

FOIA MARKER

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

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Communications
Series/Staff Member: George Stephanopoulos
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 553
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Briefing 3/31/93

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	90	3	1	2

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 31, 1993

PRESS BRIEFING
BY GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS

The Briefing Room

1:31 P.M. EST

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: The President has nominated four Assistant Secretaries of Defense today: Dr. Anita Jones to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering; Graham Allison, Edwin Dorn, and Morton Halperin to be Assistant Secretaries of Defense for Plans and Policy, Personnel and Readiness, and Democracy and Human Rights. Congratulations to the Halperin family. (Laughter.)

Any questions?

Q Who is presiding at the timber summit?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: The President will be presiding.

Q Not the Vice President?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: The Vice President will be intimately involved and he's going to be at the summit, but the President is presiding.

Q Will he be policing the photo ops as well, as usual? (Laughter.)

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I'm certain that he will, actually.

Q When you first announced it, didn't you say that the Vice President would be heading it up?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I made a mistake.

Q Oooh.

Q Is that the first time you've ever admitted making a mistake? (Laughter.)

Q Mistakes were made, Helen. (Laughter.)

Q And you must learn that mistakes were made. (Laughter.) Never assume. (Laughter.)

Q You've got some irritated House Democrats on the issue of these mineral rights --

Q What are you talking about?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Mineral rights.

Q And what do you say to those in the House that say, look, we lined up with this, we took a hard position on it, we were encouraged, too; and now, at least on mining and perhaps on

MORE

#48-03/31

other things, you've gone along with some western senators and cut a side deal, and it's not fair?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, we're going to be addressing the issue of mining. There hasn't a change in policy. We've simply had a change in process. The hard rock mining royalties will be addressed through the normal legislative process. Senator Johnston has agreed to take this bill up and is committed to getting it passed. He'll be reporting it in May.

Q Why have you done that, though? Doesn't that diminish because it's not part of the overall package, which is a train that you know is going through, doesn't that diminish the overall chance of it happening?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Not necessarily. I mean, Senator Johnston is committed as chairman of that committee to reporting that bill out of his committee in June. The President is still committed to the policy. He wants to make sure that it's done in the most effective manner.

Q Do you agree with the criticism of some, George, that the President got rolled on this or was too willing to back off --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Not in the least. And I think that what we're most pleased by today is the President said this morning is that a mere six weeks after the President presented his budget to the Congress, it's not been passed.

Q No, but on this particular issue.

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, I think that when you look at the President's budget and the budget that is being passed through the Congress today -- it will pass through the House, the conference report -- it is remarkably similar to what he proposed. It reaches the deficit targets and goes -- it makes sure that we make investments in jobs and in education and health care; to make sure that we do what we need to do. And it's remarkably similar to what he proposed just six weeks ago. We've now passed a budget in record time and in record similarity to what he's proposed.

Q That's all true, but what does that have to do with him backing off on the mineral rights, at least temporarily?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Again, he's moving forward on mineral rights. We're going to have a legislative program passed through the Senate, as Senator Johnston is committed.

Q Well, if he's still committed to that, what have these guys gained, these western senators? Why are they satisfied? I mean, they don't want it to happen, obviously, which is why they objected. And he now changes the vehicle. And you say he's just as committed, but if he was still just as committed and the chances were just as good, I can't imagine what they're happy about.

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, on the second track, you're also going to be able to look at other environmental issues in addition to just the budget issues. And I think that that's something that they're interested in. And all I can say is that this is part of the normal legislative process. We are going -- we're still committed to the goals that the President set out. We're still committed to the numbers that the President set out. And if we can make some procedural adjustments, then it's okay.

Q If this was the best way to do it, why didn't you do it this way in the first place?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, one of the things you learn through consulting with the Congress is better ways to do things. And this is an appropriate accommodation. That's why we consult.

Q The Middle East -- is the President concerned about the rising violence in Israel and do you have any suggestions on how they should cope with it?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: The President is certainly concerned with the rising violence on each side. And he hopes that all sides will refrain from violence, will refrain from terrorism, will get back to the negotiating table.

Q Is the White House applying any pressure on the parties --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: We'll continue to speak out, and we'll continue to urge all parties to go to the negotiating table.

Q How far along is the President on the expanded Russian aid package? Will it be presented in his speech tomorrow? Will it be ready for him to present in some detail to Yeltsin over the weekend?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I would expect that he would present it to President Yeltsin over the weekend in Vancouver. And obviously, I don't think he'd want to make it a full announcement of the specifics until he's had the chance to discuss it with President Yeltsin. But he will be outlining the goals of the Russian aid program tomorrow, the principles behind the aid program, and try to explain to the American people why he thinks it's important for America's security and American economic interests.

Q His answer the other day in Little Rock indicated that he's somewhat concerned by the latest polling which shows that Americans -- a vast majority of the Americans don't think we should give more aid to the Russians.

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, the President believes that helping Russian reform, helping democratic reform, helping market economic reform is in American's interest, both for our security interests and our economic interests. And he's prepared to make that case.

Q Does he also recognize it as a tough sales job?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, I mean, as he said, foreign aid is always a tough sell, but he believes it's imperative.

Q George, the timber industry seems to see a short-term solution to some of the forest issues as involving, perhaps, a suspension, at least temporarily, of the Endangered Species Act. Are there any circumstances under which the administration would accept that?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I think that one of the issues that the timber summit is going to look at this weekend, this Friday, is the Endangered Species Act and all of the different factors involved. The President supports the Endangered Species Act. He will continue to support it, but obviously, we're going to discuss the range of issue around timber, around the environment this Friday in Portland.

Q You wouldn't rule that out as a possibility during some sort of interim two or three-year period?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I think it's awful hard to imagine that you would get -- you would vitiate the Endangered Species Act. But if people want to propose certain changes, it something we would look at. But I think eliminating it is -- it's hard to believe that would go through.

Q George, yesterday Secretary Christopher talked about expanding the oil embargo against Libya and also the embargo against Iran. What brought about this new, kind of get tough policy on the part of the Clinton administration? In those two areas.

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, let's take them one at a time. Number one, on Iran, I don't know that it's necessarily new. We've continually spoken out against Iranian support of terrorism. And last week, we have reports about Iranian support for terrorism, we have reports of them breaking the oil embargo against Iraq and the President does not believe that that is something we can stand for. And I think that Secretary Christopher was just expressing that yesterday.

With Libya, we want full U.N. compliance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 731 and 748. We monitor all reports of violations and we intend to continue to press for full compliance. We will not accept support for terrorism, we will not accept any breaking of oil embargoes.

Q George, any progress on getting the Serbs to come aboard with the peace plan of Yugoslavia?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: We'll continue the discussions up in New York and we hope that we will get some agreement.

Q Progress on sending Pickering to the Hill and what are the limits of what he can do in terms of participating in the summit?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I think he's been sent -- it's been sent up to the Hill. I don't know when the hearings are scheduled. I don't know when the vote will be scheduled but his nomination has been sent to the committee.

Q What are the limits of what he can participate and not participate in in the summit?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I know he is going to the summit. He will be participating in meetings and briefings.

Q Is there anything he can't do that he could do if he were confirmed today?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I'm not sure, I'd have to check. But I know that he will be going to Vancouver.

Q Who else is going?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: We don't have a complete list yet. We'll have it either later today or first thing in the morning.

Q Is the Vice President going, George?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Again, I'm not completely sure yet.

Q George, on this latest World Bank loan to Iran, given the President's and Christopher's strong feeling about Iran, did you folks try to use any kind of leverage or clout with allies to get the bank to deny that loan? And if not, why not?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, we're concerned about the reports about Iranian terrorism. I don't know that we had any specific concerns raised on this loan, but I'd like to take the question and bring it back.

Q Can you give us an idea of where the process -- the search for the Supreme Court nominee, where that is at this stage and what the President's level of involvement has been to date?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: The President has not made a decision yet, he's not made an offer yet. And beyond that I can't really can't comment.

Q Is it at a state where staff is still gathering a list of names for candidates and the President hasn't really examined that yet or --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I'll repeat the sentence I just said.

Q Has the idea of having Clinton give --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I thought that was 41, by the way. (Laughter.)

Q The talk of having Clinton give a major speech before or after the summit on Russian aid, where is that?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: It's going to be tomorrow in Annapolis.

Q That's it?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Yes.

Q Is he going to be specifically laying out --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: He'll be laying out the principles and the rationale for Russian aid.

Q Money?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Not necessarily the dollar figures or anything like that. That will come after the meeting with President Yeltsin.

Q George, will he be laying out any specifics of what form the aid is going to come in?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I think he'll be laying out the different -- the concepts -- I mean, the different principles behind it. But he won't be having the specific dollar figures or anything like that. There will be more details --

Q But in areas?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Probably general areas. I believe there will be something coming out of HHS later this week, maybe it's today, but it might be tomorrow or Friday.

Q On?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Immunization.

Q George, anything coming out on the Haiti situation soon?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: The discussions are continuing in Haiti. As you know, the U.N. Ambassador, Mr. Caputo, has stayed on in Haiti for his discussions. We continue to support that. And our envoy, Mr. Pezzullo, is also there. We continue to hope for a negotiated solution.

Q What happened to those reports that a solution was imminent and that it would be announced early this week? Was that way overblown or did something go wrong?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I think I saw one report like that. I just know that Mr. Caputo is in Haiti now. He has continued his discussions. Mr. Pezzullo has continued his discussions as well. And we remain hopeful that there will be an agreement, but there's nothing yet.

Q Are we close?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I wouldn't want to characterize it beyond that.

Q What is the status of the Justice Department's look into the deaths in Mississippi jails?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I would refer that to the Justice Department. I don't have anything new on that, but I'll try and find out.

Q If you don't have anything new, what do you have?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I just know the review is going on, as the President said. But I just don't have anything beyond that.

Q Has the President talked to Yelstin at all?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: No.

Q What are his feelings about his first summit? How is he preparing?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: He's preparing quite intensively. In fact, he's in a briefing -- he probably just completed a briefing on the aid package and on the summit. He knows that this is an important moment for Russia and for the United States and the rest of the world as we move forward to help the Russians in their reform process. And he's hopeful that, first of all, it will be a good summit, it will be a summit where we can make progress on reform, and it will lead towards more action by the G-7.

Q In terms of action by the G-7, does the President visualize that the mid-April meeting of the G-7 foreign and finance ministers will be the place where the G-7 package will be put together and approved, or do they have to wait for a G-7 summit?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, clearly we want some progress. I don't know that we would necessarily have a specific announcement on the 14th and 15th -- or the 13th and 14th, depending on how you consider the days. But I think that that's what we're going to be discussing over the next few weeks.

Q How do you see the timetable for a G-7 Russian aid package? Would they have to wait until the Tokyo summit in July?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Not necessarily. We'd like it to go as quickly as possible, but I don't have a set date yet for the announcement. And that's what the consultations are about.

Q If it's to come before the Tokyo summit, can it then be handled entirely at the foreign and finance ministers' level, or do you folks think that you will need a G-7 summit --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: It's not inconceivable, but again all of those discussions are going on right now.

Q -- all the questions --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Right.

Q George, will these new statements about Libya-Iran terrorism, are they linked to the World Trade Center? And have you discovered any link between those arrested and Hamas?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Nothing on that at all. I would just say that what they're linked to is the breaking of the sanctions by the Libyans and the Iranians and other reports of terrorism. But I would not draw that link.

Q Is the agenda for the summit in Vancouver strictly bilateral, or will the Middle East and other things be taken up?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I think it will be largely bilateral issues.

Q George, there are reports out of Bosnia now that indicate that atrocities of a kind that we really haven't seen in part of the world since World War II, may have recently occurred. I'm wondering whether the administration in reacting to these is concerned that it won't be very long before we're looking back on this time and thinking that this country and others sat by while truly horrible things occurred there.

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: We're not sitting by. That's why we were moving forward on the peace processes. That's why we're moving forward on the sanctions against Serbia. That's why we're calling for a war crimes tribunal. The President is horrified, obviously, by these reports.

Q Is there anything about --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: And he is intensively seeking a solution in the peace talks and he's also tightening the sanctions against the Serbs.

Q Well, is there anything about the nature of these reports that tends to suggest to him that if these things could have happened and may continue to happen, that the kinds of measures that have been taken by this country and others so far are simply not enough?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, clearly we do not yet have a solution in Bosnia. There is not yet peace in Bosnia. We will continue to press against all sides who are engaging in aggression. We will continue to press against all sides who are engaging in atrocities and we will continue to press for a war crimes tribunal against those who perpetrate these crimes. But we are working with our allies, we are working through the U.N. to facilitate the peace process and to ensure that everyone abides by the agreements.

Q How long are you going to give Serbia to sign up?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I can't get into that. I mean, we're going to continue to press Serbia to come forward on the Vance-Owen plan.

Q Is there a particular reason you can't say? Isn't it at a point now where they're the only ones who haven't signed. Wouldn't a deadline help?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I don't know that it would be helpful. What I know is that we're working hard now with our allies through the U.N. to get Serbia to sign on. We think it would be a helpful step.

Q Can you explain why the United States opposed the resolution supported by Britain, France and Spain at the U.N. that would make the Vance-Owen accord part of the U.N. regime?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: We believe -- what we think about the Vance-Owen plan isn't what's important. What's important is that the nations sign it, that Serbia sign it, that Bosnia sign it. The Bosnians have come forward, along with the Croats, and signed it. We believe the Serbians should do that as well.

Q I don't how that answers the question. Why did we oppose making the agreement part of a U.N. resolution when our allies supported --

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: We continue to be in discussions with our allies about the form of the resolutions, and those discussions will continue. At the same time, that is a separate question from whether or not it would be helpful for the Serbians to sign it, and that's what we believe.

Q You're still not answering her question. Why do you oppose it?

Q Since our allies believe that would lead -- put more pressure on the Serbs to sign it, why do we oppose that resolution?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: We're continuing to discuss that with our allies.

Q Are you saying that --

Q Are we less supportive of the Vance-Owen plan than we were previously?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: No. We continue to support the Vance-Owen process.

Q Does it mean that our position on that notion of making it part of a resolution is not final? Are you saying that we may yet agree to go along with such a resolution that would incorporate the language of the Vance-Owen plan?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I'm saying the discussions will continue.

Q Does it mean our position isn't final?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: It means the discussions will continue. We'll continue to look for an appropriate vehicle and we'll continue to press the Serbs to sign.

Q George, what is your opinion of the hearings, since Nunn has been holding the gays in the military?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I have no comment.

Q George, the staffers and officials in the Office of Drug Control Policy say they're not allowed to talk to the reporters because it's White House policy not to, until there is a drug czar. Is that true, and can I use your no to get them to talk to me?
(Laughter.)

Q No.

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I didn't know of the questions to the members of the Office of Drug Control Policy, but we'll be happy to take any questions about it that you have, and we'll get back to you.

Q Oh, you want to clear the questions.

Q Do you want it to go through your office instead of directly through them?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I don't know that we have a spokesman with the Office of Drug Control Policy right now, or somebody handling the press. And if we do, we'll be happy to have them get back to you.

Q George, Jesse Jackson is going to lead a demonstration outside Camden Yards on opening day, protesting the lack of black representation in management of baseball. He's also asking the President to boycott opening day. Is either the President or -- I guess Mrs. Clinton is out of pocket because of her father's condition -- would the President consider not attending opening day and throwing out the first pitch, and has he talked to Jesse Jackson about it?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I don't know that the President's talked to Jesse Jackson about it. I think Mr. Jackson has talked to some members of the White House staff about this matter, but the President intends to go forward on opening day at Camden Yards. Obviously, Mr. Jackson raises a lot of issues that we have to look at. There has been some progress in baseball over the last several years, but you can always do better. But the President intends to go forward on opening day.

Q Jackson says he's going to set up a picket line there and force the President to cross it. Is he willing to do that?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: The President's going to ball game.

Q He'll fly over. (Laughter.)

Q -- Mickey Kantor have made clear that they would like a GATT agreement this year. But now you've got a new French Parliament and a new French Cabinet, and they're even more adamantly opposed to agricultural trade concessions that would make possible a GATT agreement. How does the President propose to overcome this new obstacle? Is he going to wait until Tokyo at the G-7 summit, and how much capital is he going to expend to finally get a GATT agreement?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, he's not necessarily going to wait until Tokyo. We'll continue to press. As you know, Ambassador Kantor was in Europe this weekend. We'll continue to

press for a GATT agreement and we'll continue to press for one as soon as we can get one that's useful.

Q But aside from expressing the wish, is there any strategy to overcome these growing gaps?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, we're going to continue in discussions with our allies and others over the GATT agreement, and we hope that we can reach an accommodation.

Q Is the President meeting with some environmental groups or -- there are some environmental groups unhappy about yesterday's change in process who are coming to the White House to meet with somebody today. Do you know if that's the President?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I don't think the President is, no. It's not on the President's schedule.

Q Do you know who they are meeting with?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I'd have to check. I just don't know.

Q Not the Vice President?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I don't know if it's on the Vice President's schedule. I just don't know about it.

Q George, you mentioned the President supports a war crimes tribunal for Bosnia. Has the President ever expressed, either as President or as candidate, whether there should have been a war crimes tribunal after the Gulf War?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I'm just not sure. I don't remember anything as President, I'd have to go back and check the campaign. I don't think so but I'm not 100 percent positive.

Q George, President Mubarak is coming here April 6. Any other foreign leaders coming during the month of April?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: I know there are. I know Prime Minister Miyazawa is. I don't have the full list in front of me now, but we've put it out.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

1:52 P.M. EST
#48-03/31

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

FAX COVER SHEET

NOTE: THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS
CONFIDENTIAL AND INTENDED FOR THE RECIPIENT ONLY.

DATE

3/31/93

TO:

Susan Brophy or Howard Foster

FAX #

w/wFROM: Barbara Chow

RE:

George needs it by 12:30

PAGE 1 OF

2

IF THERE ARE ANY PROBLEMS WITH TRANSMISSION, PLEASE CALL
(202) 456-6493.

Western Issues Agreement

o Several weeks ago, a number of Western Senators met with the President to discuss their concerns regarding a number of proposals in the economic plan of special interest to Western states (including hardrock mining royalties, below cost timber sales, and grazing fees). The President agreed at that time to review the issues raised by the group and designate an Administration official to address their concerns.

o White House staff and the staffs of Western members then held a number of meetings to discuss these issues. OMB, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, the House and Senate Budget Committees, and the relevant authorizing committees (House Interior and Senate Energy and Natural Resources) were also consulted.

o On Monday, March 29, the White House and Western Senators reached an agreement with regard to the treatment of these issues. Grazing fees will be addressed but increased rates will occur through administrative rather than legislative action. Hardrock mining royalties will be addressed as part of comprehensive mining law reform through the normal legislative process instead of the budget process. This will enable Congress to address other issues such as environmental mitigation in conjunction with mining law reform which would not normally be permitted under the strict rules of Reconciliation. Senator Bennett Johnston, Chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee announced yesterday his commitment to take up mining reform legislation in May and report it out of committee in June. Below cost timber sales will be addressed through the normal appropriations process.

o The changes agreed to by the President and congressional leaders represent a change in process not a change in policy. Contrary to press reports, the President has not dropped these policies from the economic plan. Instead, we are simply seeking a better venue and more deliberative process to have them aired. The Administration will continue to press for comprehensive mining and public lands reform and the Western Senators have signalled their willingness to expeditious consideration of these issues. Both parties are seeking a fair and balanced treatment of public land fee increases and are negotiating in good faith.

Fiscal 1994 Budget Resolution Conference Agreement

o The President congratulates the budget conferees on their expeditious completion of the 1994 budget resolution. The agreement is a ringing endorsement of the President's economic program. It was completed in record time and represents an important step forward in helping the country regain its economic momentum.

o The agreement saves \$496 billion over five years, and represents the largest deficit reduction package in history.

o Despite the CBO reestimates that required Congress to go beyond the savings included in the President's plan, the congressional plan makes few changes to the structure and content of the President's plan as outlined by the February 17 address. Virtually all the changes to the President's plan involve additional spending cuts.

o The only substantive changes to the President's economic program include the following:

--The House and Senate adopted a change in the annual COLA's which limit benefits for younger federal retirees.

--Additional savings in appropriated programs were adopted to comply with the 1990 budget caps and maintain outlays below 1993 spending levels.

--The level of reductions in agriculture programs is reduced, hardrock mining royalty fees are dropped from the budget reconciliation process, and additional savings are generated from a HUD/IRS match program.

o Apart from these small differences, the budget agreement ratifies virtually all of the President's economic program.

*/ --The Senate receded from its earlier position requiring \$22 billion in revenues beyond those requested by the Administration.

*/ --The five year spending level for defense programs is virtually identical to the President's proposal.

--The conference agreement endorses the President's proposed reductions in entitlement programs.

--The agreement affirms the President's investment program.

o While the budget resolution conference agreement represents an historic step forward, it is only the beginning of a long legislative process. Reconciliation action will follow after the April recess and should be completed by early summer.

Appropriation bills implementing the agreement will begin in May and should be completed by the end of the fiscal year.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND CONFERENCE
(\$ billions)

PRESIDENT'S SAVINGS (WITHOUT STIMULUS) - 420.1

Approve new or revised administration proposals:

EITC/Food stamps	- 1.1
Debt management	- 16.4
Misc. revenues	0.3
Trade adjustment assistance	- 0.7
Revised Direct loan estimate	<u>2.1</u>
Subtotal	- 15.7

New congressional action:

Reduce Farm savings	2.3
Take partial COLA	- 2.7
IRS income match	- 1.0
NRC fees as mandatory	- 1.2
Reduce discretionary spending	- 46.8
Debt service	- 9.0
Other offsets	<u>- 1.8</u>
Subtotal	- 60.3

TOTAL DIFFERENCES - 76.0

SAVINGS IN CONFERENCE PLAN - 496.1

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages > 1

To <u>B. Chou</u>	From <u>Sen</u>
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

new

US/Iran

Q: What is U.S. policy toward Iran and are we seeking UN sanctions on Iran?

A: -- As Secretary Christopher said yesterday, the Clinton Administration regards Iran as an "international outlaw," because of its sponsorship of terrorism and its violent opposition to the Middle East peace process.

-- We are now reviewing policy toward Iran and consulting with our allies on how best to forge an international consensus on Iran. I don't want to speculate on what options we will pursue at this time.

Combat Role for Women

new

Q: What did the Secretary mean yesterday when he stated, "We're probably going to accept the commission's report...with the possible exception of the combat aircraft?"

- A: -- Secretary Aspin was responding to a question regarding the lifting of restrictions on women in combat within the context of the report issued by a commission established to study that issue.
- In indicating that the Department was preparing to accept the commission's report, the Secretary was referring to the recommendation to allow women to serve aboard U.S. Navy combatant ships with the exception of amphibious ships and submarines. Secretary Aspin was not referring to other, more controversial recommendations such as restricting the future military service of single parents which need further study.
- In his reference to the exception of combat aircraft, the Secretary was signaling the possibility that he would recommend that women pilots be allowed to fly tactical aircraft during combat missions. This is contrary to the recommendation of the commission but consistent with the position taken by Aspin who, as a Congressman, voted to lift the ban against women serving in combat.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 31, 1993

PRESIDENT TO NOMINATE FOUR DEFENSE OFFICIALS

(Washington, DC) President Clinton will nominate Dr. Anita Jones to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering, and Graham Allison, Edwin Dorn, and Morton Halperin to be Assistant Secretaries of Defense for Plans and Policy, Personnel and Readiness, and Democracy and Human Rights respectively, the White House announced today.

"At this time of change and uncertainty, it is imperative that we have a top-flight team at the Pentagon," said the President. "These four people have what it takes to keep the Defense Department moving forward."

Dr. Anita Jones is Professor and Chair of the Department of Computer Science at the University of Virginia. She was a founder and Vice President of Tartan Laboratories, and serves on the DoD Defense Science Board and many other scientific advisory panels. She previously served on the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board. Dr. Jones is the Editor in Chief of ACM Transactions on Computer Systems and has published two books and numerous articles on computer software and systems. From 1973 to 1982, she was an Assistant and Associate Professor at Carnegie Mellon University, from which she holds a Ph.D. in Computer Science. She also holds an M.A. from the University of Texas, Austin and an A.B. from Rice University.

Graham Allison, one of the country's leading scholars on defense policy, is Douglas Dillon Professor of Government at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. He has taught at Harvard since 1972. He has also been active in public policy, currently serving as Director of the Strengthening Democratic Institutions Project and Co-Director of the Avoiding Nuclear War Project. From 1985-87 he was a Special Advisor to the Secretary of Defense, and from 1978-80 he was a part of the President's Reorganization Project. He has been actively involved in a wide range of advisory committees, boards, and task forces, and has published widely on security and foreign policy issues. Allison holds an A.B. from Harvard College, B.A. and M.A. degrees from Hertford College, Oxford, and a Ph.D. from Harvard University, as well as honorary doctorates from the University of North Carolina, Davidson College, and Uppsala University.

(more)

March 31, 1993
page two

Edwin Dorn, is a Senior Staff Member of the Brookings Institution's Center for Public Policy Education. He was formerly Deputy Director of Research at the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, where he developed the military affairs program, managed international projects and wrote about domestic and foreign policy issues. He has also served at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and in the Department of Education. He has written several books on military policy, and op-ed articles in a variety of newspapers. Dorn is a graduate of the University of Texas at Austin and holds a Ph.D. from Yale University. He studied as a Fullbright Scholar in England and served as an Army officer in Germany.

Morton Halperin is currently a Senior Associate of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Baker Professor of International Affairs at George Washington University. He was previously Washington Office Director for the American Civil Liberties Union and Director of the Center for National Security Studies. He has taught and conducted research on nuclear strategy and arms control issues at a number of universities, including Columbia, Harvard, M.I.T., and Yale. From 1966-69, he served in the government as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense for International Security Affairs and as a Senior Staff member of the National Security Council staff. Halperin, the author, co-author, or editor of more than a dozen books, holds a B.A. from Columbia College and a Ph.D. from Yale University.

####

PM PRESS GUIDANCE
March 31, 1993

Vienna

NORTH KOREA: IAEA BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING

Q: What is the IAEA doing today on North Korea? Have they referred the issue to UN Security Council?

A: -- THE IAEA BOARD OF GOVERNORS MET TODAY IN VIENNA TO HEAR DIRECTOR GENERAL BLIX'S REPORT ON NORTH KOREA'S REFUSAL TO ALLOW INSPECTIONS OF TWO SUSPECTED NUCLEAR WASTE SITES IN NORTH KOREA.

-- NORTH KOREA HAS NOT TAKEN ANY ACTION TO MEET THE IAEA'S REQUESTS, INCLUDING TO ALLOW SUCH INSPECTIONS.

(-- IT IS EXPECTED THAT THE BOARD WILL FIND NORTH KOREA IN NON-COMPLIANCE WITH ITS SAFEGUARDS AGREEMENT, WHICH REQUIRES THAT NORTH KOREA ACCEPT SUCH INSPECTIONS.]

-- IF THE BOARD ~~DOES~~ FIND NORTH KOREA IN NON-COMPLIANCE, IT IS BOUND BY ARTICLE 12(C) OF ITS STATUTE TO REPORT ITS FINDING TO THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

- WE HAVE NO MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE BOARD'S ACTION TODAY.

- ~~THE~~ THE BOARD WILL PROBABLY CONSIDER ITS ACTION TODAY, AND ACTUALLY VOTE ON A RESOLUTION TOMORROW. ~~5~~

March 31, 1993

SEC

SECRETARY CHRISTOPHER ON NORTH KOREA
Senate Appropriations, 3/30/93

- WE'RE ALL VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE SITUATION IN NORTH KOREA. WE'RE TRYING TO BE DELIBERATE AND SEQUENTIAL ABOUT THAT, WORKING THROUGH THE IAEA FIRST, AND THEN THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS.

- BUT WE DON'T INTEND TO SEE THAT SITUATION CONTINUE WITHOUT MOVING TOWARD THE INSPECTION THAT WE THINK IS ESSENTIAL.

IO PRESS GUIDANCE
FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 1993

OMNIBUS

NFZ ENFORCEMENT/VANCE-OWEN/SANCTIONS RESOLUTIONS

Q: Anything new on no-fly zone enforcement? A Vance/Owen peace plan implementation resolution? Tougher sanctions on Serbia resolution?

- A: -- ~~DISCUSSION OF A NO-FLY ZONE ENFORCEMENT WILL RESUME THIS WEEK, AND WE HOPE TO SEE A VOTE BY THE END OF THE WEEK.~~
- ~~WE CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT A NO-FLY ZONE ENFORCEMENT RESOLUTION IS DESIRABLE, AND WILL CONTINUE TO PUSH FOR ONE.~~
- THE PERMANENT THREE PLUS SPAIN ARE DISCUSSING AN OMNIBUS RESOLUTION ON THE BOSNIAN CRISIS THAT CALLS UPON THE BOSNIAN SERBS TO REACH AGREEMENT WITH THE OTHER TWO PARTIES UNDER THE VANCE/OWEN PROCESS, AND PROVIDES FOR TOUGHER ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO IF THEY FAIL TO DO SO.
- WE HOPE TO REACH AGREEMENT AMONG THE PERM-THREE AND SPAIN SOON ON A DRAFT TEXT TO CIRCULATE TO THE FULL SECURITY COUNCIL.

2- Tarnoff 5/12

IO PRESS GUIDANCE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1993

Plan as process

-- U.S. POLICY AS ANNOUNCED BY THE SECRETARY ON FEBRUARY 10
IS TO SUPPORT THE VANCE/OWEN PEACE PROCESS AS A MEANS TO
ARRIVE AT AN AGREEMENT ACCEPTABLE TO ALL PARTIES. ~~WE~~
~~WILL NOT ATTEMPT TO IMPOSE AN AGREEMENT ON ANY PARTY.~~

Plan
or
process

WE ARE CONFIDENT THAT THE PERM-THREE PLUS SPAIN WILL
SOON REACH AGREEMENT ON AN OMNIBUS RESOLUTION TO
CIRCULATE TO THE FULL COUNCIL.

DISCUSSING SPECIFIC LANGUAGE
IN NEW YORK.

IO PRESS GUIDANCE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1993

No flies

NFZ ENFORCEMENT RESOLUTIONS

Q: Where do we stand on a NFZ enforcement resolution?

-- DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTION HAVE RESUMED IN NEW YORK.

A: -- ISSUES REGARDING RULES OF ENGAGEMENT ARE BEING

RESOLVED. WE ANTICIPATE THAT THE RESOLUTION WILL BE

ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL SOON, ~~PERHAPS AS EARLY AS TODAY.~~

-- EXPECT COUNCIL TO MEET INFORMALLY ON THURSDAY THIS AFTERNOON.

-- ~~NO~~ BY THE END OF THE WEEK.

-- THIS IS A MEASURE WE HAVE LONG SOUGHT, AND WE BELIEVE IT IS
AN IMPORTANT STEP TOWARDS PEACE IN BOSNIA.

REVISED S/CT PRESS GUIDANCE
Wednesday, March 31, 1993

LIBYA: SANCTIONS

Q: Can you expand the Secretary's comment yesterday that the time has come to stiffen the sanctions against Libya?

A: -- THE UNITED STATES WANTS FULL LIBYAN

COMPLIANCE WITH U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL

RESOLUTIONS 731 AND 748.

-- WE CONSTANTLY MONITOR AND FOLLOW UP ON

REPORTS OF POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF EXISTING

SANCTIONS. WE HAVE AN ACTIVE PROGRAM OF

ENSURING THE SANCTIONS ARE ADHERED TO, AND

COOPERATION FROM OTHER GOVERNMENTS HAS

BEEN VERY GOOD.

-- AS THE SECRETARY SAID YESTERDAY, WE ARE

CONSULTING WITH A NUMBER OF COUNTRIES -- IN

FOREIGN CAPITALS AS WELL AS NEW YORK --

REGARDING NEXT STEPS TO STIFFEN THE

SANCTIONS, INCLUDING AN OIL EMBARGO.

Timing
7 (If asked)

**-- I AM NOT GOING TO SPECULATE ON THE TIMING OR
DURATION OF THESE CONSULTATIONS.**

Did?
If asked:

*As Secretary said yesterday, one of the
things we want to talk about is
an oil embargo.*

- 2 -

Q: What about an embargo on oil-related equipment?

equipment
A: -- THIS IS ONE OF THE STEPS THAT WE WILL BE DISCUSSING WITH OUR ALLIES.

Q: What is the current status of the sanctions?

April 9
A: -- THE U.N. SANCTIONS COMMITTEE WILL REVIEW LIBYAN COMPLIANCE BY APRIL 9. IN THE ABSENCE OF LIBYAN COMPLIANCE, THE PRESENT SANCTIONS WILL REMAIN IN FORCE.

**Drafted:S/CT:JReap
x78682**

**Cleared:S/CT:LEPope
NEA:MParris
NEA/P:WChamberlin
P:DGoldwyn
IO/UNP:CMurray**

WHITE HOUSE PRESS GUIDANCE -- 11:30 AM
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1993

Walt Bunt
Loud
Justice
Dept
Review

China: Perceived Military Build-Up

Q: Do you have any assessments or comments on reports of a Chinese arms build-up that is provoking an arms race of at least an "arms stroll" in Asia?

A: -- * The U.S. does not believe that Chinese military modernization is provoking an arms race in Asia. it is important, however, that China and all other countries in the region continue to undertake only that military modernization strictly necessary for defensive needs.

-- Due to China's sheer size and growing economic importance, some degree of military modernization is inevitable. So long as this modernization is consistent with China's defensive requirements and China remains committed to regional stability, these changes should not constitute a threat to peace.

-- It is in China's own interest to appreciate the sensitivities of regional states to growth in its military power.

-- The U.S. will continue to monitor closely military modernization throughout Asia.

Q: Has the U.S. raised this issue with China? have they given any explanation for their purchases?

A: -- * We have urged China only to undertake military modernization strictly necessary for defensive needs. The U.S. consistently calls on all governments to use moderation in developing their armed forces.

Q: Do you have any comment on Chinese complaints that the U.S. is manufacturing this issue as a means to keep the PRC weak?

A: -- There is absolutely no substance to such comments. The U.S. recognizes China's sovereign right to modernize its military for legitimate defensive purposes.

Russia: Re-Negotiating CFE

Q: The Washington Times has run a story today which claims that Russia wants to re-open the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty. Is this true?

A: -- The Russians have publicly expressed concern that their planned deployment of troops to Russian territory in the Black Sea region would conflict with CFE Treaty flank limitations. The limits will take effect in late 1995.

-- The Russians have also expressed their concerns in diplomatic channels. In doing so, they have told us they have also told us they do not want to jeopardize CFE.

Q: Will you be discussing this issue at the Vancouver summit?

A: -- The CFE Treaty is not on the summit agenda.

Q: How will you discuss this problem with the Russians?

A: -- The CFE Treaty established the Joint Consultative Group in Vienna in which Treaty implementation issues can be discussed among Treaty Parties. These Russian concerns can be discussed in that forum.

-- We are prepared to discuss Russia's regional security concerns. But we and our Allies believe that reopening CFE is not in anyone's best interest.

Libyan Sanctions

Q: Is the U.S. pushing for additional sanctions against Libya?
Are you seeking an oil embargo?

A: -- We are committed to seeking Libyan compliance on
handing over the two suspects in the Pan Am 103 case,
and we will seek stiffer sanctions if needed.

Bosnia

Q: Is it true that the U.S. is rejecting British and French efforts in the UN to register full support to the Vance/Owen plan?

A: -- Members of the Security Council have been discussing how that body can usefully register its support for the Vance/Owen effort and to urge the Bosnian Serbs to apply themselves to the negotiations in order to reach a settlement. Security Council discussions continue.

Q: What is the Administration's problem with the Vance/Owen plan? What alternative does the Administration propose?

A: -- The views of this Administration or any other government toward the Bosnian Peace Plan are not the ones that matter in reaching a settlement. The views of the parties are the ones that matter.

-- We have been actively supportive of Vance/Owen.

-- As we have said, we applaud President Izetbegovic's courageous act of statesmanship in agreeing to all of the principal documents of the Bosnian Peace Plan. We have condemned the continuing Serb aggression in Eastern Bosnia that has resulted in thousands of refugees fleeing for their lives. We believe that their energies belong at the negotiating table in New York and not on the battlefield.

Q: But why won't the U.S. endorse the Vance/Owen plan?

A: -- As I have said, it is not for the U.S. to say whether this or any other version of the Bosnian Peace Plan is valid or acceptable. What matters is whether the parties consider the plan valid and acceptable.

Q: If the Security Council does not endorse the Vance/Owen plan, why should the Serbs feel compelled to sign it, especially since they are achieving what they want with impunity on the battlefield?

A: -- What matters to us is that the Serbs engage in serious negotiations with the aim of reaching a settlement. We are taking steps to bring that home to the Serbs by increasing up sanctions and exploring other ways in the Security Council and with others to convey this message to them.

Q: Since you're tightening sanctions because the serbs won't sign Vance/Owen, will you lift sanctions if the Serbs sign Vance/Owen?

A: -- The imposition/relaxation of sanctions is not simply related to signatures on a page.

-- The Serbs know what they have to do to gain sanctions relief.

Q: What is your view of Bosnia's sentencing two Serbs to death for war crimes?

A: -- We have focused our efforts on establishing a war crimes tribunal.

-- We have no particular comments on this trial.

Israeli Restrictions Imposed
on the Occupied Territories

Q: What is your reaction to the Israeli government move to close the Occupied Territories and relax the rules under which the Israeli soldiers may fire at armed Palestinians?

A: -- We deplore and condemn the rising violence in Israel and the Occupied Territories. We sympathize with the innocent victims on both sides.

-- We believe that the Israeli government has the responsibility of providing security for its people and all the people in the territories under its control. We have urged all parties to act with restraint.

-- It is clear that much of this violence is directed at derailing the peace process. The increase in violence makes it all the more important to renew negotiations and make progress. We must not allow the enemies of peace to succeed.

North Korea: NPT

Q: Any reaction to today's New York Times story claiming differences between South Korea and Japan over strategy for responding to North Korea's nuclear activities? Is the U.S. thinking about how to live with a nuclear-armed North Korea?

A: -- Our principal objective is to ensure that North Korea honors its international commitments not to acquire nuclear weapons.

-- This objective is shared by other states in the region, including South Korea, Japan, and China, and broadly in the international community.

-- A North Korean nuclear weapons capability would have the most serious consequences for the security and stability of the entire Northeast Asian region, as well as for the global nonproliferation regime.

-- We are working closely with South Korea and Japan to coordinate our diplomatic efforts in response to North Korea's actions. We are also in close touch with China, Russia, and others who may be able to influence the North Koreans.

HEU Deal with Russia

Q

R

Q: Has Russia tried to pull out of the HEU deal?

A: -- Russia and the U.S. have negotiated a government-to-government framework agreement for the U.S. to acquire this HEU and blend it down for use as commercial reactor fuel.

-- We are now negotiating a contract to implement that agreement, which will determine the pricing, delivery schedule, and other details.

-- The issues are complex, and it will take continued intensive discussion to resolve them. These discussions are still going on.

Q: Does Russia plan to do its own reprocessing, and would that erode US ability to verify the work being done?

A: -- No "reprocessing" is involved here. The highly-enriched uranium is simply blended with natural or low-enriched uranium to convert the weapon-grade material to reactor-grade material.

-- The government-to-government agreement provides that this blending may be done either in Russia or the U.S.

-- In either case, transparency measures will be adopted to give confidence to both sides that the uranium is being properly accounted for.

(IF PRESSED ON WHERE BLENDING WILL BE DONE)

-- The Russians have expressed a clear preference to blend the material in Russia, and we would not object to that under appropriate transparency measures.

Russia: Aid Package

Q: Is it true that President Clinton is planning to increase aid to Russia to \$1 billion?

A: -- The President intends to present a package of bilateral U.S. economic assistance to Russia at the Vancouver summit. We are not now in a position to describe the details of that package or its size.

-- The U.S. is also working to promote an effective G-7 response to the economic crisis in Russia.

Iran/Iraq

Q: What is U.S. policy on lifting sanctions on Iraq? Are you depersonalizing the conflict?

A: -- As Secretary Christopher said Sunday on CBS, our objective is full Iraqi compliance with all the UN Security Council resolutions. It is inconceivable based on Saddam's past and current behavior that Iraq will meet this standard under his leadership.

-- Iraq is not now in compliance with any of the UNSC resolutions.

-- The resolutions requirements are not personalized and they will apply to any Iraqi regime. They reflect the determination of the international community to ensure that Iraq will not again threaten its neighbors or repress its people. We want to see those requirements met. And our conversations in the region and at the UN suggest there is broad understanding and support for this approach.

-- We have reiterated our policy to Iraq as recently as last Friday when Ambassador Albright and her British, French and Russian colleagues jointly reminded the Iraq Ambassador to the UN of Iraq's responsibilities under the UN resolutions and cautioned Iraq not to take provocative actions.

(FYI: Ambassador Albright and the P4 ambassadors made a public statement on March 26 after seeing the Iraqi Ambassador in New York).

Q: What can you say about press reports that the U.S. has demarched Iran for violating UNSC sanctions against Iraq by importing Iraqi oil? (Washington Post Sunday)

A: -- We are concerned by evidence that Iraqi oil is being exported to Iran in violation of UN sanctions.

-- The Government of Iran is aware of our concerns.

-- We do not intend to discuss the details of our diplomacy or intelligence methods and sources.

Q: [IF ASKED]: Have you raised these concerns with other states?

A: -- We have had consultations with our allies on sanctions violations since the sanctions were imposed in 1990. We are consulting with our allies on this incident.

Haiti: Aid Package

[IF RAISED]:

Q: Where do we stand on the \$1 billion aid package to Haiti?

A: -- As the President told President Aristide on March 16, the U.S. will help mobilize international support for a \$1 billion 5-year fund for Haitian development and democracy, to be disbursed after the return of democracy and President Aristide to Haiti. We will contribute our fair share to this fund.

[IF RAISED]:

Q: Do you have any details on next week's meetings on aid to Haiti?

A: -- We understand that there may be some informal consultations at the World Bank next week.

Q: Are the UN/OAS negotiations in Haiti close to a political settlement?

A: -- We understand that UN/OAS negotiator Caputo has extended his visit to Haiti where he continues to meet with all sides. Lawrence Pezzullo, the U.S. Special Envoy on Haiti, and Charles Redman, our new Charge in Port-au-Prince are involved and staying informed. We leave it to the UN and the OAS to characterize these talks.

COAST GUARD NEWS

Seventh Coast Guard District Public Affairs Office
909 SE First Ave., Room 954, Miami, FL 33131-3050

PH: (305)536-5641
FAX: (305)536-7402



Release Nr. 03-35

March 30, 1993

Contact: Lieutenant Commander Jim Howe

OPERATION ABLE MANNER CONTINUES NO CHANGE IN POLICY

The United States Coast Guard continues to command a large task force for Operation Able Manner, designed to locate, rescue, and immediately return to Haiti those migrants found headed for the United States.

Contrary to rumors and some media reports, a large array of Coast Guard cutters remain on patrol off Haiti and in the waters between Haiti and the United States. Additionally, numerous Coast Guard and Navy aircraft search thousands of square miles of ocean each day for migrant-laden vessels.

Operation Able Manner started on January 15. Involved Coast Guard cutters and Navy ships have intercepted 538 Haitians bound for the United States aboard five grossly overloaded vessels. All rescued migrants were returned to Port-au-Prince. No migrants have been found departing Haiti by sea since January 22.

The primary focus of Operation Able Manner is to prevent tragedy at sea by dissuading Haitians from migrating in unsafe, underequipped, and overcrowded vessels.

The policy of immediately repatriating Haitian migrants found at sea remains in full effect.

-uscg-

Semper Paratus – Always Ready!