities that are attempting to comply with Title IX in terms of increased sports participation for women are required to be in compliance with only one part of that test.

PRESIDENT CLINTON COMMEMORATES 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX BY ANNOUNCING NEW STEPS TO ADDRESS SEX DISCRIMINATION

June 17, 1997

"...Until all women have an equal opportunity to develop their full potential and to make contributions that are accepted and welcomed by our society, our freedom as a nation will be incomplete."

-President Bill Clinton, Women's Equality Day, 1995, Proclamation

Today, President Clinton will host an event at the White House to commemorate the 25th anniversary of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and recognize the significant progress our nation has made in increasing educational and related job opportunities for millions of American women and girls.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, one of the nation's landmark civil rights laws, has made great strides toward eliminating sex discrimination in all aspects of American education -- in the classroom, in course offerings, in the school workplace, and on the athletic fields. Title IX generally prohibits sex discrimination in education programs and activities that receive federal assistance.

President Clinton Directs Agencies to Develop Tough New Enforcement Plans and Extend the Principles of Title IX to Federal Education Programs

Today, the President will sign and issue an executive memorandum designed to strengthen Title IX enforcement and extend Title IX's principle of nondiscrimination to areas not currently covered by the law. The executive memorandum:

- **Directs each federal agency to develop a plan to enforce Title IX and requires all federal agencies to report to the President on measures to ensure effective enforcement.** Each agency's new plan must include a description of the agency priorities for enforcement, methods to make recipients of federal financial assistance aware of their obligation not to discriminate, and grievance procedures to handle Title IX complaints.
- **Addresses discrimination on the basis of sex, race, color and national origin in all federally conducted education programs and activities.** Currently, Title IX generally prohibits discrimination based on sex -- and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin -- in education programs or activities that *receive federal assistance*. However, these laws do not apply to comparable education programs or activities that are *conducted by the federal government*. Today's directive will take action against discrimination in education programs or activities conducted by the federal government. This measure will hold the federal government to the same standards of non-discrimination in educational opportunities that now apply to non-federal education programs receiving federal assistance.

President Clinton Receives Report Documenting Tremendous Progress Under Title IX

Today, the Secretary of Education Dick Riley will present to the President *Title IX: 25 Years of Progress*. Produced by the Department of Education, this report documents the profound changes since the enactment of Title IX in American education and the resulting improvements in the educational and related job opportunities for millions of young Americans, particularly women and girls. The report also points to what remains to be done to reach equality in education.

Building on a Strong Commitment to Expand Opportunities for Women and Girls

Since President Clinton took office, he has worked hard to expand opportunities for women and girls. The Clinton Administration has: stepped up enforcement of civil rights statutes in areas such as access to advanced math and science programs; issued policy guidance on racial and sexual harassment and on ensuring equal opportunities in intercollegiate athletics; aggressively litigated cases presenting significant issues of discrimination, including cases challenging the exclusion of women from VMI and the Citadel; and sponsored an education campaign to help young girls build skills, confidence and good health.

**TITLE IX 25TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION
INTERNAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
JUNE 17, 1997**

Q: What is Title IX?

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which passed 25 years ago on June 23, 1972, prohibits sex discrimination in federally assisted education programs. One of the nation's landmark civil rights laws, Title IX has helped bring about profound changes in American education by improving the educational opportunities for millions of young Americans.

Q: What is the President doing today to commemorate this occasion?

Joined by the First Lady, Secretary Riley and several remarkable women whose lives have been touched by Title IX, the President will recognize the significant progress our nation has made in increasing educational and related job opportunities for millions of American women and girls. He will receive a report on the progress Title IX has made from Secretary of Education Richard Riley, entitled *Title IX: 25 Years of Progress*.

Most important, the President will commemorate the anniversary of Title IX by announcing new steps to address sex discrimination.

Q: What new steps will the President announce?

The President will sign and issue an executive memorandum designed to strengthen Title IX enforcement and extend Title IX's principle of nondiscrimination to areas not currently covered by the law. The Executive Memorandum:

- Directs each federal agency to develop a plan to enforce Title IX and requires all federal agencies to report to the President on measures to ensure effective enforcement. Each agency's new plan must include a description of the agency priorities for enforcement, methods to make recipients of federal financial assistance aware of their obligation not to discriminate, and grievance procedures to handle Title IX complaints.
- Addresses discrimination on the basis of sex, race, color and national origin in all federally *conducted* education programs and activities. Currently, Title IX generally prohibits discrimination based on sex -- and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin -- in education programs or activities that *receive federal assistance*. However, these laws do not apply to comparable education programs or activities that are *conducted by the federal government*. Today's directive will take action against discrimination in education programs or activities conducted by the federal government. This measure will hold the federal government to the same standards of non-discrimination in educational

opportunities that now apply to non-federal education programs receiving federal assistance.

Q: Why is the President issuing this Executive Memorandum?

A: The twenty-fifth anniversary of the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is a time to celebrate the enormous accomplishments that have been made in achieving equal educational opportunities for women and girls. But the President also recognizes that more needs to be done to achieve this goal.

Q. How will Title IX enforcement improve with this Executive Memorandum?

A. The Executive Memorandum requires that each federal department and agency develop a rigorous new plan to enforce Title IX and requires all federal agencies to report to the President on measures to ensure effective enforcement. Each agency's new plan must include a description of the agency priorities for enforcement, methods to make recipients of federal financial assistance aware of their obligation not to discriminate, and grievance procedures to handle Title IX complaints.

Q: Why does the President plan to issue an Executive Order addressing discrimination based on race, national origin, and sex in federally conducted education programs?

A: The President believes that we should hold the federal government to the same standards of non-discrimination in educational opportunities that now apply to non-federal education programs receiving federal assistance. Currently, Title IX generally prohibits discrimination based on sex -- and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin -- in education programs or activities that *receive federal assistance*. However, these laws do not apply to comparable education programs or activities that are *conducted by the federal government*. Today's directive will take action against discrimination in education programs or activities conducted by the federal government.

Q: Is there currently a big problem with discrimination in education programs conducted by federal agencies?

A: We are not aware of any major problem areas. However, we also are aware that discrimination frequently is covert and subtle, so it is difficult to gauge how extensive it may be. We expect that the President's Executive Order will do two things: (1) it will specifically forbid discrimination based on race, national origin, or sex in federally conducted education programs, and (2) it will require that grievance procedures be put in place so that students in those programs and their parents will have a system available to them to resolve complaints about discrimination. Thus, federal agencies will be held to the same high standards that apply to state and local governments and private institutions that offer federally-assisted education programs.

Q: What process does the Executive Memorandum call for to make sure that these things get done?

A: The memorandum directs all federal departments and agencies to do two things. First, the departments and agencies must report to the President within 90 days, following consultation with the Attorney General, on measures to ensure effective enforcement of Title IX. The Attorney General will coordinate the implementation of these measures. Second, the departments and agencies must submit reports to the Attorney General within 60 days, in which they describe their federally conducted educational programs and address any special issues that need to be addressed in preparing an Executive Order. The President directs the Attorney General to report to him within 60 days after receiving the reports with the results of her review and a proposal for an appropriate and effective Executive Order that addresses discrimination based on sex, race, color and national origin in federally conducted education programs and activities.

Q: Why didn't the President just issue the Executive Order, instead of asking for a study to be done?

A: The President has not simply directed that a study be done. Rather, he has expressed his intent to issue an Executive Order and directed that information be collected that will be needed to develop the terms of the Executive Order. Federal agencies offer numerous education programs. For example, the Department of Agriculture offers education programs for farmers and others, the Coast Guard offers boater safety training, and the Federal prisons provide educational instruction for inmates. Additionally, the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Indian Affairs each operate school systems. The President wants to be certain that he and the Attorney General have all the necessary information to close the "coverage gap" and to make sure no inequitable "loop holes" remain. At the same time, just as is the case under Title IX, it may be appropriate to include certain exemptions in the Executive Order. The study will also ensure that unique situations are covered fairly and adequately.

Q: Why are only education programs included in the President's directive concerning the Executive Order?

A: We are commemorating the 25th anniversary of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and Title IX is limited to Federally assisted education programs. This initiative to extend the principles of Title IX -- and Title VI concerning racial discrimination -- to federally conducted programs does not preclude issuing similar Executive Orders to cover other programs in the future.

Q. What kinds of education programs will be covered by the Executive Order?

A: We expect that all civilian education programs conducted by Federal agencies will be covered. These include academic, research, extracurricular and occupational training programs

unrelated to federal employment. Also included are schools operated by the Department of Defense for children of eligible personnel, schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and education fellowships awarded directly to students by Federal agencies. There currently is no comprehensive list of such programs, and creating that list is one of the important purposes of the President's directive.

Q: Will the Executive Order apply to military educational and training programs?

A: Just as Title IX exempts from its coverage educational institutions whose primary purpose is to train individuals for the military services of the United States, we expect that military training conducted by the Department of Defense will be exempted from coverage under the Executive Order. However, we expect that civilian educational programs such as schools operated by the Department of Defense for the children of eligible personnel would be covered by the order.

Q: Does the President have the authority to ban discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, or sex in Federally conducted education programs?

A: Yes, the President does have the authority to prohibit such discrimination in programs conducted by Federal agencies. The President's Executive Order will not make the specific provisions of Title IX and Title VI applicable to Federal agencies. However, the President does have the authority to require the application of the nondiscrimination principles embodied in those statutes to the Federal education programs for which he is -- ultimately -- responsible.

Q: Will the Executive Order provide students with a "private right of action" -- meaning the right to sue the Federal Government over alleged discrimination?

A: That is an issue that will have to be addressed by the Attorney General. However, one of the primary purposes of the Executive Order is to require Federal agencies to establish administrative grievance procedures within each agency offering educational programs so students and their parents have a place to go to file complaints and an administrative avenue for resolving those complaints.

Q. Why doesn't the President's memorandum address discrimination based on disability in federally conducted education programs?

A. Discrimination based on disability in federally conducted programs is already covered by section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Q: What is the report that Secretary Riley will present?

Today, Secretary of Education Richard Riley will present to the President *Title IX: 25 Years of Progress*. Produced by the Department of Education, the report documents the profound changes since the enactment of Title IX in American education and the resulting improvements in the

educational and related job opportunities for millions of American women and girls. The report also points to what remains to be done to reach equality in education.

Q. What does the Department of Education report find?

This report shows that, twenty-five years after its passage, Title IX has helped bring about profound changes in American education and the resulting improvements in the educational and related job opportunities for millions of young Americans.

- In 1994, 27 percent of both men and women had earned a bachelor's degree, whereas in 1971, about 18 percent of young women and 27 percent of young men had completed 4 or more years of college.
- In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees and 43 percent of law degrees, whereas in 1972, women earned only 9 percent of medical degrees and 7 percent of law degrees.
- Today, over 100,000 women participate in intercollegiate athletics-- a four-fold increase since 1971.
- In 1996, 2.4 million high school girls represented 39 percent of all high school athletes, compared to only 300,000 or 7.5 percent in 1971.

However, the report also shows that, even with the many advances women have made in academics, employment and athletics, we still need to recognize some dismaying facts that exist today in our efforts to achieve equality:

- In athletics, there are still about 24,000 more boys' high school varsity teams than girls' teams, women receive only one-third of all collegiate athletic scholarships, and operating expenditures for women's college sports programs represents only 23 percent of the total operating expenses.
- Although women earn half of all college degrees, they are still less likely than men to earn bachelor's or advanced degrees in high-paying fields such as engineering, mathematics and computer and physical sciences-- fields in which women are under represented.

Even though women make up half of the labor market, they are often paid less than men. For example, in 1993, women who had majored in the natural sciences earned 15 percent less than men who majored in the same field.

A CELEBRATION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX

“Honoring the successes of women and girls”

TITLE IX PARTICIPANTS BIOGRAPHY HIGHLIGHTS

Verelett Allen (Washington, DC) graduated from the Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW) electronics program in 1981 and was hired by the Metropolitan Transit Authority, where she has worked for over a decade. Ms. Allen was recently recognized by WOW for her leadership in this field. She is the Coordinator for the YWCA/HCCE Non-Traditional Employment for Women Program and founder and Executive Director of Women's Work, Inc., Silver Springs, MD. Ms. Allen's story is an example of how Title IX opened doors to women in non-traditional educational facilities and careers. She has consistently shown her personal initiative and commitment to promoting non-traditional work for women.

Dr. Nelba Chavez (Silver Springs, MD) is both the first Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) and the first Hispanic to head an agency within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Dr. Chavez directs federal policy and advises Secretary Shalala on ways to improve the quality and availability of substance abuse prevention, addiction treatment and mental health services. Dr. Chavez plays a major role in leading HHS's Girl Power Campaign to inspire all young girls to stay away from drugs, get active, get healthy, and make the most of their lives. She gained national recognition during her tenure with La Frontera Center in Tucson, Arizona, when former First Lady Rosalyn Carter designated La Frontera as a national model of an effective comprehensive community-based mental health organization.

Captain Robin Forster (Baltimore, MD) is a firefighter at Station 10 in Parkville, MD, and a member of International Association of Firefighters. A former physical education teacher, Captain Forster joined the fire department in 1982. Forster was promoted to Lieutenant in 1990, to Captain in 1995 and is one of two female Captains in the Baltimore County Fire Department. Only 5-7% of all union firefighters in this country are women. Forster was awarded a medal for her participation in the Amtrak train tragedy in January 1987.

Anne Jarvis Jefferson (Winona, MN) has distinguished herself as one of the most accomplished young scientists in our country. Ms. Jefferson is a U.S. Presidential Scholar and has also won the Pinnacle Award at the Intel International Science and Engineering Fair. She will be attending Johns Hopkins University in the fall. Current studies have shown that female high school students are just as likely as male students to take advanced math and science courses. This high participation is a direct result of Title IX programs which encourage young women to pursue these careers.

Jackie Joyner-Kersey (East St. Louis, IL) is one of the most accomplished female track and field athletes of all time. Competing in four Olympic Games, she won six medals (3 gold) and set numerous World and American records in the heptathlon and long jump. Joyner-Kersey was the 1986 Sullivan Award winner which recognizes the top outstanding amateur athletic

performance. She is also one of only two people to win the Women's Sports Foundation Amateur Athlete of the Year Award three times (1987, 1988, 1992). These amazing achievements may have not occurred without her athletic scholarship to attend UCLA. This scholarship was a result of Title IX initiatives. Joyner-Kersey is actively involved in efforts to encourage young people to excel in her hometown community of East St. Louis and has formed the Jackie Joyner-Kersey Youth Foundation to help promote these outreach and educational efforts nationally.

Dr. Sally K. Ride (La Jolla, CA) became the first American woman to fly in space when the space shuttle Challenger took off from Cape Canaveral, Florida, on June 18, 1983. Ride served as mission specialist on two Challenger flights. As a student in the mid 1970's, Ride witnessed the development and passage of Title IX from the unique perspective of a female scientist. Ride retired from NASA in 1987 and is currently the Director of the California Space Institute and Professor of Physics at the University of California, San Diego. Now as a professor, Dr. Ride supports Title IX as an educator and mentor for young students who wish to pursue a career in science.

DRAFT**Office of the Press Secretary****The White House**

For Immediate Release:**June 17, 1997****PRESIDENT CLINTON'S STRATEGY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY IN AFRICA**

President Clinton announced today a new partnership to promote economic growth and opportunity in Africa. As part of the President's strategy to organize America and our partners to meet the challenges of the 21st century, the President will work with bipartisan Congressional supporters to seek legislation expanding investment and trade between Africa and the United States and three days from now, at the Denver Summit of the Eight, he will encourage the world's other major industrialized economies. The substance of the President's Africa trade strategy is as follows:

BUILDING ON SUCCESS:

Africa is not just a continent of civil strife and humanitarian crises as seen on the news, but a continent on the doorstep of a new era of democracy and prosperity. Africa is rich in resources and potential; a majority of its 48 countries have instituted market-oriented economic and political reforms in the past seven years.

- Over 30 sub-Saharan African nations recorded positive growth rates in 1996..
- Some in Africa are attaining growth rates comparable to those of East Asia -- as high as 12% per year.
- African trade doubled between 1990 and 1995, and is expected to continue to grow by more than 6% per year through 2001. (where is this from? I'm not sure this is right and would like to double check)
- U.S. exports to Africa grew 20% last year.
- Foreign direct investment flows to Sub-Saharan African countries reached \$4.5 billion in 1996, triple the average annual level for 1990 to 1993.

PROVIDING INCENTIVES FOR SOUND ECONOMIC POLICY:

Africa's recent economic growth underscores President Clinton's strategy: countries that adopt sound financial policies and open their markets to trade should benefit most from access to our markets and from assistance resources targeted to generate growth. Steps include:

- President Clinton's budget request includes up to \$10 million (chk) annually to finance specific growth-oriented programs in Africa including emphasizing trade and investment liberalization through less strict trade regimes; the introduction of current account convertibility; providing national treatment for foreign investors; and entering into bilateral investment treaties and the World Trade Organization.
- The President's strategy will encourage African policies that invest in human resources by shifting government investment toward education and health and improving the effectiveness of education investment by focusing on outcomes (e.g., increasing the literacy rate) rather than inputs (spending).
- Support will be conditioned on efforts to improve policy management and governance through streamlining and reducing the scope of government activities; increasing the professionalism, transparency and accountability of the public sector; and developing a judicial system in which published rules are impartially applied and appeal procedures are clear.

SHIFTING FROM AID TO TRADE:

President Clinton believes American markets are one the most powerful tools we have to encourage African growth and reform efforts and will work for legislation that would expand African access to America's market.

- The poorest countries in Africa would receive duty-free access for an additional 1,800 products under the enhanced Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). These enhanced benefits would also be made available to other African countries that are undertaking concerted reforms to open and liberalize their economies, along with tariff reductions on some product groups that have traditionally been excluded from the GSP program.
- To encourage African nations undertaking reforms, the Agency for International Development (AID) will provide up to \$1 million annually to encourage greater contacts between U.S. and African firms and up to \$25 million annually to encourage African regional trade development efforts, promoting investment policy harmonization, regional business ties, financial sector development and privatization. And the Trade Development Agency (TDA) will increase the number of African trade missions. (MOVE PARA TO "support capacity building" SECTION)
- To leverage American efforts, the President will seek commitments from his Denver Summit Partners to maintain, and where possible expand, preferential tariff treatment into their

markets. Summit Partners will also work actively with the WTO and other organizations to assist African efforts to reform and liberalize their trade and investment regimes.

PROMOTING PRIVATE INVESTMENT:

President Clinton's strategy is intended to promote a strong and positive environment for private investment to spur the continued economic growth of the continent.

- For those African countries undertaking the necessary policy reforms, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) will leverage private capital by issuing guarantees for a proposed \$150 million fund investing in the region, sponsored by private sector participants.
- OPIC will work to secure partial guarantees for special investment funds with aggregate capital of up to \$500 million, concentrating on African infrastructure projects such as telecommunications, power, transportation and financial services.
- At the Denver Summit, President Clinton will urge his partners to join him in committing bilaterally and multilaterally to encourage improvements in African investment regimes by encouraging the adoption of investment protection treaties that reduce the risks faced by foreign investors.
- At the Denver Summit, President Clinton will urge his partners to encourage international institutions, the UN and other donors to work directly with African countries to develop innovative programs to encourage trade and investment.

SUPPORTING DEBT RELIEF:

The President's strategy supports efforts to alleviate the unsustainable debt burdens that act as a drag on growth in the poorest African nations. In 1995 and 1996, President Clinton joined with leaders of other major industrialized nations to establish a major new initiative to assist the heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC).

- President Clinton will call on his Summit Partners to join him in urging the World Bank and IMF to provide relief under the HIPC debt initiative for eligible countries in support of their growth-promotion efforts. The HIPC debt initiative reduces debt burdens for those heavily indebted poor countries that undertake serious economic reforms. Under this initiative, the Paris Club of creditor governments will reduce eligible debt by up to 80 percent, and the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the African Development Bank and Fund will also provide relief. Uganda is the first country to become eligible for this new relief program. It will receive several hundred million additional dollars in relief from creditor governments through the Paris Club. Several additional countries are now being reviewed as potential beneficiaries.

SUPPORTING DEMOCRACY:

President Clinton believes that private investment and business activity flourish where democratic governance and the rule of law are strong.

- The President will join with his Denver Summit Partners to promote democratic governance in Africa through supporting legal reforms and training; encouraging independent bar and other professional associations; and strengthening African efforts to combat corruption, and to bring transparency and accountability into government procurement.

SUPPORTING CAPACITY BUILDING IN AFRICA:

President Clinton's strategy is stimulate the capacity of African nations to develop and grow their own educational and economic solutions.

- President Clinton will join with Denver Summit Partners to encourage international organizations such as the Special Program of Assistance on Africa, the World Bank, the UN and other organizations to develop programs that build institutional capacity in Africa including: assessing human and institutional capacity needs; establishing and strengthen economic policy institutes throughout Africa; strengthening economic training and curriculum development at African universities; strengthening education policy; and expanding links between African experts and institutions and their counterparts in our universities and other institutions.
- INSERT POINT FROM PAGE 2 HERE

STRENGTHENING AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT:

President Clinton's strategy of growth and opportunity in Africa is designed to alleviate poverty in Africa through sound policies to promote the agricultural sector and rural development.

- Based in part on the principles endorsed at the World Food Summit, the United States will work with African governments and other donors to help develop criteria and indicators for policy development and the statistical data needed for appropriate policy decisions.
- The United States will provide up to \$15 million annually under the new multi-year Africa Food Security Initiative to support agricultural market liberalization, export development and agribusiness investment.

###

Roger V. Salazar @ OVP 06/17/97 11:24:03 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: VP Gore Announces \$25 Million Grant for Everglades Land Acquisition

**THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Vice President**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE CONTACT: (202) 456-7035
TUESDAY, June 17, 1997

**VICE PRESIDENT GORE ANNOUNCES \$25 MILLION GRANT
FOR EVERGLADES LAND ACQUISITION**

Federal-State Agreement Will Lead to Acquisition of 31,000 Acres for Restoration

MIAMI -- Vice President Al Gore traveled here today (6/17) to announce a \$25 million Federal grant to help Florida acquire 31,000 acres of private land in the Everglades, marking the next significant step in the Administration's landmark efforts to restore this unique, ecologically sensitive area.

"I am very proud of the great strides that this Administration has made in the most ambitious environmental restoration project this country has ever attempted," the Vice President said in his morning stop at Everglades National Park. "Parcel by parcel, we have acquired high-priority lands. They will help us both restore this pristine area and contribute to the economy of the entire region. "

Along with a \$25 million state matching grant, the Federal funds will enable Florida's Department of Environmental Protection to acquire the contiguous parcels that were formerly part of South Golden Gate Estates, Fakahatchee Strand and Belle Meade.

Most of these lands will go to establish Picayune State Forest in Collier County. The rest will significantly benefit Everglades National Park, Big Cypress Preserve, and Florida Panther and Ten Thousand Islands National Wildlife Refuges.

Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt, whose department is releasing the Federal funds, said, "These lands have a history rich in panthers and black bears, royal palms, bald cypress and rare orchids, but more recent history marred by failed land developments, hundreds of miles of dredging and bulldozing for canals and roads. We now stand at the verge

WHY IMPORTANT? WHY NOW?

- Africa is on doorstep of new era of growth, promise and opportunity. Most hopeful period in Africa since just after independence. Economies growing, democracy spreading, many conflicts ending.
- Major Administration goals for Africa:
 - 1) U.S. committed to defending US against threats to our national security i.e.: regional instability, terrorism, crime, narcotics, weapons proliferation, environmental degradation, disease.
 - 2) promote Africa's full integration into the global economy by:
 - galvanizing sustainable development through private sector-led growth and continued development assistance;
 - working to resolve conflicts
 - promoting and sustaining democracy.
- Among top priorities for Africa is promoting implementation of reformed policies that will accelerate growth and economic development in Africa.

BIPARTISAN EFFORT

- President welcomes leadership of many members of Congress on integrating Africa into the global economy.
- Event tomorrow will affirm commitment to work w/Congress to pass swiftly comprehensive, forward-looking new legislation to promote increased trade and investment in Africa.
- This unified bipartisan effort represents unprecedented agreement within USG on importance of Africa and need to work with African governments in a substantive and collaborative partnership to build economic and human potential of the continent.
- This domestic effort is tied closely to the efforts we will undertake later this week at the Denver Summit -- Africa major agenda item.
- Indicative of continuing commitment by the President to the continent:
 - committed to trip to Africa in Second term
 - continuing engagement on conflict resolution (African Crisis Response Force Initiative, Liberia, Angola)

-- working for growth and partnership with Africa for 21st century (Binational Commission w/South Africa, trade initiative)

KEY ELEMENTS OF AGENDA:

Economic

- Efforts to promote growth and reduce social risks in world economy; encourage reduction of deficits, investment in people and export-led growth. Increase efforts to fight corruption and money-laundering.
- Push for sound macroeconomic and financial policies and structural reforms to allow markets to function effectively in the global economy.
- Encourage strengthening of small and medium-sized businesses.

Aging

- Focus on “active aging” populations, including strengthening pension and healthy systems and encouraging medical and behavioral research.

Security

- Confront global security threats including money-laundering, cyber-crime, drug traffic, terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, nuclear smuggling.

Health

- Accelerate work on AIDS vaccine research.

Environment

- Facilitate transfer of environmentally sound technologies, promote child survival and sustainable development, take action to address greenhouse gas concentrations, advance efforts on environmental health and reform of U.N. environmental programs.

Russia

- Further efforts to integrate Russia into international financial institutions, including Paris Club, WTO and OECD.

Africa

- Africa Trade Initiative: Improve market access in industrialized countries for African producers, strengthen assistance to promote economic reform and trade liberalization, target assistance to public administration and civil society programs, enhance food security, strengthen peacekeeping capabilities.

Democracy

- Launch year-long effort to advance and coordinate human rights and democracy programs.

RUSSIA AND THE DENVER SUMMIT

- The Denver Summit of the Eight is a milestone in Russia's new role as an international partner committed to democracy and competitive international markets.
- Russia's role at Denver builds on several years of successful cooperation among the Eight:
 - Munich 1992 -- Yeltsin joins for one meeting;
 - Tokyo 1993 -- Yeltsin joins for a discussion on Russia;
 - Naples 1994 -- Yeltsin joins regional political discussion;
 - Halifax 1995 -- Yeltsin joins political and global discussions;
 - Moscow 1996 -- Russia hosts Nuclear Safety and Security Summit;
 - Lyon 1996 -- Russia joins political and global discussions.
- At Denver, the Eight will review key international political issues and strengthen cooperation on global challenges such as combating international crime, drugs, terrorism and infectious diseases and protecting the environment.
- Denver will mark the first time Russia participates in Summit discussions on economic issues such as the economic consequences of the aging of our populations, the role of small and medium enterprises in job growth and the impact of globalization on our societies.
- While at Denver, the G-7 will hold one meeting on certain financial and economic matters such as international monetary policy and will provide guidance to the International Financial Institutions.
- We expect the trend of Russia's increased cooperation with the Eight will continue after Denver. Prime Minister Blair has indicated he plans to use the Denver model next year at Birmingham.

(If raised -- G-7 continue to meet separately?)

- We expect the G-7 leaders will meet as necessary on core economic and financial issues.

Appointment of Mary Robinson as UN High Commissioner for Human Rights

- U.S. welcomes the appointment of Mary Robinson as UN High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Robinson has been tireless and effective advocate for human rights throughout her career.
- U.S. has long sought to strengthen international mechanisms to promote human rights, principally the UN Human Rights Commission. Secretary General Annan's selection of a high-profile personality to lead UNHRC sends an important signal.
- Look forward to working closely with Mrs. Robinson to promote respect for human rights around the world.

UN Arrears

Q: What is your response to Annan who said Thursday that the United States has a tough job ahead of it to convince the rest of the world to go along with its demands for UN managerial and financial reforms, especially lowering its assessment rates?

A: We agree with the Secretary General; this will be a challenge for U.S. diplomacy. But we are confident that once the UN member states look at all the details of the final plan that will emerge from Congress, once they see that a reformed UN will be stronger, more effective, and more relevant, they will support this initiative.

Q: Have you reached agreement with Chairman Helms on UN Arrears?

A: The bill the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is scheduled to mark up this week represents a major breakthrough in our discussions with the Congress on UN arrears. We are continuing to work with the committee on the details. The administration appreciates the good faith effort that Chairman Helms, Senator Biden, and other members of Congress have made to work with us on the issue. We should keep in mind, however, that today's Senate action is only one step in the legislative process.

Q: What are the terms of the agreement?

A: The Senate bill would authorize the payment of \$819 million in arrears to the UN and other international organizations over the course of the next three fiscal years (FY98 - FY00).

The release of the arrears payments would be conditioned on meeting a reform benchmarks in each of the three fiscal years. These benchmarks include reducing U.S. assessments from 25% to 20% and cutting the budgets of the UN and other international organizations.

Q: Doesn't the Senate figure fall short of the President's FY98 request?

A: The SFRC's bill provides most of what the President requested. Most important, the bill would enable us to pay off our arrears to the UN regular budget and to UN peacekeeping.

Q: Can the Administration deliver the reforms the deal calls for?

A: The bill contains some very tough reform conditions. We are concerned with some of the provisions and are continuing to discuss them with the Committee. Like Congress, however, we believe that the United Nations needs to embrace extensive reforms if it is to remain relevant in meeting the challenges of the next century.

SIERRA LEONE

June 17, 1997

Q: What is the U.S. doing to restore the democratically elected government in Sierra Leone? Will we use force or seek authorization for the Nigerians to do so?

A: We continue to work through diplomatic channels to facilitate a peaceful, negotiated restoration of the democratically elected government.

The United States supports the position taken by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Harare calling on the international community to refrain from recognizing the new regime or lending support in any form to the perpetrators of the coup d'etat.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

June 11, 1997

UN HR INVESTIGATION

Q: What is the status of the UN investigative team going to the Democratic Republic of the Congo?

A: The officer in charge of the UN human rights center in Geneva has met with his senior staff. They are organizing the advance team. The team will consist of human rights officers, Secretariat officials, investigators and forensic experts.

Q: Who will be on the team?

A: We don't have the names yet. We refer you to the UN Human Rights Center for the list of names.

Q: When will the team leave?

A: An advance team expects to deploy in the DROC by June 20. The full investigative team expects to deploy by July 7.

Q: (if asked) What is the U.S. doing about reports of massacres in Eastern Zaire?

A: The allegations are of grave concern to the United States. There are many seemingly credible reports from various sources that serious human rights violations have been, and continue to be, committed in eastern Congo against civilians.

For several months, we have been pressing our concerns with the Alliance leadership and at the highest levels with neighboring governments.

Ambassador Richardson, Assistant Secretary for Human Rights Shattuck, and other U.S. Government officials have been in the region recently meeting with DROC Government officials, representatives of civil society, non-governmental organizations and others. The U.S. Government has given a clear and consistent message that killings must stop and that a UN investigative team must be allowed to do its work.

President Kabila committed June 7 to admit a UN team to investigate allegations of killings of refugees by July 7, with an advance team to enter by June 20. He stated that DROC forces would abide by international humanitarian law and that transgressors would be prosecuted. He also agreed that the UNHCR and ICRC would have full access throughout the country to do their work.

We welcome this pledge and expect President Kabila to honor his commitments.

Q: (If asked) Who has committed the excesses? Is it Kabila's forces or is it the Rwandans?

A: We don't know. That is what the UN investigative team will try to find out.

REFUGEE UPDATE

Q: Would you provide an update on access and assistance to refugees remaining the Democratic Republic of the Congo?

A: We remain extremely concerned about the well-being of the Rwandan refugees who remain in the DROC.

With the airlift of the more than 50,000 refugees who were found in areas accessible to the international community, the refugee relief effort is shifting to a search and rescue mode.

It is essential that UNHCR and other relief agencies be allowed immediate access to all areas where refugees have been reported, particularly in light of allegations that the killing of refugees may be continuing.

It is imperative that the new government of the DROC ensure the protection of the refugees as well as of humanitarian workers.

President Kabila assured Ambassador Richardson on June 7 that he would grant full access throughout the country to UNHCR and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

While we welcome this assurance, we wish to state once again that words are not enough and that immediate action is needed.

Q: How many refugees have been airlifted back to Rwanda and what information do you have on the whereabouts of others?

A: The airlift of refugees as they emerge from the forest is continuing.

Over 50,000 Rwandan refugees have now been airlifted back to Rwanda:

39,700 refugees from Kisangani

7,150 from Mbandaka on the border with Congo (Brazzaville)

3,288 from Tingi-Tingi/Amisi, Punia, and Kindu

A number of humanitarian search teams and refugee collection points have been set up south and southeast of Kisangani, in the Mbandaka area, and west of Goma.

UNHCR plans to begin searching in the Boende area, east of Mbandaka, where there are reports of several thousand refugees and in Ikela, 200 miles southeast of Kisangani.

While this access is welcome, it is not enough. There are other areas where refugees have been reported where UNHCR and others are still not allowed to travel.

Q: What is happening to the refugees who fled to Congo (Brazzaville) given the present fighting there?

A: Approximately 30,000 Rwandan refugees had crossed into Congo (Brazzaville).

With the outbreak of fighting, UNHCR has been unable to gain access to the refugees since June 5.

There are reports of DROC refugees, who fled to Congo Brazzaville, and Congolese citizens crossing the river into the DROC. We do not have any numbers at this time.

REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)

June 17, 1997

Q: Situation/fighting update?

A: We understand there is still limited artillery fire in the vicinity of the airport, but the city is relatively calm.

Q: Have we decided to suspend our operations there?

A: The Acting Under Secretary for Management, Mr. Kennedy, will decide today whether to suspend Embassy operations in Brazzaville, effective tomorrow morning local time.

Q: Will all twelve official Americans depart? How/when? Will we be setting up Embassy operations elsewhere?

A: We expect our twelve official Americans, one Peace Corps volunteer, and a Congolese Peace Corps doctor, along with his two Amcit children to depart via private charter for Kinshasa tomorrow morning.

Our six member ESAT team and its two humvees, along with Embassy equipment, will depart at roughly the same time via the C-130 that has been standing by in Libreville.

Our Deputy Chief of Mission and consular officer will set up a temporary observation post in Kinshasa to monitor events in Brazzaville and maintain contact with any remaining American citizens in the Republic of Congo.

The Peace Corps Director will remain in Libreville TDY to complete suspension procedures.

Ambassador Hooks will return to Washington for consultations, along with remaining Embassy staff.

Q: Will anyone protect our interests/property?

A: Our foreign service national employees in Brazzaville and our local guards will remain on duty.

Q: Status of peace talks?

A: The international committee for mediation of the crisis in the Republic of Congo held its first session in Libreville yesterday. There is no reported progress yet.

The members of the committee are Gabonese President El Hadj Omar Bongo, Presidents Patasse (CAR), Deby (Chad), and Konare (Mali), and the foreign ministers of Senegal, Cameroon and Gabon, and UN Representative Sahnoun, and the special counselor of the OAU.

NIGERIA: POLICY REVIEW

June 16, 1997

Q: Is the Administration reviewing its policy toward Nigeria? Are we seeking engagement and improvement in cooperation with Nigeria rather than further sanctions?

A: We continuously fine-tune our policy to ensure it is appropriate to developments in Nigeria with the aim to pursue U.S. interests as effectively as possible. The State Department has ongoing internal discussions on the direction of our policy and these continue.

We always look at the normal array of diplomatic and other tools we have used and might use to promote our long-standing objectives on a wide range of political and technical issues.

JAPAN: CIVAIR
June 16, 1997

Background: NEC principals decided on Friday that our objective remains open skies, but that we are willing to discuss a transition agreement that results in open skies. Japan has steadfastly opposed an open skies agreement, and has resisted a transition agreement as well. Northwest, holding the largest share of the U.S.-Japan passenger market, wants the USG to stand firm for a pure open skies agreement. Other U.S. carriers, including United, Delta, American and Continental, do not want to await a pure open skies accord if it means foregoing a deal that significantly expands opportunities for them in the near term.

We are taking a firm position on violation of FedEx rights. The Department of Transportation had threatened sanctions in July of 1996, but had not imposed them. Principals feel it is important to send a clear signal that we will not wait forever for this to be resolved.

Q: What is the U.S. position in civil aviation negotiations with Japan?

A: We expect talks between the United States and Japan will resume shortly. The United States continues to seek a fully liberalized open skies civil aviation regime with Japan in a reasonable time frame.

Q: What does this mean for Federal Express? Are their rights being violated?

A: The U.S. position has not changed. We continue to believe that Japan has violated FedEx rights under our 1952 aviation agreement with Japan. It is important that this issue be resolved soon.

Meeting with Bishop Belo of East Timor

[Background for Briefer's Information only: Sandy Berger will see Nobel laureate Bishop Belo of East Timor on Wednesday, and the President is expected to drop by. Some questions may be asked as to why the President would see Belo but not see Jose Ramos-Horta, Belo's co-recipient of the Nobel Prize. (Ramos-Horta's representative requested a meeting with the President last year, and was told that such a meeting would not be possible.) To be sure, a Presidential meeting with Ramos-Horta is more difficult than a meeting with Belo. Ramos Horta has been a prominent member and spokesperson for an insurgent group involved in armed conflict with the Government of Indonesia. Thus, a Presidential meeting could risk conveying U.S. support for political goals that go beyond human rights, democratic reform and reconciliation.]

Q: Why is the President seeing Bishop Belo of East Timor?

A: Bishop Belo has been steadfast in his support for human rights, peace and reconciliation, and President wanted to meet with this prominent spiritual leader to express support for his efforts to promote these goals in East Timor.

Q: Why see Bishop Belo but not Ramos-Horta?

A: While President cannot possibly see everyone who requests a meeting, he saw the Belo visit as a special opportunity to convey U.S. support for the efforts of those working to bring human rights, peace and reconciliation to East Timor.

Would note that Mr. Ramos-Horta has seen several senior U.S. officials, including, most recently, Under Secretary of State Timothy Wirth.

We share Mr. Ramos-Horta's concerns about human rights in East Timor, as well as the need for reconciliation, and we recognize his efforts to bring the plight of the people of the territory to the attention of the international community.

As Mr. Ramos-Horta himself has said, and I quote, "President Clinton is knowledgeable and sensitive about East Timor."

In March, we once again cosponsored a resolution at the UN Human Rights Commission on the situation in East Timor, and the President has raised this issue in meetings with Indonesian President Soeharto.

We have also strongly supported the efforts of the UN Secretary General to encourage dialogue among the Indonesians, the Portuguese and the people of the territory.

Q: Would President consider seeing Ramos-Horta in the future?

A: Not prepared to speculate about President's schedule.

Q: Is the White House boycotting Ramos Horta?

A: No. A number of NSC officials have interests and responsibilities relating to Indonesia, including East Timor.

Should they receive requests for a meeting, I expect that they would have an interest in seeing Mr. Ramos Horta, and that a meeting of some kind would be arranged.

TAIWAN
June 17, 1997

[Note to Briefer : Do not refer to him as the Foreign Minister, call him by name.]

Q: Is Taiwan Foreign Minister John Chang visiting the U.S.? What is he doing?

A: John Chang is visiting the Western United States for programs with two private organizations.

It has been our practice to allow Taiwan authorities to visit the U.S. for private activities. Mr. Chang's predecessor Fred Chien also visited the United States at the invitation of private organizations.

Mr. Chang will not visit Washington.

We consider this to be a routine element of our unofficial relationship with Taiwan.

Q: Did the Chinese protest Chang's visit or his activities in the U.S.?

A: The Chinese government has expressed concern over Mr. Chang's visit. We have explained our policy.

Q: Has Chang been here before?

A: Mr. Chang last transited the U.S. in December.

If pressed:

Q: Will he be meeting with USG officials?

A: We have no plans to meet with Mr. Chang.

China-Iran Missile Sales

Q: Secretary Albright has confirmed that China has sold C-802 anti-shiping missiles to Iran. Why hasn't the administration imposed sanctions against China under the Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act of 1992 (aka the Gore-McCain Act)?

A: We take these arms transfers very seriously because they pose a direct threat to our interests and allies in the region. We have raised our concerns with China on numerous occasions.

The law requires economic sanctions against countries that provide "destablizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons" to Iran. At this point, we have not concluded that the C-802 missiles provided to Iran from China meet the standard of "destablizing." We will continue to review the situation to determine whether the requirements of the law have been met.

COSCO/LONG BEACH

- The Treasury-lead Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) is still conducting a national security review of COSCO/Long Beach. We expect the review will be completed shortly.

CHINA/TAIWAN

Q: Can you comment on reports that China and Taiwan will stage exercises in the Taiwan Strait, risking an increase in tension during the Hong Kong transition?

A: We have no evidence of any large-scale military exercises scheduled by either Taiwan or the PRC. We believe Taiwan's plans are modest in scale and non-provocative. We have no indications that the PRC is planning large-scale exercises similar to those carried out last year.

We believe both sides have shown restraint in military deployments the Taiwan Strait, and urge them to continue efforts to improve cross-Strait contacts and dialogue and further reduce tensions.

Latin American arms transfer policy

Q: Has the President decided to permit the sale of advanced fighter aircraft to Chile?

A: The President has decided to authorize the state department to issue marketing licenses in order to allow companies who wish to compete for Chile's prospective purchase of advanced fighter aircraft to participate in the process. A decision has not yet been made, however, on whether to permit such sales to Chile.

Q: Does this mean the policy on arms transfers to Latin America is still under review?

A: Yes. In light of the changes underway in Latin America, the administration has been taking a very careful look at its policy on advanced arms transfers to Latin America and whether it should move to a case-by-case review of requests to transfer advanced arms to Latin America. That policy remains under review. However, Chile's process for deciding which fighter aircraft to purchase has already begun. In order not to prejudice U.S. companies from competing for the sale while the policy review continues, the president decided to authorize companies to at least participate in the current technical stage of the bidding process.

Q. What were the president's reasons for this decision and how does it fit in the administration's overall policy toward Latin America?

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 when there was considerable tension between some Latin American states. The policy reflected U.S. desire to reduce conflict and avoid an arms race in the region.

Now democracy is taking hold in all but one country in the hemisphere, a remarkable achievement, and economic integration and political cooperation are making great advances. As a result, tensions have diminished and the risk of interstate conflict among neighbors is lower than it has been in decades.

Our main goals in Latin America are to promote and strengthen these democracies, to support the economic and social development of the hemisphere's citizens, to encourage growth, expand trade and assure access for American exports, and to cooperate on counternarcotics and other fields. We are also committed to promoting restraint in arms purchases, confidence-building and transparency measures among countries in the region.

Q. When will the president make a decision on whether US companies can actually sell fighter aircraft to Chile?

A. The administration will continue reviewing the matter and will ultimately make a decision based on several factors, including the sale's impact on regional stability and restraint and consolidation of democracy.

Lobbying on Helms-Burton

Background: Cuban Vice President Lage, Foreign Minister Robaina, and Deputy Foreign Minister Allende and others have been visiting various Latin American and European countries over the past week to encourage opposition to the Libertad Act and several proposed amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act under consideration in the Congress.

Q: What does the USG think about Cuban efforts to lobby our friends and allies against Helms-Burton?

A: Latin American and EU position on Cuba is clear -- while they may disagree with aspects of Helms-Burton, they believe that the time for peaceful democratic transition in Cuba has come.

- The EU established a Common Position last December conditioning any improvement in relations on concrete improvements in human rights and movement toward democracy in Cuba.
- The Latin American heads of state, meeting at the Ibero-American Summit in Chile last November, signed a strong declaration calling for democracy and human rights throughout the hemisphere, including Cuba.

Cuban lobbying, particularly at a time that the Castro regime is cracking down on human rights activists and independent journalists, is a sign of the regime's insecurity and growing isolation. We do not believe that these efforts will alter the international consensus for change on the island.

[If asked] The proposed legislative amendments, if passed and signed into law, will not have a significant impact on our friends and allies. They deal with withholding U.S. contributions to the IAEA for Cuba programs, earmarking funds for projects in support of the Cuban people, and requiring new internal USG reports on Helms-Burton implementation.

Haiti Reforms

Q: Is Aristide's party taking over Haitian politics? Is economic reform doomed?

A: Haiti continues its difficult process of political and economic transition. We strongly support the continuation of economic reform in Haiti, which is essential to creating the climate for long-term growth. We believe President Preval shares this commitment to reform, as demonstrated by his leadership in building Parliamentary support for civil service reductions, modernization of state owned enterprises and a fiscally restrained budget.

The international community in Haiti (including the OAS, UN and U.S. Embassy) has discussed with the Haitian election council a number of steps to enhance the integrity of the run-off elections and encourage the broadest possible participation. We hope such measures will be implemented, regardless of when the run-off elections take place.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

Q: Some Allies have reacted very negatively to your decision on NATO enlargement. Do you think you will have trouble convincing them of your decision and reaching consensus?

- NATO is a consensus organization. Initial differences of perspective are natural and we will develop a strong NATO position in the days and weeks ahead. I am sure that by the time of Madrid we will have a consensus on 3.

Q: How do you answer critics who say Romania and Slovenia should be included too?

- We have said all along that we would judge aspiring members by their ability to add strength to the alliance and their readiness to shoulder the obligations of NATO membership.
- Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic most clearly meet those criteria -- and have currently made the greatest strides in military capacity and political and economic reform.
- As I have repeatedly emphasized, the first new members should not and will not be the last. We will continue to work with other interested nations, such as Slovenia and Romania, to help them prepare for membership. Impressed with the efforts of Slovenia and Romania, want to keep the process going so that they too will be in a position to join. Other nations are making good progress -- and none will be excluded from consideration.
- We look forward to working with our NATO allies to reach agreement on this important issue.. Will seek to work through some differences (e.g., French support for Romania) before Madrid. Final NATO decision will reflect consensus of all 16 NATO members.

Q: But why not Slovenia/Romania?

- They have made good progress, and we look to them to consolidate these gains.

Spolar article

- Q: Any response to Spolar's article? -- We have looked carefully at the Polish military as well as the other CEE countries that want to join NATO.**
- A: We have found that while the Polish military must take additional steps to meet NATO standards, it is well-disciplined, highly motivated and its equipment generally well maintained. Its army is capable of mounting an effective defense against a range of threats.**
- We look forward to discussing these issues in detail, including with the Congress, as the process of NATO enlargement proceeds.**

Kissinger Op Ed Attacking NATO-Russia

Q: Any response to Kissinger's attack on the NATO-Russia Founding Act from the Sunday "WP"?

A: We are pleased by Kissinger's continued support for NATO enlargement, which he reaffirmed in his Op-ed piece of last Sunday. Unfortunately, Kissinger's piece also misunderstands and mischaracterizes the NATO-Russia Founding Act.

The Founding Act establishes a constructive partnership between NATO and Russia, even as NATO continues to take in new members. It neither replaces, weakens or dilutes NATO. Kissinger appears to have confused the NATO Alliance with the NATO-Russia arrangements. But the distinction is clear to every member of the Alliance.

NATO will take its own decisions -- and respond in cases of emergencies or threats to any of its members. The Founding Act says so explicitly (none of its provisions, "infringe upon or restrict the rights of NATO...") When all NATO members, including the U.S., agree, NATO may choose to take joint decisions with Russia. But as even FM Primakov has observed, Russia does not have a seat in the North Atlantic Council, which remains NATO's sole policy-making body.

Kissinger has called for the Senate to reaffirm the primacy of the NAC in setting NATO policy. We would welcome the Senate reaffirming a long-established position strongly and repeatedly affirmed by this Administration.

Kissinger charges that NATO's collective defense mission will somehow be weakened by NATO-Russia cooperation. Nonsense. NATO and the United States have repeatedly stated that NATO's prime mission will remain the collective defense of all its members.

Madrid Summit

Why NATO Enlargement is in America's National Interest

At its Madrid Summit on July 8-9, NATO will invite additional states to join the North Atlantic Alliance. Here are reasons why NATO enlargement serves America's national security interests:

1. Enlargement will make NATO stronger and better able to address Europe's security challenges.

- Europe remains a vital American interest. Europe's fate and America's future are joined. We fought two world wars and the Cold War in part to protect the security of Europe and the transatlantic area. Taking wise steps now will strengthen our common security, enhance NATO's ability to address Europe's future security challenges and reduce the possibility of another conflict.
- Stronger collective defense. NATO's core mission remains the collective defense of NATO territory. A NATO that embraces Europe's new democracies -- with capable militaries and a commitment to improve them -- will be better able to fulfill its basic mission.
- Greater ability to address new security challenges. NATO also is addressing Europe's new security threats, from weapons proliferation to ethnic conflict to terrorism. Enlargement increases the number of states willing to share these responsibilities. Central European countries that want to join NATO have already contributed troops and bases to NATO's efforts in Bosnia and have stated their intention to do their part in NATO's security mission in the future. Combined with the Partnership for Peace and NATO's new constructive partnership with Russia, a larger Alliance will be better able to address the new security challenges of the 21st century.
- Past enlargements made NATO stronger. NATO has enlarged three times before -- adding Greece and Turkey in 1952, West Germany in 1955 and Spain in 1982. Each time, the Alliance benefited from the addition of states committed to the security of the transatlantic area and prepared to contribute to it. Current efforts to enlarge the Alliance will have the same result.

2. Enlargement will help secure the historic gains of democracy in Europe.

- Part of a broader effort to build a new Europe. As President Clinton has stated since 1994, we have an opportunity, for the first time in history, to build an undivided, democratic and secure Europe. NATO can now do for Europe's east what it did for Europe's west -- provide a secure climate where freedom, democracy and prosperity can grow. Such a Europe would be a stronger and better partner in trade, investment, diplomacy and other aspects of security. While other institutions play a role -- including the European Union, OSCE, and others -- NATO remains the keystone of America's involvement in transatlantic security.
- Bolsters progress toward strong democracies and free markets. Joining NATO helped Italy, Germany and Spain reintegrate into the democratic community. Now, the very prospect of

NATO membership has encouraged Central European states to continue and deepen their democratic and market reforms. Already, states in the region have strengthened civilian control of their militaries, improved relations with ethnic and religious minorities and accelerated economic privatization -- in part to improve their prospects for membership in and cooperation with NATO.

- Improves and protects the business climate for American firms and workers. Our economic ties with Europe are among the most significant in the world and Europe's fastest-growing economies are now in Central Europe. Growing European markets will yield benefits for American exporters and export-industry workers. The stabilizing effect of NATO enlargement and its encouragement of free market reforms will help create a better long-term environment for trade, investment and economic growth in Central Europe. The resulting prosperity will benefit the United States, as did Western Europe's American-assisted recovery after WWII.
3. **Enlarging NATO will encourage prospective members to resolve their differences peacefully.**
- NATO enlargement is helping to resolve potentially dangerous conflicts. When he signed the NATO Treaty in 1949, President Truman said that if NATO had existed in 1914 or 1939, it would have prevented the hostilities that tore the world apart. NATO has helped reconcile former adversaries like France and Germany and helped moderate tensions between Greece and Turkey. Today, the prospect of NATO's enlargement has made Europe safer by encouraging the new democracies to improve their ties. Many countries have already reached agreements on border and ethnic issues that otherwise might have become sources of tension (Hungary-Romania, Poland-Lithuania, Poland-Ukraine, Slovenia-Italy, the Czech Republic-Germany).
4. **Enlarging NATO will erase the artificial line in Europe that Stalin drew, bringing Europe together in security.**
- Eliminates gray zone of insecurity. NATO enlargement will help prevent emergence of a gray zone of insecurity in a region where past insecurity has helped generate the century's worst conflicts. While not all interested European states will be invited at Madrid to join the Alliance, NATO will keep the door open for future members; the first to join shall not be the last. Enlargement, combined with other arrangements like the Partnership for Peace and NATO's new relationship with Russia and Ukraine will yield security benefits beyond NATO's own borders. By contrast, a decision *not* to enlarge NATO would suggest a permanent acceptance of the Cold War dividing line.

- An enlarging NATO is forging a more constructive relationship with Russia. During the Cold War, NATO and Russia were nuclear adversaries. A new NATO, as it prepares to add new members, has also laid the foundation for constructive partnership with a new, democratizing Russia. An important part of that new relationship is the NATO-Russia Founding Act. That document creates a new Joint Council for NATO-Russia consultations, coordination and, when possible, joint action.
- Insecurity is more expensive. NATO membership involves solemn security commitments and financial obligations; like all the other elements of American security, it is not cost- or risk-free. But history shows that the cost of inaction is much higher. The Pentagon estimates that NATO enlargement will cost the U.S. \$150-200 million per year over the next decade. But when the U.S. failed to address Europe's security challenges after World War I, we paid a terrible price in blood and treasure.
- American leadership. NATO enlargement constitutes a tangible expression of America's commitment to remain engaged in Europe and to exert our leadership in efforts to build a safer and more prosperous transatlantic area for the 21st century. This is part of a larger strategy that we must pursue to put behind us the darkest moments of the 20th century and fulfill the possibilities of the 21st.

Anti-Personnel Landmines

- The President is deeply committed to promptly achieving a comprehensive, global ban on landmines. He has taken a number of important steps to help move the world closer to that goal.
- In September, 1994, at the UN General Assembly the President called for the eventual elimination of anti-personnel landmines -- the first world leader to do so.
- In May, 1996, the President publicly called for a worldwide agreement to ban the use, production, stockpiling, and transfer of anti-personnel landmines, with a view to completing the negotiation as soon as possible.
- In the fall of 1996, following up on this call, the U.S. sought to gain the support of other nations for the same goal. The 1996 U.S.-initiated resolution called for an international agreement banning the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel landmines. Following aggressive lobbying by then-UN Ambassador Albright, the resolution passed the General Assembly in December by a vote of 156-0.
- We are pursuing negotiation of a comprehensive, global APL ban through the Conference on Disarmament.
- We are also consulting with the Canadians to seek to ensure complementarity of the CD and the Ottawa process tracks.
- The United States has taken a number of important unilateral steps as well:
 - In January, 1997, the President announced that the United States will observe a permanent ban on export and transfers of APL.
 - In May, 1996, the President announced that the U.S. would destroy all of its non-self-destructing (dumb) APL by 1999, except those needed for training or for use in Korea. About 3 million of these APL are now in the process of being removed from our stockpiles and destroyed.
 - The United States has also said we would cap our APL stockpiles at current levels. (If asked, only: The current stockpile is about 11,000,000.)
- The United States led the effort to strengthen the amended Protocol on Mines in 1996. That Protocol significantly tightens international restrictions on the use of APL, even as countries work toward the goal of an APL ban. It has been signed by a number of the countries which have said they will not participate in the Ottawa process and, if observed, can save many lives.

- **Except for those reserved for use in Korea, all U.S. APL are self-destructing/self-deactivating to a reliability rate of 99.9%.**
- **Last year the President directed the Department of Defense to undertake a program of research, procurement, and other measures needed to end our reliance on APL as soon as possible. Research programs are now underway.**
- We welcome the Ottawa process, but continue to believe Conference on Disarmament provides best way forward for negotiating a ban on landmines that is global, which is necessary if it is to be effective.
- The CD includes most of countries which are historically the world's major landmine producers. It is precisely these countries which need to be part of a ban to ensure the ban will be effective.
- We have always been keenly aware of the magnitude of the challenges we face in the CD. We are very disappointed in the Mexican position. We and others in Geneva are continuing our consultations with the Mexicans and are actively working to resolve our differences.
- The CD offers the most practical alternative for achieving a global ban.
 - Its membership is broad and geographically representative.
 - It has a proven track record: The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention were successfully negotiated there and have been signed by the vast majority of nations.
- Some of the key producing states have already made clear they will not participate in the Ottawa process.
 - Russia, for example, should be part of a ban negotiation. The Russians have indicated they will not participate in the Ottawa process, but can support work in the CD on APL.

NYT Editorial

- As the President made clear in his announcement of our policy a year ago, the United States is prepared to give up self-destructing landmines in the context of a global ban. We seek to conclude a global ban as soon as possible.
- A year ago, the Pentagon was also directed to aggressively pursue research and development on alternatives to APL so we can end our reliance on them as soon as possible. DoD studies are underway.

Leahy Legislation

Q: Senator Leahy has announced that he is introducing legislation further curbing U.S. use of anti-personnel landmines. What is the State Department's position on this new legislation?

A: The President has committed the United States to aggressively pursue an international agreement to ban use, stockpiling, production and transfer of APL, with a view to completing the negotiation as soon as possible.

We are pursuing that goal in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva, working to establish a negotiating mandate as soon as possible.

The CD offers the most practical alternative for achieving a global ban. Its membership is broad and geographically representative. It has a proven track record. The CD includes most of the countries which are historically the world's landmines producers. It is precisely these countries which need to be part of a ban to ensure the ban will be effective.

The proposed legislation would prohibit funding for new U.S. deployment of anti-personnel landmines (APL) beginning January 1, 2000.

This would be inconsistent with U.S. APL policy, which seeks a global agreement to ban APL and reserves the option for the U.S. to use self-destructing/self-deactivating APL in military hostilities to safeguard American lives and hasten the end of fighting.

The United States views the security situation on the Korean Peninsula as a unique case and in the negotiation of a global APL ban will protect our right to use APL there until alternatives become available or the risk of aggression has been removed.

We note that the legislation does take into consideration a key element of U.S. APL policy in allowing for the possibility of an exception for U.S. deployment of APL on the Korean Peninsula, provided the President submits an annual report to Congress certifying that new deployments are "indispensable to the defense" of South Korea.

However, this recognition of our security requirement in Korea does not outweigh the disadvantages of the proposed legislation, especially in undermining our strategy of seeking negotiated global ban rather than a unilateral measure.

Growing Political Instability

Q: Would the U.S. support a NATO member led by a military regime, if it came to that?

A: U.S. is firmly committed to both secularism and democracy in Turkey. Position we repeatedly make in discussions with all elements of Turkish political establishment.

Not productive to speculate about hypothetical situations. We expect Turkey to continue to be a bulwark of democratic secularism in its turbulent region..

Turkish Incursion into Iraq

Q: What is your reaction to the incursion of Turkish forces into northern Iraq on May 14 to attack PKK strongholds?

A: The Turkish military launched an operation against PKK forces in northern Iraq on May 14. This action is similar to Turkish operations that have taken place in the past. The U.S. supports the right of Turkey to defend itself against the terrorist PKK which uses northern Iraq as a staging ground to mount attacks into Turkey. At the same time, we have repeatedly stressed that operations of this sort must be limited in scope and duration and that adequate safeguards must be taken to protect the lives and property of the civilian population. We have repeated this message with respect to the current operation and have been assured by the Turkish government that this operation will be conducted with these concerns in mind. We also note that Prime Minister Erbakan confirmed publicly on May 16 that the operation would be limited in scope and temporary in duration.

Our position on the PKK remains clear, it is a vicious terrorist group of Marxist-Leninist origin responsible for the deaths of many innocent ethnic Kurds and Turks in Turkey and has no role to play in northern Iraq.

Middle East Peace and Stability Fund

Q: Why does Jordan need more aid?

A: King Hussein's leadership has been a very important force for peace and reconciliation in the Middle East, especially over the past difficult year. Jordan played a major role in reducing tensions and the King helped bring the Hebron negotiations to a close.

Jordan's economy remains vulnerable to external shocks and it has not seen substantial economic benefits from peace. We, and Jordan's partners in the region, have a strategic interest in seeing Jordan succeed economically.

Q: Is this the end of the Camp David earmarks for Israeli and Egyptian aid? Have they both agreed to this? What about the Congress?

A: For FY97, \$50 million each of the allocation of aid to Egypt and Israel will be re-directed to Jordan. We are consulting with the Congress on the appropriate way to extend this fund into the next several years.

What's important to recognize here is that both Egypt and Israel have recognized their own interest in responding to new needs in the region, and supported this initiative to create a regional fund drawing on a small percentage of the resources that have traditionally been allocated to them.

We have had discussions with the Congress on this initiative and will work closely with the Congress as we proceed.

Q: Will Israel be compensated for giving up part of its economic support funding?

A: As you know, our joint programs and assistance devoted to Israel reach far beyond U.S. provision of Economic Support Funds. We have had discussions with the Israeli Government on easing the burden this initiative places on its budget. We have also agreed recently on very substantial enhancements of our joint defense R&D. Obviously this initiative serves Israel's strategic interest in having Jordan as a stable, prosperous neighbor in the region.

Q: Do you expect other countries to contribute to this fund?

A: This is not an international fund, but we hope and we will ask that others increase their own assistance to respond to Jordan's needs. The President plans to raise this in Denver with our G-7 partners.

Q: Why not just take the whole amount out of Egypt's unspent aid pipeline?

A: We oppose singling out one of the Camp David parties for reduction. It is important to recognize that both Israel and Egypt have responded positively to the President's call to create a fund to meet new regional needs. This joint response needs to be encouraged. Singling out Egypt would not serve U.S. interests.

Q: Will the Palestinians get any of this new fund?

A: The fund, in its first years, will be aimed at addressing Jordan's needs. Over time, the fund could be used to meet other needs. We would consult closely with the Congress as we proceed.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

June 17, 1997

Q: Your announcement on aid for Jordan seems to be the only U.S. activity related to the peace process. Have you decided to step back from active engagement?

A:

- The United States has a fundamental interest in pursuing a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. That has been our consistent objective over many years. During difficult moments, it is easy to forget that some very significant progress toward that goal has been made.
- The framework in which that success was achieved has been a credible, direct negotiating process between the parties. That is what is lacking we lack now, and what we, the Egyptians, and the parties themselves are working to restore.
- Obviously, for such a process to succeed, there must be a 100% effort to discourage and prevent terrorism. It is essential that the Palestinian Authority leave no doubt that it is committed to fighting terror and that it neither encourages nor tolerates it.
- The parties need to return to the serious give and take of negotiations. We can help them with that, but we cannot do it for them.
- They need to take each others' interests into account and they need to avoid actions which preempt negotiation, especially on those difficult permanent status issues that they have agreed to deal with in negotiations.
- We have done a lot in recent weeks and months to help them understand each others' interests and needs. They will need to take the tough political decisions that can put them back on the road to credible negotiations.

Q: So you are essentially ruling out an American initiative in which you would present your own ideas on how to deal with the tough issues?

- We are going to stay involved in this process as one of the highest foreign policy priorities of the Administration. We cannot and will not impose solutions -- that approach just doesn't make sense. This is not an academic project. It's one thing to write studies and papers that reflect a certain view of a new reality; it's quite another to carry out the painstaking diplomacy necessary to effect change.
- I'm not ruling out the notion of the United States presenting ideas to the parties on how to treat certain issues. That has been part of our role and it will continue to be. But the focus still has to be on the parties themselves nurturing a credible negotiating process in which it is possible to address difficult issues constructively and have some decent chance of reaching agreement.

Q: Do you believe Israeli intransigence on Har Homa and its efforts to expand settlements should be viewed as the main problem holding up progress now?

- We've made our views very clear about actions that tend to preempt negotiations on permanent status issues.
- We are not going to spend a lot of effort blaming one party or the other. We frankly need to see less focus on blame and more focus on efforts to restore serious engagement by the parties.

Q: What is your reaction to the confrontation between IDF soldiers and Palestinian youths in Hebron?

A. Our position is very clear that no benefit can be gained in the peace process through violence.

For concrete progress to be made in the process both the Palestinian and the Israeli leadership should return to the negotiating table to discuss their differences.

Q: Do you have any update on the peace process?

A. The Egyptian initiative to intensify Israeli-Palestinian dialogue is continuing.

We are in close contact with Egyptian as well as the Israeli and the Palestinians on the Egyptian initiative.

Q: Is the U.S. role is marginal at this time? When will you become more active?

A: We're staying in close touch with the Egyptians, as well as the Israelis and Palestinians. We support the Egyptian efforts. Keep in mind that it's the parties themselves who need to restore the kind of confidence and trust necessary to move this process forward.

Q: Any reaction to the Netanyahu plan on dividing up the West Bank? Do you view this as a serious proposal?

A: Not going to comment on particular ideas or proposals. The key is for the parties to get back to a credible negotiating process.

House Resolution on Jerusalem as Capital of Israel

Q: Any reaction to the House resolution reaffirming the view that Jerusalem is the Capital of Israel?

A: Our views on this issue are of course very well known. The President has made it clear on numerous occasions that we are simply not going to be drawn into a public discussion of this sensitive issue, an issue which the parties themselves have agreed to deal with in their permanent status negotiations.

The focus needs to be on getting the Palestinians and Israelis back to the negotiating table to deal with their differences in a credible and constructive way. This sort of resolution doesn't help, it simply detracts.

KAZAKSTAN MISSILE SALES TO IRAN

- We do not comment on alleged intelligence information or reports.
- We remain concerned about Iranian efforts to acquire advanced weapons systems and technology; we will continue to work with other countries to prevent destabilizing arms transfers to pariah states.

General

NATO-Russia

- Summit of NATO heads of state and government and Russian President Yeltsin held May 27 in Paris to sign Founding Act. Milestone agreement -- lays basis for robust and growing partnership between NATO and Russia.
- Plans for NATO enlargement proceeding on schedule -- Madrid summit on track; will issue first invitations to prospective new members at July 8-9 meeting.
- Enlargement part of broader effort to build comprehensive European security system, which includes strong NATO-Russia relationship. Going forward in way that does not threaten any nation's security, enhances stability in Europe.
- See Russia as partner of NATO in shaping more secure, stable and undivided Europe. That is good for United States, Russia and Europe.

Suspension of Harvard Contracts

- AID suspended certain Harvard Institution for International Development contracts in Russia until further notice. Preliminary AID Inspector General investigation indicates two HIID employees potentially involved in serious conflicts of interest. Refer to AID for details.

Prospects for START II Ratification by Russian Duma

- Believe Yeltsin committed to START II ratification by Duma -- without conditions. Note that in May 20 meeting with Duma leaders Yeltsin made pitch for START II ratification.
- START II ratification in both U.S. and Russia's best interests -- provides for stabilizing reductions in strategic forces, reduced costs, and opens the door to negotiations on further reductions in "START III," as agreed in Helsinki.
- Ratification of START II by Russia remains an essential prerequisite to begin START III negotiations toward further reductions in nuclear forces.

Denver Summit of the Eight (see special section on Denver/Russia, above)

- Denver meeting will be Denver Summit of Eight; will build on increased Russian involvement; Yeltsin to arrive and depart with others; will be one press conference by leaders of the Eight.
- **Will still discuss economic, financial matters at Seven, but this involves only one meeting.**

REACTION TO IRANIAN STATEMENTS

Q: What is your reaction to new and apparently accommodating statements by Iranian President Khatami?

A: We look for indications that Iran is moving toward a more responsible approach to the region and the world community.

As we have often said, we have no animosity toward the Iranian people or an Islamic government per se.

Our concern is about the actual policies and practices of the Iranian regime.

The core of those concerns, as you know, are Iran's support for terrorism, Iran's pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, Iran's efforts to destabilize neighbors, and Iran's abuse of human rights.

We will judge Iran by its actions.

U.S./ROK/DPRK Talks

Q: Can you provide a readout of the U.S. and ROK efforts to obtain DPRK agreement to begin the four party talks?

A: Working-level meetings between the U.S., ROK, and DPRK continue periodically in New York to discuss the details of setting up the four party process, to which the DPRK has agreed in principle. These working level talks are useful and we expect them to continue.

Q: Can you provide some more general background about these working-level trilateral talks?

A: The U.S., ROK, and DPRK agreed in April to continue working-level discussions aimed at realizing the U.S.-ROK proposal for four party peace talks.

The purpose of these meetings is to continue discussions at the working level to realize four party talks. The North Koreans are interested and willing to discuss it, but we have not yet reached an agreement to actually enter these talks. We will work patiently to realize this goal, through working meetings and other contacts. These diplomatic contacts are moving in the right direction, but we do not expect to have something new to report after each meeting.

SAUDI ARABIA

Q: What about the Sayegh story?

- **We have been discussing with Canadian authorities our interest in Mr. Sayegh for some time, including our interest in having him brought to the United States for questioning.**
- **I cannot comment on whether he might be brought here.**

The Administration's international trade agenda is on track and moving forward at full speed. In APEC, the Free Trade Area of the Americas, and in the WTO, the United States and the Clinton Administration are setting the agenda to open markets, expand trade, and increase domestic prosperity. More than 25% of our economic growth in the past four years has been driven by export growth.

- In the last six months, the U.S. led the world to conclude trade agreements in information technology and telecommunications which covered more than \$1 trillion in global trade. We just led the developed countries of the world to conclude an historic anti-corruption agreement among the 29 developed nations in the OECD. We are moving forward in financial services talks at the WTO.
- The President was personally involved in securing the ITA agreement, working with APEC leaders last Fall to build support for this agreement. APEC has already embarked on "ITA II" to expand the reach of this agreement and will consider other sectoral trade agreements this year.

The President and the Administration are actively engaged with the Congress on the trade agenda.

- We are now working in Congress to preserve MFN trade status with China -- normal trade relations -- a critical measure to protect the economic health of Hong Kong because half of U.S.-China trade goes through Hong Kong.
- We have secured commitments from the congressional leadership to address "fast track" on an expedited basis this Fall and conclude this year. This effort will involve the President, the Vice President, and the resources of the White House.

We would like to see Congress approve "fast track" in the Fall to ensure that we can gain the best possible trade terms on a reciprocal basis for U.S. companies and workers. The trade agenda has not been held back by the absence of "fast track" negotiating authority. We are moving forward in the FTAA, within APEC, and in the WTO on a wide range of negotiations including financial services.

- Fast track is important because trade barriers in the fastest growing markets in the world are much higher than ours, and fast track will increase our leverage to bring those barriers down and open markets.
- We will work with the Congress this summer to build consensus on the scope of fast track and how to address labor and environmental issues.

TRIPS AND VISITORS

- **HRH Crown Prince el Hassan bin Talal of Jordan at the White House on Wednesday, June 18 re Middle East developments and U.S./Jordanian economic cooperation.**
- Denver Summit of the Eight June 20-22.
- Australian Prime Minister John Howard to meet with President Clinton at the White House on June 27.
- POTUS will travel to Denmark in July in conjunction with the July 8-9 NATO Summit in Madrid.
- President's visits to Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela rescheduled to October 12-17.
- APEC Summit in Vancouver November 24-25.

Visit of President Aliyev of Azerbaijan

Background: The President wrote Aliyev May 10, inviting him to visit Washington, "perhaps in late July or August." Amb Kauzlarich delivered the letter to Aliyev on Saturday, who promptly had the part regarding the invitation read to the Azeri press.

- POTUS has invited Aliyev to visit Washington; date TBD, possibly in the late summer.

Visit of President Shevardnadze

Background: VOA informs us that the Georgian state news agency is reporting that Shevy is coming here in August to see Clinton.

- The President wrote to Shevardnadze on May 31 (letter presented on June 2 by Amb. to Shevy) inviting him to DC for a meeting sometime in August (date to be tied down in near future). Shevy accepted the invitation on the spot.

BURMA

Q: What is the USG's reaction to the ASEAN foreign ministers' decision to admit Burma, Laos, and Cambodia into ASEAN during that organization's July 25-26 ministerial meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia?

A: Our concerns about the SLORC's (State Law and Order Council) policies are well known. It has violated the rights of its own citizens and taken actions that undermine stability in the region by producing refugee flows and allowing Burma to remain a major source of narcotics.

ASEAN shares these concerns and, like the U.S., wants to see them addressed.

We have acknowledged that decisions about ASEAN's membership are for ASEAN member nations to make.

We nonetheless regret that ASEAN appears to have invited Burma to join its organization at this time.

We will look to ASEAN to urge the SLORC to seriously address our mutual concerns by entering into a productive dialogue with democratic forces in Burma and by ceasing its actions that damage stability in the region.

Q: Doesn't this decision constitute a rejection of U.S. and Western pressure to keep Burma out of ASEAN?

A: The U.S. relationship with ASEAN spans a range of important political, security, and economic issues of joint concern.

We look forward to continuing to work with this key group of nations to further our mutual interests in stability and economic growth in Southeast Asia.

At the same time, we now look to ASEAN to persuade the SLORC to enter into a productive dialogue with democratic forces in Burma and to cease its actions that have undermined stability in the region.

Croatian Elections/Annexation of Bosnia?

- We are concerned that the recent elections in Croatia were not democratic and fair. Clearly, Croatia still has a way to go before it can be considered a democracy.
- Croatia will continue to have only limited access to international assistance and international institutions until it demonstrates a commitment to democracy and fully cooperation with the efforts toward peace and reconciliation in Eastern Slavonia and Bosnia.
- Many Bosnian Croats who are dual citizens with Croatia voted in the election at consulates as was their legal right. This is not an infringement on Bosnia's sovereignty or a violation of Dayton.

War Criminals/NATO Discussions? (WP)

- Detention of war criminals was not on the agenda for the NATO Defense Ministers' meeting and was not discussed.

War Criminals/General

- We continue to remain deeply concerned with the slow progress on war crimes front in Bosnia. Recent convictions in a German Court and by the International Criminal Tribunal are important steps toward justice in Bosnia, a key ingredient to long-term peace.
- With these convictions and the recent delivery of indicted war criminal Zlatko Aleksovski to the Hague, it is clear we are making slow progress on war crimes. We will not be satisfied, however, until all indicted war criminals stand trial at the Hague.
- We continue to press the parties to fulfill their obligations to turn over indicted war criminals. We are also examining a variety of ways we can help the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals to justice. We have made no decisions on how to assist the Tribunal. We are reviewing many different options.

If pressed about sending teams of special police or commandos to arrest war criminals:

- We have been examining several options to assist and enhance the ability of the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals into custody. One option may be to establish some sort of capability to execute the court's arrest warrants. We are studying the feasibility of these options but have made no decisions yet.

If asked whether we can withdraw in mid-98 without apprehending war criminals

- We are trying to reinvigorate implementation of Dayton across the board so that conditions for self-sustaining peace can be established before end of SFOR's mission.
- Bringing indicted war criminals to justice is one of our chief priorities among the many challenges we face. We are increasing pressure on the parties to comply with their obligation under Dayton to cooperate with the Tribunal.

Cohen-Albright Split? (NYT)

- The President and his foreign policy team recently agreed on a plan to reinvigorate implementation of the peace process -- quite the opposite of any split within the Administration on Bosnia.
- As part of this effort, SFOR will continue to play a key role within its current mission, both in implementing the military aspects of the peace and in support of civilian implementation.
- Civilian and military officials will continue working together on how SFOR can best continue to support civilian implementation efforts within its resources and capabilities.
- As the President said, the best way to build a self sustaining peace is to focus on the current implementation effort in Bosnia rather than speculation about what happens after SFOR's mission ends in June 1998.

Bosnia Implementation Plan/European Trips

- At the President's direction, we have recently conducted an extensive policy review and developed a Bosnia implementation plan aimed at reinvigorating U.S. and international efforts to bring self-sustaining peace to Bosnia. A key conclusion of our review is that Dayton remains the only viable framework for long-term peace.
- Secretary Albright briefed our re-energized approach to our Contact Group partners and the parties at the Peace Implementation Council Steering Board Ministerial on May 30. She followed up on her recent travel to the region by further pressing the parties hard on their obligations.
- Both Allies and the parties welcomed our renewed efforts to ensure timely, concrete progress on implementation. Secretary Albright was particularly firm and specific in her meetings with the parties on the need for improved performance in areas such as war crimes, public security, refugee returns and joint institutions.
- Dayton's continuing success is evident in the substantial progress we have made since we began the implementation effort: stopping the fighting, separating the warring factions, holding successful national elections, creating joint institutions, making great strides in economic reconstruction, and gradual momentum on freedom of movement and return of refugees and displaced persons.

- The implementation plan is a detailed step-by-step road map aimed at creating a self-sustaining peace beyond June 1998, establishing courses of action and benchmarks in all priority implementation areas.
- Priority areas are:
 - bringing war criminals to justice;
 - improving indigenous public security capabilities to maintain law and order;
 - preventing a resumption of fighting after SFOR departs by promoting military balance through completion of train and equip program and arms reductions;
 - advancing development of democratic, self-sustaining joint institutions and promoting the rule of law;
 - securing consistent progress on the return of refugees and displaced persons and the ability of all Bosnians to move freely throughout the country; and
 - enhancing economic reconstruction, inter-entity commerce and accelerated distribution of economic assistance to all areas of Bosnia;
- The plan calls for a strategy to develop and apply greater incentives and other forms of leverage to give the parties a stake in implementing Dayton and to overcome their differing visions of Bosnia's future. We will link cooperation with Dayton with all aspects of our implementation effort using economic, political and every other form of leverage we have available.
- We will also be launching an intensive campaign to reinvigorate the international effort. The goal is to re-focus implementation efforts and rally the international community on areas where we expect greater support, such as international police.
- We are introducing new programs to effectively and quickly target economic assistance to "Open Cities" that accept return of refugees and displaced persons from other ethnic groups.
- Implementation of Dayton and bringing long term peace and reconciliation to Bosnia remains a long term process and much work remains to be done. Nevertheless, we should take heart in all that we have accomplished and re-focus our efforts in order to finish the job.

IFC Loan to Croatia

- We have made clear to the Croatians that U.S. support for multilateral lending and assistance will be conditioned on Croatian cooperation on Dayton implementation issues.
- The U.S. did not object to the \$13 million International Finance Corporation loan to Croatia (considered on June 9) because of the recent positive actions taken by the Croatian Government in this regard, including opening the Brcko bridge and commitments on inter-ethnic reconciliation, including full implementation of the amnesty law.
- We expect to see follow-through on these and other obligations commitments, such as better cooperation on war criminals, in advance of other IFI votes on Croatia.

Train and Equip Program

- The international Train and Equip program is successfully helping to establish a stable military balance in Bosnia, which is one of the keys to establishing a lasting peace in the region. The recently announced delivery order of 116 refurbished howitzers and 21 heavy equipment transporters from U.S. Army excess stocks to Bosnia is part of the ongoing program to meet the defense requirements of the Federation, as identified shortly after Dayton, and within the parameters of the Bosnia arms control agreements.
- The T&E program continues to facilitate concrete progress in the formation of joint Federation defense structures that will be critical to strengthening the Bosniak-Croat Federation. The latest step forward in this regard, announced in Sarajevo last week, are the agreements between Presidents Izetbegovic and Zubak on a joint Federation Military Strategy and on key commands.

Radovan Karadzic

- Karadzic was removed from office and remains banned from any public or political role as agreed by Republika Srpska. We continue to monitor the situation and will insist that Republika Srpska live up to their agreement. We remain concerned about his potential influence and will not be satisfied until he is brought to justice in the Hague.

IRISH ELECTION

Q: Any reaction to Irish election? Will results have any impact on peace process?

A: Though composition of new government not yet final, appears that composition of Ireland's governing coalition will change as a result of last Friday's election.

Had excellent, productive relationship with government led by Prime Minister Bruton. Look forward to continued cooperation on peace process as well as European and other issues.

Congratulate Bertie Ahern, leader of the Fianna Fail (FEENA FOIL) party, for his party's strong showing. (Ahern will almost certainly be the next PM.)

NORTHERN IRELAND

- **We are outraged by the callous murder of two policemen in Northern Ireland and extend our deepest sympathy to the families of the the two slain officers.**
- **The IRA has claimed responsibility for this brutal act of terrorism. There can be no reason, no excuse, no apology for these heinous crimes. No one should make the mistake of granting these thugs the status of Irish patriots -- there is nothing patriotic or heroic about shooting two men in the back.**
- **The vast majority of the people of Ireland, North and South, have repudiated violence and murder. They know that a just and lasting peace can only come about through painstaking dialogue and negotiation. The true heroes and patriots are the many people of both communities who work tirelessly and peacefully for reconciliation and understanding.**
- **We will continue to do all we can to support their efforts and the efforts of the political leaders participating in the Belfast peace talks.**

IRA Shooting

- We are shocked and outraged.
- We understand the British and Irish PMs are meeting on the margins of the Amsterdam EU Summit .

High-Level Talks with Sinn Fein

- The United Kingdom has taken strong steps in pursuit of a cease-fire in Northern Ireland that would lead to inclusive peace talks.
- We have been urging the IRA to declare an unequivocal cease-fire as a precondition for Sinn Fein's participation in such talks.
- Those discussions have been ongoing since the previous cease-fire was broken.
- The U.S. has had contacts at high levels with all of the parties to reinforce this message. Some of these contacts have been well-publicized, such as last week's meeting between British Northern Ireland Secretary Mowlam and National Security Advisor Berger.
- We have not, however, chosen to publicize all of our contacts.

PEARSON DEPORTATION

Background: DOJ has decided to appeal the lower court's ruling that Brian Pearson is eligible to stay in the U.S. Pearson served time for an IRA bombing (of a military/ policy barracks--no one injured) before coming to the U.S.

- This decision was made by the Department of Justice on legal grounds. Questions concerning the case should be referred to DOJ.
- If asked: This is a deportation case; our policy toward Northern Ireland was not at issue. That policy is clear --we strongly condemn IRA terrorism and will continue to support efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

MITCHELL RESIGNATION AS SAPASS FOR ECONOMIC INITIATIVES IN IRELAND

[Background: It has not been made public yet but Senator Mitchell has submitted a letter to POTUS resigning his position as Special Advisor to the President and Secretary of State for Economic Initiatives in Ireland -- a position he has held since late 1994. Ideally, we would prefer to announce it at same time his successor is named, which will take a few weeks.]

- Yes, Senator Mitchell has decided to give up position as Special Advisor to President and Secretary of State for Economic Initiatives in Northern Ireland. Will of course continue as chair of Belfast peace talks; in fact, understand his decision to resign the economic job based on need to devote his time to the talks.
- We are moving to select a successor to Senator Mitchell to oversee Administration support for economic initiatives. Creating jobs through investment and trade is key to underpinning Northern Ireland peace process over long term.

CONTINUED IRA VIOLENCE

- Strongly condemn continued IRA violence in Northern Ireland and in Britain, urge immediate, unequivocal cease-fire.
- Belfast peace talks (now in recess until June) have best chance of long-term success if they are inclusive (that is, if Sinn Fein participates) but that can only happen after IRA cease-fire.

ON WHETHER IRA NEEDS TO DISARM BEFORE JOINING TALKS

- U.S., like British and Irish governments, have accepted the report issued last year by Senator Mitchell and his colleagues, which suggested decommissioning of arms in parallel with talks.

GULF WAR ILLNESSES

June 17, 1997

Q: What is your reaction to the recent GAO report criticizing the government's Gulf War illnesses-related research efforts and specifically suggesting that health problems experienced by Gulf War veterans may have been caused by exposure to chemical or biological weapons?

A:

- The GAO report you refer to is a draft, not yet released, that has been circulated for interagency comment.
- GAO raises important, substantive issues many of which have already been reviewed by the Departments of Defense, HHS, and VA, as well as the Presidential Advisory Committee.
- I'd like to clarify that, to our knowledge, the draft does not conclude that the health problems of Gulf War veterans have in fact been caused by exposure to chemical or biological weapons, nor does it conclude that any of the possible risk factors identified -- and currently under study -- are in fact the cause of Gulf War illnesses.
- The main thrust of the draft report, as we understand it, is that a shift in research emphasis and better use of collected data is called for.
- Once the report is finalized and released, the Departments will be in a position to comment more specifically on its conclusions -- all of which will in any case be carefully factored in to the ongoing research and medical care programs.
- Finally, the President's commitment to Gulf War veterans is clear. If evaluation of the GAO report indicates that a shift in emphasis and/or additional research are needed, these decisions will be taken.

Q: During yesterday's Pentagon press conference, comments by DOD's Special Assistant for Gulf War Illnesses (Dr. Rostker) seemed to indicate that GAO, DOD and the Presidential Advisory Committee have significant differences of opinion on the causes of Gulf War illnesses. What does this mean to veterans?

A:

- First and foremost, the President supports all efforts -- by the agencies involved, by his independent advisory committee, and by Congress -- to investigate the historical and scientific facts and to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the ongoing government efforts to meet the needs of our Gulf War veterans.
- In terms of any differences of opinion at this stage, we have to remember that the causation issues involved are numerous and complex, and the research available to date is limited -- which is precisely why the ongoing government research program

encompasses more than 90 projects.

- **Finally, once the GAO report is finalized and released, the agencies and the independent advisory committee will be in a position to comment more specifically on its conclusions -- all of which will in any case be carefully factored in to the ongoing research and medical care programs. If evaluation of the GAO report indicates that a shift in emphasis and/or additional research are needed, these decisions will be taken. The President's commitment to Gulf War veterans is clear.**

Landmines UNGA Resolution

- **On November 4, 1996 at the UN First Committee, then-UN Ambassador Albright introduced the U.S.-initiated resolution entitled "An Agreement to Ban Anti-Personnel Landmines," with 84 original co-sponsoring countries. (The number of co-sponsors grew to 115 following introduction.)**
 - **That resolution urged states "to pursue vigorously an effective, legally-binding international agreement to ban use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel landmines, with a view to completing the negotiation as soon as possible."**
- **On December 10, 1996, this U.S.-initiated resolution was passed in the full UN General Assembly by a vote of 156-0.**
 - **(If asked: There were 10 abstentions, including Russia and China.)**

Deportation of Nicaraguans

Background: U.S. District Judge King heard oral argument on a preliminary injunction that would bar the deportation of Nicaraguan and other immigrants affected by the recent immigration law. The law significantly limited the availability of a remedy known as "suspension of deportation" and could lead to the deportation of thousands of immigrants. However, the judge did not issue a decision; as a result, the temporary restraining order that was in place since May 20 has now expired and the INS theoretically is now free to resume its deportations. The judge said he hoped the INS would use its discretion to halt deportations for the time being.

[NOT FOR PUBLIC USE]: INS is working on guidance to its field officers that would temporarily hold off the deportations of Nicaraguans and other immigrants who do not have a criminal background and were adversely affected by changes in the law governing suspension of deportation.

Points

- Ruling from the judge is anticipated in the near future.
- In meantime, Administration is considering impact of expiration of temporary restraining order on INS operations, including deportations.
- At same time, as President indicated, we remain concerned about aspects of recently enacted immigration law that could have serious humanitarian implications for families here.
- We hope we can begin an Executive-Congressional dialogue that looks at ways to ameliorate these harsh measures without undermining immigration control.

Gingrich and Nicaraguans

Background: Rep. Gingrich reportedly wrote to AG Reno on behalf of thousands of Nicaraguans who are here illegally and are subject to deportation. During the Reagan Administration, AG Meese ordered that these deportation of illegal Nicaraguans be suspended, and that order was in effect rescinded some years ago (during the Clinton Administration). However, during an interim period, INS has continued to permit Nicaraguans here illegally to obtain work authorization, but this will end this month. At the same time, the new immigration law makes it much harder for these illegal Nicaraguans -- as well as all illegals -- to make hardship applications to stay in the U.S.

The President has expressed concern about changes in the law that make these hardship applications harder to file for a range of people (beyond Nicaraguans); thus -- without focusing on Nicaraguans per se -- we should note that Gingrich's sentiments are similar to our own.

Points

- We have not seen the Gingrich letter, but will study it carefully.
- We have seen the Speaker's comments, and -- as the President has indicated -- we very much share the Speaker's concerns about certain aspects of the recently enacted immigration law that could have serious humanitarian implications for families here.
- Thus, we were encouraged by the Speaker's sentiments, and hope that they can form the basis for an Executive-Congressional dialogue that looks at ways to ameliorate these harsh measures without undermining immigration control.

U.S. ENRICHMENT CORPORATION

June 13, 1997

Pleiades

Q: Is the U.S. Government aware that a group of investors called Pleiades has expressed an interest in buying the U.S. Enrichment Corporation?

A: Yes, we are aware that Pleiades has expressed an interest in USEC as have some other organizations. However, since the Government has not yet determined the method by which USEC will be privatized and has not, therefore, received bids from potential purchasers, we have not evaluated any organization interested in purchasing the Corporation.

Q: Is the U.S. Government aware of allegations that the Pleiades group has close ties to the Russian Federation, specifically MINATOM?

A: Yes, we are aware that the Pleiades group has ties to Russia. While we have made no determination as to how these ties would impact the viability of a Pleiades bid for USEC, any prospective buyer of the Corporation will be evaluated to ensure that USEC is not "owned, controlled, or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government" per the restrictions of the Energy Policy Act, Section 1502(a)(2).

Q: Would the U.S. Government allow the sale of USEC to be made to any group with close ties to a foreign government?

A: Having close ties to a foreign government would not automatically disqualify a group. As required by the USEC Privatization Act, any prospective purchaser would have to prove they are not "owned, controlled, or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government" per the restrictions of the energy Policy Act, Section 1502(a)(2). If Pleiades or any other organization ultimately makes a bid to purchase the Corporation, many USG agencies will be involved in determining whether the bidder is qualified to purchase USEC. The National Security Council, the Departments of Defense, State, Treasury, and Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and others will be involved in evaluating potential bidders.

Q: Would the buyer of USEC also own the rights to the AVLIS technology and other potentially sensitive technology? How would the U.S. Government ensure that such information was properly safeguarded?

A: Any organization purchasing USEC would also purchase the rights to the AVLIS technology and they would be involved with other sensitive technologies. As a result, prospective buyers must be able to hold the necessary security clearances. Before any classified information could be transferred to a purchaser of USEC, facility and individual security clearances would be required. Failure to receive such clearances would preclude prospective purchasers from acquiring USEC.

Q: What are the requirements which will be placed on a prospective buyer of USEC with respect to the maintenance of a domestic uranium enrichment capability?

A: The USEC Privatization Act, in Section 3116, added a limitation to the Atomic Energy Act which states the NRC cannot issue a license or certification of compliance to USEC or its successor if it is determined that the "Corporation is owned, controlled, or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government" or that "the issuance of such a license or certificate of compliance would be inimical to the common defense and security of the United States or the maintenance of a reliable and economical domestic source of enrichment services."

Q: What is the status of privatization? Why has it taken so long?

A: The Administration has nearly finished a comprehensive review of all aspects of the privatization. This includes completing actions such as the stabilization of the important Russian HEU contract.

Once the process has commenced, the sale could be consummated in about six months.

Q: How do you intend to sell USEC?

A: The privatization plan recommended by USEC to the President involves a dual-path process, with each path pursued in parallel.

1) The *Merger-Acquisition (M&A) path* will evaluate offers from qualified companies or groups to buy USEC.

2) The *Initial Public Offering (IPO) path* will evaluate the sale of USEC securities to the public.