

FOIA MARKER

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

Original OA/ID Number: CF 412				
Document ID: White House Talking Points [Whitewater/FBI Files]				
Stack: V	Row: 21	Section: 3	Shelf: 4	Position: 3

WHITEWATER/FBI FILES/DRUG USE

Q: What do you make of this FBI files issue?

A: The President and I am appalled at the invasion of privacy that resulted in 1993 when the White House obtained FBI reports on people who no longer work there. The President has apologized to those whose privacy has been violated. No one is more determined than he is to get to the bottom of this. The White House is cooperating with the Independent Counsel investigation and the ongoing congressional inquiries. We have taken action to make sure that this will never happen again -- not in this administration and not in any future administration.

Background: The Senate and the House are expected to hold additional days of hearings on this issue in the coming weeks. The Independent Counsel continues to examine the incident.

Q: Does Mrs. Clinton know Craig Livingstone's mother?

A: No. Mrs. Clinton has stated that she does not know Mrs. Livingstone. Mrs. Livingstone -- herself -- says she has never met Mrs. Clinton.

Q: What is your reaction to Anthony Marceca's invoking of the 5th Amendment before the Senate?

A: Although Mr. Marceca had the right to do what he did, the President and I are disappointed that the public's right to know all the facts has been partly blocked for the time being. The President has instructed the White House staff to cooperate fully to provide the complete facts to the public.

Q: Will Whitewater damage the Clinton Administration's re-election prospects?

A: No. I have faith that the American people are fair-minded. They understand that Whitewater has now been examined for four years by an unprecedented number of reporters, two Independent Counsels, Congress and the Resolution Trust Corporation. We have cooperated fully with every legitimate inquiry. Throughout all of this, there has never been any showing that the First Lady or President did anything wrong or unethical.

I firmly believe the American people are far more concerned with the real issues that effect their lives on a daily basis -- balancing the budget, reforming welfare, providing

safe streets for our families, investing in education for our children, protecting the environment and preserving medicare. These are the issues people care about now -- and will care about come election time.

Q: What are your thoughts about Bruce Lindsey being named an unindicted co-conspirator?

A: Bruce Lindsey has said under oath he has done nothing wrong, and we do not doubt his word. For more than a year, Mr. Lindsey has cooperated with the Independent Counsel and Congress by responding to each and every question about the 1990 Gubernatorial Campaign and Perry County Bank. And he continued his cooperation by testifying in the ongoing trial in Little Rock.

Background: The President discussed Mr. Lindsey on June, 19: "He was thoroughly investigated and not charged with ample opportunities. I've got lots of confidence in him. I'm confident he didn't do anything wrong."

Q: What role is the President playing in the Hill and Branscum trial?

A: The President provided the Court with the information it needed in the form of a videotaped deposition. The President has always said he will provide whatever information the Court deems necessary. Americans understand that in this case -- as in the case that concluded in May -- the prosecution did not seek the President's testimony. Instead, his testimony was requested by the defendants, who believe he had relevant information to offer.

Background: The President's videotaped testimony was played on Thursday, July 18, 1996.

Q: What are your thoughts on reports that the Clinton Administration hired staff with recent drug use in their pasts?

A: The President has been very clear: he has an absolute zero-tolerance standing for drug use at the White House. This is a policy that has been maintained throughout the Clinton Administration.

New White House employees must submit to drug tests, and all employees are subject to random testing. We have stated on previous occasions that a White House appointment was given to a small number of individuals who admitted to having used drugs in the recent past. In these cases, a special drug-testing program was established to monitor these individuals. The Congress has no such program or policy.

WHITEWATER/FBI FILES/TRAVEL OFFICE

Questions and Answers

Q: What are your thoughts about Bruce Lindsey being named an unindicted co-conspirator?

A: Bruce Lindsey has said under oath he has done nothing wrong, and we do not doubt his word. For more than a year, Mr. Lindsey has cooperated with the Independent Counsel and Congress by responding to each and every question about the 1990 Gubernatorial Campaign and Perry County Bank. Mr. Lindsey will soon testify in public about the facts, and he welcomes the opportunity to do so.

Q: What do you make of this FBI files issue?

A: The obtaining of the FBI background files summaries by the White House's personnel security office in late 1993 and early 1994 is inexcusable. No one is more upset about this than the President. The President has apologized to the people whose files were obtained and his Counsel, Jack Quinn, has taken action to make sure that this will never happen again - not in this administration and not in any future administrations.

The White House is NOT conducting its own investigation into this issue. The Independent Counsel is examining the issue and the White House has been cooperating with this inquiry.

What is clear is that the procedures for obtaining FBI background summary files in place for some three decades, through seven administrations, at both the White House and the FBI, were not adequate. The White House has moved very aggressively to address the problems that clearly existed. The White House has instituted a number of reforms to govern the procedures for White House requests to the FBI for background investigation material. In addition, the Office of Personnel Security has been restructured and will now be staffed entirely by career professionals. It is headed by Charles "Chuck" Easley, a long-time career professional. Finally, the White House placed the former Director of the Personnel Security Office on paid administrative lead.

Q: What role will the President play in the trial in Little Rock involving the two bankers?

A: The President has always said that he will provide whatever information the Court deems necessary. Americans will understand that in this case -- as in the case that just concluded -- the prosecution is not seeking the President's testimony. As the Office of the Independent Counsel has emphasized, the indictments against the bankers do not charge the President with any wrongdoing. Instead,

President's testimony is being requested by one of the defendants, who believes that the President has relevant information to offer. The President will provide the Court with the information it requests.

Q: Will the White House turn over the remaining travel office documents the House Government Oversight Committee is seeking?

A: The remaining documents have nothing to do with the FBI files issue. Ninety percent of the remaining documents were created over the last year to prepare for Congressional hearings.

We have bent over backwards in an attempt to reach an agreement with the Republican Congress on the remaining documents. We are open to having continued discussions with the Republicans. However, the Republicans seem far more interested in provoking a political confrontation designed to gain headlines than in reaching an agreement. Why is this? The answer is simple: 1996 is a presidential election year, and the President's partisan opponents are bound and determined to inflict political damage on him. At some point we have to say enough is enough.

Q: What are your thoughts on the Whitewater verdicts?

A: There was one thing everyone involved with this trial -- prosecutors and the defense -- could agree on: The President had nothing to do with the allegations that were the subject of the trial. In a time when the President's political opponents seem to be trying to put their own partisan spin on what this trial means, I would listen to the jurors who heard all the evidence. These jurors stated that they found the President's testimony credible but that his testimony did not relate to the transactions that were the focus of the trial -- which is what we have said all along and what even the prosecutor said during his closing argument.

Q: Will Whitewater damage the President's re-election prospects?

A: No. We have faith that the American people are fair-minded. They understand that Whitewater has now been examined for four years by an unprecedented number of reporters, two Independent Counsels, Congress and the Resolution Trust Corporation. The White House has cooperated fully with every legitimate inquiry. Throughout all of this, there has never been any showing that the President or First Lady did anything wrong or unethical.

We firmly believe the American people are far more concerned

with the real issues that effect their lives on a daily basis -- balancing the budget, reforming welfare, protecting our children, investing in education and the environment and preserving medicare. These are the issues people care about now -- and will care about come election time.

Q: What do you think of the recent revelations about Senator D'Amato stock trading practices?

A: I think the facts speak for themselves.

Q: Isn't Whitewater really a question of character and trust?

A: The President makes tough decisions EVERY DAY. During the course of this administration, President Clinton has made some of the toughest and most difficult choices any President has had to make. President Clinton took on the Washington lobbyists and pushed through the largest deficit reduction package in history. The President confronted the NRA in his fight to pass the Brady Bill and the assault weapons ban. The President is taking on the powerful tobacco industry so as to reduce smoking by teenagers. Right now, the President is fighting the Gingrich-Dole Congress to protect American families against the Republican attempt to gut medicare funding for our elderly and education programs for our children. The President has taken on the special interests and the Gingrich-Dole Congress and won because it best serves all Americans. To me, that is what character and trust are all about.

WHITEWATER/FBI FILES/ALDRICH BOOK

Questions and Answers

Q: What do you make of this FBI files issue?

A: The President and I am appalled at the invasion of privacy that resulted in 1993 when the White House obtained FBI reports on people who no longer work there. The President has apologized to those whose privacy has been violated. No one is more determined than he is to get to the bottom of this. The White House is cooperating with the Independent Counsel investigation and the ongoing congressional inquiries. We have taken action to make sure that this will never happen again -- not in this administration and not in any future administration.

Background: The Senate and the House are expected to hold additional days of hearings on this issue in the coming weeks. The Independent Counsel continues to examine the incident.

Q: Did the White House improperly obtain Chris Emory's background file, including IRS related information, as part of an effort to have him fired?

A: I don't know anything about background investigations of Mr. Emory. Presumably the Independent Counsel will pursue questions related to this matter.

Background: Documents produced by Anthony Marceca -- that we cannot vouch for -- suggest that at least Marceca understood that Emory was due for his 5 year reinvestigation. When an employee is reinvestigated, he or she also executes a Tax Check Waiver that permits the IRS to answer certain questions about the tax status of the employee. Mr. Emory is reported to have said that he voluntarily signed the IRS waiver form.

Q: Do you know Craig Livingstone's mother?

A: No. To my knowledge, I have never met Mrs. Livingstone.

Background: Mrs. Livingstone confirmed that she has never met you.

Q: What is your reaction to Anthony Marceca's invoking of the 5th Amendment before the Senate on Friday?

A: Although Mr. Marceca had the right to do what he did today, the President and I are disappointed that the public's right to know all the facts has been partly blocked for the time being. The President has instructed the White House staff

to cooperate fully to provide the complete facts to the public.

Q: Do you think it is appropriate to require White House employees to answer questions regarding their political affiliation?

A: Many White House employees work in close contact with the President and other high level White House aides. The information they see on a daily basis is often of a highly confidential and sensitive nature. It is not at all surprising that before allowing people a certain level of access that you would attempt to gauge their trustworthiness. Remember, all the employees of the White House serve at the pleasure of the President.

Q: What do you think about the new book by former FBI agent Gary Aldrich?

A: It is sad just how far the right wing will go to make a dollar, but after what I have seen from the extreme right since my husband was elected nothing surprises me any more.

Q: Do you think Mr. Aldrich should be called to testify before Congress?

A: That is not really a question for me to decide on.

Q: What are your thoughts about Bruce Lindsey being named an unindicted co-conspirator?

A: Bruce Lindsey has said under oath he has done nothing wrong, and we do not doubt his word. For more than a year, Mr. Lindsey has cooperated with the Independent Counsel and Congress by responding to each and every question about the 1990 Gubernatorial Campaign and Perry County Bank. And he will continue to cooperate by testifying in the ongoing trial in Little Rock.

Background: The President discussed Mr. Lindsey on June, 19: "He was thoroughly investigated and not charged with ample opportunities. I've got lots of confidence in him. I'm confident he didn't do anything wrong."

Q: What role will the President play in the Hill and Branscum trial?

A: The President has always said he will provide whatever information the Court deems necessary. Americans understand that in this case -- as in the case that concluded in May -- the prosecution is NOT seeking the President's testimony. Instead, his testimony is being requested by one of the defendants, who believes he has relevant information to

offer.

Background: The President will be testifying at 2:00 p.m.
on Sunday.

Jane,

Nelson Cunningham
called. Needs you to
review these TP's which
were given to McGung this
morning. Please call if
you have changes b/c they
would need to re-distribute.

3:00pm 6-19 Cheryl

Questions and Answers

FBI Files

Q. How does shifting these responsibilities to another office make the situation any better?

A. Review of security information will now be coordinated by a long-time, career security officer, Chuck Easley. For the past decade, he has handled security for most of the EOP's agencies that are predominately staffed by career employees.

Additionally, the unprecedented procedures put in place by Jack Quinn in his June 14, 1996 memo and agreed to by the FBI, make the process much better than it has ever been before.

Q. Who works in the EOP Security Office?

A. Work involving background investigations in the EOP Security Office is done by career employees of the Office of Administration -- an Executive Office of the President agency which provides common administrative support functions (i.e. computers, human resources for all EOP agencies (the White House Office is another of the 13 EOP agencies).

Q. Will the White House employees who currently staff the White House Personnel Security Office work in the EOP Security Office?

A. Of course, the current employees of the White House Personnel Security Office will assist us in making the transition to the new operations of the EOP Security Office. However, the employees in the EOP Security Office who handle background investigations are career employees in positions that are filled through a competitive process (as opposed to "political appointees" who staff positions within the White House Office). If the employees of the White House Personnel Security Office choose to submit an application as part of the competitive process to fill open positions in the EOP Security Office, they are welcome to do so. However, the advertisements for these positions will clearly state that we are looking to fill the positions with people who have extensive security backgrounds.

Q. Why did the White House request FBI files on officials from previous administrations?

A. As we have said previously, when the previous administration departed from the White House, all files -- including background files -- were removed from the White House. Because many employees remained from the previous administration, Mr. Marceca, a civilian detailed from the Army, was attempting to recreate their security files. Mr. Marceca has said in a sworn statement, that he used a Secret Service access list obtained from a veteran of the office, Nancy Gemmell, to determine those files he needed to request.

Q. How many files were requested?

The FBI list of requested files included 341 names of files that had been archived by Mr. Marceca's replacement, as well as an additional 138 names. The FBI asked the White House to determine whether any of the requests for these individuals had been made mistakenly.

- The White House determined that 47 of these requests had been made properly, 74 were mistaken, and 17 were inconclusive.

The White House returned 71 of the 74 mistakenly requested files to the FBI on June 13, 1996. (Two of the 74 files related to individuals who currently have access. The remaining file had been returned earlier in the week.)

The total number of mistakenly obtained files was 408.

Q. Why was a "long-time Democratic political operative" assigned to work on this project?

The information we have available indicates that Mr. Marceca was assigned to the White House through the proper process for obtaining detailees.

Q. Which senior official from the White House directed these actions?

A. Based on known facts, we have no evidence to indicate that any "senior White House official" directed Mr. Marceca to collect background files. In fact, as soon as senior White House officials learned of the files that had been archived, they promptly -- that night -- turned 333 of them over to the custody of the FBI. (A small number of the files turned out to have been for current employees, so the White House maintained custody.)

Q. Was Craig Livingstone prompted by a White House official to ask to be put on Administrative Leave?

A. To the best of my knowledge, the action was initiated by Mr. Livingstone.

Q. What happens to Craig Livingstone's job given the new security office operations announced today?

A. As mentioned yesterday, Craig Livingstone is on Administrative Leave until this matter is clarified to the Chief of Staff's satisfaction.

Q. Will he be involved in the EOP Security Office?

A. No. The positions in the EOP Security Office are staffed by career civil servants.

Q. If Livingstone is cleared from any wrongdoing, will the Chief of Staff allow him to return?

A. As mentioned previously, he is currently on Administrative Leave until this matter is clarified to the Chief of Staff's satisfaction. At the time that the investigation is complete and the Chief of Staff has reviewed the findings, the Chief of Staff will recommend appropriate action.

Q. Would he ever be allowed to return to the security office or will he have to be reassigned within the White House?

We really can't speculate on what will or will not happen to Mr. Livingstone. We have no information to indicate that he has been involved in any wrongdoing and to discuss "what if's" based on unsubstantiated allegations would be improper.

Q. Was the "White House Personnel Security Office" reviewed as part of the 1993 "Reinventing Government" efforts?

A. All Executive Office of the President agencies and organizations were reviewed to some extent by the Reinventing Government teams. Within the EOP however, their level of review was not such that they would have looked at the day-to-day processes of an office such as White House Personnel Security.