

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 Materials 4/22/93

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

EAP PRESS GUIDANCE
April 22, 1993

*File: GS
 Briefing
 4-22-93*

KOREA: HIGH-LEVEL MEETINGS WITH NORTH KOREA?

Q: Does the Department have any comment on reports that high-level talks between the U.S. and North Korea will soon take place? Where, when, and why?

A: -- NO MEETING IS SCHEDULED. ~~IN FACT, NO DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE ON ANY MEETINGS~~ IN FACT, NO DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE ON ANY MEETINGS.

-- BUT AS WE HAVE CONSISTENTLY SAID, THE ISSUE IS BETWEEN NORTH KOREA AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY. OUR TASK IS TO SUPPORT THE EFFORTS OF THE APPROPRIATE INTERNATIONAL BODIES AS THEY WORK TO RESOLVE THE SITUATION.

*Flasher.
 Tarnoff
 Kim* -- I WILL NOT COMMENT ON THE EXCHANGE UNDER SECRETARY TARNOFF HAD WITH PRESIDENT KIM IN SEOUL.

A MEETING -- ~~AS WE HAVE SAID BEFORE, THE U.S. WOULD BE WILLING TO MEET~~ WITH NORTH KOREA IF THIS COULD HELP RESOLVE THE CURRENT SITUATION CONCERNING NORTH KOREA'S NON-COMPLIANCE WITH ITS NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS OBLIGATIONS AND DECISION TO WITHDRAW FROM THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY (NPT).

-- ~~IF WE MEET, IT WOULD BE IN THE CONTEXT OF~~ THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL PRESIDENT'S APRIL 8 STATEMENT IN WHICH HE SAID THAT "THE MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL WELCOME ALL EFFORTS AIMED AT RESOLVING THIS SITUATION." WE ARE PREPARED TO DO OUR PART.

NOT RULE OUT

IO PRESS GUIDANCE
THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1993

Biden letter

LIFT ARMS EMBARGO/LAUNCH AIR STRIKES

Q: Did we send a letter to Sen. Biden? What does the letter say? Is it true that no new resolution is required to use force in Bosnia? Would new UN Security Council resolutions be required to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia or to launch air strikes against the Bosnian Serbs? What is the policy regarding further UN resolutions on the use of force in Bosnia?

A: -- THE DEPARTMENT SENT A LETTER ON APRIL 19 IN RESPONSE TO AN INQUIRY BY SENATOR BIDEN.

-- THE SENATOR ASKED ABOUT THE DEPARTMENT'S VIEW AS TO THE SCOPE OF THE AUTHORITY PROVIDED BY UN SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 770 TO USE "ALL MEASURES NECESSARY" TO DELIVER HUMANITARIAN SUPPLIES TO BOSNIA. HE SPECIFICALLY ASKED WHETHER OR NOT THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZED THE USE OF FORCE AGAINST MILITARY INSTALLATIONS HINDERING THE RELIEF EFFORT.

-- THE DEPARTMENT REPLIED THAT "IT IS UNDERSTOOD BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL THAT THE AUTHORIZATION TO USE 'ALL MEASURES NECESSARY' IS AN AUTHORIZATION FOR MEMBER STATES TO USE NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE FORCE. ... IN THE YUGOSLAVIA CONTEXT, RESOLUTION 770 WOULD PROVIDE LEGAL AUTHORITY TO USE FORCE AGAINST MILITARY INSTALLATIONS HINDERING THE RELIEF EFFORT, CONSISTENT WITH SUBSEQUENT RESOLUTIONS OF THE COUNCIL, INCLUDING THE RESOLUTION IMPLEMENTING THE NO-FLY ZONE OVER BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA."

**IO PRESS GUIDANCE
THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1993**

- THE RESOLUTION DOES NOT PROVIDE A BLANKET AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF FORCE. RATHER THE FORCE CONTEMPLATED IS WHERE NECESSARY TO FACILITATE THE DELIVERY OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

*IF/MS
Embargo
Pasked:*

THE LIFTING OF THE ARMS EMBARGO AGAINST BOSNIA WOULD REQUIRE A NEW SECURITY COUNCIL DECISION.

- WE ARE ACTIVELY CONSIDERING ALL OPTIONS REGARDING OUR POLICY IN BOSNIA.

- WE WILL CONTINUE TO WORK CLOSELY WITH OUR PARTNERS IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT ANY PARTICULAR STEPS WOULD REQUIRE A NEW SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION.

SECRETARY CHRISTOPHER: I don't want to try to become a United Nations lawyer here today. I think whatever we would do, we would do multilaterally and we would want to do it with the full concurrence of the U.N. We would not try to take any shortcuts in the matter. Once the policy has been decided, I'm sure there will be full discussions with the U.N. as well as others because, as the President has emphasized so many times, we want to do this on a fully multilateral basis, and that will be our intention.

EUR PRESS GUIDANCE
April 22, 1993

TUDJMAN

Advise

Q: Did we advise the Holocaust Council to invite Croatian President Tudjman to the opening of the Holocaust Memorial Museum? Did we prepare a suggested list of invitees? What criteria were used for inclusion on the list?

A: -- THE UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL DEVELOPED ITS OWN CRITERIA FOR ISSUING INVITATIONS TO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS FOR THE CEREMONIES SURROUNDING THE OPENING OF THE UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM.

- ~~WE BELIEVE~~ THE CRITERIA WERE THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAD TO BE ONE RECOGNIZED BY THE UNITED STATES AND DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED.**
- AS REQUESTED, WE ADVISED THE COUNCIL ON WHICH COUNTRIES MET THAT CRITERIA. WE DID NOT PREPARE A SUGGESTED LIST OF INVITEES.**

(IF ASKED)

- IN RESPONSE TO THE COUNCIL'S INQUIRY, WE TOLD THEM THAT ~~IN OUR VIEW~~ CROATIA MET THE REQUIRED CRITERIA FOR AN INVITATION.**

EUR PRESS GUIDANCE
April 21, 1993

TUDJMAN VISIT

Q: Who invited Croatian President Tudjman to the U.S.? Will he be meeting with U.S. officials during his stay? If so, what will they discuss? Has the U.S. raised with Tudjman the subject of his anti-Semitic writings?

A: -- PRESIDENT TUDJMAN, AS WELL AS OTHER EUROPEAN LEADERS, WAS INVITED BY THE UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL, A PRIVATE ENTITY CHARTERED BY CONGRESS, TO BE PRESENT DURING THE CEREMONIES SURROUNDING THE OPENING OF THE UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM. HIS VISIT IS NOT AN OFFICIAL ONE.

LIKE OTHER HEADS OF STATE, -- PRESIDENT TUDJMAN WILL BE ^{PARTICIPATING IN} MEETING WITH SENIOR U.S. OFFICIALS DURING HIS WASHINGTON VISIT. WE WILL USE THAT OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS OUR CONCERNS ABOUT THE CURRENT FIGHTING IN BOSNIA BETWEEN BOSNIAN CROATS AND BOSNIAN GOVERNMENT FORCES. WE WILL ALSO DISCUSS THE CURRENT SITUATION IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA, PRESSING THE NEED FOR CONTINUED DEMOCRATIZATION AND A FREE PRESS IN CROATIA.

17

offensive

-- WE HAVE DISCUSSED WITH TUDJMAN OUR CONCERNS
FOR THE WELFARE OF ALL MINORITIES IN CROATIA. THE
OFFENSIVE NATURE OF PRESIDENT TUDJMAN'S
PREVIOUS WRITINGS HAVE BEEN RAISED WITH HIM IN THE
PAST.

EUR Guidance
April 22, 1993

Bulgaria

HOLOCAUST MUSEUM: BULGARIA PARTICIPATION

Q: We understand that the Bulgarian delegation to the Holocaust opening has decided to return to Sofia. What can you tell us about that?

A: -- WE UNDERSTAND THAT THERE WAS SOME CONTROVERSY YESTERDAY BETWEEN THE BULGARIAN DELEGATION AND THE HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM COMMITTEE.

-- WE REFER YOU TO THE COMMITTEE FOR DETAILS OF THOSE ISSUES.

-- HOWEVER, OUR UNDERSTANDING IS NOW THAT PRESIDENT ZHELEV WILL ATTEND TODAY'S CEREMONIES.

**PM Press Guidance
April 22, 1993**

CS

TEAR GAS USE IN WACO, TEXAS

Q: Did our law enforcement authorities use CS gas at Waco (Branch Davidian complex)? Does the use of CS gas contravene the CW Convention?

A: --I WOULD REFER YOU TO THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FOR ANY QUESTIONS ON THE USE OF SPECIFIC GASES BY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.

-- THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION EXPLICITLY PERMITS THE USE OF RIOT CONTROL AGENTS (SUCH AS CS GAS) DOMESTICALLY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES.

-- WHEN THE CONVENTION ENTERS INTO FORCE, EXPECTED IN 1995, THE USE OF RIOT CONTROL AGENTS WOULD BE PROHIBITED ONLY AS A METHOD OF WARFARE.

HOMOSEXUALS AT ARLINGTON

- o The Army, as the executive agent for military cemeteries, has denied permission today for a public memorial service at Arlington National Cemetery's Memorial Amphitheatre. The letter is available for those who are interested.
 - o The Army has approved a wreath-laying at the Tomb of the Unknowns at Arlington National Cemetery to be conducted on Monday, April 26, by the Gay, Lesbian and Bi-Sexual Veterans of America.
 - o It is important to remember that Arlington cemetery is not just another public facility. It is a hallowed national shrine which honors who those died in defense of our country, and therefore, activities at the cemetery are governed by long-standing regulations. These regulations regulate not content but tone, appropriateness and solemnity. They are viewpoint neutral and they apply to everyone.
 - o We have been in discussions with the Arlington National Cemetery Commemoration Committee for some time. They have made several proposals which did not meet the requirements of the regulations. Their final proposal, which was received on April 20th, was turned down because the details were not sufficient to evaluate the proposed event in light of the regulations.
 - o (If asked: They had not provided a final list of key participants, nor adequate details of important aspects of the form and content of the proposed ceremony. There was not sufficient time to resolve the issues nor to make the necessary arrangements for the administrative, transportation, and other logistical support which would be required.)
 - o The wreath-laying was approved because it was proposed early and, more importantly, a wreath-laying is a very traditional event with standardized form and content. The group is plugging into a preset ceremony exactly like that which would be done by any other organization, veterans groups, boy scouts, etc. The group that was turned down was invited to attend this event, if they desire.
-
- o (Additional Point if Pressed: The regulations preclude activities that are considered partisan in nature. "Partisan in nature" is defined as an activity designed to influence policies or positions of the U.S. An event at the cemetery that is close in time and nature to another partisan event at a nearby location could also be considered "partisan." This regulation would preclude anything such as a demonstration. It is not clear that the final proposal by the committee would have been ruled out by this regulation.)

[Background: Today [Thursday] at 10 a.m. Pelosi and Mitchell will hold a joint press conference to introduce draft legislation which would condition China's MFN renewal on progress on human rights. Pelosi is very disappointed that she could not fend off the Tibetophiles from adding a binding condition to the effect that China would have to stop any more ethnic Chinese from moving into Tibet (language was provided to people on the Hill from the Dalai Lama's rep here, Lyodi Gyari).

This is a troublesome addition from many perspectives; it smacks of ethnic cleansing in reverse, is unachievable in practical terms given relative freedom to travel within China, and would be seen as a particularly odious, unacceptable interference in China's internal affairs by its leaders. In short, if left in the bill, it would, all by itself, be an MFN killer. Moynihan seems especially keen to keep this in. However, Pelosi is working the issue hard to seek to satisfy the Tibet people some way, while finessing the population-transfer issue.]

Q: What is your reaction to the China MFN bill being introduced into Congress today?

A: -- The President shares the concerns of the Congress about China's record. In formulating the Administration's policy toward China, including the issue of MFN, the Administration will consult closely with the Congress to build a solid bipartisan basis for relations with China.

Q: What is the Administration's policy concerning Most-Favored-Nation status (MFN) for China?

A: -- President Clinton has made his position on China very clear. The President recognizes China's importance on regional as well as global issues affecting peace, security and trade. The President believes China should adhere to international obligations and standards in the areas of human rights -- including in Tibet, weapons proliferation and trade.

-- As for MFN, the President's decision will depend on China's actions on human rights, weapons proliferation and trade.

-- With this goal in mind, we are now engaged in discussions with the Chinese aimed at making progress in our bilateral relations. We note China has made some positive gestures, but much more remains to be done.

Q & A on Estimated Drop in Deficit

Q: The Washington Post reports this morning that a number of Wall Street budget watchers are projecting that the deficit for 1993 is apt to be about \$35 billion less than the Clinton Administration estimated only a few weeks ago. What is your response?

A: The President said that an honest budget that tackles deficit reduction in a credible way would set us in a new direction and we believe this is evidence of this new direction. The experts cited in the Post report estimated that the deficit for 1993 will be around \$280 billion. The President's Budget estimated a deficit of \$316 billion for 1993.

If the 1993 deficit does come in much lower than our estimates it will reflect two strong benefits of the President's economic plan.

First, it shows that our deficit reduction plan is bold and real and that claims to the contrary are unfounded. Long-term interest rates have come down considerably in response to the President's plan for deficit reduction. Last week the 30-year long-term bond reached a new, 16-year low. The interest rate on the 10-year treasury bill has fallen 0.8% below the 6.7% average we assumed for this fiscal year. These lower interest rates obviously translate into big savings on servicing the federal debt.

Second, it shows that our deficit reduction plan was honest and credible. In devising the Budget, we used the most conservative growth assumptions -- those of the Congressional Budget Office.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 22, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR GEORGE STEPHANOPOLOUS

FROM: GENE SPERLING

SUBJECT: POSITIVE ECONOMIC SPIN

Here is possible language that builds the case for why we deserve credit for future good news, while setting the framework for saying that the Republicans destroyed the insurance we needed to prevent risk of future decline.

We believe that the positive, action oriented approach the President has advocated has helped put both our recovery and our long-term path on a surer footing.

First, the President's plan has lead to lowest long-term interest rates in 20 years, which has lead to a flurry of refinancing which has certainly helped the recovery.

Second, as the Washington Post stated, the lower interest rates brought on by our plan has led Wall Street experts to believe that we are already having a positive effect on the deficit.

Third, there is no dispute that the increase in consumer confidence by the President's election helped spur a strong fourth quarter.

So we do feel we've seen improvement in the recovery over the last six months. But the reason we are different from our opponents are two-fold.

One, we believe we should take action to ensure the recovery get on sound footing. After so many false starts and stops, we believe that it is inexcusable not to do at least a modest stimulus jobs package as an insurance policy against a future decline. The worst enemy of deficit reduction would be another economic decline.

The second reason why we want to take further action, is that we believe that even if we are spurring some recovery, we believe that we cannot be satisfied with a recovery that leaves us 1 million private sector jobs behind where we were in June of 1990.

So we do believe our action agenda has helped this recovery and put us on a better path. But we simply believe that we should build on this success with more action not less.

TALKING POINTS ON THE *Barclays* CASE

- The Administration has decided not to file an unsolicited *amicus* brief in the case of *Barclays Bank International v. California Franchise Tax Board*. The cert petition in that case is currently pending before the US Supreme Court.
- The issue presented in that case--unitary taxation by individual States--is a matter of great importance and much domestic and international sensitivity. The Administration has initiated a process to consider these issues and will work with both foreign governments and state governments to address these issues in a prompt, comprehensive, and equitable manner.
- The Administration believes that it would inappropriate to decide such complex and sensitive questions in the context of an unsolicited *amicus* brief, particularly as the California law under challenge is no longer in effect (having been amended in 1986).
- It is important to note that the Administration's decision today concerns only *state* tax policy; the Administration stands by well-established federal policy that the "separate accounting" method of taxation is the appropriate method for calculating *federal* taxes on multinational corporations.

OS & AS ON THE *Barclays* CASE

Q: Does this decision represent a change in federal policy?

A: As in virtually every other policy area, a change in Administrations provides an opportunity to review existing policy. The Administration recognizes that the two previous Administrations vigorously supported the British in this matter. The Administration believes that this complex and sensitive issue should be reviewed in the context of the Administration's broader international trade and tax policy.

Q: Did domestic political considerations influence the President's decision?

A: Obviously the President is aware of the severe impact that a ruling against California would have. ~~However, that severe impact is really only an indicator of how important and sensitive this issue is--at home and abroad. Economists and policymakers have long disagreed about the advantages of various tax methodologies.~~ The President was unwilling to address such a sensitive and complex policy matter in the context of an unsolicited brief to the Supreme Court. Such issues are better handled through our traditional domestic and international policymaking processes.

Q: Isn't it possible that the Supreme Court will ask for the Government's views? What will the Administration file then?

A: The Court very well might "call for the views of the Solicitor General." We'll cross that bridge when we get to it.

WHITE HOUSE PRESS GUIDANCE -- 11:30 AM
THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1993

Resumption of Middle East Peace Talks

Q: What promises or commitments have been made to Palestinians to induce them to return to the negotiations?

A: -- The Secretary of State has worked hard over the past few months with the Palestinians and with Prime Minister Rabin to address the concerns of all parties.

-- Agreement was reached on several measures which all believe address their concerns.

-- From the outset of the Administration, President Clinton made clear his commitment to promoting peace in the Middle East. Our extensive efforts over the past few months and the developments announced today reflect the high priority the President attaches to that objective.

Q: Why is Faisal Husseini now on the delegation? Isn't this a change in the Madrid terms of reference?

A: -- The United States proposed that Mr. Husseini join the Palestinian delegation and no one objected.

-- We hope this and other steps that will be taken will help the parties make rapid and significant progress in the negotiations.

-- (If pressed) We have not changed the terms of reference.

Q: Have we changed our policy on Jerusalem?

A: -- We have not changed our position on any matter of substance in the negotiations which led to the resumption of talks.

Q: Was Arafat helpful in this process?

A: -- A lot of parties played helpful roles. I am not going to go into details, except to say that we commend the parties for taking the decision to return to negotiations.

Q: Will the Israelis agree to resume the talks on April 27 as suggested by the Arabs? Have all parties formally accepted to return then?

A: -- All of the parties, including the Israelis, have agreed to resume the talks on April 27.

Q: Can you confirm that you have proposed the talks be conducted continually and no longer in rounds?

A: -- The Secretary of State has proposed that talks be held on a continuous basis and we are in the process of consulting with the parties.

-- We believe that the concept has merit and could help advance the process.

Q: Did the U.S. secure Saudi funding for the PLO?

A: -- We encouraged Saudi Arabia to help alleviate the economic difficulties Palestinians are experiencing in the Territories.

Rocket Attacks on Israel

[Background: Northern Israel has been subjected yesterday and today [Thursday] to the heaviest Katyusha rocket attacks -- from Lebanon -- in six months. Three Israelis have been wounded. Timing of the attacks is linked to the announcement of resumed peace talks.]

Q: What is your reaction to the attacks on Northern Israel?

A: -- We deplore these attacks and call upon all parties to exercise maximum restraint. We also ask all those with influence to do everything possible to bring this violence to an end. The focus should be upon peace and the resumption of negotiations.

Vessey Mission: Talking Points

- General John Vessey, the President's Special Emissary to Hanoi returned on April 20 from a mission to Vietnam. The purpose of General Vessey's mission was to stress the President's resolve to obtain the fullest possible accounting on POW/MIA's in Vietnam, review past progress toward that objective and explore prospects for further concrete results through bilateral cooperation. Early on April 21, General Vessey reported to President Clinton that the mission succeeded in some key areas.
- While in Hanoi, General Vessey met with President Le Duc Anh, Foreign Minister Nguyen Manh Cam, Vice Foreign Minister Le Mai and senior officials from the Ministries of Defense and Interior to press for greater progress towards the fullest possible accounting of American POW/MIAs.
- All of the Vietnamese officials with whom General Vessey met firmly expressed Vietnam's intention to accord the highest priority to cooperation on all POW/MIA issues.

Russian Document

- The Vietnamese declared erroneous Russian information stating that a higher number of American POW's that previously known.
- Nevertheless, they expressed their willingness to assist us in resolving this matter. Interviews and documents obtained during the mission shed useful light on the Russian document. Further analysis, however, will be required before any firm conclusions may be reached on the accuracy of the information in the Russian document.

POW/MIA Cooperation

- We achieved tangible results in almost every area related to POW/MIA accounting that we set as a goal for the trip:
 - Vietnam agreed to hold trilateral talks with us and the Lao May 6 -8 in Hanoi to promote joint searches of numerous known and probable aircraft crash sites along the Lao-Vietnamese boarder.
 - The Vietnamese provided us previously unavailable POW/MIA-related documents from the files of their General Political Directorate, as well access to personnel who worked in Group 875 of the Directorate, which was responsible for American POW's. The most important of the documents is a 39-page ledger which records chronologically the capture of American POW's in North Vietnam and Laos between 1964 and early 1972.

- Vietnam agreed in writing to our proposal to establish new joint investigation teams to follow-up the remaining 92 discrepancy cases, in locations throughout Vietnam. With few exceptions, our Joint Task Force-Full Account (JTFFA) personnel now have permission to travel freely throughout Vietnam, and freely interview and investigate sites of interest.
- The Vietnamese also provided documents on their operations in south and central Vietnam during the War, with information on Americans who died in captivity. This information confirmed previously assumed deaths of 45 American POW's plus some foreigners. Details of the deaths could be useful in investigating unresolved cases.
- We also received maps showing the grave sites of seven Americans, which our Joint Task Force-Full Accounting will investigate immediately. This information results from a new program negotiated by General Vessey on his last mission in October, 1992. This program is designed to encourage Vietnamese civilians to furnish information on MIA's or remains.
- Our Joint Task Force Research Team has developed information on 5 other possible grave sites.
- On April 7, Vietnam unilaterally turned over remains from 8 cases possibly related to 27 individuals. General Vessey urged the Vietnamese authorities to intensify their efforts to locate and repatriate remains.

Bosnia

Q: What is the situation on the ground in Eastern Bosnia? How can the West just stand by while the Serbs continue their ethnic cleansing?

A: -- A cease-fire is in place in the area of Srebrenica. The UN forces that have moved in there are playing an important role in helping to maintain that cease-fire and get additional aid in.

-- The U.S. is continuing its air drops and we have been in touch with allies and others to help ensure that the operation do not run short of supplies.

Q: What is the West doing about the Serb's unwillingness to negotiate in good faith?

A: -- Active enforcement of the No-Fly Zone over Bosnia sends the message that the will of the Security Council cannot be flouted.

-- The recent passage of the UN Security Council Resolution (820) was an important step in tightening sanctions dramatically on Serbia.

-- Most transshipment through Serbia will be banned, as will most services, and Serbian controlled financial assets abroad will be frozen.

-- Additionally, President Clinton has been in touch with Prime Minister Major of Great Britain and President Mitterrand, and others regarding next steps. We all agree that the wanton killing cannot simply continue.

-- The President has just sent Mr. Leon Fuerth, National Security Adviser to the Vice President, to discuss with our allies ways in which we can act swiftly to enact the UN resolution and close loopholes. We're aiming for the complete isolation of Serbia.

Q: How will the U.S. react if the violence in Eastern Bosnia resumes?

A: -- I won't address that hypothetical situation, but will stress that we continue to follow events in Bosnia very closely and have not ruled out any options.

Bosnia: Fighting Between Croats and Muslims

Q: What are you doing about the fighting between Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Muslims?

A: -- Heavy fighting between Bosnian government and Bosnian Croat forces continues in central Bosnia.

-- So far, efforts to stop the fighting have had little effect. We strongly urge both sides to halt the fighting.

-- We have seen reports that both forces have committed atrocities in the fighting. We have no confirmation of these reports but are looking into them.

Croatia: Tudjman Visit

Q: Who invited Croatian President Tudjman to the U.S.?

- A: -- President Tudjman, as well as other European leaders, was invited by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, a private entity chartered by Congress.
- President Tudjman has been meeting with the President and senior U.S. officials during his Washington visit. We are using expressing our concerns about the current fighting in Bosnia between Bosnian Croats and Bosnian government forces.
- We have discussed with President Tudjman our concerns for the welfare of all minorities in Croatia. The offensive nature of President Tudjman's previous writings have been raised with him in the past.

Waco: Use of Chemical CS

Q: What can you tell us about the report in today's Washington Times about the use of the riot control agent CS to end the siege in Waco, Texas?

A: -- The article is correct that the recently completed Chemical Weapons Convention prohibits the use of riot control agents as "a method of warfare".

-- The treaty recognizes, however, that the use of riot control agents in domestic law enforcement situations can actually save lives, by precluding the need to use more lethal force.

-- That was, in fact, the objective behind the use of the riot control agent CS in Waco. Unfortunately, David Koresh and his followers chose not to end this tragic standoff in a nonviolent way.

-- Let me just emphasize again, however, that the manner in which we used CS in Waco is explicitly permitted under the Chemical Weapons Convention.

-- (FYI: Treaty language permits the use of riot control agents "for law enforcement, including domestic riot control purposes.")

China MFN

[Background: Today [Thursday] at 10 a.m. Pelosi and Mitchell will hold a joint press conference to introduce draft legislation which would condition China's MFN renewal on progress on human rights. Pelosi is very disappointed that she could not fend off the Tibetophiles from adding a binding condition to the effect that China would have to stop any more ethnic Chinese from moving into Tibet (language was provided to people on the Hill from the Dalai Lama's rep here, Lyodi Gyari).

This is a troublesome addition from many perspectives; it smacks of ethnic cleansing in reverse, is unachievable in practical terms given relative freedom to travel within China, and would be seen as a particularly odious, unacceptable interference in China's internal affairs by its leaders. In short, if left in the bill, it would, all by itself, be an MFN killer. Moynihan seems especially keen to keep this in. However, Pelosi is working the issue hard to seek to satisfy the Tibet people some way, while finessing the population-transfer issue.]

Q: What is your reaction to the China MFN bill being introduced into Congress today?

A: -- The President shares the concerns of the Congress about China's record. In formulating the Administration's policy toward China, including the issue of MFN, the Administration will consult closely with the Congress to build a solid bipartisan basis for relations with China.

Q: What is the Administration's policy concerning Most-Favored-Nation status (MFN) for China?

A: -- President Clinton has made his position on China very clear. The President recognizes China's importance on regional as well as global issues affecting peace, security and trade. The President believes China should adhere to international obligations and standards in the areas of human rights -- including in Tibet, weapons proliferation and trade.

-- As for MFN, the President hopes we will be able to extend MFN this year. The President's decision will depend on China's actions in these ~~three~~ areas of ~~key~~ ~~of concern~~ human rights, weapons proliferation, and trade.

-- With this goal in mind, we are now engaged in discussions with the Chinese aimed at making progress in our bilateral relations. We note China has made some positive gestures, but much more remains to be done.

DOLE: WHAT HAPPENED TO "JUST PAY FOR IT"?

*"A lot of our members think paying for it is secondary.
The bottom line is not to have it all."
-- Bob Dole, Washington Post, 4/22/93*

- "We just have a basic difference. We think they ought to be paid for. We believe they can be paid for. If we did it on a pay-as-you-go basis, there would be considerable support on this side of the aisle." [Congressional Record, 4/2/93]
- "So, I think it is just a fundamental difference in parties in this debate. We believe we ought to pay for them....

So in my view it is fundamental. There is no reason to raise our voices. It is just a fundamental difference. Republicans believe in cutting spending. If we cannot cut spending, at least we ought to pay for it and not add it to the deficit." [Congressional Record, 4/3/93]

- "If this bill is necessary, then Democrats should be willing to pay for it. It's that simple--it is a basic philosophical difference." [Congressional Record, 4/5/93]
- "But as I said the other day, there is just a fundamental difference in our parties. The Democrats like to tax and tax and tax, and spend and spend and spend, and we like to cut spending first. If we cannot cut it back, we would like to pay for it. That is a basic difference in our parties. That is just the way it is....

"So, Madam President, we are prepared to discuss working out some compromise, if that is the word. But first we are going to cut it. First we are going to cut it, and then we are going to pay for it. Those are the two principles we espouse." [Congressional Record, 4/5/93]

- "Madam President, it seems to me we just have this basic fundamental difference in our philosophies: We want to cut spending. My colleagues on the other side want to increase spending. We want to pay for it. My colleagues on the other side do not want to pay for it. That is a fairly big gap in our philosophy." [Congressional Record, 4/5/93]
- "I don't believe any Republicans- they can call and talk to the Republican senators, certainly the president has a right to do that, but they're not going to change their minds in my view. We're prepared if they'll pay for it and make a substantial reduction in the package, but they don't want to do either. They don't want to cut it, and particularly they don't want to pay for it..." [CNN Transcripts, 4/8/93]
- "But let me also underscore, I would say that out of the 43 Republicans, there are not very many who want to do anything except the unemployment piece. They think that we can make a statement here that we're opposed to spending that we don't pay for.

"If you go out and ask the average person on Main Street America, they tell you, cut spending first and when you finish cutting spending, pay for the rest of it. And that's the message. We just happen to have a different vision for America, I think, than some of the Democrats do." [on Face the Nation, 4/11/93]

- "MacNeil: Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole dismissed the new proposal. He said, 'It isn't a compromise when the President absolutely refuses to pay for his new spending programs.' He also had this to say at a stop in Minneapolis. 'I've talked to President Clinton twice on the telephone. I made it clear to him we're not trying to embarrass you, Mr. President, but this is a matter of just basic fundamental difference in our philosophy between Republicans and Democrats, and when I go to my hometown or my home state, people tell me to cut spending first and if you don't cut it, at least pay for it. This package does neither.'" [The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour, 4/16/93]
- "Well, the reason we shot it down immediately is he doesn't focus on the basic issue, and that's paying for it. The size of the package, as I said, may not be the important thing; it's whether or not you pay for it....

"But, see, that's not the issue; the issue is paying for it, and the Democrats have never offered to pay for anything. That's the fundamental difference in party philosophy. We think we ought to pay as you go; they think somebody else ought to pay later." [on Meet the Press, Reuter Transcript Report, 4/18/93]
- Dole said President Clinton's offer to chop \$4 billion from the \$16.3 billion jobs program is irrelevant because it "doesn't focus on the basic issue, which is paying for it."

"It's not a compromise," Dole said. "He didn't offer to pay for one cent of it." [Chicago Tribune, 4/19/93]
- Bob Dole describes Republican opposition to the stimulus provisions as a matter of fiscal principle. The size of the bill is not the issue, he says, nor even its contents (though he has some problems with those), but the fact that it isn't financed and would add to the deficit. "If the president wants to have new spending programs, Republicans will continue to demand offsetting cuts," the minority leader declares. "It's a fundamental difference." [Washington Post, 4/19/93]
- "The Republican alternative is paid for, and gives them that simple choice.... The proposal by the President contained no provision to pay for this nearly \$20 billion in increased spending.... most importantly, we asked that everything other than unemployment insurance be paid for....

"The President responded with a proposal that trimmed some of the spending, but not a single penny of the President's revised package was paid for. Apparently, the White House had not gotten the message all of us have been hearing loud and clear in our home States the past 2 weeks--cut spending first, and if we cannot cut it, pay for new programs with offsetting cuts in other programs....

"But the biggest difference between our plan and the President's proposal is we propose paying for our package with spending cuts....

"So Madam President, I have talked to the President a couple of times. We had good visits. We talked about whether or not there could be any negotiation. I told him I did not think so unless we could figure out some way to pay for the package. Our guiding principle remains: cut it first and then pay for whatever is left." [Cong. Record, 4/20/93]

DOLE'S \$36,258,000 IN 1992 KANSAS PORK

<u>KANSAS PROGRAM</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
AVIATION TRAINING CENTER KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY TECHNOLOGY CENTER, PITTSBURGH STATE UNIVERSITY	\$ 7,700,000.00 \$ 4,000,000.00
COURT HOUSE RENOVATION, WICHITA	\$ 9,900,000.00
ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER, WICHITA	\$ 680,000.00
FIVE-MILE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION	\$ 1,400,000.00
INTERSTATE 135 HIGHWAY INTERCHANGE	\$ 2,600,000.00
INTERSTATE 435 INTERCHANGE	\$ 3,600,000.00
TREATMENT CENTER, WICHITA	\$ 750,000.00
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CENTER, WICHITA	\$ 500,000.00
POLLUTION RESEARCH PROJECT UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS	 \$ 1,450,000.00
TORNADO WARNING SIRENS	\$ 1,150,000.00
FOOD SAFETY RESEARCH, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	\$ 1,900,000.00
ALFALFA RESEARCH, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	\$ 125,000.00
CANOLA RESEARCH, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	\$ 100,000.00
GREAT PLAINS AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER	\$ 100,000.00
INTERNATIONAL MEAT AND LIVESTOCK PROGRAM KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	 \$ 94,000.00
ETHANOL STUDY, KANSAS STATE	\$ 50,000.00
<u>WHEAT GENETICS RESOURCE CENTER, KANSAS STATE</u>	<u>\$ 159,000.00</u>
TOTAL PORK	\$36,258,000.00

[SOURCE: Associated Press, 2/26/92]

BOB DOLE & THE CLINTON JOBS PACKAGE

PACKAGE 'IS NOT A JOBS BILL':

NOW: "This is not a jobs bill. This is a new spending program." [Washington Times, 4/3/93]

THEN: Dole spoke in favor of the 1991 highway bill saying "I think the highway bill is going to give a lot of people confidence out there looking for jobs, it could create 4 million jobs, so they're -- you know, that in itself, which was bipartisan, I might add -- the highway bill -- will be helpful to President Bush." The Clinton jobs package includes \$3 billion for highway construction. [News Conference, Federal News Service, 11/27/91]

HEAD START & WIC:

NOW: Dole opposes the \$500 million President Clinton wants to invest in Head Start and the \$75 million in WIC funds through the jobs package.

THEN: But in 1992, Dole co-sponsored the Every Fifth Child Act of 1992 which called for full funding of Head Start Head Start, and increased funding for Women Infants and Children and the Job Corps by \$2 billion. Dole spoke in favor of the Act on the Senate floor and said "These programs are among the best weapons we have in our fight against poverty." [San Francisco Chronicle, 8/31/92]

HIGHWAY PROJECTS:

NOW: Dole opposes the \$3 billion President Clinton wants to use to invest in creating jobs and improving the nations infrastructure.

THEN: Dole spoke in favor of the highway bill in 1991 saying "I think the highway bill is going to give a lot of people confidence out there looking for jobs, it could create 4 million jobs, so they're -- you know, that in itself, which was bipartisan, I might add -- the highway bill -- will be helpful to President Bush." [News Conference, Federal News Service, 11/27/91]

Dole also added \$7.6 million in highway funding for Kansas to the 1992 budget at the last minute. When the funding was targetted as 'pork' by a bipartisan congressional group, Dole responded that the group's "definition of 'pork' is a little wacky" and said the projects "have been longtime priorities back home". [AP, 2/26/92]

DEFICIT SPENDING:

NOW: Dole says he opposes President Clinton jobs package because it would 'add to the deficit'. Dole says cuts in other programs should be made up front to pay for the package.

THEN: A National Taxpayers Union study shows that Dole sponsored bills that would have spent nearly \$5 for every \$1 he would cut. Dole sponsored bills would increase spending by \$24,980,000 and cut spending by \$1 million. [National Taxpayers Union, 9/7/92]

PORK BARREL SPENDING:

NOW: Dole says that "nothing in [the Clinton package] is emergency except the unemployment piece, and that's about \$4 billion..." [CNN, 4/8/93]

THEN: Last year a bipartisan congressional group calling themselves "Porkbusters" identified \$36,258,000 in "wasteful, pork barrel spending" for Kansas. Much of the funding was slipped into appropriations bills by Dole at the last minute without full committee review.

Dole responded to charges of pork barrel spending saying that the group's "definition of 'pork' is a little wacky" and arguing that many of the projects funded "have been longtime priorities back home". [AP, 2/26/92]