

FOIA MARKER

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

Folder Title:

POTUS Trip to Paris, France, Rotterdam and The Hague, Netherlands and London, England
(May 26-29, 1997) [5]

Staff Office-Individual:

Press-Crowley, Philip (PJ)

Original OA/ID Number:

3459

Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:	Stack:
42	5	7	2	V

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(London, England)

For Immediate Release

May 29, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING BY MIKE MCCURRY
AND JIM STEINBERG

Queen Elizabeth Conference Building
London, England

4:30 P.M. (L)

MR. MCCURRY: And just when you thought you had plenty of words to report -- more. There is not a lot that we have to add, but I've asked Jim Steinberg to at least be available if there was substantively -- anything you want to know more about any of the topics covered, he can tell you a little bit about that. And we can give you some sense of the flavor of the discussion, although I think you can pretty well tell from the chemistry that the Prime Minister and the President had during the press conference that it was a very amiable meeting.

And I'll wrap up if there are any other subjects you need.

Mr. Steinberg, welcome.

MR. STEINBERG: Thank you, Mr. McCurry. This is a far more capacious space than the last time I had the pleasure of talking to you all.

Q Do you know how to work --

MR. STEINBERG: We're in England now, we have no -- I would just invite you all -- "words, words, words" was McCurry's Shakespearean allusion, and it was very elegant of him to do that.

Q I missed it.

MR. STEINBERG: Words, words, words -- Hamlet.
(Laughter.) Okay, let's move right on to something that we all know something about. (Laughter.)

Q Is this McCurry's ghost or something --

MR. STEINBERG: Hamlet to Polonius.

MORE

Let me just give you a brief rundown on the topics and then I'll get into your questions. The two began with about a 50- to 60- minute meeting in what our British friends call "four eyes," that is, just the two of them. And the topics were largely focused on the Prime Minister having an opportunity to give the President his view of his job and what he's trying to do in his first months in office. And they had an extensive discussion of the economic issues that you heard a lot about during the press conference.

They then moved from there to a small group discussion, and the two issues in the small group discussion were on Bosnia and Northern Ireland. On Bosnia, the focus was on what they can do together to strengthen the implementation. The President made a strong case for a strong push for renewed efforts between now and 13 months from now when SFOR will leave Bosnia. He laid out for the Prime Minister the action plan that we've been developing and that will be discussed at the ministerial meeting in Portugal this week. And he made a particular emphasis on the need to strengthen the local police forces there. And you heard the President speak about that at the press conference.

They also talked about Northern Ireland and their sense that there was an opportunity to move forward here. The Prime Minister gave a sense that he wanted to see the process move forward, to bring Sinn Fein in if at all possible in the event that there is a cease-fire, and that they would be really trying to use the period in the time ahead to make that move forward.

They went from there to a larger group at lunch where halibut in chive sauce was served, and the focus there was -- I think the main issues had to do with NATO-related issues; in particular, plans for the Madrid Summit and moving forward. There was also a discussion of Britain's approach to the development of the European security identity within NATO.

They had a brief discussion on Iran, in which the President indicated that the United States remained of the view that we needed to see real action from Iran, but that we would be watching the situation very carefully in the months ahead. They had an extensive discussion on Hong Kong and reiterating in both cases their interest in making sure that the transition goes smoothly and that China lives up to its commitments under the 1984 basic agreement.

Prime Minister Blair gave an exposition on his approach to Britain's role in the EU and how it would approach the question of economic and monetary union. It was during the lunch that the President extended his invitation to the Prime Minister to visit the United States on an official visit this year, and the Prime Minister indicated that he wanted to do that.

MORE

... They also had a chance to talk about some personal issues, including children of senior officials, and that was pretty much it.

Q They talked about senior officials' children?

MR. STEINBERG: Their children. How it was like to have children growing up with the head of government and their attempts to make sure that they could have normal, happy, productive lives while still being in the public eye.

Q The President seemed to leave the distinct impression that June 1998 is not a hard date for SFOR to withdraw and that it really depends on how much progress is made in implementation.

MR. STEINBERG: I don't think he left that impression, nor is that his intention. I think the President made clear that our goal is to complete the mission of SFOR by June of 1998, and we're convinced that that can be done if there's a really effective effort. What he was addressing was the fact that there obviously have been a number of political figures who have raised questions about that, and what he is saying is that what we ought to do is focus on getting the job done. If we get the job done, then there won't be any disagreement about that because if we reach the conditions that he thinks can be done, there will be a consensus about the need -- about the appropriateness of pulling those forces out.

So, as he said, what we ought to not be doing is talking about this hypothetical situation in the future, but the very real need to move forward now on implementation.

Q But it's not a hypothetical situation. Is it the goal of the United States to be out by then, or will, under any conceivable circumstances, the United States absolutely be out by that date?

MR. STEINBERG: It is the intention and the plan of the United States --and it is the SFOR mandate, which ends in June 1998. The mandate ends in 1998, and that's when the SFOR forces will come out.

Q Jim, saying you have no intention and no plan, that sounds sort of like the formulation of the NATO-Russia Charter. That leaves you some wiggle room, doesn't it?

MR. STEINBERG: Well, I think the Russians were pretty happy with that. Let me make clear that we have a mandate for SFOR which ends in June 1998. It is the intention and the plan that they come out. That is the basis on which we're operating; that is the President's intention. What he would like his colleagues to do is to focus with him on creating the

MORE

conditions so that when we reach that time there will be no question whatsoever that it's the right thing to do.

Q And what if there is a question then? What if you have not achieved the goals that the President has set out for Bosnia?

MR. STEINBERG: I think you can create all kinds of hypotheticals by all kinds of situations. We intend to get this done, and that's the basis on which we're moving forward.

Q Jim, it's not us creating hypotheticals. The President said, we're behind schedule. I mean, those were his words.

MR. STEINBERG: Absolutely. And the President also said that he's convinced that we can get on schedule if we do the things that we need to do, and that the surest way to make sure that we don't get these things done is to focus on an eventuality which the President doesn't intend to have happen, which is to have this fail. So the way to get this done is for everybody to focus on the fact that we've got 13 months to create the conditions that will make it the self-evident decision for all parties that the SFOR mandate has been completed.

Q What do you do, though, besides take this hortatory approach?

MR. STEINBERG: Well, there is quite a lot that we're prepared to do. The President, as he indicated -- we have just completed a very extensive review of Bosnia policy. We have identified a number of initiatives in six areas that ought to be taken. The Secretary of State is in Portugal right now meeting with her colleagues. There will be, as result of this ministerial, I think a common action plan that's developed to move forward on key issues like police security, refugee return, strengthening the joint institutions, making sure that the economic reconstruction generates benefits to real people. And we're convinced that if we can move forward with that, that we will be able to create the conditions.

We have never believed that the conditions for SFOR to leave was that all the problems of civilian implementation be resolved; simply that there is sufficient security and sufficient momentum that the process will go forward. And we believe that with the plan that the Secretary of State is going to be discussing, with the new and strengthened team in Bosnia, that we can make that happen.

Q Does the European approach on Iran look a little more credible now? We heard the President; he said the usual about terrorism and all, but he also seemed to be keeping -- opening the door just a bit. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to attempt some sort of dialogue, directly or

MORE

indirectly? Or are you just going to wait and see what kind of new government might ensue?

MR. STEINBERG: Barry, the President reiterated what has been the policy of the United States, that we are open to a dialogue with Iran, an authoritative dialogue on the issues that are of concern to us; and that if Iran is prepared to address those concerns on terrorism, on the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction, on its opposition to the peace process, that we have been willing since the beginning of the administration to engage on those issues.

As the President said, we don't have a quarrel with the Iranian people, but we do have deep concern about those policies. And he both reiterated those concerns to Prime Minister Blair in the meeting and told you about them today.

Q -- intervene between the last --

MR. STEINBERG: Yes, absolutely --

Q -- it's a real thing now. And are you going to seize that opportunity or are you just going to wait for them to --

MR. STEINBERG: Well, I think the question is whether they're going to seize the opportunity; that is, that there is a new leader there. Certainly on domestic issues in Iran, that leader has said some interesting things. He said a lot less about foreign policy, and it's a lot less clear about what his role is with respect to foreign policy.

While we certainly have concerns about the internal human rights situation in Iran as well, we very much feel that in order to move forward that they need to prepare to address these things which directly affect the vital security interests of the United States.

Q Does that mean that the United States is going to wait and see what Iran does, as opposed to starting to set something in motion to set up some communications with --

MR. STEINBERG: There are channels that are open and that have been available to the Iranians, should they take to avail themselves of it. As I say, from the beginning of the administration, we have said that we're open to authoritative dialogue. Those channels are available and all they have to do is say, we want to move forward. They know what the topics are; they know what the issues are. Up till now, they have declined to avail themselves of that.

Q Could you just explain how this meeting came to pass today? Was it -- I was hearing over there that it was Mr.

MORE

Clinton who wanted to come see Mr. Blair on his way through Europe. Is that true?

MR. STEINBERG: Yes, I think that's a fair statement. I think that he felt that there was an opportunity to take advantage of the fact that we were making this trip which had obviously previously been scheduled, in connection first with the 50th anniversary, and then, as we succeeded in getting the NATO-Russia agreement, adding the event in Paris, to have this discussion.

He knew he was going to see the Prime Minister during this trip and thought, rather than have a kind of quick bilateral on the margins of one of these meetings, that we really ought to take advantage of this. The United States and the U.K. are two very close partners, and I think the President felt that there's nothing more important to the United States than getting this off to a fast and constructive relationship. And the meetings today really reflected that.

Q It seems like they obviously had good chemistry, but is there any practical effect -- these two men seeming to enjoy their company on issues that come up between the two governments? And secondly, are there any concerns that Prime Minister Blair's statement about a generation of leaders might come off as arrogant to other people around the world?

MR. STEINBERG: With respect to the first, I think that at the core of the relationship between the United States and the U.K. is sort of the commonality of interests and values, and that remains constant regardless of who is the head of government. And the President made clear in his remarks today that we had a very productive and extraordinarily good working relationship with Prime Minister Major.

At the same time, there's no harm in having a good personal relationship as well as a good commonality of interests. And I think one of the things that we've seen over the last three days is that the President's close relationship with a broad range of European leaders really gives him an ability to move forward on our common agenda with these leaders. And you saw it with Chancellor Kohl and President Chirac. And so, I think that, regardless of the age or generation of the leader, that the President's own engagement on these issues and the chance that he's had over the past now four and half years to work with them is clearly an asset. And I'm sure he wants to get that same kind of basis for moving forward with Prime Minister Blair.

Q And about the generation statement --

MR. STEINBERG: I think that, as I said -- I think what he sort of suggested was that generation is sort of in the mind rather than the chronological age. He talked about Wim Kok and how he saw him as a leader who was taking his country and

MORE

Europe into a right direction. I think what was interesting about the illustrative list that President mentioned is that it had older and younger, from different parties. But I think it's more a shared set of objectives about trying to make government work for their people, about trying to make the world a safer and more prosperous place. And I think it's that perspective rather than age or party that really is what he was talking about.

Q Jim, going back to Bosnia for a moment, the President specifically mentioned shortcomings on refugee return effort and on economic problems that linger there, and that's where the impression comes that he's using those specific areas as a reason -- that's not yet building a case, but is using them as a reason to continue the presence there longer than mid-1998.

MR. STEINBERG: I would draw the exact opposite conclusion, which is, what he is doing -- by drawing attention to these things, he is trying to generate momentum and support for taking what he called the hard choices that are necessary to get the job done -- that these are tough issues; that they are going to take a real determination both by the parties and the international community; and that if we don't call attention to them, if you didn't start talking about them, then we would not get the kind of success and momentum that we need.

And I think it's precisely why, both in terms of the action plan we're developing and the very clear public discussion that the President is trying to stimulate and the Secretary of State is trying to stimulate, is to make clear that these are real issues and that they won't get solved by themselves.

Q At what point between now and that deadline of the middle of next year is the moment of truth on these two issues and the others that are going to decide whether the troops do come out?

MR. STEINBERG: I don't think there's -- there's not a decision about whether the troops will come out or won't. The mandate will end in June of 1998. What we want to do is maximize what we get done between now and then.

Q Did the British kind of push for a more open-ended commitment?

MR. STEINBERG: There was not a particular push in these discussions. There have been a variety of discussions about this issue. But I think their focus mostly on this -- was a concern that the conditions not lead to a problem in June of 1998, but what they both agreed on was that rather than talking about the what-ifs, that they should do about what-now, and that that what-now is to get the implementation job done.

Q Back to the personal relationship for a second. The question on the effect that personal warmth has on the agenda

MORE

today, that while NATO and Northern Ireland were certainly discussed, there was a suggestion in the British press that because of the interests of these two men and what they share, that you had much more interest in domestic matters, job creation, education, and so on than has ever been the case in a U.S.-British meeting of this type.

MR. STEINBERG: I can't compare it to any other U.S.-British meetings. I think that it is true that if you look at the agenda, for example, of the Denver Summit, that the issues that leaders deal with are not just sort of classical foreign policy issues. I mean, we have an interest in these issues -- the United States hosted an employment-related meeting in Detroit a couple of years ago that came out of the -- what was then the G-7 process. So the economic -- the linkage between domestic and international, as the President always says is really a very blurred one, and the line is largely erased.

To talk about -- he talked about growth in Britain not only benefits the British people, it benefits the American people. And so, the way in which the leaders, particularly the leaders of the industrialized countries, work together -- they're working together -- for example, at the Denver Summit, they're going to be talking about the impact of aging on their societies. So it's more and more common to see in these discussions these kinds of issues be part of the discussion. And I think that that was what they were trying to get at -- particularly the positive coincidence of the fact that we will be chairing the meeting this year and then the summit will be in Birmingham next year. So there was a sense that they could kind of talk about continuity between the two.

Q To follow up on that, you just said what used to be the G-7 process. Prime Minister Blair twice called it the G-8. In Helsinki, we were told, it's not a G-8, that it's still the G-7, but some -- is it now officially the G-8?

MR. STEINBERG: It is the Summit of the 8. And those are exactly the words that President Clinton used in Helsinki.

Q So it's not the G-8?

MR. STEINBERG: It's the Summit of the 8.

Q Back to the relationship for a moment. When was the last time these two countries had leaders of such similar minds? And is the Reagan-Thatcher model an important parallel?

MR. STEINBERG: We all have an historian deep buried inside of us, but I think I'll just pass on that question.

Q Can either of you give us more of a sense of a personal interaction between the two men during the two meetings?

MORE

MR. STEINBERG: I think it was -- there was a very engaged discussion. I think they had a sense of a lot of common interests and common challenges and really looking forward to working together on dealing with them. There was just a real sense of back and forth, and, yes, we've got this, let's try to see what we can do together on that.

MR. MCCURRY: One measure of the comfort that the two of them had with each other is that they kicked everyone else out the minute they got together, and talked --

MR. STEINBERG: For almost an hour.

MR. MCCURRY: For almost an hour, just the two of them. That was not in the original plan, no. And there was a great deal of bantering back and forth and, as Jim suggested, the mixture of both the personal and the policy-related in the discussion.

Q What are they doing tonight?

MR. MCCURRY: The President's plans for the afternoon are still unclear. He wanted to go back to the Ambassador's Residence and gather up the First Lady, and they planned to maybe go out and do some OTR-type things. Tonight, if I understand from the Prime Minister's troop correctly, they are going to go and quaff a pint at a pub and then go to a nearby restaurant for dinner.

Q Just the four of them?

MR. MCCURRY: Just the four, and then there will probably be umpteen hangers-on nearby.

Q How well do the two leaders, for all the commonalities, how well do they actually know each other? How much of this is getting acquainted, or do they really already have a strong working relationship?

MR. MCCURRY: One of Blair's aides told me that he was delighted to see that the President clearly had read things like the new Labor Party program. The President had, according to this aide, clearly read parts of the Queen's speech, although I'm not absolutely certain that that's true. But the President follows international politics closely, and I think he's followed the presentation of the new Labor government's program to Parliament.

Q (Inaudible) --

MR. MCCURRY: They did not -- not that I'm aware of, no. They have met, of course, twice before, here in London and back at the Oval Office, and had very energetic exchanges each

MORE

time they met, so I think they've already had some sense of each other. But this was a much broader and deeper stock-taking of each of the other.

Q But do you know what they were talking about during the Paris signing, when they had that animated conversation?

MR. MCCURRY: I know at least in part that they had a discussion about where they were going to go to dinner tonight, what kind of cuisine they might dine upon tonight.

Q -- what to wear?

MR. MCCURRY: No, there's a great anecdote, that somehow or other, the way officious advance people often are, it was suggested that the Clintons were interested in having an Indian meal this evening, and the Prime Minister apparently at one point reported to the President, well, we found this great place that's going to be exactly right, it will be wonderful. And the President, of course, said, where did you get the idea I wanted Indian food? So I gather they're not going to an Indian restaurant.

MR. STEINBERG: That's not a comment on our foreign policy or relationship with India --

MR. MCCURRY: That is not a comment on our policy towards Southwest -- South Asia.

Q I'd like to follow up a little bit on the give-and-take and new generational politics. Could you give us an example of the type of domestic policies that these two could share? I mean, the Prime Minister mentioned welfare and education. What can the United States --

MR. MCCURRY: I tell you, we must not have gotten the press conference transcript done, because it's loaded up with those observations. One of the quintessential challenges in both of these industrial societies is maintaining labor productivity in the face of the shortage of time that workers feel as they try to balance out the needs of family life with work life and how you create that right now. The President talked very eloquent about that. That is something that certainly has generational aspects.

Now, one thing -- I'll part company a little bit with Jim -- remember, the Prime Minister has just come through an election period in which he made a generational argument in front of his electorate quite forcefully. President Clinton, as he ran for reelection, chose not to make that argument or cast it in that way, and there is somewhat of a difference there. It was interesting to hear some resonance of the difference in the way our two political cultures deal with those questions, because President Clinton as he sought reelection tried to make a broader argument about the community that he sees and the future he sees

for America. Not that we take any deep issue with the way Tony Blair presented that argument, but the President expanded it a bit and said he did not see it as a matter of chronological age.

Q Bosnia one more time. When you say that the mandate then is in the summer of 1998, do you mean to say by that we cannot keep the troops there even if we wanted to keep the troops there? We weren't intending to keep the troops --

MR. MCCURRY: As a technical matter, the North Atlantic Council would not have authorized any mission to be in Bosnia at that point. There would be --

Q So you have to have a reauthorization --

MR. MCCURRY: I think you'd have to have some action by the North Atlantic Council if they were to remain, but we are choosing to put the focus not on that question but on what we do to successfully complete the mission that they've been assigned, which we believe will end June 1998.

Q Mike, will the President go to Texas to look at the devastation?

MR. MCCURRY: On Texas, let me just, for you and your colleague there, the President got an update from Washington this morning. He's obviously been very moved by the tragic loss of life and some of what the families there are going through. He wanted to make sure that every step the federal government needed to take is being taken. He was assured by folks back in Washington that James Lee Witt has been in very contact with state of Texas officials. They are currently assessing the tornado damage, which, while it was quite tragic, was thankfully very isolated.

It was a very powerful storm that created an enormous amount of damage, but in a very concentrated area. So the state is now assessing what the economic and damages beyond the obvious tragic loss of life, and the state will then have to make determinations on its own about what they seek in terms of assistance. We're following that very carefully. There hasn't been any decision made by the President or the Vice President to travel to Texas.

Any other subjects?

Q What are you going to do tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to gaggle tomorrow. I'll be around. The President has got a down day tomorrow. Check in late morning on the question of briefing. I'll probably go out and brief early afternoon. But I don't see any need for a gaggle in the morning because we don't have any real schedule or anything tomorrow. Is that okay with everyone? Since you get back not much before the gaggle time, anyhow.

All right. Enjoy the rest of your evening. Take some time off. We'll probably -- this is -- I'm sure, as most social occasions are with President Clinton, there will be some substantive quality to the discussion he has with the Blairs tonight, but I think it will be more of a personal nature. We don't plan any extensive briefing on it, although we'll try to provide updates to the pool traveling with the President this evening on any interesting aspect of their social program. But we're not guaranteeing any exhaustive readout, just beyond little tidbits from dinner.

Q Mike, I may not have heard everything the President said. When he spoke of all of the problems with implementation, did he refer to the war crimes problem? I don't think he did. The question being, does he share -- I know you can say yes easily -- but does he share Albright's emphasis on economic and other things?

MR. MCCURRY: Absolutely. Jim -- the President did not list amongst his list of things that he was concerned about with Dayton implementation war crimes, but within the action plan that we're developing and with the review the President has conducted based on the advice from his foreign policy advisors, certainly a more effective effort to fulfill the Dayton Accords with respect to war crimes is very much warranted along the lines that Secretary Albright has suggested in the speech she just made at The Hague yesterday.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

4:56 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 30, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

2:50 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: All right. Welcome back to those of you who were on the trip; welcome to those of you who didn't go -- you missed a great trip.

Q You didn't send us any postcards.

MR. MCCURRY: We send back love letter every day from various -- from all the European capitals.

Q We didn't get one.

MR. MCCURRY: You didn't get a single one?

Why don't I start -- a couple of you wanted to get a little preview of the President's commencement remarks tomorrow at West Point. The President is going to say to the young women and men that he addresses tomorrow as they launch their careers, that the world that they will go out and protect and defend America's interests are going to be a much safer, more hopeful place because of all the work that we are doing now to adapt the structures of the post Cold War era to the new challenges we face in the 21st century.

He will talk a lot about America's vision of what the 21st century will be as we look around the world, and then, specifically what we can do now to build the record of the last four years and, indeed, of the last 50 years, to preserve and protect America's interest in the world and make sure this is a safer planet on which to live.

He will specifically make the case to the American people about the need for enlarging the North Atlantic Treaty

organization, a subject that has very much been on the President's mind this week and very much been a part of the conversations we had with our other treaty allies -- obviously, given the ministerial meeting that has just concluded in Portugal.

The President will say essentially that the expansion of the most successful security alliance in the history of the world so that it adapts to the new challenges of the post Cold War era is manifestly in the interests of the American people. And he'll try to tell these young graduates that the job they do on behalf of their families, many of whom, of course, will be in the audience, is one that they should not only be proud of, but that they should recognize has real tangible benefits to all of the people in the country that they are about to serve; that the American people will benefit from a more secure, stable, democratic, prosperous and peaceful Europe; and that in time that creates economic benefits as well as just tangible benefits for the American people by making the world a safer place in which our security interests are less expensive to defend and protect.

So he will, in a way, try to link some of the positive economic news, that you've just seen the Vice President and others talk about, to the success we can have in expanding the horizons of peace and prosperity on the European continent and, indeed, the President will talk about how that is, in effect, what's happening around the world as we expand the community of nations pledged to the market economies and to democracy.

So I'll describe this as a speech that really continues to present the President's vision of the world that we will live in in the 21st century, that will specifically build on the argument he made in Europe to the Europeans about the need for NATO enlargement put in the context now of the argument that he wants the American people to hear, and in some ways, this will begin a debate that will go on now for well over a year about the merits of amending the North Atlantic Treaty so that we can begin to take on the new members that we expect to admit to the Alliance in Madrid in July.

Q Is he going to talk to these graduates specifically about their military role and the new military role of NATO as it expands to the East?

MR. MCCURRY: He will talk about the security challenges that they will address as members of the uniform military looking ahead to their years of service and looking beyond into the 21st century, not only with respect to Europe, but as we look around the world how we advance and protect America's security interests throughout the world. Many of them are bound to be deployed in

forward positions around the world where we call upon young men and women to advance our interests, the reason why the President sends them to those positions of challenge is important to express and the President, indeed, will call them forward for the challenge that they've agreed to accept by taking on their assignment.

Q Will there be specifically more on Bosnia?

MR. MCCURRY: I expect he will touch on Bosnia. I don't expect that to be a major focus of his remarks.

Q Mike, do you think there will be warm welcomes from the news that West Point's going to take a \$14 million budget cut?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that everyone who is graduating from West Point tomorrow has been following very closely the debate in the United States about how we configured our military forces so they meet the challenges we face, and every single one of them no doubt studied and are aware of the defense reviews that have been conducted, and are probably proud of what they are capable of doing in an area in which we have set some contours on the resources that we make available for our military.

I think what they're interested in knowing and what our budget and what our defense -- recently concluded defense review makes clear is, they will be equipped with the most modern technologically capable equipment and tools that they need in order to do the jobs we send them to do.

Q As a follow up, this is the Army's home, they've taken a beating pretty much this year -- how's he going to cheer these guys up?

MR. MCCURRY: I think the President will find a way, both by his presence there and what he expresses by way of his personal respect for the challenge that these young officers take on, he will be able to boost morale, and I think he will talk about the challenges they face as they deal with all of the quality of life issues that are important to the nation's military -- not only the Army, but all of the uniformed military service.

Q Will he be dealing with military --

MR. MCCURRY: I don't expect that to be a major focus of his remarks.

Q -- maybe?

MR. MCCURRY: I think it's possible he's still working through the address and it remains to be seen whether he will address that specifically.

Q Will he lay out a major argument for the American people here for NATO expansion? Is this the principal goal --

MR. MCCURRY: His principal goal is really to begin the debate on the reasons why the United States needs to remain engaged in Europe, why that's in the interest of the American people. In some ways, the President made that argument during the course of his trip to Europe this past week, but I think he's going to amplify on it this week. He's going to really make it clear that for every American, we are safer, more secure, and in the long run more prosperous when we live in a world in which security is no longer something that defines the worries that we face day to day and he will find a way to make that argument, I think, compellingly.

Q If I could follow up on that. There's this new question about our NATO allies wanting to add additional members to NATO that we are not too anxious to add, and that this would -- doesn't this conjure up a picture of an ever expanding NATO which will cost us a lot of money?

MR. MCCURRY: No. This is the perfect snapshot that explains why this has been the most successful alliance in the history of the world, because it is 16 nations that cooperate together that have, in a way, made a sacred pledge to each other, and they take the commitments they make and membership in that organization very, very seriously. It's why this has been the subject of ongoing discussions now intensified at the ministerial level, it is why we'll continue to be working on this specific issue, my guess, right through to the beginning of the summit in Madrid.

Q Well, what's going to happen to that issue?

MR. MCCURRY: It will be resolved and new membership invitations will be extended in Madrid.

Q How vigorously with the United States fight the addition of the two members, and what impact will that have in terms of the Senate confirmation?

MR. MCCURRY: I think Secretary Albright made it quite clear yesterday that we had not rendered any final judgment on this, because NATO is an organization that operates by consensus. Our role is to advance our own thinking and do so in a way that will lead to the consensus that will be there in the end of the day as

the North Atlantic Council makes decisions and then they are ratified and affirmed by the Presidents at their summit.

Q Mike, the administration has committed to maintaining 100,000 troops in Asia, and the cornerstone of U.S. presence in Asia is the alliance with Japan. Next week, the interim report on defense guidelines review of that alliance will be coming out. Do you think in light of that the President will make any remarks on the U.S. Japan security alliance?

MR. MCCURRY: Again, I don't know -- we're not down to the specific line that is on the speech, and I can't tell you specifically how that will be addressed, but certainly the President would not say anything contrary to what we have said repeatedly, that we foresee our interests in the Asian Pacific region extending into the future. Our commitment to afford deployed presence there is something that has been reaffirmed by the President, the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, others. And that that will continue to be a fundamental aspect of the way we view our security interests in the region.

Q Some health groups are charging that the administration is not giving adequate support to EPA Administrator Browner and her revision of the air quality rules. Could you respond to that?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I think they're misreading what is the normal bureaucratic process by which federal regulations are promulgated, reviewed, commented upon and then finalized by the Office of Management and Budget. We are in the midst of that process. There's a lot of discussion back and forth about the ozone and particulate standard -- there's been a lot of public comment, as well. And OMB will carefully consider all those views before it finalizes a rule.

Oh, what news from -- (laughter.)

Q This just in.

MR. MCCURRY: This just in. This bulletin: The President of the United States today announced his intent to nominate James Franklin Collins, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service who holds the rank of Minister Counsellor in the Foreign Service, as U.S. Ambassador to the Russia Federation. Good news to all who know Jim. Paper to follow -- or paper available. He's done a great job. He has been --

Q Where is he now?

MR. MCCURRY: Paper here, ready to go. Wires in the back, come get it. He has currently been serving -- has he been Assistant Secretary or --

MR. JOHNSON: He has been the Ambassador At Large for Russia --

MR. MCCURRY: Ambassador at Large for Russia and the newly independent states. He is really, ever since the point at which Strobe Talbott became Deputy Secretary, the Department has really been the person who had senior responsibility for the Russia portfolio within the State Department and has been I think extraordinarily successful in building a good relationships with a variety of his counterparts in the Russian Federation; and has been equally good, I think, at advancing our interests in all the newly emerging states.

Q Can we go back to Russia? Do you think this is a tough public sell, and does the President plan to take this to more general audiences?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, I think it is a tough public sell because Americans look around the world, they see a world at peace, largely; they see regional conflicts of which they hear about sporadically. But they know they live in a world in which the dominate reality of a confrontation with adversary, bipolar world is defined by a clash between totalitarianism and democracy no longer defines their day to day existence. And so they do wonder what is the purpose of NATO, what useful role does it serve in a world where we're no longer worried about Russia any longer as a proximate threat to our own security.

And I think making the argument of why this security alliance continues to have vibrancy and relevance in the post Cold War era and looking ahead to the 21st century, how it can play a role in keeping Europe at peace, as the President argued this past week, is a very, very important argument to get down to the tangible level that the average American can understand and grasp and embrace. And the President is going to make that argument vigorously, beginning Saturday, will have to make it early and often because there are a lot of people in the country -- and it's reflected somewhat in the sentiment you see expressed in Congress from time to time, that begin to question the utility of America's engagement in the world -- and specifically in Europe.

Q What about the costs?

Q Is he going to mention to these graduates the idea that the United States military is being asked to do more with fewer resources around the world?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, again, we're not down to the final tinkering with the speech, so I don't know specifically if he'll make that point. But the President has addressed that in the past. One of the hallmarks of the success of the U.S. military in this day and age is that they are doing more with less. And they're doing that because they are combining better training, better productivity among members of both the uniformed service and the officer corps. And they're using wisely the technological superiority that we have.

One of the reasons why you hear the Pentagon often express concern about procurement and funding for procurement is they need to have the resources that make them a more efficient fighting force as they deal with the reality of a somewhat downsized military.

Q As he makes this case, is he going to tell the American people how much it's going to cost?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, they know how much it costs because we've proposed it in our budget, the Congress and the President have agreed to roughly what the spending track is going to be for defense -- it's a considerable investment. But the argument has to be, this investment is about protecting the interests that we secure around the world by the presence of our military and by our readiness and our capacity to deal with the challenges we face.

Q Mike, how concerned is the President about what's happening in the new Republic of Congo, and government of Kabila?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have monitored very closely those developments. I think as some of you know, we expect Ambassador Richardson to travel to the region next week, you know, to continue the discussions that he has had periodically. We continue to believe that the newly formed government of the Republic of Congo needs to be broad based, needs to take into view the different elements of the political life within the Republic of Congo. And that the track that has been announced for elections is an important one to adhere to. It is one that needs to now be followed through with so there can be free and fair elections that will reflect the will of the people of Congo, formerly Zaire.

Q Does the two year time frame seem reasonable?

MR. MCCURRY: As the State Department said yesterday, it is reasonable. We would have obviously preferred something on a faster track but we think the most important thing is for there to be a commitment to inclusiveness in forming that government and, in the period of transition, to assure that all political viewpoints are accounted for in the political life of the emerging government.

Q Mike, Jennifer Laslow has been boasting of her connections to the Clinton camp -- of her '92 '96 political consultant connections -- has been recycling a tape that came up months ago in the Virginia attorney general's race showing -- an amateur tape showing Gilbert Davis, Paula Jones' attorney, in a very intoxicated state and making some very lewd comments. Are you -- is the White House embracing this sort of effort that she says it to clear the President's name? And is she on the payroll of the party in any way, shape or form?

MR. MCCURRY: I, frankly, don't know thing about that.

Q She's been on all of the talk shows.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, good, let's leave it there then.
(Laughter.)

Q The administration has already come pretty close to losing in both Houses on legislation. It could potentially derail the budget deal. Did the briefing this afternoon reflect some concerns about the need to keep the pressure on Congress to make this happen or -- because otherwise there wasn't immediately apparent what the news value was. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I think it was pretty clear what was going on there. It was on a slow Friday afternoon; we were claiming the bragging rights that are rightfully ours.
(Laughter.) You know, on a day when we had important economic statistics on first quarter growth we took the opportunity, which was certainly news because I heard it reported already at least by some of your news organizations -- we took that opportunity to comment on the record the administration has had.

But I think the reminder here, to answer your question maybe a little more adroitly, is that those who paid the sacrifice of voting for the President's economic plan in 1993 ought to be proud of that vote. Those who committed themselves to the deficit reduction in 1993 ought to know that that vote produced the results that the President said would be produced, and that voting for this balanced budget agreement can continue that path of success.

So to those Democrats who stood with the President and made that economic program a reality, that's something they should take great pride in. And as we move through this process and continue the work of balancing the budget, that that type of success is still out there as the ultimate outcome of staying on this path, even though at times it requires tough votes and tough choices.

Q Is the agreement in trouble? Is it going to pass or --

MR. MCCURRY: The agreement, as you know from the votes in both Houses, got overwhelming majorities in both parties in both Houses. But there will be moments of challenge to that as we go through specific issues.

By the way, in the President's radio address -- which he'll tape shortly I think, so you'll get it shortly, embargoed for use tomorrow morning -- he'll talk not only about his trip to Europe this week and how -- saying many of the same things said here today -- how the performance of the U.S. economy is now a given as world leaders gather and they talk about what economic challenges we face in the world, but he will also talk about those things that we need to do to codify and embrace this balanced budget agreement and lay down some specific ideas on how the formation of the tax component of that balanced agreement ought to go forward.

That's the subject he will address tomorrow, but he'll continue to make the case that this is in the economic interests of the United States, that the performance we're seeing is because we made the commitment in 1993 to move on the path of deficit reduction, and we have to stay on that path.

Q Mike, I don't want to beat this down, but you said you didn't know about the tape. Aren't you concerned that there are people out there apparently free lancing on your behalf?

MR. MCCURRY: Again, I don't know a thing about it. I didn't know she had a press conference, in fact, I don't even know who she is -- personally I don't, and I'll check and see if anyone here cares one way or the other.

Q Has the President met, does he plan to meet with Bob Bennett to discuss all this anytime --

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I know of. He had, as I told the troop on the way, he had a conversation with him in Paris, and I'm now aware that they've had any follow up conversation.

Q Does the President -- does the White House sanction Democratic attacks on the credibility of her lawyer? Is that --

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know a thing about what you're talking about, so --

Q Just the principle, is that something --

MR. MCCURRY: It sounds like something that, if it's an attorney -- if it's anyone who has got an indirect connection to the case, she should best ask Mr. Bennett about it. I don't really have anything for you and don't plan to have anything for you on it.

Q Mike, since the economy is doing so well and Yeltsin signed the pact in Paris and Mr. Clinton has called him a good democrat, is there pressure now to take some of that money and give it to Russia when they come over for G 8? Are they looking for more specific monetary plans?

MR. MCCURRY: They have, of course, talked about the resources they need to continue the economic progress they're making, the modernization they're committed to. That has largely been done within the confines of the international financial institutions that lend capital to the Russian Federation and there will no doubt be considerable discussion of that point. The U.S. Direct Assistance Programs are carefully tailored, they're fairly modest, given the resources that are available, but a large part of our assistance comes in the form of multilateral lending, and that has proven very successful as Russia's economy has stabilized and is just beginning to turn the corner.

Q There's an estimated \$50 billion in international money going into Central and Eastern Europe. What percentage of U.S. money do you think that is?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, I'd -- I mean, that's \$50 billion total of multilateral lending of which my guess is the U.S. portion is a fifth, maybe. That would be a rough guess. I mean, I could check on that.

Q You're talking about the lessons for congressional Democrats to learn from '93 dealing with the balanced budget. Has the President made that point one on one with Dick Gephardt? Has he had any sort of conversation with him on this subject?

MR. MCCURRY: They've talked about it in the past. I don't know that they've -- I mean, that's kind of a given, because a Minority Leader would certainly take that point and acknowledge

that point. And he understands exactly how his caucus felt about the '93 vote, and the pain they went through, but he understands that it produces results. And the President, in general, on his relations with Mr. Gephardt I think handled that pretty well in London yesterday.

Q Mike, it turns out the same day the AMA endorsed the partial birth abortion ban, they also sent a letter to the Hill with their legislative wish list. Is the White House concerned there was some kind of deal going on here or quid pro quo?

MR. MCCURRY: They say there wasn't. I don't know -- we don't have any information that suggests there was. It seems like one of those curious coincidences that happen in Washington from time to time. (Laughter.)

Q Next week?

MR. MCCURRY: Want me to do next week? Next week is very quiet. Maybe I'll start with the end of the week. I think as you know, Chelsea Clinton graduates from Sidwell Friends College next Friday. By tradition, that is a private event. We've been working to try to find some way that at least a portion of that ceremony, specifically the President's remarks, might be made available. I'll keep you posted on whether we make any progress on that. We appreciate some of the ideas we've gotten from the White House Correspondents Association on that and we'll try to work something out on that. But because --

Q So we don't have to buy the amateur videotape? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: So you can go find some proud mommy and daddy who will make it available? (Laughter.) Well, exactly.

But, really, because of that, most of the week they are doing -- we've given them a lot of family time this week because I think they're doing things in and around that event that they want to do as a family. The President, obviously, tomorrow has got his trip up to West Point.

Sunday and Monday, nothing planned; Tuesday, nothing planned; Wednesday, we plan a signing ceremony for the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act on the South Lawn. That's really the reauthorization of the legislation that dates back to the mid 1970s that really give disabled children the right to a specifically tailored and appropriate public education that has made such a difference in the lives of millions of disabled children. That has been reauthorized and the President will sign the reauthorization Wednesday morning at 10:30 a.m.

And then that evening is the repeat performance at Filomena's Restaurant between the President of the United States and the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Q Is he going to bring -- so she can eat for her country again?

MR. MCCURRY: No, they are all -- the President is on a diet, and the Chancellor is facing a campaign, so I think it's going to be a somewhat more modest occasion than their first encounter at that venue.

Thursday is off. Friday is the graduation, as you know, and Saturday is the radio address. So we're looking forward to a quiet week around here and we're going to have to figure out something to make news out of.

Q Mike, when do we get the radio address?

MR. MCCURRY: He has not taped it yet, but the President dropped by the Oval Office a short while ago to just clear off some paperwork since he was out for most of the week, and several eager staffers encouraged him to tape it early this afternoon -- since we have one, two pieces of paper coming out within a half hour, and then with the exception of the radio address, that's our full lid for the day.

Q It says here on my radar screen that James Carville has started something called the "Education and Information Project." Do you have any idea what that might be?

MR. MCCURRY: Not a clue. (Laughter.) But I'm sure it will provide grist for many mills, and I'm sure he'll be happy to talk to you about it.

Q The White House doesn't have any knowledge of this?

MR. MCCURRY: There are a lot of people at the White House and a lot of people who talk to James, and they probably acknowledge some of what he's doing, but I don't know specifically what that is.

Q Do you expect any more ambassadorial appointments next week? Any with an Indonesian tinge to them?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, as I told you, things are now coming in the pipeline as you can tell from Ambassador Collins' appointment. I wouldn't rule it out, but -- specifically, no.

Q Mike, press conference in the near future?

MR. MCCURRY: Press conference? Yes.

Q When?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. I was looking to say something interesting today, since there hasn't been a whole -- else to say.

Q Where is it on the block?

MR. MCCURRY: I think we're doing it mid June.

Q Mid June?

MR. MCCURRY: Right, mid June.

Q Before the summit?

MR. MCCURRY: No.

Q That would be late June then. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: What was the date?

MR. JOHNSON: Denver is 20th through the 22nd.

MR. MCCURRY: I think we were looking to do it sometime around the second week in June. But I'll announce it next week so we'll have something to talk about next week. Since so far, not much, right?

What else? Anything else? I have to do a farewell for Mr. Small. The last day? Is today the last day?

Q Today is it.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, today is sort of technically Mary Ellen's last day and she chose not to show up at work -- (laughter) -- so I applaud your presence here.

Q A UPI man is always at the scene.

MR. MCCURRY: For 17 years for United Press International, Bill has reported. And I, for one, can attest I hear him every single morning, one way or another on the radio, reporting for someone who picks up UPI's product and distributes it under their own name. And there are more that do that than some of you think, I would make the point. But he has been here at the White House for 12 years and good service rendered to United Press

International and lots of good times had with you, Bill.
(Applause.)

Not many of your colleagues would get that kind of applause
-- (laughter) -- upon their departure.

Q We're just glad to see him go. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: You'll probably be happy to see go, too, and I shall.

Q You might also acknowledge the arrival of my replacement, returning to the role that he fulfilled here during the Nixon administration, that is Mr. Don Fulsome, the new UPI radio correspondent.

MR. MCCURRY: Don, welcome.

Q Thank you.

MR. MCCURRY: Welcome, we are delighted to have you here, and it's a reminder to me that we owe you all a radio --

Q When did you sneak in here? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: A reminder to me, since we didn't do it on your watch, that we owe the radio folks a radio roundtable -- good for me to put that record because now I can't take it back, right?

Q I figured you'd wait until I'm out of here.
(Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: No, it would have been a pleasure to do it while you were here. Maybe we should do an exclusive with you on departure. No, you don't want to work.

All right. Thanks, everyone. We'll see you on Monday.

Q Did you just announce your resignation?

Q Yes, you said you were going.

MR. MCCURRY: I meant going now. Leaving. I was trying to conveniently end the briefing.

END

3:23 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Embargoed For Release
Until 10:06 A.M. EDT
Saturday, May 31, 1997

RADIO ADDRESS
BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

The Map Room

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. I've just returned from Europe where I commemorated the 50th Anniversary of the Marshall Plan, which joined America's investment to Europe's commitment to rebuild, and in so doing, helped to spark 50 years of prosperity, not only for Europe, but for America as well.

I also had the opportunity to discuss with leaders of Europe the present success of our economy and what we can do together to promote prosperity in the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe in ways that will ensure their prosperity and ours for the next 50 years.

This morning I want to talk with you about the new economic policy we brought to America for the last four and a half years and how our balanced budget and tax cut plans can help in creating jobs, raising incomes, strengthening business and moving America forward in the years to come.

Recall for a moment what America's economy looked like four years ago: high unemployment, few new jobs, stagnant wages, exploding budget deficits. I took office determined to replace trickle down economics with invest and grow economics. There were three principal elements to our strategy: Reduce the budget deficit, and invest in the education, training and security of working men and women and our children, and open new markets for American made goods and services through tough trade agreements.

I believe all three were necessary to create the conditions for private sector prosperity and to ensure that all our people have the opportunity to reap the rewards of growth. We made tough, often controversial, decisions in 1993 and afterward to implement our new invest and grow economic policy. Some fine

members of Congress lost their seats because they had the courage to change course and vote for the future.

But just look at the results. Today our confidence has returned and our economy leads the world. In 1992, the deficit was \$290 billion. Today, we expect it to drop to \$67 billion, a 77 percent reduction. In 1992, unemployment averaged 7.5 percent. Today, it's 4.9 percent -- the lowest in 24 years.

In 1992 there were few new jobs. Since then, the economy has produced 12.1 million of them, including the most ever in a single presidential term. And while the years before our plan took effect saw sluggish growth, yesterday we learned that in the first quarter of this year the economy grew at a 5.8 percent rate -- the highest in a decade. Inflation is at a 30 year low; business investment, a 30 year high. Each year we've had a record number of new businesses started. Wages are rising. In the last two years, over half the new jobs have paid higher than average wages, and inequality among working people has seen the biggest drop since the 1960s. Our economy is the healthiest in a generation.

All this didn't just happen. We've had better managed, more competitive businesses, more productive working people; the entrepreneurial spirit of small business; a Federal Reserve committed both to low inflation and to economic growth; and continued advances in technology.

Americans' hard work and high energy, smart decisions and tough choices, and our invest and grow strategy -- all these have worked together to produce this success.

Now in the coming months, America will have to decide whether to stick with this strategy. Will we continue to engage the world economy by continuing to give normal trading status to China? Will Congress give the President the tools necessary to open new markets abroad for American products through tough new trade agreements? And, above all, will we finish the job of balancing the budget while protecting our values?

Earlier this month I reached agreement with the leaders of Congress on a bipartisan balanced budget plan that will continue our economic strategy into the next century. This is a balanced budget plan that also is in balance with our values. It will eliminate the budget deficit by 2002, honor our parents by securing the Medicare Trust Fund for a decade, preserve our environment through strong enforcement in the cleanup of 500 toxic waste sites, and protect the next generation by extending health insurance coverage to as many as 5 million uninsured children. And, most important of all, it will invest in the

skills of our people through the most significant increase in higher education since the G.I. Bill half a century ago, the expansion of Head Start and an investment in higher national academic standards for our children.

Both Houses of Congress moved forward on this budget before they left town for the Memorial Day recess. I was pleased that a strong majority of both parties supported this bipartisan plan. When Congress gets back to work, it's time to finish the job of enacting the broad outlines of the budget plan. Then in the weeks to come, Congress will fill in the details and begin writing this budget and its tax cut into law. I want a tax cut that helps families raise their children and send them to college, and keeps the economy growing. That's my goal.

I look forward to continuing to work together with the Republican and Democratic members of the tax writing committees in Congress to meet this goal as we write the details of the tax cut into law. As that process begins, I want to tell you three of the things this final tax cut plan should include: First, with education our most important goal, our tax cut must help open the doors of college to every American. Our bipartisan budget plan includes \$35 billion in tax relief, targeted to help families pay for higher education. Our HOPE Scholarship is a \$1,500 per year tax cut to help pay for the first two years of college and open them to all Americans. I will also recommend that students who already receive Pell Grant Scholarships can still receive the HOPE Scholarship for education costs beyond those covered by their Pell Grant. With this step, we'll make sure that our tax cut reaches all those who want to take responsibility for their own lives and go on to college. Beyond ??that, I favor a tax deduction for the cost of any education after high school for people of any age.

Second, as many families as possible should have a chance to receive the dividend created by economic growth. Our plan will give families a \$500 child tax credit. This is the kind of tax relief we need -- targeted to helping families raise their children and meeting the competing demands of work and family. As we craft this tax cut, I believe it's especially important that we make sure that the child tax credit is fair to working families -- especially those with lower incomes.

Third, the tax cuts must be consistent with a balanced budget and must not be written in such a way that they reopen the deficit and bust the budget in years to come. This was absolutely key when we reached a budget agreement, and I will continue to insist on it as we write the agreement into law. Fiscal responsibility helped to produced a strong economy. Fiscal irresponsibility will surely undo it. We cannot put our

prosperity at risk through time bomb tax cuts that explode the deficit in five or 10 or 20 years. We must continue with discipline. We tried it the other way before and it failed.

We are now nearly five years into our economic strategy of invest and grow, and it is working -- well beyond our most optimistic expectations. We have now an historic chance to continue this growth and give the American people the dividends of expansion through a tax cut. We can protect our values as we expand our economy. The American people deserve a tax cut and they need a balanced budget. We can give them both. If we make sure that this tax cut helps all working families, that it opens wide the doors of college, and that it never, never throws the budget out of balance, we can propel our country into the 21st century even stronger than it is today.

Thanks for listening.

END

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 30, 1997

FACT SHEET

Charter on a Distinctive NATO-Ukraine Partnership

On May 29, NATO Secretary General Solana and Ukrainian Foreign Minister Udovenko initialed at a meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers in Sintra, Portugal a "Charter on a Distinctive NATO-Ukraine Partnership." The Charter lays the foundation for the development of a strong, enduring relationship between NATO and Ukraine. It is anticipated that the Charter will be signed in Madrid when President Clinton travels to Europe for the NATO Summit.

President Clinton congratulated NATO and Ukraine for their hard work toward completing the Charter since he met President Kuchma in Washington on May 16. President Clinton noted that the Charter represents a political commitment at the highest level and constitutes an important step toward his goal of a secure and undivided Europe. An independent, prosperous and stable Ukraine is key to building a more integrated and secure Europe.

The Charter provides the framework for an open-ended and evolving NATO-Ukraine relationship through consultation and cooperation on issues of common concern. It contains five sections.

Section I provides the context for an enhanced NATO-Ukraine relationship. NATO and Ukraine affirm their intent to broaden and strengthen their cooperation and to develop a distinctive and effective relationship to promote further stability in Europe.

Section II details the principles on which NATO and Ukraine will base their relationship, including the recognition that the security of all states in the OSCE area is indivisible. It affirms common respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all other states.

Section III lists areas for consultation and cooperation between NATO and Ukraine. These include political and security-related subjects, including the security of Ukraine, NATO-Ukraine military cooperation and interoperability, civil-military relations, civil emergency planning and support for Ukrainian defense reform.

Section IV outlines the practical arrangements for consultation and cooperation between NATO and Ukraine. These include meetings of the North Atlantic Council and appropriate NATO committees with Ukraine, reciprocal high-level visits and establishment of a Ukrainian military liaison mission in Brussels.

Section IV also provides that the North Atlantic Council will meet periodically with Ukraine as the NATO-Ukraine Commission to assess broadly the implementation of the relationship and suggest ways to further develop cooperation. The Commission will meet at least twice annually.

Section V welcomes and supports the fact that Ukraine received, as a non-nuclear weapon state, security assurances from the five nuclear powers when it acceded to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It underscores that NATO and Ukraine will cooperate on adaptation of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty to reflect the changed security environment since the Treaty was signed in 1990. They will also cooperate in developing a crisis consultative mechanism.

The Charter does not provide any new NATO security guarantees to Ukraine, which under the terms of the Washington Treaty are available only to NATO members. The Charter allows the development of a crisis consultative mechanism and provides for consultation should Ukraine perceive a direct threat to its territorial integrity. The Charter does not restrict NATO's ability to act unilaterally.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Paris, France)

For Immediate Release

May 27, 1997

FACT SHEET

NATO-Russia Founding Act

President Clinton, the other leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, including NATO Secretary General Solana, and Russian President Yeltsin today signed the NATO-Russia "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation." This historic document lays the foundation for a new and substantive relationship between the Alliance and Russia.

At the Helsinki summit in March, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin agreed on the importance of crafting a cooperative relationship between NATO and Russia, despite their differences over NATO enlargement. The eight weeks that followed were characterized by intensive negotiations between NATO and Russia, which produced the Founding Act. The Act provides the basis for an enduring and robust partnership between the Alliance and Russia, one that allows them to deal together with challenges to their common security and to help shape a more secure Europe.

Under the terms of the Act, NATO and Russia will consult and coordinate regularly and, where possible and appropriate, act jointly -- as in Bosnia now. The Act has five principal sections:

- The preamble notes that NATO and Russia do not consider one another adversaries and cites the sweeping transformations in NATO and Russia that make possible this new relationship.
- Section I lays out the principles governing the relationship, e.g., restatement of the norms of international conduct in the UN Charter and OSCE Helsinki Final Act and explicit commitments, such as respecting the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of states and settling disputes peacefully.
- Section II creates a new forum called the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council for NATO-Russia meetings and describes how this Council will function.
- Section III describes a range of issues that NATO and Russia will discuss, including conflict prevention, peacekeeping, prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and exchange of information on security policies and defense forces.
- Section IV describes the military dimensions of the relationship. Among the key provisions:

- Reiteration by NATO of aspects of its current defense policy and strategy, including the December 1996 statement of “no intention, no plan and no reason” to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, including no nuclear weapons storage sites.
- Reference to NATO’s March 14, 1997 statement that in the current and foreseeable security environment, NATO will carry out its collective defense and other missions through interoperability, integration and capability for reinforcement rather than by additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces.
- Recognition that NATO will require adequate infrastructure on new members’ territories commensurate with NATO’s collective defense and other missions.
- Commitment by NATO and Russia to work for prompt adaptation of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty to reflect the changed security environment since CFE was completed in 1990. NATO and Russia also agreed on the goal of significantly reducing the total amount of Treaty-limited equipment permitted in the CFE area.

Section IV also provides mechanisms to foster closer military-to-military cooperation between NATO and Russian militaries, including by creating military liaison missions in respective NATO and Russian military headquarters.

NATO retains its full prerogatives. While Russia will work closely with NATO, it will not work within NATO. The Act makes clear that Russia has no veto over alliance decisions and NATO retains the right to act independently when it so chooses.

The Act has no impact on NATO enlargement, which is proceeding on schedule; NATO leaders at the Madrid summit in July will extend invitations to the first countries to begin accession talks. Those countries admitted will have the full rights and responsibilities of Alliance membership, and NATO’s door to membership will remain open to all emerging European democracies.

#

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Paris, France)

For Immediate Release

May 27, 1997

FACT SHEET

NATO-Russia Founding Act

President Clinton, the other leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, including NATO Secretary General Solana, and Russian President Yeltsin today signed the NATO-Russia "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation." This historic document lays the foundation for a new and substantive relationship between the Alliance and Russia.

At the Helsinki summit in March, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin agreed on the importance of crafting a cooperative relationship between NATO and Russia, despite their differences over NATO enlargement. The eight weeks that followed were characterized by intensive negotiations between NATO and Russia, which produced the Founding Act. The Act provides the basis for an enduring and robust partnership between the Alliance and Russia, one that allows them to deal together with challenges to their common security and to help shape a more secure Europe.

Under the terms of the Act, NATO and Russia will consult and coordinate regularly and, where possible and appropriate, act jointly -- as in Bosnia now. The Act has five principal sections:

- The preamble notes that NATO and Russia do not consider one another adversaries and cites the sweeping transformations in NATO and Russia that make possible this new relationship.
- Section I lays out the principles governing the relationship, e.g., restatement of the norms of international conduct in the UN Charter and OSCE Helsinki Final Act and explicit commitments, such as respecting the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of states and settling disputes peacefully.
- Section II creates a new forum called the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council for NATO-Russia meetings and describes how this Council will function.
- Section III describes a range of issues that NATO and Russia will discuss, including conflict prevention, peacekeeping, prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and exchange of information on security policies and defense forces.
- Section IV describes the military dimensions of the relationship. Among the key provisions:

- Reiteration by NATO of aspects of its current defense policy and strategy, including the December 1996 statement of “no intention, no plan and no reason” to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, including no nuclear weapons storage sites.
- Reference to NATO’s March 14, 1997 statement that in the current and foreseeable security environment, NATO will carry out its collective defense and other missions through interoperability, integration and capability for reinforcement rather than by additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces.
- Recognition that NATO will require adequate infrastructure on new members’ territories commensurate with NATO’s collective defense and other missions.
- Commitment by NATO and Russia to work for prompt adaptation of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty to reflect the changed security environment since CFE was completed in 1990. NATO and Russia also agreed on the goal of significantly reducing the total amount of Treaty-limited equipment permitted in the CFE area.

Section IV also provides mechanisms to foster closer military-to-military cooperation between NATO and Russian militaries, including by creating military liaison missions in respective NATO and Russian military headquarters.

NATO retains its full prerogatives. While Russia will work closely with NATO, it will not work within NATO. The Act makes clear that Russia has no veto over alliance decisions and NATO retains the right to act independently when it so chooses.

The Act has no impact on NATO enlargement, which is proceeding on schedule; NATO leaders at the Madrid summit in July will extend invitations to the first countries to begin accession talks. Those countries admitted will have the full rights and responsibilities of Alliance membership, and NATO’s door to membership will remain open to all emerging European democracies.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 27, 1997

**PRESIDENT CLINTON NAMES BONNIE R. COHEN AS UNDER SECRETARY FOR
MANAGEMENT AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

President Clinton today announced the nomination of Bonnie R. Cohen as Under Secretary for Management at the Department of State.

Ms. Cohen, of Washington, DC, has served as Assistant Secretary of Interior for Policy, Management and Budget since 1993. Her achievements have included assisting Secretary Babbitt in streamlining the Department, implementing state and federal cooperative efforts to restore the Everglades, and initiating new more self supporting fee structures for the National Parks, Wildlife Refuges and recreation areas. Prior to joining the Administration, Ms. Cohen was a Senior Vice President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. She earned a B.A. degree from Smith College in 1964, an Ed., M. degree in Research and Statistics from the Harvard Graduate School of Education in 1964, and an M.B.A. from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration in 1967.

In her capacity as the Under Secretary for Management, Ms. Cohen will serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary on management matters and supervise the execution of management policies at the State Department.

-30-30-30-

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 27, 1997

Statement of the President

It was with regret that I learned today that Reed Hundt, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, intends to leave before the end of his term, upon appointment of his successor.

Chairman Hundt has been a strong and visionary leader of the FCC during this historic period in telecommunications policy. His steadfast commitment to the public interest and to bringing the benefits of competition to consumers is evident in his many accomplishments during his tenure, including the successful launching of spectrum auctions and the Commission's on-time implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. His expertise and counsel were indispensable in bringing home this year's World Trade Organization agreement on telecommunications, which will open markets abroad as never before.

Perhaps most importantly, Chairman Hundt helped make the FCC an advocate for our children. He reinvigorated children's broadcasting, and he took pathbreaking steps to ensure that every classroom and library in America will be linked to the information superhighway.

Chairman Hundt's leadership has opened opportunity to businesses, here and abroad, while ensuring that all Americans share in the benefits of the telecommunications revolution. The Vice President and I are sorry to see him go, and extend to him thanks on behalf of the American people for his excellent service.

-30-30-30-

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 28, 1997

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the Federal Register for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), as expanded to address the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, is to continue in effect beyond May 30, 1997.

On December 27, 1995, I issued Presidential Determination No. 96 7, directing the Secretary of the Treasury, inter alia, to suspend the application of sanctions imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and to continue to block property previously blocked until provision is made to address claims or encumbrances, including the claims of the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia. This sanctions relief, in conformity with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1022 of November 22, 1995 (hereinafter the "Resolution"), was an essential factor motivating Serbia and Montenegro's acceptance of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina initialed by the parties in Dayton on November 21, 1995, and signed in Paris on December 14, 1995 (hereinafter the "Peace Agreement"). The sanctions imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) were accordingly suspended prospectively, effective January 16, 1996. Sanctions imposed on the Bosnian Serb forces and authorities and on the territory that they control within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina were subsequently suspended prospectively, effective May 10, 1996, also in conformity with the Peace Agreement and the Resolution.

Sanctions against both the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Bosnian Serbs were subsequently terminated by United Nations Security Council Resolution 1074 of October 1, 1996. This termination, however, did not end the requirement of the Resolution that blocked funds and assets that are subject to claims and encumbrances remain blocked, until unblocked in accordance with applicable law. In the last year, substantial progress has been achieved to bring about a settlement of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia acceptable to the parties. Elections occurred in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as provided for in the Peace Agreement, and the Bosnian Serb forces have continued to respect the zones of separation as provided in the Peace Agreement. The ultimate disposition of the various remaining categories of blocked assets are now being addressed, beginning with the unblocking of five Yugoslav vessels located in various United States ports effective May 19, 1997.

Until the status of all remaining blocked property is resolved, the Peace Agreement implemented, and the terms of the Resolution met, this situation continues to pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy interests, and the economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force these emergency authorities beyond May 30, 1997.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 28, 1997.

#

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 28, 1997

NOTICE

CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC
OF YUGOSLAVIA (SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO) AND THE BOSNIAN SERBS

On May 30, 1992, by Executive Order 12808, President Bush declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the actions and policies of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, blocking all property and interests in property of those Governments. President Bush took additional measures to prohibit trade and other transactions with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) by Executive Orders 12810 and 12831, issued on June 5, 1992, and January 15, 1993, respectively. On April 25, 1993, I issued Executive Order 12846, blocking the property and interests in property of all commercial, industrial, or public utility undertakings or entities organized or located in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and prohibiting trade related transactions by United States persons involving those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina controlled by Bosnian Serb forces and the United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia. On October 25, 1994, because of the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serbs, I expanded the scope of the national emergency by issuing Executive Order 12934 to block the property of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the property of any entity organized or located in, or controlled by any person in, or resident in, those areas.

On December 27, 1995, I issued Presidential Determination No. 96-7, directing the Secretary of the Treasury, inter alia, to suspend the application of sanctions imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) pursuant to the above referenced Executive orders and to continue to block property previously blocked until provision is made to address

claims or encumbrances, including the claims of the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia. This sanctions relief, in conformity with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1022 of November 22, 1995 (hereinafter the "Resolution"), was an essential factor motivating Serbia and Montenegro's acceptance of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina initialed by the parties in Dayton on November 21, 1995, and signed in Paris on December 14, 1995 (hereinafter the "Peace Agreement"). The sanctions imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) were accordingly suspended prospectively, effective January 16, 1996. Sanctions imposed on the Bosnian Serb forces and authorities and on the territory that they control within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina were subsequently suspended prospectively, effective May 10, 1996, also in conformity with the Peace Agreement and the Resolution. Sanctions against both the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Bosnian Serbs were subsequently terminated by United Nations Security Council Resolution 1074 of October 1, 1996. This termination, however, did not end the requirement of the Resolution that blocked funds and assets that are subject to claims and encumbrances remain blocked, until unblocked in accordance with applicable law.

In the last year, substantial progress has been achieved to bring about a settlement of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia acceptable to the parties. Elections occurred in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as provided for in the Peace Agreement, and the Bosnian Serb forces have continued to respect the zones of separation as provided in the Peace Agreement. The ultimate disposition of the various remaining categories of blocked assets is now being addressed, beginning with the unblocking of five Yugoslav vessels located in various United States ports effective May 19, 1997.

Until the status of all remaining blocked property is resolved, the Peace Agreement implemented, and the terms of the Resolution met, the national emergency declared on May 30, 1992, as expanded in scope on October 25, 1994, and the measures adopted pursuant thereto to deal with that emergency must continue beyond May 30, 1997.

Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Bosnian Serb forces and those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of the Bosnian Serb forces. This notice shall be published in the Federal Register and transmitted to the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 28, 1997.

#

Office of the Press Secretary

The White House
(The Hague, Netherlands)

For Immediate Release

May 28, 1997

United States and European Union Announce Steps to Address Common Problems

As part of a broader effort to build a new Atlantic Community and a new Transatlantic Marketplace, the United States and European Union have sought to strengthen its partnership to improve their security and prosperity for the 21st century. Today, the United States and European Union announced several initiatives to strengthen their cooperation and partnership on several major fronts. Today's agreements include:

EU Accession to KEDO: The European Union has reached agreement to join the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization to counter the threat of nuclear proliferation and assist North Korea in meeting its legitimate energy requirements. The EU will provide 15 million ECU (\$20 million) for five years, joining the US, Japan and South Korea in responding to the new global security threats of terrorism and nuclear proliferation. The EU's accession to KEDO represents a significant broadening of the coalition of nations concerned with the threat of proliferation in Asia and sends a strong message to North Korea of international solidarity in demanding adherence to the Agreed Nuclear Framework.

Cooperation on Fighting Drugs: Under the New Transatlantic Agenda, the United States and European Union have agreed to their first formal anti-drug initiative. The agreement will help prevent the diversion of chemicals to narco-traffickers engaged in the production of illicit drugs. The agreement will facilitate the exchange of information on transactions in regulated chemicals in order to identify suspicious shipments that may be intended for the production of illicit drugs. For some chemicals, shipments will not be permitted without specific authorization from importing country officials. The agreement also provides for an exchange of information on suspicious shipments to third countries and will contribute to the further development of a worldwide consensus on the need for strengthening anti-drug cooperation. This initiative is part of a broader effort to strengthen our ongoing bilateral drug cooperation with European nations and to further President Clinton's anti-drug strategy.

Customs Agreement: The United States and EU also agreed today on the Customs Cooperation and Mutual Administrative Assistance Agreement (CMAA) intended to improve transatlantic efforts to combat customs fraud and facilitate legal trading opportunities. The CMAA provides a framework for the goal of establishing mutual assistance programs, simplifying customs procedures and allowing for the exchange of

intelligence and other information related to customs enforcement. The CMAA also established the first Joint Customs Cooperation Committee consisting of representatives from customs authorities of both parties to oversee implementation and future cooperation. This is the first customs arrangement negotiated between the United States and an economic union and will lead to an agenda built around exchange of US and EC customs officials, coordination of key customs issues in advance of international meetings and linking up technical assistance programs to customs authorities in third countries.

People-to-People Links: The leaders also announced "The US-EU Democracy and Civil Society Awards Program" that will award \$1 million over the next two years to communities and individuals for the specific purpose of furthering the recipient's efforts in promoting democracy and civil society. These awards will be chosen by a panel of American and Europeans based on outstanding achievements in such areas as democracy, human rights and civil society. The summit also sought to highlight model programs and develop new initiatives to strengthen the cultural, educational and professional links between American and European societies. The US and EU sponsored 400 American and European leaders from business, labor, foundations, community groups, academia, and government to discuss practical, action-oriented proposals that could serve as an agenda to strengthen ties. Examples of new initiatives recommended by the working group include: a multilingual electronic forum on the Internet to connect institutions and initiatives related to US-EU affairs; an education exchange program with the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe; a conference on workforce development to focus on the impact of integration of the US and EU economies.

COPY



FAXTRANSMISSION

U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

600 17TH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508
202-395-3230
FAX: 202-395-7226

TO: *ANNE LUZZATO*
MARY ELLEN GAYN

FAX NUMBER[s]:

Pages: *2*, including this cover sheet

From: *JAY ZIGGLER*

Subject: *U.S.-EU SUMMIT MATERIAL*

COMMENTS:

05/24/97 SAT 10:18 FAX 202 395 3511 U.S. TR
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.
20506

USTR Press Releases are available on the USTR home page at WWW.USTR.GOV.
They are also available through the USTR Fax Retrieval System at 202-395-4809.

May 24, 1997
For Immediate Release

Contact: Jay Ziegler
202/395-9501
(pager #: 800-689-2617)

**TALKS SUSPENDED ON UNITED STATES - EUROPEAN UNION
MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENTS (MRAs)**

United States Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky issued the following comment regarding the suspension of negotiations today on a package of mutual recognition agreements intended to facilitate market access between the European Union (EU) and the United States:

"We have suspended negotiations on a package of mutual recognition agreements today," said U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky. "Our position is clear: We have been ready to move forward with a balanced package for some time -- a package already welcomed by the U.S. and European business communities' that would also encourage further cooperation between U.S. and EU regulatory agencies. At the same time, we take our obligation seriously to protect the health and safety interests of the American public."

The MRAs would allow qualifying bodies in the EU and the United States to perform certain procedures -- e.g., testing, inspection, certification -- in the United States to EU requirements, and vice versa. Areas being negotiated include pharmaceuticals, medical devices, telecommunications, information technology and sports craft. The Commerce Department estimates the value of trade in these areas between the U.S. and the European Union is approximately \$40 billion.

Ambassador Barshefsky also outlined the importance of the anti-bribery agreement reached last night among the twenty-nine member countries of the OECD, saying, "This is an agreement the Clinton Administration has been working on for some time. Bribery and corruption are among the most pernicious trade barriers encountered by U.S. companies abroad. The OECD accord is a step toward a more open and accountable international standard on how governments' conduct business which subjects our competitors to the same terms we expect of U.S. concerns. We welcome the opportunity to build on this agreement in the WTO."

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 28, 1997

**PRESIDENT CLINTON NAMES SUSAN RICE
AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS
AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

President Clinton today announced his intent to nominate Susan Rice as the Assistant Secretary for African Affairs at the Department of State.

Dr. Rice, of Washington, DC, has been serving as Special Assistant to the President and as Senior Director for African Affairs at the National Security Council since March 1995. She was Director for International Organization Affairs, and Peacekeeping in the Office of Global Affairs at the National Security Council from February 1993 to March 1995. Prior to joining the Clinton Administration, Dr. Rice was a management consultant with McKinsey and Company in Toronto, Canada. She earned her Bachelor's degree from Stanford University and a Master's and Doctorate degree in International Relations from Oxford University in 1990.

In her capacity as Assistant Secretary, Dr. Rice will advise the Secretary of State on the conduct of United States foreign relations with the countries of sub-Saharan Africa and guide the operation of U.S. diplomatic missions in that region.

-30-30-30-

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(The Hague, Netherlands)

For Immediate Release

May 28, 1997

United States and European Union Announce Steps to Address Common Problems

As a part of a broader effort to build a new Atlantic Community and a new Transatlantic Marketplace, the United States and European Union have sought to strengthen its partnership to improve their security and prosperity for the 21st century. Today, the United States and European Union announced several initiatives to strengthen their cooperation and partnership on several major fronts. Today's agreements include:

EU Accession to KEDO: The European Union has reached agreement to join the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization to counter the threat of nuclear proliferation and assist North Korea in meeting its legitimate energy requirements. The EU will provide 15 million ECU (\$20 million) for five years, joining the US, Japan and South Korea in responding to the new global security threats of terrorism and nuclear proliferation. The EU's accession to KEDO represents a significant broadening of the coalition of nations concerned with the threat of proliferation in Asia and sends a strong message to North Korea of international solidarity in demanding adherence to the Agreed Nuclear Framework.

Cooperation on Fighting Drugs: Under the New Transatlantic Agenda, the United States and European Union have agreed to their first formal anti-drug initiative. The agreement will help prevent the diversion of chemicals to narco-traffickers engaged in the production of illicit drugs. The agreement will facilitate the exchange of information on transactions in regulated chemicals in order to identify suspicious shipments that may be intended for the production of illicit drugs. For some chemicals, shipments will not be permitted without specific authorization from importing country officials. The agreement also provides for an exchange of information on suspicious shipments to third countries and will contribute to the further development of a worldwide consensus on the need for strengthening anti-drug cooperation. This initiative is part of a broader effort to strengthen our ongoing bilateral drug cooperation with European nations and to further President Clinton's anti-drug strategy.

Customs Agreement: The United States and EU also agreed today on the Customs Cooperation and Mutual Administrative Assistance Agreement (CMAA) intended to improve transatlantic efforts to combat customs fraud and facilitate legal trading opportunities. The CMAA provides a framework for the goal of establishing mutual assistance programs, simplifying customs procedures and allowing for the exchange of intelligence and other information related to customs enforcement. The CMAA also established the first Joint Customs Cooperation Committee consisting of representatives from customs authorities of both parties to oversee implementation

and future cooperation. This is the first customs arrangement negotiated between the United States and an economic union and will lead to an agenda built around exchange of US and EC customs officials, coordination of key customs issues in advance of international meetings and linking up technical assistance programs to customs authorities in third countries.

People-to-People Links: The leaders also announced “The US-EU Democracy and Civil Society Awards Program” that will award \$1 million over the next two years to communities and individuals for the specific purpose of furthering the recipient’s efforts in promoting democracy and civil society. These awards will be chosen by a panel of Americans and Europeans based on outstanding achievements in such areas as democracy, human rights, and civil society. The summit also sought to highlight model programs and develop new initiatives to strengthen the cultural, educational and professional links between American and European societies. The US and EU sponsored 400 American and European leaders from business, labor, foundations, community groups, academia, and government to discuss practical, action-oriented proposals that could serve as an agenda to strengthen ties. Examples of new initiatives recommended by the working group include: a multilingual electronic forum on the Internet to connect institutions and initiatives related to US-EU affairs; an education exchange program with the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe; a conference on workforce development to focus on the impact of integration of the US and EU economies.

#

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.
20508

USTR Press Releases are available on the USTR home page at WWW.USTR.GOV.
They are also available through the USTR Fax Retrieval System at 202-395-4809.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Wednesday, May 28, 1997

Contact: 97-50
Jay Ziegler
Kirsten Powers
Christine Wilkas
(202) 395-3230

U.S.-EU ACHIEVE BREAKTHROUGH ON MRA NEGOTIATIONS

United States Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky and Commerce Secretary William J. Daley today indicated that outstanding issues with the European Union on a package of Mutual Recognition Agreements (MRAs) have been largely resolved and that overall agreement is expected soon.

"We have achieved a major breakthrough on MRAs and are very hopeful we will conclude an agreement in the next few days," said U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky. "The MRA package continues the Administration's emphasis on expanding trade and opening markets in areas where the United States leads the world."

"The Trans-Atlantic Business Dialogue, in partnership with the Administration, made it possible to reach this point," said Secretary Daley. "This package would serve to increase U.S. exports by saving manufacturers up to 10% of the cost of delivering U.S. exports to Europe."

The MRA package covers trade in telecommunications equipment, information technology products, medical devices, pharmaceuticals, and sportscraft. Mutual Recognition Agreements allow products or processes to be assessed for conformity (e.g. testing, inspection, and certification) in the U.S. to EU standards, and vice versa.

The fifteen EU member countries represent the largest market for U.S. goods and services and the MRAs encompass more than \$47 billion in two-way trade.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(The Hague, Netherlands)

For Immediate Release

May 28, 1997

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

President to Meet with Australian Prime Minister

The White House has announced that Australian Prime Minister John Howard will be in the United States June 25-July 1. He will meet with President Clinton at the White House on June 27. The President and the Prime Minister will discuss a range of regional and bilateral issues building on their discussions last November. The President looks forward to reciprocating the warm welcome he and Mrs. Clinton received from the Australian people and government during his visit last November.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 30, 1997

**THE PRESIDENT NAMES JAMES FRANKLIN COLLINS
AS AMBASSADOR TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

The President today announced his intent to nominate James Franklin Collins, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, as Ambassador to the Russian Federation.

Mr. Collins, of Aurora, Illinois, currently serves as Ambassador-at-Large and Special Advisor to the Secretary for the New Independent States in the Department of State. He assumed that position after two years of service as Senior Coordinator in the Office of the Ambassador-at-Large for the New Independent States and a three-year tour as Deputy Chief of Mission at the American Embassy in Moscow. Prior to his Moscow assignment, Mr. Collins held management positions in the Department of State in Washington and worked extensively on Russian/Soviet and on Middle East affairs. In addition to one other posting in Moscow, he served as Political Counselor in Amman, Jordan and as Vice Consul in Izmir, Turkey. Mr. Collins's Washington assignments have included tours on the staff of the Secretary of State as Deputy Executive Secretary for Europe and Latin America and as Director of the State Department's Operations Center. He has also served as a member of the National Security Council staff as Director for Intelligence Policy, and held positions in the Department of State in the Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs, Bureau of Near East and South Asian Affairs and Bureau of Intelligence and Research. Mr. Collins holds several Meritorious and Superior Honor Awards from the Department of State. He was awarded the Secretary of State's Award for Distinguished Service in January 1993 and the Department's Distinguished Honor Award in October 1993.

Before joining the Department of State, Mr. Collins taught Russian and European History at the U.S. Naval Academy. He holds a cum laude A.B. degree from Harvard University (1961) and an M.A. from Indiana University (1964), and conducted research as an exchange fellow at Moscow University in 1965 and at the British Museum in London in 1966. Mr. Collins has been married for 32 years to Dr. Naomi F. Collins, presently Executive Director at NAFSA, an association of international educators, headquartered in Washington. They have two grown sons, Robert and Jonathan.

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 30, 1997

May 29, 1997

Presidential Determination
No. 97-25

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SUBJECT: Determination Under Subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade
Act of 1974, as Amended -- Continuation of Waiver
Authority

Pursuant to the authority vested in me under the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, Public Law 93-618, 88 Stat. 1978 (hereinafter "the Act"), I determine, pursuant to subsection 402(d)(1) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1), that the further extension of the waiver authority granted by subsection 402(c) of the Act will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. I further determine that continuation of the waiver applicable to the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the Federal Register.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

#

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 30, 1997

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

I hereby transmit the document referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act"), with respect to the continuation of a waiver of application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act to the People's Republic of China. This document constitutes my recommendations to continue in effect this waiver for a further 12 month period and includes my determination that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act, and my reasons for such determination.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 29, 1997.

#

**AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AND THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
ON CUSTOMS COOPERATION
AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE IN CUSTOMS MATTERS**

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY, hereinafter referred to as the "Contracting Parties",

TAKING ACCOUNT of the joint United States-European Union action plan, signed in Madrid on 3 December 1995;

CONSIDERING the importance of the commercial links between the United States of America and the European Community and desirous of contributing, to the benefit of both Contracting Parties, to the harmonious development of those links;

BELIEVING THAT, in order to attain this objective, there should be an undertaking to develop customs cooperation of the widest possible scope;

CONSIDERING that operations in breach of customs legislation are prejudicial to the economic, fiscal and commercial interests of both Contracting Parties, and recognizing the importance of ensuring the accurate assessment of customs duties and other taxes;

CONVINCED that action against such operations can be made more effective by cooperation between their customs authorities;

TAKING ACCOUNT of the respective competences of the European Community and the Member States of the European Community, and desiring to conclude an agreement on those matters falling under the competences of the European Community;

CONSIDERING the existing agreements on customs cooperation and mutual assistance which have been concluded between the United States of America and individual Member States of the European Community and other international agreements and conventions already accepted by the CONTRACTING PARTIES,

HAVE AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

TITLE I

GENERAL PROVISIONS

ARTICLE 1

Definitions

For the purposes of this Agreement:

- (a) "customs legislation" shall mean provisions adopted by the United States of America and the European Community governing the import, export, transit of goods and their placing under any customs procedure, including measures of prohibition, restriction and control;**

- (b) "customs authority" shall mean, in the United States of America, the U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, and, in the European Community, the competent services of the Commission of the European Communities and the customs authorities of the Member States of the European Community;
- (c) "applicant authority" shall mean the competent customs authority which has been appointed by a Contracting Party for this purpose and which makes a request for assistance in customs matters;
- (d) "requested authority" shall mean the competent customs authority which has been appointed by a Contracting Party for this purpose and which receives a request for assistance in customs matters;
- (e) "personal data" shall mean all information relating to an identified or identifiable individual;
- (f) "breach of customs legislation" shall mean any violation of the customs legislation as well as any attempted violation of such legislation.

ARTICLE 2

Territorial application

This Agreement shall apply, on the one hand, to the territory of the United States of America and, on the other hand, to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty.

ARTICLE 3

Future developments

The Contracting Parties may by mutual consent expand this Agreement with a view to increasing the levels of customs cooperation and supplementing them, in accordance with their respective customs legislation, by means of agreements on specific sectors or matters.

TITLE II

SCOPE OF AGREEMENT

ARTICLE 4

Performance of cooperation and assistance

All cooperation and assistance under this Agreement shall be performed by the Contracting Parties in accordance with their relevant laws, rules, and other legal instruments. In addition, all cooperation and assistance under this Agreement by either Contracting Party shall be performed within the competence and available resources of its customs authority.

ARTICLE 5

Obligations imposed under other agreements

1. Taking into account the respective competencies of the European Community and the Member States, the provisions of this Agreement shall:

- not affect the obligations of the Contracting Parties under any other international agreement or convention,

- be deemed complementary with agreements on customs cooperation and mutual assistance which have been, or may be, concluded between the United States of America and individual Member States of the European Union, and
- not affect the provisions governing the communication between the competent services of the Commission and the customs authorities of the Member States of any information obtained under this Agreement which could be of interest to the Community.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1, the provisions of this Agreement shall take precedence over the provisions of the bilateral agreements on customs cooperation and mutual assistance which have been, or may be, concluded between the United States of America and individual Member States of the European Union insofar as the provisions of the latter are incompatible with those of this Agreement.

3. In respect of questions relating to the applicability of this Agreement, the Contracting Parties shall consult each other to resolve the matter in the framework of the Joint Committee set up under Article 22.

TITLE III

CUSTOMS COOPERATION

ARTICLE 6

Scope of the cooperation

1. The customs authorities undertake to develop customs cooperation of the widest possible scope. In particular, the Contracting Parties shall seek to cooperate in:

- (a) establishing and maintaining channels of communication between their customs authorities to facilitate the secure and rapid exchange of information;**
- (b) facilitating effective coordination between their customs authorities;**
- (c) any other administrative matters related to this Agreement that may from time to time require their joint action.**

2. Under this Agreement, customs cooperation shall cover all matters relating to the application of customs legislation.

ARTICLE 7

Cooperation in customs procedures

The Contracting Parties affirm their commitment to the facilitation of the legitimate movement of goods and shall exchange information and expertise on measures to improve customs techniques and procedures and on computerized systems with a view toward achieving that objective in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 8

Exchange of personnel

The customs authorities may exchange personnel when mutually beneficial, for the purpose of advancing their understanding of each other's customs techniques and procedures, and computerized systems.

ARTICLE 9

Coordination in international organizations

The customs authorities shall seek to develop and strengthen their cooperation on topics of common interest in order to seek a coordinated position when those topics are discussed in the framework of international organizations, such as the Customs Cooperation Council.

ARTICLE 10

Technical assistance to third countries

The Contracting Parties may, where appropriate, exchange information on actions undertaken or to be undertaken with third countries in relation to technical assistance in the customs field, with the aim of improving on the provision of such assistance.

TITLE IV

MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

ARTICLE 11

Scope of the mutual assistance

- 1. The Contracting Parties shall assist each other, in the areas within their competence, in the manner and under the conditions laid down in this Agreement, in ensuring compliance with customs legislation.**

2. Consistent with the terms of this Agreement, each Contracting Party shall, on its own initiative or upon request, furnish the other Contracting Party appropriate information regarding activities that may result in operations in breach of customs legislation within the territory of one Contracting Party.

3. Assistance provided pursuant to this Agreement shall include in particular:

- (a) information which might be useful to combat operations in breach of customs legislation and, in particular, special means of combating such operations;
- (b) information concerning new methods used in committing operations in breach of customs legislation or relevant to patterns of illegal activity; and
- (c) information concerning observations and findings resulting from the successful application of new enforcement aids and techniques.

4. This Agreement is solely between the Contracting Parties; the provisions of this Agreement shall not give rise to a right on the part of any private person to obtain information or to impede in the execution of a request.

5. Nothing in this Agreement shall prejudice the relevant laws, rules and other legal instruments governing criminal matters or judicial proceedings, including mutual legal assistance.

ARTICLE 12

Assistance on request

- 1. The Contracting Parties shall assist each other, upon request, by providing appropriate information to the applicant authority, to enable it to ensure compliance with customs legislation, including information regarding operations noted or planned which are, or might be, in breach of such legislation.**
- 2. At the request of the applicant authority, the requested authority shall inform it:**
 - (a) whether goods exported from the territory of one of the Contracting Parties have been properly imported into the territory of the other Party, specifying, where appropriate, the customs procedure applied to the goods;**
 - (b) whether goods imported into the territory of one of the Contracting Parties have been properly exported from the territory of the other Party, specifying, where appropriate, the customs procedure applied to the goods.**
- 3. The Customs authorities of one Contracting Party, upon request of the Customs authorities of the other Contracting Party, shall, to the extent of their ability, and within the limits of their available resources, exercise special surveillance of:**
 - (a) persons known to the applicant authority to have committed a breach of customs legislation or suspected of doing so;**

- (b) goods either in transport or in storage notified by the applicant authority as giving rise to suspected illicit traffic; and
- (c) means of transport suspected of being used in breaches of customs legislation.

4. The customs authorities of the Contracting Parties shall, upon request, provide relevant documentation relating to transportation and shipment of goods.

ARTICLE 13

Spontaneous assistance

1. On their own initiative, the Contracting Parties shall assist each other by providing appropriate information if they consider that information to be necessary to ensure compliance with customs legislation, particularly when they obtain information pertaining to:
- (a) operations which are, or appear to be, in breach of such legislation and which may be of interest to the other Contracting Party;
 - (b) new means or methods employed in carrying out such operations;
 - (c) goods known to be the subject of breaches of customs legislation.

2. In serious cases that could involve substantial damage to the economy, public health, public security, or any other essential interest of the other Contracting Party, the Customs authorities shall wherever possible supply such information on their own initiative.

ARTICLE 14

Form and substance of requests for assistance

1. Requests pursuant to this Agreement shall be made in writing. Documents necessary for the execution of such requests shall accompany the request. When required because of the urgency of the situation, oral requests may be accepted, but must be confirmed in writing immediately.

2. Requests made pursuant to paragraph 1 shall include the following information:

- (a) the name of the authority making the request;
- (b) the nature of the requested proceedings;
- (c) the subject of, and the reason for, the request;
- (d) the names and addresses of the parties concerned in the proceedings, if known;

(e) a brief description of the matter under consideration and the legal elements involved;
and

(f) a summary of the investigation to date and any relevant facts.

3. Requests shall be submitted in an official language of the requested authority or in a language acceptable to that authority.

4. Where a request fails to meet requirements as set forth in this Article, the applicant authority may be asked to revise or supplement it. Where appropriate, precautionary measures may be taken.

ARTICLE 15

Execution of requests

1. In order to comply with a request for assistance, the requested authority shall, within the limits of its competence and available resources, take all reasonable measures to execute the request.

2. Where the requested authority is not the appropriate agency to comply with the request for assistance, it shall promptly transmit the request to the appropriate agency and so advise the applicant authority.

3. Duly authorized officials of a Contracting Party may, with the agreement of the other Contracting Party and within the conditions laid down by the latter, obtain from the offices of the requested authority the relevant books, registers, and other documents or data media held in those offices, make copies thereof or extract any information or particulars relating to operations in breach of customs legislation which the applicant authority needs for the purposes of this Agreement.

4. Officials of a Contracting Party may, with the agreement of the other Contracting Party and subject to the conditions laid down by the latter, be present at inquiries carried out in the latter's territory and assist in the formulation of the official report.

5. A request by a Contracting Party that a certain procedure be followed shall be complied with, subject to the legislation of the requested Party.

6. The applicant authority shall, if it so requests, be advised of the time and place of the action to be taken in response to the request, so that such action may be coordinated.

ARTICLE 16

Form in which information is to be communicated

1. The requested authority shall communicate appropriate information to the applicant authority in the form of documents, certified copies of documents, reports and the like.

2. Originals of files, documents and other materials shall be requested only in cases where copies would be insufficient. Upon specific request, copies of such files, documents and other materials shall be appropriately authenticated.
3. Originals of files, documents and other materials that have been transmitted shall be returned at the earliest opportunity; rights of the Contracting Parties or of third parties relating thereto shall remain unaffected.
4. In lieu of documents stipulated in this Agreement, computer-based information may be transmitted in any form for the same purpose. All relevant information for interpreting or utilizing that information shall be supplied at the same time.

ARTICLE 17

Exchange of information and confidentiality

1. Any information communicated in whatsoever form pursuant to this Agreement shall be of a confidential or restricted nature, depending on the laws, rules and other legal instruments applicable in each of the Contracting Parties. It shall enjoy the protection extended to like information under the relevant laws, rules and legal instruments of the Contracting Party which received it.

2. Personal data may be provided only where the Contracting Party which will receive the data undertakes to protect such data in a way which is at least equivalent to the one applicable to that particular case in the Contracting Party which may supply the data.

3. Information obtained shall be used solely for the purposes of this Agreement. Where one of the Contracting Parties requests the use of such information for other purposes, it shall obtain the prior written consent of the administrative authority which furnished the information. Such use shall then be subject to any conditions established by that authority.

4. Paragraph 3 shall not impede the use of information in any judicial or administrative proceedings subsequently instituted for failure to comply with customs legislation. The Contracting Parties may, in their records of evidence, reports and testimonies and in proceedings and charges brought before the courts, use as evidence information obtained and documents consulted in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement. The competent authority which supplied that information shall be notified of such use.

5. The receiving Contracting Party may disclose, to a defendant in a criminal prosecution, information material to that defendant's innocence or the credibility of witnesses testifying against that defendant in the prosecution to the extent that the law applicable in such a case in the receiving Contracting Party so requires. The receiving Contracting Party shall notify the providing Contracting Party in advance of such proposed disclosure and provide an explanation regarding the legal requirements for disclosure.

The receiving Contracting Party shall consider specific concerns related to disclosure of the information such as the safety and privacy of persons named or identified by the information. In any case, the receiving Contracting Party shall ensure that the items of information which are to be disclosed shall be limited to what is strictly necessary for the specific purpose of the disclosure concerned, and that personal data can only be used, treated or stored for the purpose of that criminal prosecution.

ARTICLE 18

Experts and witnesses

An official of a requested authority may be authorized to appear, within the limitations of the authorization granted, as expert or witness in judicial or administrative proceedings regarding the matters covered by this Agreement in the territory of the other Contracting Party and to produce such objects, documents or authenticated copies thereof, as may be needed for the proceedings. The request for an appearance must indicate specifically on what matters and by virtue of what title or qualification the official will be questioned.

ARTICLE 19

Exceptions to the obligation to provide assistance

1. Assistance may be refused or withheld or may be subject to the satisfaction of certain conditions or requirements in cases where a Party is of the opinion that assistance under this Agreement would be likely to prejudice the sovereignty of the United States of America or of a Member State of the Community, or would be likely to prejudice public policy, security, or other essential interest (such as that referred to in Article 17(2)), or be contrary to the legal system of the requested Contracting Party, including, where appropriate, the legal system of the Member States of the Community liable to provide assistance.
2. If the applicant authority would be unable to comply if a similar request were made by the requested authority, it shall draw attention to that fact in its request. Compliance with such a request shall be at the discretion of the requested authority.
3. Assistance may be postponed by the requested authority on the ground that it will interfere with an ongoing investigation, prosecution or proceeding. In such a case, the requested authority shall consult with the applicant authority to determine if assistance can be given subject to such terms or conditions as the requested authority may require.
4. Where a request cannot be complied with, the applicant authority shall be promptly notified of that fact, and provided with a statement of the reasons for postponement or denial of the request. Circumstances that might be of importance for the further pursuit of the matter shall also be provided to the applicant authority.

ARTICLE 20

Assistance expenses

1. The Contracting Parties shall waive all claims for reimbursement of costs incurred in the execution of this Agreement, except for expenses and allowances paid to experts and to witnesses as well as costs of interpreters other than Government and public service employees.
2. If expenses of a substantial and extraordinary nature are, or will be, required to execute the request, the Contracting Parties shall consult to determine the terms and conditions under which the request will be executed as well as the manner in which the costs shall be borne.

TITLE V

FINAL PROVISIONS

ARTICLE 21

Management

1. The management of this Agreement shall be entrusted to the competent departments of the Commission of the European Communities and, where appropriate, the Customs Service (Department of Treasury) of the United States of America on the one hand and the customs authorities of the Member States on the other. They shall decide on all practical measures and arrangements necessary for its application.

2. The Contracting Parties shall consult each other and subsequently keep each other informed of:

- any detailed rules which arise from the implementation of this Agreement,**
- the evolution of their respective competences which affect the scope of the Agreement.**

ARTICLE 22

Joint Customs Cooperation Committee

1. A Joint Customs Cooperation Committee is hereby established, consisting of representatives of the customs authorities of the Contracting Parties. The Joint Customs Cooperation Committee shall meet at a place and on a date with an agenda fixed by mutual consent.

2. The Joint Customs Cooperation Committee shall, inter alia:

- (a) see to the proper functioning of this Agreement;**
- (b) examine all issues arising from its application;**

- (c) take measures necessary for customs cooperation in accordance with the objectives of this Agreement;
 - (d) exchange views on any points of common interest regarding customs cooperation, including future measures and the resources for them;
 - (e) recommend solutions aimed at attaining the objectives of this Agreement.
3. The Joint Customs Cooperation Committee shall adopt its rules of procedure.

ARTICLE 23

Entry into force and termination

1. This Agreement shall enter into force on the first day of the month following the date on which the Contracting Parties have notified each other of the completion of the procedures necessary for this purpose.
2. Either Contracting Party may terminate this Agreement at any time by notification through diplomatic channels. The termination shall take effect three months from the date of notification to the other Contracting Party. Ongoing proceedings at the time of termination shall nonetheless be completed in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 24

Authentic texts

This Agreement shall be drawn up in duplicate in the Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish and Swedish languages, each text being equally authentic.

US/CE/en 25

AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AND THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
ON PRECURSORS AND CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES
FREQUENTLY USED IN THE ILLICIT MANUFACTURE
OF NARCOTIC DRUGS OR PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

NW:

Signed by Albright @ The
Hague

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, hereinafter referred to as the "United States",

of the one part, and

THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY, hereinafter referred to as the "Community",

of the other part,

DETERMINED to prevent and combat the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances by controlling the supply of precursors and chemical substances frequently used for such purposes;

ACKNOWLEDGING Article 12 of the United Nations Convention of 1988 against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances;

AGREEING with the final Report of the Chemical Action Task Force (CATF), approved by the London G-7 Economic Summit on 15 July 1991, which recommended the strengthening of international cooperation by the conclusion of bilateral agreements, in particular between regions and countries involved in export, import and transit of these chemical substances;

CONVINCED that international trade constitutes a specific risk factor and that only cooperative arrangements between the regions concerned can prevent this danger, in particular by linking export and import controls;

AFFIRMING their common commitment to setting up assistance and cooperation mechanisms between the United States and the Community in order to combat the diversion of controlled substances to illicit purposes, in harmony with the orientations and actions decided at the international level;

UNDERLINING their common will to improve the current information exchange between relevant agencies, and without disturbing the existing working relations between them;

RECOGNIZING that these chemical substances are also mainly and widely used for legitimate purposes and that international trade must not be hindered by excessive monitoring procedures;

HAVING DECIDED to conclude an Agreement for the control of precursors and chemical substances frequently used in the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances,

HAVE AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

ARTICLE 1

Scope of the Agreement

1. This Agreement sets out measures to strengthen administrative cooperation and to improve working relations between the Contracting Parties to prevent the diversion of substances frequently used in the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances, without prejudice to the due recognition of the legitimate interests of trade and industry.

Nothing in this Agreement:

- may be interpreted in a manner which is inconsistent with the UN international drug control treaties, or
- shall disturb existing working law enforcement relations in drug-related matters between the United States and the Member States of the Community.

2. For this purpose, the Contracting Parties shall assist each other, as set out in this Agreement, notably in:

- monitoring the trade between them in scheduled substances, with the aim of preventing their diversion to illicit purposes,
- granting each other the means of mutual consultation on the legitimacy of proposed transactions in scheduled substances destined for third countries, and
- providing mutual administrative assistance to ensure that the provisions of the relevant substance trade control legislation are correctly applied.

3. Without prejudice to possible amendments which might be adopted within the competence of the Joint Follow-up Group, this Agreement applies to the chemical substances listed in the Annex to the 1988 UN Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances as amended, hereinafter referred to as "controlled chemical substances".

TITLE I

Trade in controlled chemical substances between the Contracting Parties

ARTICLE 2

Trade surveillance

1. The Contracting Parties shall consult and inform each other on their own initiative of any suspicion that controlled chemical substances may be diverted from legitimate trade between them to the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances, in particular when a shipment occurs in unusual quantities or under unusual circumstances.
2. With regard to the controlled chemical substances listed in Annex A to this Agreement, the competent authority of the exporting Contracting Party shall, at the same time as the export authorization is issued or a notification of export is received, and as soon as possible, forward a copy of this information to the competent authority of the importing Contracting Party. Specific information shall be provided where the operator benefits, in the exporting country, from an open individual authorization covering multiple export operations.

3. With regard to the controlled chemical substances listed in Annex B to this Agreement, the export shall be authorized only when the importing Contracting Party has given its consent.

4. The Contracting Parties undertake to provide, reciprocally and in good time, due feedback on any information provided or measure requested under this Article.

5. When implementing the abovementioned trade control measures, the legitimate interests of trade shall be duly respected. In particular, in cases covered by paragraph 3, the reply by the importing Contracting Party shall be provided within 15 working days after the reception of the message from the exporting Contracting Party. The absence of a reply within this time period shall be deemed as granting an import authorization. The refusal to grant an import authorization shall be notified in writing, including electronic means, to the exporting Contracting Party within this time period and the reasons for it must be documented.

ARTICLE 3

Suspension of shipment

1. Without prejudice to any possible implementation of technical enforcement measures, shipments shall be suspended if, in the opinion of either Contracting Party, there are reasonable grounds to believe that controlled chemical substances may be diverted to the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances.

2. The Contracting Parties shall cooperate in supplying each other with information relating to suspected diversion operations.

TITLE II

Trade in controlled chemical substances with other countries

ARTICLE 4

Pre-shipment consultation

1. Without prejudice to Articles 6, 7 and 8, whenever a competent authority, in processing a request for an export authorization to a third country, suspects that the controlled chemical substances involved may be diverted to the illicit manufacture of drugs, appropriate information should normally be relayed to the other Contracting Party to this Agreement, with the request to the competent authority of that Contracting Party for relevant information in its possession which may confirm or refute the possible diversion.
2. To comply with the request mentioned in paragraph 1, provided that the necessary information has been made available, the requested Contracting Party shall search its databases or other available sources for information relating to the case and communicate its findings to the requesting Contracting Party. Whenever possible, the reply should be given within five working days after receipt of the request.

3. The requesting authority, on its own responsibility and with due assessment of all the elements of the case, shall determine whether to authorize, deny or take other action concerning the export in question. It shall then notify the requested authority of the decision taken.

4. The Contracting Parties shall immediately notify each other of any decision to stop a shipment of controlled chemical substances to third countries, which they believe may be of interest to the other Contracting Party, and shall provide such information regarding the shipment as appropriate.

ARTICLE 5

Other information

Without prejudice to Articles 6, 7 and 8, the Contracting Parties shall periodically exchange other data and information concerning trends and circumstances as seem desirable to achieve the purposes of this Agreement.

TITLE III

General provisions

ARTICLE 6

Mutual administrative assistance

1. The Contracting Parties shall supply to each other, either on their own initiative or on request, information to prevent the diversion of controlled chemical substances to the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances and shall investigate cases of suspected diversion. When necessary, they shall adopt appropriate precautionary measures to prevent diversion.
2. Any request for information or precautionary measures shall be responded to as promptly as possible.
3. Requests for administrative assistance shall be executed in accordance with the laws, regulations and other legal instruments of the requested Contracting Party.
4. Officials of a Contracting Party may, with the agreement of the other Contracting Party, be present at the inquiries carried out in the territory of the latter.

5. The Contracting Parties shall assist each other to facilitate the provision of evidence.
6. Administrative assistance provided under this Article shall not prejudice the rules governing mutual legal assistance in criminal matters, nor shall it apply to information obtained under powers exercised at the request of a judicial authority, unless the authority so agrees.
7. Information may be requested in respect of chemical substances which are frequently used in the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances but which are not included in the scope of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 7

Information exchange and confidentiality

1. Data relating to natural persons may be exchanged only where the receiving Contracting Party undertakes to afford such data with at least substantially the same level of protection as the one applicable to that particular instance in the Contracting Party liable to supply them. To this end, the Contracting Parties shall provide each other with information setting forth the applicable standards of the Contracting Parties, including where appropriate the legal standards of the Member States of the Community.
2. Any information communicated in whatsoever form pursuant to this Agreement shall be of a confidential or restricted nature, depending on the rules applicable in each of the Contracting Parties, and shall be used solely for the purposes of this Agreement. Such information shall be afforded in the receiving Contracting Party the same protection in respect of confidentiality and official secrecy as applies in that Contracting Party to similar information under the relevant laws of the Contracting Party which received it.

3. Assistance may be postponed, or provided with conditions, on the ground that it would otherwise interfere with an ongoing investigation, prosecution or proceeding, or jeopardize the security of sensitive sources and methods of gathering information. In such a case, the authority which could provide assistance shall consult with the competent authority of the other Contracting Party to determine if assistance can be given subject to such terms or conditions as the providing authority may require.

4. Information obtained shall be used solely for the purposes of this Agreement. Where one of the Contracting Parties requests the use of such information for other purposes, it shall ask for the prior written consent of the authority which furnished the information. Moreover, such use shall be subject to any restrictions laid down by that authority.

5. Paragraph 4 shall not impede the use of information in any judicial or administrative proceedings subsequently instituted for failure to comply with substance control legislation. The competent authority which supplied that information shall be notified of such use.

ARTICLE 8

Exceptions to the obligation to provide assistance

1. The Contracting Parties shall make every reasonable effort to routinely provide requested information and assistance.

2. In cases where the requested Contracting Party is of the opinion that compliance with the request would:

- infringe upon the sovereignty of the United States or of a Member State of the Community, or
- present a serious issue of public policy, security or other essential interests, in particular the cases referred to in Article 7(1) concerning natural persons, and in Article 7(3) concerning ongoing investigations, prosecutions or proceedings and the security of sensitive sources and methods of gathering information, or
- be contrary to the legal system of the requested Contracting Party, including, where appropriate, the legal system of the Member States of the Community liable to provide the assistance,

assistance can be refused or compliance may be made subject to the satisfaction of certain conditions or requirements.

3. If one Contracting Party requests assistance which it could not itself supply entirely or partially pursuant to a similar request, it shall so state in its request. The other Contracting Party shall then decide in what form it can comply with the request.

4. If assistance is refused under this Article, the decision and its explanatory reasons shall be communicated without delay to the other Contracting Party.

ARTICLE 9

Technical and scientific cooperation

The Contracting Parties shall cooperate in the identification of new diversion methods as well as appropriate countermeasures, including technical cooperation to strengthen administrative and enforcement structures in this field and to promote cooperation with trade and industry. Such technical cooperation may concern, in particular, training and exchange programmes for the officials concerned.

ARTICLE 10

Implementation measures

1. Each Contracting Party shall identify a competent authority or competent authorities to coordinate the application of this Agreement. These authorities shall communicate directly with one another for the purposes of this Agreement.
2. The Contracting Parties shall keep each other informed of the provisions which they adopt for the implementation of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 11

Joint Follow-up Group

1. A Joint Follow-up Group on the control of precursors and chemical substances is hereby established, hereinafter referred to as "the Joint Follow-up Group", in which each Contracting Party to this Agreement shall be represented.

2. The Joint Follow-up Group shall act by mutual agreement. It shall normally meet once a year, date, place and programme being fixed by mutual agreement.

Extraordinary meetings of the Joint Follow-up Group may be convened by agreement of the Contracting Parties.

3. The Joint Follow-up Group shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

ARTICLE 12

Role of the Joint Follow-up Group

1. The Joint Follow-up Group shall monitor the administration of this Agreement and ensure its proper implementation. For this purpose:

- it shall study and develop the necessary means to ensure the correct functioning of the present Agreement,
- it shall be regularly informed by the Contracting Parties of their experience in applying this Agreement,
- in the cases provided for in paragraph 2, it shall take decisions,
- in the cases provided for in paragraph 4, it shall make recommendations,

- it shall study and develop the cooperation measures referred to in Article 9, and
- it shall study and develop other possible forms of cooperation in matters relating to precursors and chemical substances.

2. The Joint Follow-up Group shall adopt by mutual consent decisions to amend Annexes A and B.

Such decisions shall be implemented by the Contracting Parties in accordance with their own legislation.

If, in the Joint Follow-up Group, a representative of a Contracting Party has accepted a decision subject to the completion of procedures necessary for that purpose, the decision shall enter into force, if no date is contained therein, on the first day of the second month after such a completion is notified.

3. The Joint Follow-up Group shall adopt, by mutual consent, the procedures to be followed in pre-shipment consultations laid down in Article 4.

4. The Joint Follow-up Group shall recommend to the Contracting Parties:

- amendments to this Agreement, and
- any other measures required for the implementation of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 13

Other agreements

1. As regards controlled chemical substances, and subject to Article 7(3), nothing in this Agreement or in other agreements concluded between the United States and the Community shall prejudice Community provisions governing the communication between the competent administrative authorities within the Community of any information obtained in matters covered by this Agreement which could be of Community interest.
2. Nothing in this Agreement shall prejudice the provisions of any Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty between the United States and any Member State of the Community.
3. The Contracting Parties shall also exchange information with each other on measures in substance control matters taken with other countries.

ARTICLE 14

Entry into force

This Agreement shall enter into force on the first day of the second month following the date of signature.

ARTICLE 15

Duration and denunciation

1. This Agreement shall be concluded for five years and, unless otherwise terminated, it shall be automatically renewed for successive five-year periods.
2. This Agreement may be amended by mutual consent of the Contracting Parties.
3. This Agreement may be terminated at any time by either Contracting Party upon 90 days' written notice.

ARTICLE 16

Authentic texts

This Agreement is drawn up in duplicate in the Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish and Swedish languages, all texts being equally authentic.

Participants in Signing Ceremony

The President

Secretary General Javier Solana (NATO)
President Jacques Chirac (France)
President Boris Yeltsin (Russia)
Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene (Belgium)
Prime Minister Nyrup Rasmussen (Denmark)
Chancellor Helmut Kohl (Germany)
Prime Minister Konstandinos Simitis (Greece)
Prime Minister David Oddsson (Iceland)
Prime Minister Romano Prodi (Italy)
Prime Minister Jean Claude Juncker (Luxembourg)
Prime Minister Wim Kok (The Netherlands)
Prime Minister Thorbjorn Jagland (Norway)
Prime Minister Antonio Guterres (Portugal)
Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar (Spain)
Prime Minister Tony Blair (United Kingdom)
Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Irwin (Canada)

Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security Between The Russian Federation and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

The Russian Federation, on the one hand, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its member States, on the other hand, hereinafter referred to as Russia and NATO, based on an enduring political commitment undertaken at the highest political level, will build together a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area on the principles of democracy and cooperative security.

Russia and NATO do not consider each other as adversaries. They share the goal of overcoming the vestiges of earlier confrontation and competition and of strengthening mutual trust and cooperation. The present Act reaffirms the determination of Russia and NATO to give concrete substance to their shared commitment to build a stable, peaceful and undivided Europe, whole and free, to the benefit of all its peoples. Making this commitment at the highest political level marks the beginning of a fundamentally new relationship between Russia and NATO. They intend to develop, on the basis of common interest, reciprocity and transparency a strong, stable and enduring partnership.

This Act defines the goals and mechanism of consultation, cooperation, joint decision-making and joint action that will constitute the core of the mutual relations between Russia and NATO.

NATO has undertaken a historic transformation - a process that will continue. In 1991 the Alliance revised its strategic doctrine to take account of the new security environment in Europe. Accordingly, NATO has radically reduced and continues the adaptation of its conventional and nuclear forces. While preserving the capability to meet the commitments undertaken in Washington Treaty, NATO has expanded and will continue to expand its political functions, and taken on new missions of peacekeeping and crisis management in support of the United Nations (UN) and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), such as in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to address new security challenges in close association with other countries and international organisations. NATO is in the process of developing the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance. It will continue to develop a broad and dynamic pattern of cooperation with OSCE participating States in particular through the Partnership for Peace and is working with Partner countries on the initiative to establish a Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. NATO member States have decided to examine NATO's Strategic Concept to ensure that it is fully consistent with Europe's new security situation and challenges.

Russia is continuing the building of a democratic society and the realisation of its political and economic transformation. It is developing the concept of its national security and revising its military doctrine to ensure that they are fully consistent with new security realities. Russia has carried out deep reductions in its armed forces, has withdrawn its forces on an unprecedented scale from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Baltic countries and withdrawn all its nuclear weapons

back to its own national territory. Russia is committed to further reducing its conventional and nuclear forces. It is actively participating in peacekeeping operations in support of the UN and the OSCE, as well as in crisis management in different areas of the world. Russia is contributing to the multinational forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

I. PRINCIPLES

Proceeding from the principle that the security of all states in the Euro-Atlantic community is indivisible, Russia and NATO will work together to contribute to the establishment in Europe of common and comprehensive security based on the allegiance to shared values, commitments and norms of behaviour in the interests of all states.

Russia and NATO will help to strengthen the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, including developing further its role as a primary instrument in preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, crisis management, post-conflict rehabilitation and regional security cooperation, as well as in enhancing its operational capabilities to carry out these tasks. The OSCE, as the only pan-European security organisation, has a key role in European peace and stability. In strengthening the OSCE, Russia and NATO will cooperate to prevent any possibility of returning to a Europe of division and confrontation, or the isolation of any state.

Consistent with the OSCE's work on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-First Century, and taking into account the decisions of the Lisbon Summit concerning a Charter on European security, Russia and NATO will seek the widest possible cooperation among participating States of the OSCE with the aim of creating in Europe a common space of security and stability, without dividing lines and spheres of influence limiting the sovereignty of any state.

Russia and NATO start from the premise that the shared objective of strengthening security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area for the benefit of all countries requires a response to new risks and challenges, such as aggressive nationalism, proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, terrorism, persistent abuse of human rights and of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities and unresolved territorial disputes, which pose a threat to common peace, prosperity and stability.

This Act does not affect, and cannot be regarded as affecting, the primary responsibility of the UN Security Council for maintaining international peace and security, or the role of the OSCE as the inclusive and comprehensive organisation for consultation, decision-making and cooperation in its area and as a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

In implementing the provisions in this Act, Russia and NATO will observe in good faith their obligations under international law and international instruments, including the obligations of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights as well as their commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent OSCE documents, including the Charter of Paris and the documents adopted at the Lisbon OSCE Summit.

To achieve the aims of this Act, Russia and NATO will base their relations on a shared

commitment to the following principles:

- development, on the basis of transparency, of a strong, stable, enduring and equal partnership and of cooperation to strengthen security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area;
- acknowledgment of the vital role that democracy, political pluralism, the rule of law, and respect for human rights and civil liberties and the development of free market economies play in the development of common prosperity and comprehensive security.
- refraining from the threat or use of force against each other as well as against any other state, its sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence in any manner inconsistent with the United Nations Charter and with the Declaration of Principles Guiding Relations Between Participating States contained in the Helsinki Final Act;
- respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all states and their inherent right to choose the means to ensure their own security, the inviolability of borders and peoples' right of self-determination as enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents;
- mutual transparency in creating and implementing defence policy and military doctrines;
- prevention of conflicts and settlement of disputes by peaceful means in accordance with UN and OSCE principles;
- support, on a case-by-case basis, of peacekeeping operations carried out under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE.

II. MECHANISM FOR CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION. THE RUSSIA-NATO PERMANENT JOINT COUNCIL

To carry out the activities and aims provided for by this Act and to develop common approaches to European security and to political problems, Russia and NATO will create the Russia-NATO Permanent Joint Council. The central objective of this Permanent Joint Council will be to build increasing levels of trust, unity of purpose and habits of consultation and cooperation between Russia and NATO, in order to enhance each other's security and that of all nations in the Euro-Atlantic area and diminish the security of none. If disagreements arise, Russia and NATO will endeavour to settle them on the basis of goodwill and mutual respect within the framework of political consultations.

The Permanent Joint Council will provide a mechanism for consultations, coordination and, to the maximum extent possible, where appropriate, for joint decisions and joint action with respect to security issues of common concern. The consultations will not extend to internal matters of either Russia, NATO, or NATO member States.

The shared objective of Russia and NATO is to identify and pursue as many opportunities for joint action as possible. As the relationship develops, they expect that additional opportunities for joint action will emerge.

The Permanent Joint Council will be the principle venue of consultation between Russia and NATO in times of crisis or for any other situation affecting peace and stability. Extraordinary meetings of the Council will take place in addition to its regular meetings to allow for prompt consultations in case of emergencies. In this context, Russia and NATO will promptly consult, within the Permanent Joint Council in case one of the Council members perceives a threat to its territorial integrity, political independence or security.

The activities of the Permanent Joint Council will be built upon the principles of reciprocity and transparency. In the course of their consultations and cooperation, Russia and NATO will inform each other regarding the respective security-related challenges they face and measures that each intends to address them.

Provisions of this Act do not provide Russia or NATO, in any way, with a right of veto over the actions of the other nor do they infringe upon or restrict the rights of Russia or NATO to independent decision-making and action. They cannot be used as a means to disadvantage the interests of other states.

The Permanent Joint Council will meet at various levels and in different forms, according to the subject matter and the wishes of Russia and NATO. The Permanent Joint Council will meet at the level of Foreign Ministers and at the level of Defence Ministers twice annually, and also monthly at the level of ambassadors/permanent representatives to the North Atlantic Council.

The Permanent Joint Council may also meet, as appropriate, at the level of Heads of State and Government.

The Permanent Joint Council may establish committees or working groups for individual subjects or areas of cooperation on an ad hoc or permanent basis, as appropriate.

Under the auspices of the Permanent Joint Council, military representatives and Chiefs of Staff will also meet; meetings of Chiefs of Staff will take place no less than twice a year and also monthly at military representatives level. Meetings of military experts may be convened, as appropriate.

The Permanent Joint Council will be chaired jointly by a representative of Russia, the Secretary General of NATO and, on a rotation basis, a representative of one of the NATO member States.

To support the work of the Permanent Joint Council, Russia and NATO will establish the necessary administrative structures.

Russia will establish a Mission to NATO headed by a representative at the rank of Ambassador. A senior military representative and his staff will be part of this Mission for the purposes of the military cooperation. NATO retains the possibility of establishing an appropriate presence in Moscow, the modalities of which remain to be determined.

The agenda for regular sessions will be established jointly. Organisational arrangements and rules of procedure for the Permanent Joint Council will be worked out. These arrangements will be in place for the inaugural meeting of the Permanent Joint Council which will be held no later than four months after the signature of this Act.

The Permanent Joint Council will engage in three distinct activities:

- consulting on the topics in Section III of this Act and on any other political or security issue determined by mutual consent;
- on the basis of these consultations, developing joint initiatives on which Russia and NATO would agree to speak or act in parallel;
- once consensus has been reached in the course of consultation, making joint decisions and taking joint action on a case-by-case basis, including participation, on an equitable basis, in the planning and preparation of joint operations, including peacekeeping operations under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE.

Any actions undertaken by Russia or NATO, together or separately, must be consistent with the United Nations Charter and the OSCE's governing principles.

Recognizing the importance of deepening contacts between the legislative bodies of the participating States to this Act, Russia and NATO will also encourage expanded dialogue and cooperation between the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation and the North Atlantic Assembly.

III. AREAS FOR CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION

In building their relationship, Russia and NATO will focus on specific areas of mutual interest. They will consult and strive to cooperate to the broadest possible degree in the following areas:

- issues of common interest related to security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic or to concrete crises, including the contribution of Russia and NATO to security and stability in this area;
- conflict prevention, including preventive diplomacy, crisis management and conflict resolution taking into account the role and responsibility of the UN and the OSCE and the work of these organizations in these fields;
- joint operations, including peacekeeping operations, on a case-by-case basis, under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE, and if Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) are used in such cases, participation in them at an early stage;
- participation of Russia in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace;
- exchange of information and consultation on strategy, defence policy, the military doctrines of Russia and NATO, and budgets and infrastructure development programmes;
- arms control issues;
- nuclear safety issues, across their full spectrum;
- preventing the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, and their delivery means, combatting nuclear trafficking and strengthening cooperation in specific arms control

areas, including political and defence aspects of proliferation;

- possible cooperation in Theatre Missile Defence;
- enhanced regional air traffic safety, increased air traffic capacity and reciprocal exchanges, as appropriate, to promote confidence through increased measures of transparency and exchanges of information in relation to air defence and related aspects of airspace management/control. This will include exploring possible cooperation on appropriate air defence related matters;
- increasing transparency, predictability and mutual confidence regarding the size and roles of the conventional forces of Russia and member States of NATO;
- reciprocal exchanges, as appropriate, on nuclear weapons issues, including doctrines and strategy of Russia and NATO;
- coordinating a programme of expanded cooperation between respective military establishments, as further detailed below;
- pursuing possible armaments-related cooperation through association with Russia with NATO's Conference of National Armaments Directors;
- conversion of defence industries;
- developing mutually agreed cooperative projects in defence-related economic, environmental and scientific fields;
- conducting joint initiatives and exercises in civil emergency preparedness and disaster relief;
- combatting terrorism and drug trafficking;
- improving public understanding of evolving relations between Russia and NATO, including the establishment of a NATO documentation centre or information office in Moscow.

Other areas can be added by mutual agreement.

IV. POLITICAL-MILITARY MATTERS

Russia and NATO affirm their shared desire to achieve greater stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic area.

The member States of NATO reiterate that they have no intention, no plan and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy - and do not foresee any future need to do so. This subsumes the fact that NATO has decided that it has no intention, no plan, and no reason to establish nuclear weapon storage sites on the territory of those members, whether through the construction of new nuclear storage facilities or the adaptation of old nuclear storage facilities. Nuclear storage sites

are understood to be facilities specifically designed for the stationing of nuclear weapons, and include all types of hardened above or below ground facilities (storage bunkers or vaults) designed for storing nuclear weapons.

Recognizing the importance of the adaptation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) for the broader context of security in the OSCE area and the work on a Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the Twenty-First Century, Russia and the member States of NATO will work together in Vienna with the other States Parties to adapt the CFE Treaty to enhance its viability and effectiveness, taking into account Europe's changing security environment and the legitimate security interests of all OSCE participating States. They share the objective of concluding an adaptation agreement as expeditiously as possible and, as a first step in this process, they will, together with other States Parties to the CFE Treaty, seek to conclude as soon as possible a framework agreement setting forth the basic elements of an adapted CFE Treaty, consistent with the objectives and principles of the Document on Scope and Parameters agreed at Lisbon in December 1996.

Russia and NATO believe that an important goal of CFE Treaty adaptation should be a significant lowering in the total amount of Treaty-Limited Equipment permitted in the Treaty's area of application compatible with the legitimate defence requirements of each State Party. Russia and NATO encourage all States Parties to the CFE Treaty to consider reductions in their CFE equipment entitlements, as part of an overall effort to achieve lower equipment levels that are consistent with the transformation of Europe's security environment.

Russia and the member States of NATO commit themselves to exercise restraint during the period of negotiations, as foreseen in the Document on Scope and Parameters, in relation to the current postures and capabilities of their conventional armed forces - in particular with respect to their levels of forces and deployments - in the Treaty's area of application, in order to avoid developments in the security situation in Europe diminishing the security of any State Party. This commitment is without prejudice to possible voluntary decisions by the individual States Parties to reduce their force levels or deployments, or to their legitimate security interests.

Russia and the member States of NATO proceed on the basis that adaptation of the CFE Treaty should help to ensure equal security for all States Parties irrespective of their membership of a politico-military alliance, both to preserve and strengthen stability and continue to prevent any destabilizing increase of forces in various regions of Europe and in Europe as a whole. An adapted CFE Treaty should also further enhance military transparency by extended information exchange and verification and permit the possible accession by new States Parties.

Russia and the member States of NATO propose to other CFE States Parties to carry out such adaptation of the CFE Treaty so as to enable States Parties to reach, through a transparent and cooperative process, conclusions regarding reductions they might be prepared to take and resulting national Treaty-Limited Equipment ceilings. These will then be codified as binding limits in the adapted Treaty to be agreed by consensus of all States Parties, and reviewed in 2001 and at five-year intervals thereafter. In doing so, the States Parties will take into account all the levels of Treaty-Limited Equipment established for the Atlantic-to-the-Urals area by the original CFE Treaty, the substantial reductions that have been carried out since then, the changes to the situation in Europe and the need to ensure that the security of no state is diminished.

Russia and the member States of NATO reaffirm that States Parties to the CFE Treaty should maintain only such military capabilities individually or in conjunction with others, as are commensurate with individual or collective legitimate security needs, taking into account their international obligations, including the CFE Treaty.

Each State-Party will base its agreement to the provisions of the adapted Treaty on all national ceilings of the States Parties, on its projections of the current and future security situation in Europe.

In addition, in the negotiations on the adaptation of the CFE Treaty, Russia and the member States of NATO will, together with other States Parties, seek to strengthen stability by further developing measures to prevent any potentially threatening build-up of conventional forces in agreed regions of Europe, to include Central and Eastern Europe.

Russia and NATO have clarified their intentions with regard to their conventional force postures in Europe's new security environment and are prepared to consult on the evolution of these postures in the framework of the Permanent Joint Council.

NATO reiterates that in the current and foreseeable security environment, the Alliance will carry out its collective defence and other missions by ensuring the necessary interoperability, integration, and capability for reinforcement rather than by additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces. Accordingly it will have to rely on adequate infrastructure commensurate with the above tasks. In this context, reinforcement may take place, when necessary, in the event of defence against a threat of aggression and missions in support of peace consistent with the United Nations Charter and the OSCE governing principles, as well as for exercises consistent with the adapted CFE Treaty, the provisions of the Vienna Document 1994 and mutually agreed transparency measures. Russia will exercise similar restraint in its conventional force deployments in Europe.

Russia and the member States of NATO will strive for greater transparency, predictability and mutual confidence with regard to their armed forces. They will comply fully with their obligations under the Vienna Document 1994 and develop cooperation with the other OSCE participating States, including negotiations in the appropriate format, inter alia within the OSCE to promote confidence and security.

Russia and the member States of NATO will use and improve existing arms control regimes and confidence-building measures to create security relations based on peaceful cooperation.

Russia and NATO, in order to develop cooperation between their military establishments, will expand political-military consultations and cooperation through the Permanent Joint Council with an enhanced dialogue between the senior military authorities of Russia and of NATO and its member States. They will implement a programme of significantly expanded military activities and practical cooperation between Russia and NATO at all levels. Consistent with the tenets of the Permanent Joint Council, this enhanced military-to-military dialogue will be built upon the principle that neither party views the other as a threat nor seeks to the disadvantage the other's security. This enhanced military-to-military dialogue will include regularly-scheduled reciprocal briefings on Russian and NATO military doctrine, strategy and resultant force posture and will include the broad possibilities for joint exercises and training.

To support this enhanced dialogue and the military components of the Permanent Joint Council, Russia and NATO will establish military liaison missions at various levels on the basis of reciprocity and further mutual arrangements.

To enhance their partnership and ensure this partnership is grounded to the greatest extent possible in practical activities and direct cooperation, Russia's and NATO's respective military authorities will explore the further development of a concept for joint Russia-NATO peacekeeping operations. This initiative should build upon the positive experience of working together in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the lessons learned there will be used in the establishment of Combined Joint Task Forces.

* * *

The present Act
takes effect upon the date of its signature.

Russia and NATO will take the proper steps to ensure its implementation in accordance with their procedures.

The present Act is established in two originals in the Russian, French and English language.

The Government of the Russian Federation and the Secretary General of NATO will provide the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Secretary General of the OSCE with the text of this Act with the request to circulate it to all members of the Organisations.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 26, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE

Arlington National Cemetery

11:30 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. General Foley, Chaplain Schwartzman, Mr. Metzler, to the members of the Cabinet, General Shalikashvili, and the leaders of our armed forces, to members of Congress, and especially to the members of the armed forces who are here, the leaders of our veterans organizations, all of you who are veterans and your families, and all of you who are family members of those who have given their lives in the service of our country.

My fellow Americans, we gather here today, as we do faithfully every year, to pay tribute to our country men and women who fell in the line of duty, who gave their lives to preserve the liberties upon which our nation was founded, and which we have managed to carry forward for more than 200 years now. All across America, our grateful nation comes together today to honor these men and women -- some celebrated, others quite unknown, each a patriot and a hero.

For many of our schoolchildren who have known no war, today may seem to be little more than a day off from school or a welcome start to the summer. But on this day, and all that we pause to remember, there are essential lessons for the young, and indeed for all the rest of us as well: Appreciate the blessings of freedom; recognize the power and virtue of sacrifice; respect those who gave everything on behalf of our common good. This day reminds us of what we can achieve when we pull together as one nation, respecting each other with all of our myriad differences, but coming together -- we can fight any battle and face any challenge.

It reminds of our duty to honor not only those we have lost in freedom's cause but also, through attention and care, the service men and women who came back home and are now our veterans, as well as the families of those for whom there

tragically has never been a final accounting.

It reminds us of our obligation to take care of those who have taken care of us and those who take care of us today. That means ensuring that our men and women in uniform have the best training and equipment and preparation possible to do their jobs for freedom, because even in times of peace we must remain vigilant in a very new and still uncertain world.

And above all, it reminds us of America's responsibility to remain the world's leading force for peace and prosperity and freedom as we enter the 21st century so that future generations of young Americans who wear our uniform will never have to endure the losses in battles that our predecessors did in the 20th century.

Behind me, just a few yards from where we gather today, lies the grave of General George Marshall, an heroic soldier in war and a visionary statesman for peace after the Second World War. He built the armies that enabled freedom to triumph over tyranny in World War II. And after the war, along with President Truman, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, and others, he inspired America to make the investments and forge the institutions that built the peace, reached out to former adversaries, spread democracy and prosperity, and ultimately won the Cold War. General George Marshall was the very first full-time soldier ever to win the Nobel Prize for Peace. A half-century ago, he knew that in order to be strong at home and safe at home, we had to lead the world to a more secure and better place.

Now, at the end of the Cold War, when there appears to be no looming threat on the horizon, we must rise to Marshall's challenge in our day. We must remember the lessons of those who gave their lives in World War II and those who worked so hard to make sure that we would prevail in the Cold War and not have to go back to war again. We must create the institutions and the understandings that will advance the security and prosperity of the American people for the next 50 years.

This great endeavor must begin in Europe. Twice in this century -- indeed, twice within a period of a few decades -- Americans went over there and gave their lives in defense of liberty. Many more stood sentry with our European allies through the long night of the Cold War.

Today, our generation has been given a precious chance to redeem that sacrifice and service, to build an undivided, democratic European continent at peace for the very first time in history.

Over the course of this week, beginning this evening, I will travel to Europe to advance this goal. Tomorrow, in Paris, President Yeltsin of Russia, my fellow NATO leaders, and I will join an historic signing of the Founding Act of the NATO-Russia partnership, opening a new era of cooperation in Europe to bridge the historic divisions there.

Then I will have the great honor to represent you in the Netherlands, joining with leaders from all over Europe to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Marshall Plan, the plan that helped Europe to recover its prosperity and secure its liberty. I will challenge Europe's people to work together with America to complete the work that General Marshall's began -- extending the reach of security and prosperity to the new democracies in Europe that once were on the other side in the Cold War.

Finally, I will have a chance to meet with the new Prime Minister of Great Britain to celebrate our unique partnership with our old and close ally.

My fellow Americans, if you look at all the gray stones here today, you will see that they have not died in vain, when you see what we enjoy today and that we stand at the pinnacle of our power, our success, and our influence as a nation. But that means we stand at the pinnacle of our responsibility.

At the end of World War II, General Marshall could make that case to America. We fought a bloody war because we did not assume that responsibility at the end of World War I. Today it is perhaps more difficult because we feel no impending threat as we did from the communist forces in the Cold War.

But I ask you when you leave this place today to ask yourself, as an American, what can I do to honor the sacrifices of those we honor here today. For what did General Marshall dedicate his life? For what did these people fight and die? And how can we make sure that we have a new century in which we do not repeat the mistakes of the last one?

I will say, the only way that can happen is if America refuses to walk away from the world and its present challenges. We must learn the lessons General Marshall and his generation left us. Their sacrifice and their spirit call upon us to seize this moment, to shape the peace of the present for future generations, to turn the hope we share into a history we can all be proud of.

And so on this day when we remember those who gave everything for our nation and its freedom, let us resolve to honor them by renewing our commitment on the edge of a new century and a new era, to lead the world toward greater peace and security, freedom and prosperity. In doing that, we will make

Americans safer. We will allow our men and women in uniform to stand sentinel for our freedom with less risk to their lives.

May God always bless the American heroes we honor today. May He bless those fallen and those who still stand at the ready. May He always bless the United States, and may He always give us the wisdom to do what is right for tomorrow.

Thank you and God bless you all. (Applause.)

END

11:42 A.M. EDT

Pool Report #2
Handshakes in The Hague

The president made some brief comments to your pool on the Jones case in between shaking hands along downtown sidewalks. He was clearly prepared to address the matter, and walked over to speak with the pool, eliminating the need for awkward shouted questions.

The president got a three-part question: Was he concerned about the precedent the Supreme Court apparently has set on future presidents? Has the case been a distraction for him? Is he considering a settlement, "regardless of the merits" of the case, to avoid further distractions?

The president's response: He said he heard Bennett talking about the case this morning on CNN. "I have nothing really to add to what he said. I think I should continue to let him speak for me.

"As to what might happen to future presidents, I am concerned about that. There may not be anything to be done about that. The Supreme Court made its decision."

Pressed again on a settlement, Clinton responded: "I think I'll let him (Bennett) comment on all this. I want to do my job, and his job is to deal with that."

Clinton said the matter has not been a distraction for him in Europe. Why not? "This is too big," he said.

Then he walked across the street to continue shaking hands before hopping back in the motorcade to be dropped off at the Palace.

McCurry said Clinton was prepared for the matter to come up at the three-way news conference. But your pool got stiffed by the officious Dutch official in charge of recognizing all questioners. McCurry said Clinton was happy to get the question and his non-answer out of the way, so it was not left hanging in the air.

McCurry also said Clinton spoke with Bennett while in Paris yesterday.

Working with the Dutch, by the way, has not been an unalloyed pleasure for your pool. In addition to getting stiff-armed at the news conference, there was minor unpleasantness as we were leaving. Kris Engskov tried to keep a door clear for the pool, since the president's motorcade was leaving immediately. Several Dutch reporters tried to charge past him; Engskov, polite as ever, made it clear in stern terms that this was not acceptable. "Yankee go home," said one Dutch reporter at the back of the crowd, to the merriment of his colleagues. Engskov points out that, as a technical matter, he is not a Yankee.

John Harris
Washington Post
Josh Shenk
US News

Pool Report #1
May 28, 1997

Brief photo-op at the Binnenhof Palace with the Dutch Prime Minister and the European Union President. A Dutch reporter asked the President about the Marshall Plan and whether Clinton has a new Marshall Plan and whether Clinton has a new Marshall Plan in store. His response in part: "this meeting between the United States and the European Union is a symbol of how we're fulfilling the real dream and promise of the Marshall Plan and we're making some good progress...I expect a new set of initiatives that meets the demands of this time and will have impact equal to the impact of the Marshall Plan." As Clinton turned away, a U.S. reporter tried to ask him about a matter "back home," but Clinton was out of the room before questions could be posed.

Your pool gets another shot at Clinton later this morning when the three leaders are expected to briefly take questions.

John Harris, The Washington Post
Josh Shenk, U.S. News & World Report

POOL REPORT 8-A,8 (Pool Report #3)
MAY 28, 1997

PALACE GREETING, LUNCHEON, MARSHALL SPEECH

Clinton and HRC were greeted at Noordeinde Palace by Queen Beatrix under chandeliers in the blue-and white Balcony Room. As cameras snapped, POTUS engaged in some pleasant banter with Crown Prince William Alexander, the Prince of Orange.

Clinton said he was surprised at the number of TV cameras he runs into everywhere he goes in The Hague. "They must have the same network with a lot of cameras. How many networks do you have?" he asked the prince. Seven or eight, the prince replied, to which Clinton said, "That's good." Then, "I had quite an exciting time last night ... channel surfing. ... I love to go to Japan and do that. I watch the Sumo wrestling." Yes, this is actual dialogue.

The luncheon with OSCE leaders took place in the misnamed "Small Ballroom" of the palace, actually quite a large affair with a high concave white ceiling and walls of gold-colored marble. High along the walls were plaster reliefs of winged mythological beasts (perhaps Griffins) in pairs. Pairs of doors, teal green with gold trimming, ran down the walls.

Clinton was seated at a LONG table that held about 60 guests, with Queen Beatrix to his left and Hillary across the table, sitting next to the Prince Consort. On the table were displays with real candles burning, 10 to a setting. Chandeliers with electric candles burned overhead.

You should have the text of Clinton's toast. Queen Beatrix spoke first, while POTUS listened pensively, nodding in agreement from time to time.

The motorcade to Binnenhoff Palace was uneventful, although it passed crowds, mostly assembled where roads over the canal had been blocked by police. Several waved U.S. flags, or balloons with an American flag on them. The citizens of Hague were smiling, but not overly enthusiastic. There was one sign from PETA welcoming Clinton, but adding, "Please Ban the Leg-Hold Trap." One woman the motorcade passed wore a dress in the colors of the U.S. flag.

As Clinton arrived in the courtyard of Binnenhoff, a brass band on a stage struck up a tune. He was greeted with a standing ovation as he entered the Ridderzaal accompanied by the Queen and HRC.

You probably saw the room on TV, but it was breathtaking: a vaulted wooden ceiling perhaps 100 feet high, stained glass windows with the emblems of Dutch localities, a large area to one side under an awning, under which stood a pair of red-covered thrones.

The event began with a blaring of trumpets from a balcony behind Clinton, which was met by more trumpets on the stage in front of him, joined by other instruments, including saxaphones, which Clinton followed with interest, bobbing his head to the music. On either side of the main stage - which held a huge, gold-colored rendition of George C. Marshall's signature, were movie screens which flashed pictures of post-World War II history, beginning with the war's devastation, and continuing with Arafat, Ghandi, Adenauer, De Gaulle, JFK, etc. For some reason it ended with the US moon landing in 1969.

As Dutch PM Kok was speaking, a huge crash could be heard in the back of the room. We were told later that a German photographer had fallen off the riser, and that someone had called for a doctor. No word on the photographer's condition.

After Clinton's speech, we were treated to the bizarre spectacle of young men and women, dressed in skin-tight suits in the color of all Europe's flags, dancing and twirling, with what looked like blue tubing running from their shoulders to their wrists. After the solemn speeches, the effect was a little like having the Los Angeles Olympics invade Westminster Abbey. This was followed by a rendition of "We are the World," more pictures on screens - including of Jimi Hendrix and Woodstock - and a (no kidding) singing version of Marshall's Harvard Commencement address, followed by 5 young men and women reading from the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris, etc, etc. This had all the marks of a Mort or Harry Thomasson production....

Clinton and HRC did an unscheduled walk-about down a small Hague street, with a 10-minute stop at an outdoor bistro, before heading to the N. Palace and then on to Rotterdam. Color to come...

STROBEL, Wash Times.

Pool Report # 5
Wilhelmina Pier, Rotterdam, and Tour of Delft
28 May 1997

No news just color.

1) Thank You America ceremony. Rotterdam

It looked like the campaign again except the crowd was Dutch and the backdrop was the Port of Rotterdam, from which according to Clinton more than one million Dutch folk emigrated to America. The dramatic Erasmus Bridge, nicknamed "The Swan" by locals and linking the city's southern district Kok van Zuid to Coolsingel, lay behind the podium. As POTUS looked out he saw a relaxed throng with carnival booths, inflatable moonwalks and sea dragons, a Heineken stand, and cargo containers stacked on top of each other decorated with green and white bunting.

The Clintons were greeted by children bearing pale yellow tulips. Hillary kissed one of the children three times in European fashion. "You're so precious," Hillary said.

POTUS was preceded by Bram Peper, the mayor of Rotterdam, who mentioned that Baltimore was its sister city. Gustaav Sedee, the Dutch man and former exchange student to the U.S. who had introduced Clinton earlier at The Hague, introduced him again. POTUS gave him a an actual copy of the Feb. 4, 1949 New York Herald Tribune which mentioned the meeting of Sedee's student group with President Truman. It was wrapped in plastic and Sedee held it over his head like an Oscar.

After POTUS' remarks (you have transcript), Clinton pulled a lever which made the sides of a faux shipping crate fall away to reveal a bronze relief of Gen. Marshall set in a beige stone. Then a children's choir from the American School in The Hague and the International School in Rotterdam made POTUS feel right at home with a rousing rendition of Fleetwood Mac's "Don't Stop Thinking About Tomorrow." They were dressed in white shirts and black pants. Mayor and Mrs. Peper danced and clapped, and the Clintons swayed to the music. At the end of the song, Clinton punched the air, laughing and smiling, and gave the kids and their loose-limbed director Jim Yarnell a big thumbs up. From behind the stage they released balloons and doves. Someone in the crowd yelled, "C'mon Hillary, speak!," which got a smile.

The Clintons worked the rope line (no cane). Hillary brought Sedee down to see his son in the audience and said, "Thank you, you were wonderful. Your whole family was part of this," and showed him the newspaper POTUS had given Gustaav. The schoolkids were brought over to meet Clinton, causing much Secret Service consternation.

As we walked towards the motorcade, Berger, veteran of a thousand campaign stops, came up to your pool and joked: "Our next stop is Cleveland."

Motorcade notes: Coming from The Hague to Rotterdam, your pool overheard one woman in the crowd say to another: "If you ask me, this is overkill on Bill." There were clumps of spectators all along the route, waving, taking pictures and mostly just standing there. Just before getting to the port, we saw one Rip Van Winkle holding up a large red banner emblazoned with Che Guevara's face.

2) Tour of Delft

Returning home, motorcade stopped in Delft, a gorgeous old city. We walked through large and growing crowds to the cobbled town square. Its main features are a 16th century town hall and the 15th century New Church, with its high steeple and the graves of most of the House of Orange. There was a real scrum as we walked to our objective; there were lots of teenagers who smelled of beer yelling at Bill, local news folks, Dutch police unused to the Secret Service's ways, people sitting in open windows trying to catch a glimpse of the Clintons (the news of his tour had been on the radio for several hours). People were friendly but the crowds were thick and agents had to do a lot of shoving.

We first stopped at the Royal Delft-Ware DePorceleynne Fles which has been making blue and white porcelainware since 1653. POTUS looked in the window and someone asked, "Do you like the china?" He nodded and said "Very much." The first couple then stopped at Het Wapen Van Delft, a cafe-restaurant best known for its mussels. He sat on the second floor, just inside the leaded windows; every time he looked outside the crowd cheered and waved.

Clinton was served by Alain Soltani, a 17-year-old economics student who said he talked with POTUS for five minutes about why his family had come to Holland from Iran. Asked to repeat his story, he said, "It's only for the president." Clinton, joined by Commerce Secretary Bill Daley, Bruce Lindsey, Sandy Berger and John Podesta, ordered poffarges, which are thick, sweet eggy pancakes the size of a silver dollar, with strawberries and whipped cream. Mrs. C. had them with cherries and whipped cream. Leaving the restaurant, the president said "It was wonderful. I had the strawberry and the cherry." The menu price was 9.75 guilders.

Clinton then took a snail-paced motorcade through the crowd to the New Church. When he entered, the organist, Bram Vroome (translation of Vroome: "pious"), was playing "The Star Spangled Banner." He had been instructing students and the mayor, who gave Clinton the tour of the church, asked him to stay to play for POTUS. Berger walked up to your pool and said: "How many times do you hear the Star Spangled Banner on an organ in a 15th century Dutch church?" The far end of the church is actually a mausoleum which holds the bodies of the Family of Orange, the Dutch royal family. It is the only place in Holland, a curator said, where bodies can be legally

buried indoors.

Clinton was told that the crypt has not been opened since 1962, the last time a royal died. Once a year the mayor and pastor of the church go into the basement to examine the sarcophagi; they are the only ones with the key, and they must go together.

Clinton asked also about the ceilings, which were made of wood and replaced last in 1536 after a fire. The curator said "they were only medium old." Clinton said, "By American standards they are quite old." He also said he had never seen a church built before the Reformation that had been converted to the Calvinist style (the pews don't face the end of the church but are arranged to face three sides of an altar moved to the center of the structure). POTUS was quite interested in this.

Each pew had a warmer and a steel plate at the feet to keep parishoners' feet toasty. Hillary said, "I've always been so cold in cathedrals. This is a great idea." Clinton said "If we were here on Sunday, I'd love to come to church here." As they left, Clinton asked that the organist be brought down for a thank-you and told him that "I liked it all." He wrote in the guestbook: "Thank you for the wonderful time in your magnificent church."

Dina Temple-Raston, Bloomberg
Josh Shenk, USNWR
Jef McAllister, TIME

Pool Report #3
May 30, 1997

The President and Mrs. Clinton left #10 Downing Street at 4:05 pm, ten minutes after the President's press conference with Tony Blair ended. The Clintons and the Blairs posed for photos outside of #10 before the Clintons left for the 13 minute ride to Winfield House, the 35-room residence of the U.S. Ambassador in Regents Park, North London.

The President's motorcade drove along White Hall, where hundreds of people lined the streets and waved at the President's limosine. A woman held up a sign which said "Help the Homeless." The motorcade drive past Buckingham Palace, where a fatal traffic accident had occurred earlier in the day.

The motorcade proceeded without noticeable incident up to Marble Arch, Oxford Street, Gloucester Place, Park Road, and through Hanover Gate in to Regents Park and the Ambassador's residence.

The President and Mrs. Clinton entered the mansion for a brief rest before they met with American embassy employees and their families and U.S. Navy officers and their families. As we walked along the driveway in front of the house, we saw silver keys left in the front door, under the canopied entrance.

Yours truly and the rest of the pool were ushered into the bowels of the mansion where we were greeted by 5 telephones, 4 blue cloth covered tables, a table saw and jig saw, a rumpled American flag, and several non-gourmet sandwiches.

Rumors, and they are only rumors, and they are still only rumors, are that the Clintons will meet the Blairs for a sightseeing tour and dinner later in the evening. The location of their walkabout and their dining experience are being kept secret because the President said if the word leaked out about where they would go he would cancel.

The up to the minute last word is that the President would not leave Winfield House until at least 6pm.

Lou Salone
Cox Newspapers

Pool Report #5
May 29, 1997

Terence Conran was one of the large group of businessmen who supported Blair's campaign at an early date. Blair called Conran on Wednesday to ask him about bringing the Clintons over for dinner tonight. Conran was not about to say no.

Lou Salone
Cox Newspapers

The great Presidential mystery tour began at 6:19 p.m. when President and Mrs. Clinton left their 200 hundred guests at Winfield House and drove across the city to the south bank of the River Thames where they met Tony and Cherie Blair at Le Pont De La Tour restaurant, officially billed "Wine Merchants, Bar and Grill, Food Store, Baker, Oil and Spice Shop."

The Clintons arrived at 6:45 pm and met the Blairs who were waiting inside the restaurant. They strolled briefly along the river walkway behind the restarant and movced inside for dinner at 7pm.

Blair said "thank you, thank you very much," when people shouted "Tony," and Clinton said "thank you" and "thanks." That was all that was audible above the din of the helicopters and music blaring from a large two-masted sailboat docked right outside the restaurant.

The restarant is considered one of London's finest and is owned by designer and restaurateur Terence Conran.

The restaurant overlooks the River Thames, Tower Bridge, and the Tower of London. The bridge is about 100 yards west of the restaurant and the Tower of London is on the opposite side of the river.

A large number of police gathered along Shad Thames, the narrow street where the restaurant is located and where large crowds of people greeted the president's motorcade. Some people waved and smiled but there was no shouting or open displays of welcome.

The restaurant is located on a section of river front called Butler's Wharf.

The Clintons traveled from Winfield House along a maze of major streets and narrow roadways through the West End, past Hyde Park, in front of Buckingham Palace, past Whitehall and Big Ben, over Westminster Bridge and then along a number of small streets on the south side of the Thames until they reached the restaurant.

The dinner was expected to last about 2 hours, but there's no telling how long they will they will dine and what they will do next. Stay tuned...

Lou Salone
Cox Newspapers

Pool Report 5/28/97 (Pool Report #4)
 Clintons stroll through Hague shopping street

After the Marshall Plan speech (to be covered in another pool report), the motorcade deposited us in a quaint part of downtown. The Clintons turned down Denneweg, a street of bistros, antique shops, boutiques and bakeries. People lined the streets and more came out of the shops as the hubub approached. POTUS shook hands, smiled and waved, sometimes received polite applause. The crowds, being Dutch, were exceedingly well-behaved; they didn't press around him much and generally waited for him to make the first move. There were guys drinking beer, chefs who emerged from their kitchens, small children. At the Ulysses bookstore POTUS examined some volumes on tables outside; he admired merchandise in the window of the Ten Boom antique store, "Sinds 1878." A dog kept yapping as the entourage approached. "The dog's not convinced," quipped deputy chief of staff John Podesta. Ron Fournier struck up conversation with Mrs. Clinton, asking her how she was enjoying herself. "We're having a great time," she answered with feeling. One generous soul offered the president a sip of beer, which he took; the crowd cheered and applauded. POTUS was also offered a raw herring, which he waved off. According to the U.S. chargé d'affaires, May 28 is the first day of the herring season and the frenzy for the new crop here is comparable to what Parisians feel for *beaujolais nouveau*. We saw an aide carrying a small styrofoam tray with two herrings slathered in onions a few minutes later; no news on their eventual fate.

The scrum then turned left into Hooistraat, where a few doors down the presidential party sat down outside for a drink like any tourists on a pleasant spring day. The establishment was the Bar-Bistro Hooischaar. POTUS bantered with the waitress, who brought him coffee, tea for Mrs. Clinton and her aide Kelly Goodhead (sp?), and beers for Podesta and Bruce Lindsey. National Security Advisor Berger joined them a few minutes later and had a beer too. A crowd looked on from across the narrow street; no one bothered the party with shouts or interruptions. It really was fairly nice. When the group got up to go, Clinton said "bye" and the crowd said "bye" back. As he made his way towards the limo, Clinton stopped to chat for a minute to a Dutch officer on a bike. He was Lt. Col. Martin Slingenberg, who met Clinton two years ago at a conference in Hawaii. Clinton appeared to recognize him when he was drinking his coffee and came over to check his recollection.

We caught Berger for a minute and asked him about the wire report that quoted Chirac as saying that Yeltsin did mean to say that the Russians would destroy warheads, rather than just detarget them as senior U.S. officials glossed the news last night. He stuck up for the U.S. interpretation. "We talked to Primakov," he said with a shrug. "They come off in 2003 anyway because of START 1," he said. "If he wants to take them off faster, they can ratify START 2."

McAllister TIME

(Pool Report #2)

Pool Report #12
Cabinet Meeting at #10
May 29, 1997

Since you have the transcript of the remarks, herewith some bloody color from the Bill and Tony Show and 10 Downing:

The pool could not see the two leaders when they immediately entered Downing and walked down a corridor with yellow wallpaper and plenty of artwork. Just before entering the Cabinet Room, they walked through a room with red wallpaper, a very prominent marble bust of Benjamin Disraeli and a portrait of William Pitt. The Cabinet Room itself has light yellow walls, three chandeliers and five tall windows. It is very airy and bright. There was a clock on the mantelpiece over the fireplace and a portrait of an old gent with a flowing white wig atop his head. Alas, even with the benefit of telephoto lens, the pool could not make out his name beyond Sir Robert. The cabinet table itself is rectangular, not oval. There were 11 persons sitting on the side opposite the PM and the Pres; one on the end to their left and nine other joining Blair and Clinton on their side. Of the 21 (not counting Blair and Clinton) at the table, five were women.

Placed on the table were several decanters of water and seven silver candlestick holders. Oddly, there were no candles in them. Most of the ministers also had in front of them red binders with their titles (Secretary of State for Northern Ireland; Secretary of State for Education, etc.) embossed on them under a crown. Most also had a blue pencil in front of them. Clinton had one of those blue pencils. But in what most likely was a fit of pique left over from 1776, his pencil, like the others, was marked in large white letters "Government Property." They weren't taking any chances on some guy from the colonies running off with their pencil.

When Clinton and Blair entered the room, the members did not stand. They greeted them with applause delivered with some of that legendary British reserve. Warm and beyond polite, but not enthusiastic. The president, looking very ruddy today, shook hands with one minister and sat down, leaning his cane against the table so that it was between him and Blair. There was a burst of enthusiasm from the ministers when Blair concluded his remarks with praise for the president's leadership. Many of the cabinet members pounded the table and said, "Hear, hear."

When the president made his remarks, Blair gazed at him like a schoolboy with a crush. Admirably understates it. Only when Wolf Blitzer posed two questions did the PM look anxious or distressed. But he and the other members guffawed appreciatively when the president mentioned their 179 seat majority.

(Pool Report #1)

Pool report 11; May 29, 1997; From the Hague to London

POTUS kept the motorcade waiting for hours it seemed on the driveway of Noordeinde Palace. We finally left for helicopter ride about 9:45 a.m.

Crowds of people lined up along the motorcade route, some of them fairly large in size. In fact, a good many people stood behind a police barricade at the queen's residence to witness the president's departure.

The crowds were largest along Mauritskade Street. Some people held signs, "Bye Bill and Hillary" said one. "Thanks for taking all the cars away Bill," said another, in apparent reference to the street being closed off to traffic during Clinton's visit.

Within 10 minutes, the president arrived at the landing zone, a nondescript field really with rather long grass. He walked, using his cane, to Marine One, with Mrs. Clinton at his side.

Dutch Prime Minister Kok and his wife accompanied the Clintons to Schipol Airport in Amsterdam, where a receiving line awaited them at the steps of Air Force One. The two couples greeted about a dozen dignitaries from the Dutch government, often stopping to chat. Then Clinton did a cheek to cheek goodbye with the prime minister's wife and shook Kok's hand. Kok followed Clinton's lead and did the same with the two of them. The Clintons walked to the top of the stairs of Air Force One and waved. The Koks stood at the bottom of the stairs and waved back.

Nobody came to the back of the plane to chat.

On the tarmac in London, McCurry said it was fairly unusual for an American president to meet with the entire cabinet of the British government. He said Clinton and Blair were "going to do a full tour of all the bilateral issues that we deal with."

During the cabinet meeting, he said, the plan was to talk about some of the issues Blair's government outlined in the Green speech. "There are some similarities of things that new labour has proposed, but I think they reflect that the United States and the United Kingdom are post-World War post-industrial societies," McCurry said.

McCurry said Blair and Clinton will meet privately for a while today, have lunch and do the press conference. They'll probably end up going out for some sightseeing and to dinner at a restaurant about 8:30, allowing Clinton to leave London about 9:30 tonight. He said Mrs. Clinton has her own plans for the day, including a production at the Globe Theatre with Mrs. Blair.

Asked about Northern Ireland peace talks, McCurry said simply, "We maintain ongoing contact with the parties. We don't detail when and where we talk to them."

The Clintons looked rather old walking down the stairs of Air Force One, perhaps because the mister was using his cane and the misses was wearing a sky-blue coat dress that simply looked too matronly. A fly or bee crossed her face as she was walking down the stairs, which she waved off with her hand.

A red carpet laid the entire distance between the plane and the car. The Clintons were greeted by representatives of the British government, including from the offices of the queen, the foreign and commonwealth.

The motorcade to Downing Street was interesting in as much as this city bustles with people and activity. The van the pool was in was a trip: It had high ceilings and low windows. It was perfect for a 3-year-old, but most of us are a little older and bigger than that. Suffice it to say we all got crooks in our necks and back pain from hunching over to see out of the windows.

If for no other reason, one sign made the pain worth enduring: A huge United Airlines billboard parked on the curb on Cromwell Road. It read: "US candidate wins British election."

Ann Scales

The Boston Globe

Two sidenotes: When the president mentioned seeing someone on TV, he was directing his remarks at Mo Mowlam, the Northern Ireland Secretary, who was sitting across the table and a little bit to the right of the president. She seemed very pleased to be so singled out.

Also just a few minutes before the president arrived, there was an abrupt change in the planned positioning for the pool camera. It turns out, according to a British aide, that David Blunkett, the first blind member of a cabinet, had parked his seeing eye dog, Lucy, in the spot for the camera. Blunkett, according to one British reporter, is the education secretary. Once the proceedings started, Lucy could not be spotted in the cabinet room, although it is possible she was either under the table or hidden from pool view by the British pool.

-- George Condon, Copley News Service

**Memorial Day, May 26, 1997
Pool Report #1**

President Clinton wore a black suit, black tie and white shirt for his appearance at Arlington National Cemetery. He was hatless, but the intermittent rain stopped when he stood in the open for the laying of the wreath and his addresss. He used a cane, which he carried in his left hand. The motorcade to and from the cemetery was uneventful, and the ceremony went off without a hitch. You'll have the speech.

--James Rosen, McClatchy Newspapers

May 26-27 aboard air force one.

Your pool shooed away McCurry after he insisted he had nothing to say that berger/talbott had not already briefed on last week.

Another senior administration official went through a bit of the history leading up to today's signing. He said the Administration in the first term put time and debate into how to deal with post Cold War Europe, leading to Janaury 1994 when Clinton announced the partnership for peace and said Nato enlargement is not a question of if but when.

He says that Clinton has understood that "this is a relatively unique moment in history where once again the United States really is the preeminent force on the national scene." The U.S. has a strong economy. ``The President's own stature abroad is very high and there is a world that is looking at the United States for leadership.''

On another matter he noted that in London Clinton will be meeting with Blair's full cabinet which is quite unusual and a ``sign of the kind of partnership these two leaders want to build.''

we landed at 8:15 am to a red carpet on the tarmac and a low key greeting from Donald Bandler, the deputy chief of mission. McCurry told us that Bruce Lindsey's 49th birthday was celebrated on Air Force One.

and with that to all a good night.

mittchell/ nytimes.

Pool Report #1

May 27, 1997

Clinton-Chirac Bilateral

We were whisked quickly in and out. Clinton sat on a small sofa next to Chirac with a group of French and American officials arrayed in a semi-circle in front of them. The American officials included Albright, Talbott, and Berger. Clinton spoke softly, but we were able to pull these quotes after listening several times to the tape recorder.

Clinton was asked about Russian assertions that they would a veto over NATO matters. he responded "I think we all understand what we doing here and its a good thing. NATO will come out of it unimpaired, with a good partner in Russia, and that's what we want."

As we were leaving, clinton was asked whether he would tell Chirac that it was possible to have a balanced budget with a divided government. The President laughed and said "Hey, he still has another election yet. He doesn't know if he will have a divided government or not."

Glenn Kessler
Newsday

Pool Report #2

May 28, 1997

Elysee Palace Signing Ceremony

The Founding Act was signed about 10:45 a.m. Paris time by members of NATO plus Russian President Yeltsin and NATO Secretary General Solana. The accord was signed in a rust red room of the Elysee Palace marked by at least 24 crystal chandeliers, gilt and tapestries. The atmosphere was slightly tense until Yeltsin caused a ripple of laughter when he took a deep sigh and then signed the document.

There were actually two copies, one bound in blue, and one bound in red. When the all 18 heads of government, including Solana had signed, Yelstin took a copy and Solana took a copy and Yeltsin kissed Solana on the cheek. Each man spoke and underscored what they refered to as the historic nature of the event.

The documents were signed by each man with ink pens, which they all kept, and then each head of government made remarks. During the signing, Tony Blair, the new Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Clinton, who sat next to each other, kept talking even when they were signing. It was as if they could not wait to compare political strategy and the personalities of various aides.

When each head of government arrived at the palace, he was greeted by Chirac and the Republican Guard, France's highest honor guard, who flanked the traditional red carpet. Chirac had a few personal words for each man and did not seem nervous about explaining his current political troubles. He asked clinton how his knee was doing as he escorted him up the stairs.

Later, at the signing creremony, Chirac said that the founding act they were signing opened up a new chapter in the history of Europe, a chapter without precedent in that it expresses a common vision of the future. It then took quite a while as each head of government said his piece about the historic nature of the day before they went to lunch.

Ann McFeatters
Scripps Howard

As Tony Blair finished his remarks about hope, growth, opportunity and the end of divisiveness in Europe, Clinton flashed him a huge smile and gave him a big, bold thumbs up. This is clearly the class friendship of the summit. Incidentally, there was an uproar among reporters during the ceremony about whether Yeltsin meant to say warheads were being removed physically, as was translated, thus making news, or was merely restating earlier thoughts on retargeting, with the latter being the consensus of the moment lacking a direct question to Yeltsin and pending clarification later.

The leaders moved outside to the absolutely beautiful green velvet lawn overlooking a lavish fountain and flanked by rose gardens in bloom. The heads stood on the palace steps. Clinton was between the Turkish p.m. and Yeltsin and at one point Clinton, Yeltsin and Chirac (tall guys in the front) all held hands at the instigation of the photogs. Clinton laughed and said, "Were we even all looking forward at the same time?" In the background, Albright was seen in a lavender suit working her peers. They broke quickly for lunch where press was kept out.

McFeatters
Scripps Howard