RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: cqwa15375@cq.com@INET@LNGTWY (cqwa15375@cq.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1998 03:57:08.00

SUBJECT: Nitealert Report - Nassif

TO: Robert J. Nassif@EOP (Robert J. Nassif@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

```
!==================================================================
!  Nite-Alert Created for Rob Nassif - Office of Mgmt & Budget
!          2-FEB-1998 03:46:51
!==================================================================
!          Searching the BILLTRACK database
!  For New Legislative Action on bills with your search terms
!          in the title or summary of the bill
!
!                    Using the word list NASSIF
!
```

1 of 11 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: S1208

SPONSOR: Boxer (D-CA)

BRIEF TITLE: Family Planning and Choice Protection Act of 1997.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to protect women's reproductive health and
constitutional right to choice, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 09/23/97

COSPONSORS: 3 (Dems: 3 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Labor and Human Resources

RELATED BILLS: See HR2525

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 Cosponsor(s) added: 1
Kennedy, E. (D-MA)

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: S104

SPONSOR: Murkowski (R-AK)

BRIEF TITLE: Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

INTRODUCED: 01/21/97

COSPONSORS: 29 (Dems: 3 Reps: 26 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Energy and Natural Resources

RELATED BILLS: See HR1270, HRes280, HRes283

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 BRYAN, D-Nev., Senate speech: Opposes the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997. (CR p. S219-S221)

3 of 11 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: HR1270

SPONSOR: Upton (R-MI)

BRIEF TITLE: Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

INTRODUCED: 04/10/97

COSPONSORS: 164 (Dems: 49 Reps: 115 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: House Resources
House Transportation and Infrastructure
House Commerce

RELATED BILLS: See S104, S296, HRes280, HRes283

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 BRYAN, D-Nev., Senate speech: Opposes the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997. (CR p. S219-S221)

 CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: HR2676

SPONSOR: Archer (R-TX)

BRIEF TITLE: Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1997.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restructure and reform the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 10/21/97

COSPONSORS: 44 (Dems: 20 Reps: 24 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: House Ways and Means
House Rules
House Government Reform and Oversight
Senate Finance

RELATED BILLS: See S1096, HR2292, HRes303

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 Committee hearings held by the Senate Finance Committee. (CR p. D37-D38)

 CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: S10

SPONSOR: Hatch (R-UT)

BRIEF TITLE: Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Act of 1997.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by juvenile criminals, punish and deter violent gang crime, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 01/21/97

COSPONSORS: 27 (Dems: 0 Reps: 27 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Judiciary

RELATED BILLS: See S3, S718, S825

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 LEAHY, D-Vt., Senate speech: Urges bipartisan improvement of the "Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Act." (CR p. S239-S240)

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: S1096

SPONSOR: Kerrey (D-NE)

BRIEF TITLE: Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1997.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to restructure the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 07/31/97

COSPONSORS: 35 (Dems: 13 Reps: 22 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Finance

RELATED BILLS: See HR2292, HR2676

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 Committee hearings held by the Senate Finance Committee. (CR p. D37-D38)

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: S1252

SPONSOR: D'Amato (R-NY)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of low-income housing credits which may be allocated in each state, and to index such amount for inflation.

INTRODUCED: 10/03/97

COSPONSORS: 18 (Dems: 9 Reps: 9 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Finance

RELATED BILLS: See HR2990

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 Cosponsor(s) added: 1
Durbin (D-IL)

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: S1251

SPONSOR: D'Amato (R-NY)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of private activity bonds which may be issued in each state, and to index such amount for inflation.

INTRODUCED: 10/03/97

COSPONSORS: 17 (Dems: 8 Reps: 9 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Finance

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 Cosponsor(s) added: 2
Kempthorne (R-ID) Kerrey, R. (D-NE)

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: S1260

SPONSOR: Gramm (R-TX)

BRIEF TITLE: Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1997.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to limit the conduct of securities class actions under state law, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 10/07/97

COSPONSORS: 23 (Dems: 9 Reps: 14 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs

RELATED BILLS: See HR1689

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 Cosponsor(s) added: 2
Cochran (R-MS) Nickles (R-OK)

10 of 11 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: SConRes12

SPONSOR: Torricelli (D-NJ)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the
Congress with respect to the collection on data on
ancestry in the decennial census.

INTRODUCED: 03/17/97

COSPONSORS: 13 (Dems: 8 Reps: 5 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Governmental Affairs

RELATED BILLS: See HConRes38

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 Cosponsor(s) added: 1
Mikulski (D-MD)

11 of 11 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

*** HISTORY REPORT -- ALL LEGISLATIVE ACTION, COSPONSORS, SPEECHES ***

MEASURE: SConRes65

SPONSOR: Snowe (R-ME)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A concurrent resolution calling for a U.S. effort to end
restriction on the freedoms and human rights of the
enclaved people in the occupied area of Cyprus.

INTRODUCED: 11/06/97

COSPONSORS: 8 (Dems: 6 Reps: 2 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Foreign Relations

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

01/29/98 Cosponsor(s) added: 6
Biden (D-DE) Harkin (D-IA) Lieberman (D-CT)
Collins, S. (R-ME) Kennedy, E. (D-MA) Specter (R-PA)

There are no more items to display.

You are in BILLTRACK
Enter number(s), a command, or MENU

!===
! Searching the BILLTEXT database
! For New Bills or New Bill Versions containing your search terms
!
! Using the word list NASSIF
!
1 S1579 DeWine (R-OH) 01/28/98 (8919 lines)
Introduced in Senate

To amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to extend the authorizations of appropriations for such Act, and for other purposes.
Item Key: 8339

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

2 S1577 Chafee (R-RI) 01/28/98 (796 lines)
Introduced in Senate

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional tax relief to families to increase the affordability of child care, and for other purposes.
Item Key: 8338

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

3 HR3114 Leach (R-IA) 01/27/98 (231 lines)
Introduced in House

To authorize United States participation in a quota increase and the New Arrangements to Borrow of the International Monetary Fund, and for other purposes.
Item Key: 8291

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

4 HR3115 Millender-McDonald 01/27/98 (413 lines)
(D-CA)
Introduced in House

To establish professional development partnerships to improve the quality of America's teachers and the academic achievement of

students in the classroom, and for other purposes.
Item Key: 8292

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

5 HR3136 Traficant (D-OH) 01/28/98 (64 lines)
Introduced in House

To recognize and compensate Boris Korczak for intelligence gathering services rendered during the cold war.
Item Key: 8365

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

6 HR3130 Shaw (R-FL) 01/28/98 (797 lines)
Introduced in House

To provide for an alternative penalty procedure for States that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, and to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements.
Item Key: 8359

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

7 S1580 Shelby (R-AL) 01/28/98 (158 lines)
Introduced in Senate

To amend the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to place an 18-month moratorium on the prohibition of payment under the medicare program for home health services consisting of venipuncture solely for the purpose of obtaining a blood sample, and to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to study potential fraud and abuse under such program with respect to such services.
Item Key: 8340

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

8 SRES170 Specter (R-PA) 01/29/98 (137 lines)
Introduced in Senate

Expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal investment in biomedical research should be increased by $2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.
Item Key: 8370

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

Enter one or more numbers or ALL, a command, or MENU

!===
! Searching the NEWS database for CONGRESSIONAL MONITOR articles
! Using the word list NASSIF
!

1 of 6 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

GREENSPAN, RUBIN PLEAD TO HOUSE PANEL FOR IMF FUNDING
Afternoon News Highlights
(NEWS 01/30/98; 70 lines)
Item Key: 9535

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

GREENSPAN, RUBIN PLEAD TO HOUSE PANEL FOR IMF FUNDING

By Matthew Tully, CQ Staff Writer

Facing a skeptical but grudgingly supportive House Banking Committee, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan and Clinton administration officials today urged Congress to send the International Monetary Fund (IMF) an additional $18 billion to help bail out Asia's faltering economies.

Greenspan said that while the Asian crisis is unlikely to have a substantial effect on this country, the potential risk is too great to ignore. "Its consequences should not be left to chance," he said.

The White House is expected soon to formally ask Congress to authorize the funds for a series of bailout packages the IMF has prepared for South Korea, Indonesia and other countries. The anticipated request is drawing a mixed reaction from Capitol Hill, where many Democrats and Republicans want to tie any financial support to changes at the IMF.

"This is an organization that didn't even see the warning signs in South Korea," Rep. Spencer Bachus, R-Ala., complained today.

Committee Chairman Jim Leach, R-Iowa, supports the IMF, but says the organization needs greater accountability. He has introduced a bill (HR3114) that would require the IMF to disclose its financial ratings of individual countries, and create Federal Reserve Board-like agencies in countries accepting funding.

Greenspan said the IMF's urgent need for money will give the United States more leverage to demand changes at the IMF and in the countries receiving its help.

International bankruptcy laws are one area ripe for change, Greenspan said, since they often put foreign creditors at the end of the line, thus encouraging foreign investors to run at the first sign of trouble.

The administration's success in securing IMF funding may hinge on convincing Congress that the money will not simply bail out private financial institutions that made poor decisions. Many lawmakers argue that such bailouts would encourage banks and other creditors to make risky loans and assume that the international community will come to their rescue.

"This Congress is not about to authorize anything that amounts to a bailout of private institutions," Leach said.

Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin said the administration expects a bailout package that forces companies and banks to pay "as full a price as possible" for the role they played in the recent economic crisis.

Rubin told the committee that the IMF's bailout packages do not rely too heavily on U.S. funding. The financial aid will be doled out as loans only when it is needed, he said. But Congress should authorize the additional funding now, he added, so that the United States will not be caught in a nasty international financial crisis months or years from now.

"This funding is absolutely necessary to enable the IMF to respond effectively if this financial instability were to spread and intensify," he said.

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen told the committee that U.S. national security depends on its role as an economic leader.

"If we send the signal that we are moving away, slipping away," Cohen said. " ... [U.S. allies] will take action in their own self interest, which may be an arms race of their own."

2 of 6 items   CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

SO, WHAT ELSE IS NEW?
CQ News Service
(NEWS 01/30/98; 87 lines)
Item Key: 9540
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

SO, WHAT ELSE IS NEW?

By Sara Fritz, CQ Staff Writer

WASHINGTON -- You hear it repeated everywhere: People saying they are not surprised that President Clinton may have had a sexual relationship with a 21-year-old White House intern, but they are horrified that he could be lying about it.

Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr insists he chose to investigate the intern case not because he wanted to embarrass Clinton with allegations of sexual misconduct, but because he suspected the president is guilty of perjury.

You might conclude that lying -- not sex -- is the central issue in the scandal that currently threatens to engulf the Clinton presidency. But if Starr, the media and the public are so worried about Clinton's truthfulness, why have they waited until now to express their qualms about the president's behavior? Starr's four-year probe previously has yielded far more serious allegations of lying or obstruction of justice by the president and the First Lady that failed to either stir public outrage or cause the independent counsel to bring charges.

In Starr's nearly forgotten investigation of the Arkansas land deal known as Whitewater, Clinton's former investment partner, James

McDougal, told a grand jury the president lied under oath when testifying in a criminal trial. But the news that McDougal had called the president a liar -- just as Lewinsky has done -- did not cause even the slightest ripple in public opinion polls.

Nor did Starr charge Clinton with perjury based on McDougal's testimony, and the reason bears heavily on the current case. Even though the independent counsel's office was firmly convinced that Clinton lied under oath in the Whitewater trial, a perjury case against the president would have relied almost entirely on the credibility of McDougal and his co-conspirator, David Hale. Both men would have been poor prosecution witnesses against the president. Both were admitted felons, and McDougal had previously told a contradictory story. Legal scholars say Lewinsky's assertion that she has "lied all my life" would undermine her credibility as a prosecution witness.

Then there was the case of the Rose Law Firm billing records, which mysteriously showed up on a table in the White House months after the president's advisers failed to produce the documents in response to a subpoena from Starr. These billing records revealed that Hillary Rodham Clinton had previously understated her role as a private attorney for McDougal's savings and loan.

Discovery of the records prompted Starr to launch an investigation into whether Mrs. Clinton tried to cover up the nature of her legal work for McDougal by concealing the documents. He even summoned Mrs. Clinton to testify before a grand jury. But no one was ever charged, and the public seemed unruffled by this apparent case of skulduggery at the highest levels.

Nor should we forget the obstruction-of-justice case that Starr has tried to build involving former Justice Department official Webster Hubbell, an old friend of the Clinton's from Little Rock. Last year, investigators discovered that some of Clinton's closest friends, including Washington lawyer Vernon Jordan, had arranged a variety of lucrative jobs for Hubbell after he came under investigation by the independent counsel. Starr suspected the deals were intended to prevent Hubbell from cooperating with his probe.

Yet no one has been charged in that case, either. Here again, the problem that thwarted Starr has a parallel in the Lewinsky controversy. Although Starr was able to trace the arrangements for Hubbell's income to Jordan and other Clinton confidantes, he has not been able to prove that anyone helping Hubbell explicitly demanded his silence in exchange for financial assistance. Such deals tend to be implied, not explicit. Even if Lewinsky will testify that Jordan tried to buy her off with a job, a corroborating witness may be hard to find.

It is curious that none of these earlier allegations of lying or obstruction of justice in criminal matters stirred as much hysteria as the suggestion Clinton lied in a civil suit about his sexual activities. It is easy to see why the public might deceive itself into thinking it is more offended by lying than adultery. But it is harder to understand how Starr, an expert lawyer, could anticipate building a case in the Lewinsky matter when he has failed to do so in these other circumstances.

As any lawyer knows, a string of unproven coverup charges does not constitute a pattern of obstruction. If the shock of the sex scandal wanes, will Starr or Congress have the determination to pursue such a hard-to-prove case?

DISSENSION SPLITS GAMBLING COMMISSION
CQ News Service
(NEWS 01/30/98; 65 lines)
Item Key: 9541
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

DISSENSION SPLITS GAMBLING COMMISSION

By Elizabeth A. Palmer, CQ Staff Writer

WASHINGTON -- The behind-the-scene tensions that have plagued the National Gambling Impact Study Commission burst into the open Friday, when commissioner James Dobson sent out a scathing news release complaining of what he called the undue influence of pro-gambling forces.

"It is becoming apparent that the gambling industry and its advocates are attempting to prevent the commission from taking a fair and objective look at casinos and other forms of gambling," he said. In particular, Dobson criticized the commission's two-day site visit to Atlantic City, N.J., last week.

"Missing was any discussion of suicides related to gambling, compulsive gambling among casino employees, the proliferation of pawn shops and 'cash for gold' establishments along Atlantic City's main street, or the explosion of bankruptcies" there, he said.

Dobson's anti-gambling views are no secret. He is president of Focus on the Family, an evangelical Christian organization based in Colorado Springs, Colo., which has a budget of $114 million, a daily radio program and a monthly magazine.

Congress established the commission in 1996 to study the social and economic impact of the $47.6 billion gaming industry. In the last 20 years, legal gambling has exploded in the United States, with 26 states allowing some kind of casino gambling and all but two (Utah and Hawaii) permitting some form of legalized gambling, such as lotteries.

From the start, the nine-member commission has been the subject of intense political battles: Most of the members either have very strong ties to the gaming industry or strongly oppose gambling as immoral.

Ironically, gaming supporters have argued that the commission has an anti-gambling bias. On the same two-day trip that Dobson complained about, the only sites commissioners visited were the Atlantic City Rescue Mission and pawnshops along the boardwalk. Industry supporters say that itinerary did not show the positive impact gambling has had on Atlantic City's economic development, or the schools and civic institutions funded with gaming tax revenues.

And despite the fact that the commission is charged with studying gambling, the commissioners seemed strangely uncomfortable about actually watching people gamble. Though some visited a casino on their own, the commission as a whole did not.

In a response to Dobson's letter, Frank J. Fahrenkopf Jr., president of the American Gaming Association, said, "It is obvious that Mr. Dobson is attempting to derail the commission's efforts to complete a fair and accurate assessment of the U.S. gaming industry because the evidence presented has not supported his preconceived objectives. Mr. Dobson's prejudice was well-known before he was appointed to the commission, and his current irrational comments validate the original judgment that this is a man with a closed mind who has no concern for fairness and the truth."

The commission's next meeting will be in Boston on March 16-17, where it will hold a hearing on state lotteries before heading south to visit the biggest, most successful Indian casino in the nation -- Foxwood, in Connecticut.

4 of 6 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY: IRAQ RESOLUTION
Scheduled Events
(NEWS 02/02/98; 46 lines)
Item Key: 9554
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY: IRAQ RESOLUTION

By Richard Sammon, CQ Staff Writer

The Senate is scheduled to act this week on a joint resolution warning Iraq to cooperate with international inspection teams trying to root out its weapons of mass destruction programs.

Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., wanted to act on the resolution (SCONRES71) last Thursday, but the effort ground to a halt when key Democrats expressed concern about the broad scope of the resolution, which urges the president to "take all necessary and appropriate actions" to force Iraq to comply with international inspection --

essentially authorizing using force without limitation.

The resolution adheres to President Clinton's warning to Iraq's Saddam Hussein in his State of the Union address that he cannot defy the determination of world powers to strip Iraq of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons materials.

Vietnam War veterans Max Cleland, D-Ga., and Bob Kerrey, D-Neb., said the current wording could lead the United States into a protracted conflict.

Kerrey said the language "bears a striking similarity to Tonkin Gulf," the historic resolution often cited as the starting point of the Vietnam War.

Kerrey said he was confident new language could be developed that would be more specific about what actions Congress would authorize and for how long. It may also call for a larger administration effort to shore up allies' support for possible military action if the standoff continues.

Paul Wellstone, D-Minn., said Congress should not act on a resolution until the military briefs members on the situation and what steps the administration is considering. The briefings could occur this week.

Lott said it was important that Congress send a message to Iraq that the United States is not shying away from a potential showdown and that it is not preoccupied with domestic issues at a time when much of the news is being driven by Clinton's personal affairs.

Lott said his intent is for a bipartisan resolution, and he wants Minority Leader Tom Daschle, S.D., to be the chief co-sponsor.

[ThisWeek]

5 of 6 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION VETO
Scheduled Events
(NEWS 02/02/98; 33 lines)
Item Key: 9558
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION VETO

By Bob Gravely, CQ Staff Writer

The House is set this week to resume battle with President Clinton over the fate of 38 military construction projects.

The chamber will try on Wednesday or Thursday to override Clinton's veto of legislation that would restore $287 million in project funding that was in the $9.2 billion fiscal 1998 military construction spending bill (PL 105-45) but that Clinton struck with the line-item veto.

The House last year passed legislation (HR2631) to restore the funding on a 362-64 vote -- a wide enough margin needed for a two-thirds majority to override the veto.

The Senate last year passed the bill to restore the projects by voice vote, but earlier it had voted 69-30 on a bill that would have overturned all but two of the line-item vetoes. The Senate margin was also wide enough to overturn the veto.

The $287 million worth of projects would be built in 24 states and include training and maintenance facilities, improvement projects, and what House members called "quality of life projects," such as dining hall improvements. The largest item struck was a $20 million appropriation for a naval yard in Norfolk, Va.

The White House has acknowledged that 18 vetoes were based on erroneous data, although officials have not said which projects were canceled in error.

Clinton said he would work with Congress to fix any errors but that he stands by his decision to strike the other projects.

[ThisWeek]

SOCIAL POLICY: SURGEON GENERAL NOMINEE
Scheduled Events
(NEWS 02/02/98; 44 lines)
Item Key: 9559
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

SOCIAL POLICY: SURGEON GENERAL NOMINEE

By Richard Sammon, CQ Staff Writer

The Senate this week is poised to consider the nomination of David H. Satcher, President Clinton's pick to be surgeon general.

Satcher won the blessing of a divided Labor and Human Resources Committee on Oct. 5 when the panel voted 12-5 to send his nomination to the Senate.

Led chiefly by Daniel R. Coats, R-Ind., conservatives have criticized Satcher's support of President Clinton in opposing legislation that would ban "partial-birth" abortion, a specific type of late-term abortion technique.

Coats has also criticized Satcher for supporting some controversial AIDS studies conducted on pregnant, HIV-positive women in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. The studies raised criticism because some women were given AIDS drugs and others were given placebos.

But Satcher can look to other Republicans to rally to his defense.

Bill Frist, R-Tenn., a former heart surgeon, supports Satcher's nomination and is expected to express that support in a floor speech. Frist also defended the AIDS studies as ethical and appropriate.

Susan Collins, R-Maine, James M. Jeffords, R-Vt., and John W. Warner, R-Va., all voted for Satcher in committee and are expected to help shore up support on the floor.

With the help of Democrats and GOP moderates, Satcher's confirmation appears safe. But the debate could turn heated. Conservatives like John Ashcroft, R-Mo., and Rick Santorum, R-Pa., two vocal leaders in the GOP effort to ban the abortion procedure, are expected to speak in opposition.

The surgeon general post has been vacant since 1994 when Joycelyn Elders was fired for remarks she made on sexuality. Clinton tapped Dr. Henry Foster to replace her, but questions about the number of abortions he performed derailed his. nomination.

Satcher, 56, is currently the director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[ThisWeek]

There are no more items to read.

You are in NEWS
Enter number(s), a command, or MENU

!===
! Searching the SCHEDULE database
! Using the word list NASSIF
!

1 of 19 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

FY99 NATIONAL SECURITY APPROPS
Subcommittee Hearings
Future House committees
(SCHEDULE 02/04/98-02/26/98; Appropriations -- Subcommittee on National Security)
Item Key: 79
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

FY99 NATIONAL SECURITY APPROPS
Subcommittee Hearings

National Security Subcommittee (Chairman Young, R-Fla.) of House Appropriations Committee will hold hearings on FY99 appropriations for programs under its jurisdiction.

Feb. 4 9:30 am 2359 Rayburn Bldg.
Feb. 12 10:00 am 2359 Rayburn Bldg. CLOSED
Feb. 24 2:00 pm H-140 Capitol Bldg.
Feb. 25, 26 10:00 am & 1:30pm room TBA

Agenda & witnesses scheduled:
Feb. 4 Overview of defense budget
William S. Cohen - secretary of Defense; Gen. Henry H. Shelton - chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Feb. 12 Medical Programs
Edward D. Martin - acting assistant secretary of Defense, Services Surgeon General

Feb. 24 U.S. Central Command
Gen. Anthony C. Zinni - Commander in Chief, Marine Corps

Feb. 25
10am: FY99 Navy/Marine Corps Budget Overview
John H. Dalton - secretary of the Navy; Adm. Jay L. Johnson - chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Charles C. Krulak - commandant of the Marine Corps
1:30pm: FY99 Navy/Marine Corps Acquisition Program

Feb. 26
10am: FY99 Army Budget Overview
Robert M. Walker - under secretary of the Army; Gen. Dennis J. Reimer - chief of staff, Army
1:30pm: FY99 Army Acquisition Program

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

FY99 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
Future House committees
(SCHEDULE 02/05/98; National Security)
Item Key: 104
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

FY99 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

House National Security Committee (Chairman Spence, R-S.C.) will hold a hearing on the FY99 budget request for national defense programs.

Feb. 5 10:00 am 2118 Rayburn Bldg.

Witnesses scheduled:

William S. Cohen - Secretary of Defense; Gen. Henry Shelton
- chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

3 of 19 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

NATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING
Future House committees
(SCHEDULE 02/04/98; National Security)
Item Key: 105
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

NATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING

House National Security Committee (Chairman Spence, R-S.C.) will meet to consider pending business.

Feb. 4 2:30 pm 2118 Rayburn Bldg.

Agenda:

Official photograph
Tribute to Rep. Ronald V. Dellums, D-Calif.

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

4 of 19 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

FY99 TRANSPORTATION APPROPS
Subcommittee Hearings
Future House committees * Revised *
(SCHEDULE 02/03/98-03/12/98; Appropriations -- Subcommittee on Transportation)
Item Key: 75
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

FY99 TRANSPORTATION APPROPS * Revised *
Subcommittee Hearings

Transportation Subcommittee (Chairman Wolf, R-Va.) of House Appropriations Committee will hold hearings on FY99 appropriations for programs under its jurisdiction.

Feb. 3 10:00 am 2358 Rayburn Bldg.
Feb. 11, 12 2:00 pm 2358 Rayburn Bldg.
March 3, March 4, March 5, March 10, March 11, March 12 10:00 am 2358 Rayburn Bldg.

Witnesses scheduled:
Feb. 3
10am
Mayor Neil Giuliano - city of Tempe, Ariz., and chairman, Regional Public Transportation Authority Board of Directors representing Tempe and Phoenix cities; Rep. Diana DeGette, D-Colo., on behalf of the Regional Transportation District of Denver
10:10am
Reps. John L. Mica R-Fla.; Bill McCollum, R-Fla.; Leo Auger - executive director, Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority (LYNX)
10:30am
E. Clay Shaw, Jr. R-Fla, on behalf of Dade County Expressway Authority (DCEA); William Lehman - chairman, Intergovernmental Affairs Committee, DCEA Board, Servando M. Parapar - executive director, DCEA; Vice-mayor Jose Smith - city of Miami Beach
10:40am
Rep. Jim Davis, D-Fla.; Mayor Dick Greco, Tampa, Fla.; Perry Maull - transit director, Regional Transit System, Gainesville, Fla.; Howard R. Champion - president, Coalition for American Traua Care and research director, Program in Trauma and research professor of surgery, University of Maryland
10:55am
Charles M. Barclay - president, American Association of Airport Executives, and on behalf of Airports Council International-North America; Michael D. Fanfalone - president, Professional Airways Systems Specialists; Ed Bolen - president, General Aviation Manufacturers Association; Betty Ann Krahnke - member, executive committee, National Organization to Insure a Sound-Controlled Environment and councilmember, Montgomery County Council
11:15am
William W. Millar - president, American Public Transit Association; William Loftus - president, American Short llnea nd Regional Railroad Assocation; Harriet Parcells - executive director, American Passenger Rail Coalition; Max R. Sproles - general chairman and senior vice-president, American Road and Transportation Builders Association and Frederic R. Harris, Inc.; James E. Davis - executive director, American Society of Civil Engineers

12pm
Rep. Jack Quinn, R-N.Y.; Vito Fossella, R-N.Y.; Joseph P. Kennedy II, D-Mass.; Robert A. Weygand, D-R.I.
12:15pm
William D. Ankner - director, Rhode Island Department of Transportation, Coalition of Northeastern Governors; John G. Daly - senior advisor to Gov. George Pataki, N.Y.; Mayor Sharpe James, Newark, N.J.
12:30pm
Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-Calif.; Brian P. Bilbray, R-Calif.; Bob Filner, D-Calif.; Sarah L. Catz - chairman, Orange County Transportation Authority; Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, R-Calif.
12:50pm
Martin Hernandez - organizer, Labor/Community Strategy Center, Los Angeles, Calif.; Bill davis - vice-chair, Southern California Regional Rail Authority and chair, Ventura County Transportation Commission and council member, City of Simi Valley
1pm Rep. Norm Dicks, D-Wash.; Adam Smith, D-Wash.; Bob Drewel - chairman of the board, Central Pudget Sound Regional Transit Authority; Mayor Brian Ebersole - Tacoma, Wash. and chairman of the board of directors, Pierce Transit; Rep. Elizabeth Furse, D-Ore., on Westside Light Rail Project; Rep. Earl Blumenauer, D-Ore. and Bob Clement, D-Tenn. on the South/North Light Rail Project
1:20pm
Rep. Harold E. Ford., Jr., D-Tenn. on Memphis Area Transit Authority
1:30pm
Rep. Kay Granger, R-Texas on Trinity Railway Express; Rep. Martin Frost, D-Texas; Pete Sessions, R-Texas; Eddie Bernice Johnson, D-Texas; and Ralph M. Hall, D-Texas on the Dallas Area Rapid Transit; Rep. Ken Bentsen, D-Texas
1:45pm
Rep. Joe Knollenberg, R-Mich; Bart Stupak D-Mich.; Tim Roemer, D-Ind. on Transpo Intermodal Faciity, South Bend, Ind.; Rep. Peter J. Viscosky, D-Ind.
2pm
Rep. Owen B. Pickett, D-Va.; Robert C. Scott, D-Va.; Constance A. Morella, R-Md.; Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, D-Md. and Mayor Kurt Schmoke - Baltimore, Md. on the Baltimore People Mover Project; Albert R. Wynn, D-Md.; Paul E. Kanjorksi, D-Pa.
2:30pm
Michael F. Ouellette - director of legislative affairs, Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America; Dennis M. Duggan - assistant director, National Security Foreign Relations Commission; S. Peter Huhn - director of legislative affairs, Navy League of the United States
2:45pm
Rep. Wayne T. Gilchrest, R-Md. and chairman, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, Committee on

Tranpsortation and Infrastructure

Feb. 11
National Transportation Safety Board

Feb. 12
Office of Inspector General
U.S. General Accounting Office

March 3
Rodney Slater - secretary of Transportation

March 4
Federal Highway Administration
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

March 5
Coast Guard

March 10
Federal Aviation Administration

March 11
Federal Railroad Administration
Amtrack

March 12
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

5 of 19 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

NATO STRATEGY REFORM & FUTURE OF EUROPEN SECURITY
Future other news events
(SCHEDULE 02/04/98-02/05/98)
Item Key: 144
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

NATO STRATEGY REFORM & FUTURE OF EUROPEN SECURITY

British American Security Information Council will sponsor two briefings on NATO strategy reform and the future of European security.

Feb. 4 11:00 am SH-731 Hart Bldg.
Feb. 5 10:00 am Sommers Room, Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Ave. N.W.

Agenda:

Feb. 4
This session in intended primarily for Senate members and staff.
Speaker: Rob de Wijk - former head, Defense Concepts Division, Dutch Ministry of Defense
Contact: Jason Mott at 202-785-1266

Feb. 5
This session is open to the public and will be in the form of a statement followed by responses.
Speaker: Rob de Wijk - former head, Defense Concepts Division, Dutch Ministry of Defense
Responses: Martin Butcher - director, Center for European Security and Disarmament (Brussels); David Cortright - president, Fourth Freedom Forum
Moderator: James Leonard - former U.S. ambassador
Contact: Alistair Millar at 202-785-1266

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

FY99 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
Future Senate committees
(SCHEDULE 02/03/98; Armed Services)
Item Key: 22
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

FY99 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Senate Armed Services Committee (Chairman Thurmond, R-S.C.) will hold a hearing on the FY99 defense authorization request.

Feb. 3 2:00 pm SH-216 Hart Bldg.

Witnesses scheduled:
William S. Cohen - secretary of Defense; Gen. Henry H. Shelton, Army - chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

FY99 DEFENSE BUDGET
Future Senate committees
(SCHEDULE 02/05/98; Armed Services)
Item Key: 23
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

--- ---

FY99 DEFENSE BUDGET

Senate Armed Services Committee (Chairman Thurmond, R-S.C.) will hold a hearing on the FY99 Defense Department budget.

Feb. 5 2:00 pm SR-222 Russell Bldg.

Witnesses scheduled:
John Dalton - secretary of the Navy; Adm. Jay L. Johnson - chief of naval operations; Gen. Charles Krulak - commendant, Marine Corps

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR CLASSIFIED DISCLOSURES
Future Senate committees
(SCHEDULE 02/04/98; Select Intelligence)
Item Key: 66
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR CLASSIFIED DISCLOSURES

Senate Select Intelligence Committee (Chairman Shelby, R-Ala.) will hold a hearing on proposals the strengthen the protections for whistleblowers who convey classified information to Congress.

Feb. 4 9:30 am SH-219 Hart Bldg.

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

BANKRUPTCY ISSUES
Future other news events
(SCHEDULE 02/18/98)
Item Key: 137
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

BANKRUPTCY ISSUES

American Bankruptcy Institute will sponsor a debate on "The Time Has Come for a Needs-Based Consumer Bankruptcy System." Participants will include Rep. Bill McCollum, R-Fla.

Feb. 18 1:30 pm 2237 Rayburn Bldg.

Contact: Mana Zarinejad at 703-739-0800

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

BRIEFING ON IRAQ
Future House committees * New *
(SCHEDULE 02/04/98; Select Intelligence)
Item Key: 124
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

BRIEFING ON IRAQ * New *

House Select Intelligence Committee (Chairman Goss, R-Fla.) will receive a closed briefing on the situation in Iraq.

Feb. 4 2:00 pm H-405 Capitol Bldg. CLOSED

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION VETO
Schedule highlights
(SCHEDULE 02/02/98)
Item Key: 6
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION VETO

By Bob Gravely, CQ Staff Writer

The House is set this week to resume battle with President Clinton over the fate of 38 military construction projects.

The chamber will try on Wednesday or Thursday to override Clinton's veto of legislation that would restore $287 million in project funding that was in the $9.2 billion fiscal 1998 military construction spending bill (PL 105-45) but that Clinton struck with the line-item veto.

The House last year passed legislation (HR2631) to restore the funding on a 362-64 vote -- a wide enough margin needed for a two-thirds majority to override the veto.

The Senate last year passed the bill to restore the projects by voice vote, but earlier it had voted 69-30 on a bill that would have overturned all but two of the line-item vetoes. The Senate margin was also wide enough to overturn the veto.

The $287 million worth of projects would be built in 24 states and include training and maintenance facilities, improvement projects, and what House members called "quality of life projects," such as dining hall improvements. The largest item struck was a $20 million appropriation for a naval yard in Norfolk, Va.

The White House has acknowledged that 18 vetoes were based on erroneous data, although officials have not said which projects were canceled in error.

Clinton said he would work with Congress to fix any errors but that he stands by his decision to strike the other projects.

[ThisWeek]

U.S.-CHINA NUCLEAR COOPERATION
Future House committees
(SCHEDULE 02/04/98; International Relations)
Item Key: 99
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

U.S.-CHINA NUCLEAR COOPERATION

House International Relations Committee (Chairman Gilman, R-N.Y.) will hold a hearing on the implementation of the U.S.-China nuclear cooperation agreement.

Feb. 4 10:00 am 2172 Rayburn Bldg. OPEN/CLOSED

Witnesses scheduled:
Robert Einhorn - deputy assistant secretary of State for non-proliferation, Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs (open session); John Lauder - director, Nonproliferation Center, CIA (closed session)

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

SOCIAL POLICY: SURGEON GENERAL NOMINEE
Schedule highlights
(SCHEDULE 02/02/98)
Item Key: 7
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

SOCIAL POLICY: SURGEON GENERAL NOMINEE

By Richard Sammon, CQ Staff Writer

The Senate this week is poised to consider the nomination of David H. Satcher, President Clinton's pick to be surgeon general.

Satcher won the blessing of a divided Labor and Human Resources Committee on Oct. 5 when the panel voted 12-5 to send his nomination to the Senate.

Led chiefly by Daniel R. Coats, R-Ind., conservatives have criticized Satcher's support of President Clinton in opposing legislation that would ban "partial-birth" abortion, a specific type of late-term abortion technique.

Coats has also criticized Satcher for supporting some controversial AIDS studies conducted on pregnant, HIV-positive women in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. The studies raised criticism because some women were given AIDS drugs and others were given placebos.

But Satcher can look to other Republicans to rally to his defense.

Bill Frist, R-Tenn., a former heart surgeon, supports Satcher's nomination and is expected to express that support in a floor speech. Frist also defended the AIDS studies as ethical and appropriate.

Susan Collins, R-Maine, James M. Jeffords, R-Vt., and John W. Warner, R-Va., all voted for Satcher in committee and are expected to help shore up support on the floor.

With the help of Democrats and GOP moderates, Satcher's confirmation appears safe. But the debate could turn heated. Conservatives like John Ashcroft, R-Mo., and Rick Santorum, R-Pa., two vocal leaders in the GOP effort to ban the abortion procedure, are expected to speak in opposition.

The surgeon general post has been vacant since 1994 when Joycelyn Elders was fired for remarks she made on sexuality. Clinton tapped Dr. Henry Foster to replace her, but questions about the number of abortions he performed derailed his. nomination.

Satcher, 56, is currently the director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[ThisWeek]

FY99 VA-HUD APPROPS
Subcommittee Hearings
Future House committees
(SCHEDULE 02/10/98-04/23/98; Appropriations -- Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies)
Item Key: 80
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

FY99 VA-HUD APPROPS
Subcommittee Hearings

Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Subcommittee (Chairman Lewis, R-Calif.) of House Appropriations Committee will hold hearings on FY99 appropriations for programs under its jurisdiction.

Feb. 10 10:00 am & 11am H-143 Capitol Bldg.
Feb. 12 9:00 am, 10am & 11am H-143 Capitol Bldg.
Feb. 24, 26 10:00 am & 11am H-143 Capitol Bldg.
March 3, March 4 10:00 am & 2pm H-143 Capitol Bldg.
March 5 10:00 am H-143 Capitol Bldg.
March 10 10:00 am & 2pm 2359 Rayburn Bldg.
2359 Rayburn Bldg.
March 11 10:00 am & 2pm 2359 Rayburn Bldg.
March 12 10:00 am H-143 Capitol Bldg.
March 17, March 18 10:00 am & 2pm 2359 Rayburn Bldg.
March 19 10:00 am & 11am H-143 Capitol Bldg.
March 24, March 25 10:00 am & 2pm 2359 Rayburn Bldg.
March 26 10:00 am & 2pm H-143 Capitol Bldg.
March 31, April 1 10:00 am & 2pm 2359 Rayburn Bldg.
April 21, April 22 10:00 am & 1pm H-143 Capitol Bldg.
April 23 10:00 am H-143 Capitol Bldg.

Agenda & witnesses scheduled:
Feb. 10
10am: Consumer Product Safety Commission
11am: Consumer Information Center

Feb. 12
9am:
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board
10am:
Department of Defense - Civil
Cemeterial Expenses, Army
11am:
Council on Environmental Quality

Feb. 24
10am: Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
11am: National Credit Union Administration

Feb. 26
10am: Court of Veterans Appeals
11am: Selective Service System

March 3
Federal Emergency Management Agency

March 4
Corporation for National and Community Service

March 5
Community Development Financial Institution

March 10
Environmental Protection Agency

March 11
Environmental Protection Agency

March 12
NASA Space Station Programs

March 17
Department of Veterans Affairs

March 18
Department of Veterans Affairs

March 19
10am: American Battle Monuments Commission
11am: Office of the Inspector General, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

March 24
Department of Housing and Urban Development

March 25
Department of Housing and Urban Development

March 26
National Science Foundation

March 31
National Aeronautics and Space Administration

April 1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration

April 21
Public Witnesses

April 22
Public Witnesses

April 23
Congressional Witnesses

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

15 of 19 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98
REVISION OF GOVERNMENT ACQUISITION POLICIES
Other news events
(SCHEDULE 02/02/98)
Item Key: 13
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

REVISION OF GOVERNMENT ACQUISITION POLICIES

American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA) will sponsor a conference on "Acquisition Reform: For the Long Haul." Scheduled speakers include Jacques Gansler, under secretary of Defense for acquisition and technology.

Feb. 2 Time TBA Hyatt Regency Hotel Crystal City

Contact: 800-639-2422

Information verified as of 09:47pm 01/30/98

16 of 19 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

KYOTO CLIMATE AGREEMENT
Other news events
(SCHEDULE 02/02/98)
Item Key: 16
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

KYOTO CLIMATE AGREEMENT

Energy and Environment Task Force of Women in Government Relations will sponsor an event to receive a briefing by Acting Assistant Secretary of State Melinda Kimble on the recent global climate treaty negotiations in Kyoto, Japan. Other participants include representatives of the Environmental Defense Fund, the Global Climate Coalition and Senate Energy Committee staff.

Feb. 2 3:00 pm American Trucking Associations, 430 First St. S.E.

Contact: 202-347-5432

Note: There is a charge for this event of $15 for members, $10 for public sector members and $25 for non-members. Reservations must be made in advance. Send a check, made payable to WGR, to:
Women in Government Relations
1029 Vermont Ave. N.W.
Suite 510
Washington, D.C. 20005

Information verified as of 09:47pm 01/30/98

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY: IRAQ RESOLUTION
Schedule highlights
(SCHEDULE 02/02/98)
Item Key: 2
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY: IRAQ RESOLUTION

By Richard Sammon, CQ Staff Writer

The Senate is scheduled to act this week on a joint resolution warning Iraq to cooperate with international inspection teams trying to root out its weapons of mass destruction programs.

Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., wanted to act on the resolution (SCONRES71) last Thursday, but the effort ground to a halt when key Democrats expressed concern about the broad scope of the resolution, which urges the president to "take all necessary and appropriate actions" to force Iraq to comply with international inspection -- essentially authorizing using force without limitation.

The resolution adheres to President Clinton's warning to Iraq's Saddam Hussein in his State of the Union address that he cannot defy the determination of world powers to strip Iraq of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons materials.

Vietnam War veterans Max Cleland, D-Ga., and Bob Kerrey, D-Neb., said the current wording could lead the United States into a protracted conflict.

Kerrey said the language "bears a striking similarity to Tonkin Gulf," the historic resolution often cited as the starting point of the Vietnam War.

Kerrey said he was confident new language could be developed that would be more specific about what actions Congress would authorize and for how long. It may also call for a larger administration effort to shore up allies' support for possible military action if the standoff continues.

Paul Wellstone, D-Minn., said Congress should not act on a resolution until the military briefs members on the situation and what steps the administration is considering. The briefings could occur this week.

Lott said it was important that Congress send a message to Iraq that the United States is not shying away from a potential showdown and that it is not preoccupied with domestic issues at a time when much of the news is being driven by Clinton's personal affairs.

Lott said his intent is for a bipartisan resolution, and he wants Minority Leader Tom Daschle, S.D., to be the chief co-sponsor.

[ThisWeek]

18 of 19 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

AMERICAN SEA POWER IN THE 21ST CENTURY
Future other news events
(SCHEDULE 02/25/98-03/19/98)
Item Key: 162
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

AMERICAN SEA POWER IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The American Shipbuilding Association in cooperation with the U.S. Naval Institute, the National Defense Industrial Association, the Navy League of the United States, the Naval Submarine League, the Surface Navy Association and the Association of Naval Aviation, with the co-sponsorship of several senators and members of the House will sponsor a series of seminars on "American Sea Power in the 21st Century."

Feb. 25 Noon SC-5 Capitol Bldg.
March 19 7:30 am HC-5 Capitol Bldg.

Contact: Liz Roberts at 202-544-8170

March 19 Liz Roberts at 202-544-8170

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

19 of 19 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

REVISION OF GOVERNMENT ACQUISITION POLICIES

Future other news events
(SCHEDULE 02/03/98)
Item Key: 164
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

REVISION OF GOVERNMENT ACQUISITION POLICIES

American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA) will sponsor a conference on "Acquisition Reform: For the Long Haul." Scheduled speakers include Jacques Gansler, under secretary of Defense for acquisition and technology.

Feb. 3 Time TBA Hyatt Regency Hotel Crystal City

Contact: 800-639-2422

Information verified as of 09:55pm 01/30/98

There are no more items to read.

You are in SCHEDULE
Enter number(s), a command, or MENU

!==
! Searching the FLOORWATCH database for CQ's HOUSE ACTION REPORTS
! Using the word list NASSIF
!

1 of 1 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

LEGISLATIVE WEEK -- WEEK OF FEBRUARY 2, 1998
House Legislative Week
(FLOORWATCH 02/02/98; 680 lines)
Item Key: 731
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
-- including historically black and hispanic institutions, and technical colleges or at undergraduate institutions in connection with other FAA-supported research activities. Grants would have to be awarded through a competitive, merit-based process. The Senate version earmarks $750,000 per year for these grants (the House bill earmarked $500,000).

Promote Merit-Based Awarding of Grants

Like the House-passed bill, the measure generally prohibits private contractors and other non-federal entities who receive any type of federal grant for a project -- which was not awarded through a merit-based competitive review process -- from receiving FAA RE&D grants for a period of five years from the time the non-competitive grant was awarded. This prohibition would apply only to entities that receive non-competitive federal grants after FY 1997; the prohibition would not

----

Through his leadership and dedication, President Reagan ushered in a new era of sustained peace, prosperity, growth and freedom for our nation, and for much of the world. His policies invigorated the U.S. economy, restored national security, and paved the way for the successful end of the Cold War. All freedom-loving people throughout the world owe him a great debt of gratitude.

----

comments to the court indicating that the task force was made up only of federal employees, when, in fact, the group's membership included numerous consultants and representatives of outside interest groups. Based on Magaziner's description of the task force, Judge Lamberth and appeals court judges ruled that the task force could meet in secret. In her ruling this year, Judge Lamberth said that if the court had known of the group's actual makeup, the task force would have been forced to

----

* Two facility improvement projects in Fort Irwin, California ($2.7 million and $8.5 million);

* New support facilities at Moody Air Force Base in Georgia ($6.8 million);

* New maintenance facilities at Grissom Air Reserve Base in Indiana

----

There are no more items to excerpt.

You are in FLOORWATCH
Enter number(s), a command, or MENU

!==
! Searching the CQ WEEKLY REPORT MAGAZINE
! Using the word list NASSIF
!

1 of 12 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

Cleland Warns Against Repeating Tonkin Gulf Mistake
Defense
Foreign Policy
Government Operations/Exec Branch
Inside Congress/Lobbies
Law/Judiciary/Supreme Court
(SCONRES71; WR 01/31/98 p. 0247; 128 lines)
Item Key: 2403
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

FOREIGN POLICY

Cleland Warns Against Repeating Tonkin Gulf Mistake

>> Vietnam vet leads group of Senate Democrats in seeking less 'open-ended' Iraq resolution

By Donna Cassata, CQ Staff Writer

For Democratic Sen. Max Cleland of Georgia, the proposed congressional resolution endorsing a strong U.S. response to Iraq bore a disconcerting resemblance to a document three decades ago -- the 1964 Tonkin Gulf resolution that essentially gave the president a blank check to wage the Vietnam War.

Cleland, a former Army captain who lost both legs and one arm in a grenade explosion during the war, led a handful of dissenting Democrats on Jan. 29 in delaying all-but-certain Senate passage of an Iraq resolution.

Arguing that the non-binding, bipartisan measure (SCONRES71) was "overly broad and open-ended," the Democrats pressed congressional leaders to come up with a revised version.

"I've been down that road personally once before," Cleland said. "I don't want to go down it again."

The Senate and House are expected to act on a resolution the week of Feb. 2.

Iraq has defied the world community for months by refusing to allow international inspectors to examine its nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs.

In his State of the Union speech on Jan. 27, President Clinton had a stern warning for the president of Iraq: "I know I speak for everyone in this chamber, Republicans and Democrats, when I say to Saddam Hussein: 'You cannot defy the will of the world.' And when I say to him, 'You have used weapons of mass destruction before. We are determined to deny you the capacity to use them again.' " (Story, p. 215; text, p. 251)

Congressional leaders subsequently wrote the resolution condemning Iraq's resistance to full-scale inspections and urging Clinton to take "all necessary and appropriate actions to respond."

That wording was discomfiting to Cleland, who questioned whether history was on the verge of repeating itself.

In 1964, in the wake of reports that North Vietnamese boats had attacked U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin, President Lyndon B. Johnson ordered air strikes on Hanoi's naval base and asked Congress for a strong statement against Communist aggression.

The Tonkin Gulf resolution, which the House and Senate passed overwhelmingly, supported the president's determination "to take all necessary measures" to repel an armed attack and aggression. (1964

Almanac, p. 331)

The executive branch interpreted that broad language as the legal authority to wage war, and although Congress repealed the resolution in 1970, the conflict did not end until 1975. (1970 Almanac, p. 948)

Cleland said he supports a strong congressional statement against Iraq and has asked Minority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., and Carl Levin of Michigan, the ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, to come up with a revised version, perhaps based on the resolution Congress passed in January 1991 authorizing the use of force against Iraq after its invasion of Kuwait. That measure cited the War Powers Resolution, which granted Congress the specific statutory authority for using force. (1991 Almanac, p. 437)

If the leaders fail to come up with a revised version, Cleland said he and Sen. Richard J. Durbin, D-Ill., would offer amendments to the non-binding resolution. Another dissenting Democrat suggested it would not reach that point.

"This is really about something large being written very quickly. We'll work it out," said Sen. Bob Kerrey, D-Neb., who is also a decorated veteran of the Vietnam War.

But the delay surprised some Republicans who were baffled by the fuss over a non-binding resolution that had strong bipartisan backing and was intended to support a Democratic president who called for unity in his State of the Union address.

MESSAGE TO ALLIES

Congressional leaders felt compelled to issue a strong statement on Iraq to underscore U.S. resolve as the administration deals with a crisis over allegations that Clinton had a sexual relationship with a White House intern and told her to lie about it.

In an interview with ABC on Jan. 25, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., said the accusations were a distraction. Lott also said he was "worried now on how it will be interpreted" overseas.

The resolution was "not just for Saddam, but it's for our allies," said Sen. Chuck Hagel, R-Neb., a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright embarked on a series of diplomatic meetings in Europe on Jan. 29. She indicated that American patience with Iraq was wearing thin and that unilateral U.S. military action was a strong option.

In testimony to Congress on Jan. 28, director of Central Intelligence George J. Tenet said the United States has destroyed much of Iraq's Scud missile and chemical weapons capabilities.

However, Tenet said, "we are still worried about his biological weapons capability."

From the Tonkin Gulf resolution (HJRES1145) of August 1964:

. . . the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

From the Iraq resolution (SCONRES71) of January 1998:

. . . the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring . . . urges the President to take all necessary and appropriate actions to respond to the threat posed by Iraq's refusal to end its weapons of mass destruction programs. . . .
GRAPHICS:

Congress Finds No Easy Answers To Internet Controversies
Environment/Science
Inside Congress/Lobbies
Government Operations/Exec Branch
Trade/Transportation/Commerce
Law/Judiciary/Supreme Court
(S442, HR2380, HR695, S1482, S1356, HR2791, S474, HR1054; WR 01/31/98 p. 0237; 350 lines)
Item Key: 2402
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

TECHNOLOGY

Congress Finds No Easy Answers To Internet Controversies

>> On matters of censorship, privacy, taxation and commerce, Hill struggles to regulate new industry without stifling it

By Juliana Gruenwald, CQ Staff Writer

Internet surfers who inadvertently log on to "www.whitehouse.com" are in for a big surprise.

Instead of finding information about the president and the executive branch, visitors will find an X-rated Web site complete with flashing pictures of scantily clad women and ways to link up to live video strip shows.

This is exactly the type of site that worries members of Congress who are concerned about the relatively easy access children have to pornography on-line. Internet users will find themselves connected to the X-rated White House just by typing "com" instead of "gov" at the end of the Internet address.

As lawmakers return for the second session of the 105th Congress, they will likely take up a wide range of Internet-related issues.

From taxes to gambling to unsolicited e-mail, dozens of bills have been introduced to restrict or in some way govern the growth of the Internet, a global communications network that links people via computers and telephone lines worldwide.

Republican Rep. Rick White of Washington, co-founder of the Congressional Internet Caucus, said Congress' watchword is, "When in doubt, regulate it. [But] that's not always the right approach."

But Congress is finding there are no easy answers in dealing with this new medium.

Although developed with the help of the federal government, the Internet is not owned by anyone, and it is not confined by geographical borders. Many lawmakers may be familiar with the Internet but know little of its workings.

"There are very many members of Congress who know the Internet as a word but don't have any idea how it works and the potential it has for changing economic and human behavior," said Democratic Rep. Zoe Lofgren of California.

DEGREES OF FREEDOM

But the high-tech industry and its supporters say the Internet must remain free of regulation in order to grow and prosper.

"I think that the heart of the challenge is to expand the access of the new technology without expanding government intervention," said Sen. Ron Wyden, D-Ore., who has sponsored a bill (S442) that would impose a moratorium on taxation aimed directly at the Internet.

For the most part, the Clinton administration has said it is willing to let industry lead the way. In a report released in July 1997, the White House endorsed the idea of keeping the Internet as free of regulation as possible. "We don't want to govern the Internet," said Larry Irving, administrator of the Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

In his State of the Union address on Jan. 27, Clinton said, "We must give parents the tools they need to help protect their children from inappropriate material on the Net, but we also must make sure that we protect the exploding global commercial potential of the Internet."

But some members are determined that Congress not give special treatment to the Internet merely because it is a new form of communication.

"The Internet can ride over a phone line, cable wire or broadcast over a television signal. . . . It is not qualitatively better than other communications media," said Democratic Rep. Edward J. Markey of Massachusetts, who has raised questions about the fairness of imposing a moratorium on Internet taxes.

Other lawmakers argue that Congress must establish ground rules in some areas such as limiting children's access to pornographic sites and not expanding gambling via the Internet to states where it is currently illegal.

"You have to have some kind of rules; you just can't have totally unfettered commerce," said Rep. Michael G. Oxley, R-Ohio, who has supported restrictions on encryption -- data scrambling technology used to prevent unauthorized access to electronic data on the Internet. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 3003)

Republican Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte of Virginia, said Congress needs to examine each issue on a case by case basis. He has proposed legislation (HR2380) that would ban gambling on the Internet and require Internet service providers to discontinue service to gambling sites identified by the Federal Communications Commission.

At the same time, Goodlatte also is the chief sponsor of a bill (HR695) to relax current restrictions on the export of encryption products. He and others say securing information through encryption is a critical element in the growth of Internet commerce because many people are not willing to send sensitive information, such as their credit card numbers or Social Security numbers, over the Internet unless they can be sure it is kept private.

GOVERNMENT ORIGINS

The Internet was developed in the late 1960s by the Pentagon's Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) as an experimental computer network aimed at withstanding a military attack and communicating with universities and researchers.

As use of this network (known as ARPAnet) grew, it was divided into a military and civilian network. The civilian network was managed by the National Science Foundation. After generally being reserved for use by universities and government agencies, it was eventually opened to commercial use in the 1980s.

Today, the Internet is quickly becoming a ubiquitous part of society. One of the most popular aspects of the Internet is the World Wide Web (WWW), where companies, government agencies and even individuals can post "web pages" with news, entertainment and other information.

But the Internet is more than just a means of disseminating information. In fact, it is increasingly a way for businesses to conduct transactions.

A study in July 1997 by Forrester Research, a technology research company based in Cambridge, Mass., estimated that the value of goods and services traded over the Internet would grow from $8 billion in 1997 to $327 billion by 2002. That does not include consumers who are increasingly shopping on the Internet.

According to a joint survey by CommerceNet, an industry association that promotes electronic commerce, and Nielsen Media Research, the media research firm that produces the Nielsen ratings of television viewership, released in March 1997, about 5.6 million people reported using the Internet to purchase products.

DEALING WITH PORNOGRAPHY

Among the first issues lawmakers will take up this year is pornography on the Internet. The Senate Commerce, Science and Committee has scheduled a hearing Feb. 10 on on-line pornography and on Coats' bill (S1482), which would prohibit Internet distribution of material harmful to minors, including material that depicts, describes or represents sexual acts.

"I'm the last person who wants to impose regulation on what I think is a marvelous technology," Coats said. But "I do think that society has a responsibility" to protect minors.

Congress banned dissemination to minors of "indecent" or "patently offensive" material on the Internet in the 1996 telecommunications law (PL 104-104). The Supreme Court struck down that provision in June 1997, saying its broad wording also imposed impermissible limits on adults. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 1519)

Many of the high-tech free speech groups that fought that anti-pornography provision all the way to the Supreme Court have come out against S1482 as well. "Given the fact that parents already have tools available to control what their children see [on the Internet], the [Coats'] legislation would be unconstitutional,"said James X. Dempsey, senior staff counsel for the Center for Democracy and Technology, a group that promotes on-line civil liberties.

WEB OF ISSUES

Prodded by the administration, which originally defended the communications act in court, the center co-sponsored a three-day summit in December 1997 to promote the use of software to block out Web sites that parents may not want their children to access. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 3028)

Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee Chairman John McCain, R-Ariz., has not said whether he will support Coats' bill, but he plans to introduce legislation that would tie funding for schools and libraries to hook up to the Internet to the use of some type of blocking technology that would limit minors' access to on-line smut.

"I believe the minimum of regulation is in order, but there are some things you simply can't ignore," McCain said, citing child molesters who get information about children from the Internet.

Legislation introduced by Sen. Lauch Faircloth, R-N.C., (S1356) and Rep. Marge Roukema, R-N.J., (HR2791) would prohibit Internet service providers from giving an account to those registered as convicted sexual predators under Megan's Law (PL 104-236), which allowed the FBI to provide the names of sexual offenders released from jail to local authorities.

But pornography is not the only cyber-sin that is creating problems for Congress. Lawmakers may also take action this year on legislation to crack down on Internet gambling. The House Judiciary Committee's Crime Subcommittee is scheduled to hold hearings Feb. 4 on Goodlatte's legislation. In the Senate, Republican Jon Kyl of Arizona will be pushing for floor action on a similar bill (S474). Kyl's bill was approved by the Judiciary Committee in October. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 3010)

While many high-tech companies have been reluctant to take a stand on the issue, the Interactive Services Association, which represents Internet service providers and other high-tech companies, opposes the bill, arguing that the legislation will open the door to further regulation of the Internet.

DATA SCRAMBLING

While pornography and gambling remain two areas of concern for lawmakers, encryption is one of the most contentious issues to surface in this Congress. Many high-technology companies are backing Goodlatte's bill, which would allow U.S. companies to export encryption products that are equal in strength to those generally available overseas. They say current restrictions are hampering their ability to compete with foreign companies who can export much stronger forms of encryption.

The administration has opposed relaxing export controls because of concerns by law enforcement officials that widespread use of robust encryption will hamper law enforcement and intelligence-gathering. But FBI Director Louis J. Freeh set off alarms last summer in the high-tech community by also advocating that Congress require manufacturers to include a feature in encryption products sold domestically that would allow law enforcement, under warranted circumstances, to gain access to the keys needed to decode encrypted communications -- an idea opposed by industry.

Five committees in 1997 approved various forms of HR695 that would impose the domestic controls Freeh has advocated. House Rules Committee Chairman Gerald B.H. Solomon, R-N.Y., whose panel must decide which version to send to the House floor, has said he will not allow HR695 to go to the floor unless it includes the provisions backed by law enforcement officials.

But the high-tech industry representatives say they would prefer no bill to one that imposes new controls on encryption.

So far, some lawmakers and even some industry officials question whether Congress can settle the matter.

Debra Waggoner, a vice president for international affairs at the American Electronics Association, said encryption "is where the rubber meets the road" for the Clinton administration and its declaration of avoiding any legislation that could hamper the growth of Internet commerce.

INFORMING CONGRESS

Many lawmakers and industry executives say it is no surprise that Congress is having a difficult time dealing with the Internet.

"The issues tend to be fairly complex and technical from a legal and from a technological perspective," said John Scheibel, vice president and general counsel for the Computer and Communications Industry Association.

Democratic Sen. Patrick J. Leahy of Vermont, who has been active on many Internet issues, recalled how he recently was describing to some colleagues how he uses e-mail to communicate with his children and realized afterward that many of his colleagues were not familiar with what he was talking about.

"I think at some point on some of these things, we have to stop pretending we know everything," Leahy said.

Dave McClure, executive director of the Association of On-line Professionals, said whenever a medium has emerged that has "so much potential for both good and evil, it's going to come to the attention of government and the attention of Congress." But McClure and others have expressed concern about some of the approaches lawmakers have taken. In particular, they are concerned about efforts to force Internet service providers to stop an undesirable practice, as the sexual predator and Internet gambling bills would do.

"I don't think Internet service providers should be deputized as cops on the Net," said Dempsey of the Center for Democracy and Technology.

Meanwhile, high-technology companies have been moving aggressively to inform lawmakers about how the technology works in an effort to stop troublesome legislation and promote bills favorable to their industry. (Box, p. 239)

Among the measures they are pushing is Wyden's legislation (S442) and a similar bill introduced in the House (HR1054) that would establish a moratorium on taxes specifically aimed at the Internet, while excluding such traditional levies as property and payroll taxes. Its supporters say it is necessary to call a time out so that the Internet is not handicapped by overzealous state and local officials who see an opportunity to reap tax revenues. Opponents see a moratorium as an unnecessary pre-emption of state and local taxing authority.

Sen. Byron L. Dorgan, D-N.D., believes that some in the high-tech community are trying to take advantage of the complexity and the novelty of the issues surrounding the Internet by pushing legislation that will be profitable to their industry. He points to the Internet tax bill as an example, saying it is an attempt "to do an end run around state and local tax jurisdictions."

The Internet "is raising all sorts of policy issues," Dorgan said. "There will be people who want to take advantage of that."

WHO USES THE INTERNET

Gender and marital status

Male	57%
Female	43%
Married	59%
Single	32%
Other	9%

Household income

Less than $50,000	34%
$50,000-74,000	26%
$75,000-149,000	34%
$150,000 or more	7%

Education

Graduated from college	49%
Attended college	37%
Didn't attend college	14%

Business vs. personal

Work	13.8 million of adults
Home	16.6 million of adults

Total: 31.7 million adults

SOURCE: Mediamark Research Inc., CyberStats, Spring 1997

Starr's Inquiry Prompts Questions On Independent Counsel Law
Government Operations/Exec Branch
Inside Congress/Lobbies
Law/Judiciary/Supreme Court
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0219; 340 lines)
Item Key: 2409
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

THE PRESIDENCY

Starr's Inquiry Prompts Questions On Independent Counsel Law

>> Critics say expanded inquiry and court rulings have combined to weaken the presidency

By Dan Carney, CQ Staff Writer

In his impassioned and lone dissent in Morrison v. Olson, the 1988 case that upheld the law creating independent counsels, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia minced few words. The law, he wrote, was an affront to the separation of powers and an invitation for enemies of the president to paralyze the White House with never-ending prosecutions.

"How much easier it is for Congress, instead of accepting the political damage attendant to the commencement of impeachment proceedings against the president on trivial grounds -- or, for that matter, how easy it is for one of the president's political foes outside of Congress -- simply to trigger a debilitating criminal investigation of the chief executive under this law." (1988 Almanac, p. 123)

Observing the events of the last week and a half, one can only wonder if Scalia has ribbed his fellow justices or kept his thoughts to himself. It is probably safe to say that the expression, "I told you so" has crossed his mind, if not his lips.

Independent Counsel Kenneth W. Starr's investigation into allegations that President Clinton had an affair with a former White House intern and then asked her to lie about it could play out any number of ways. Anything from the president's ruin to his exoneration, to something in between, seems possible.

What is becoming more clear though, is that the Monica Lewinsky episode will prompt a number of questions about the the relationship between the presidency and the other two branches of government. Among them: Is the nation best served by a prosecutor gathering enormous amounts information about the president, as if waiting for him to make a mistake? Have actions by Congress and the courts eroded the institution of the presidency? Is it really possible to separate the president's public functions and his private life into distinct categories, as the Supreme Court tried to do in deciding that the Paula Jones sexual harassment lawsuit against Clinton could go forward?

GROWING CRITICISM

Obviously, if Starr comes forward with evidence of wrongdoing by Clinton, much of the blame for damage done to the presidency will rest on Clinton's shoulders. Even so, lawmakers, lawyers and scholars are all beginning to wonder if something has not gone wrong with the system.

"I do think we have to ask the question, what do we really want?" said Thomas O. Sargentich, professor at the Washington College of Law at American University. "Certainly we want to have criminality investigated. But we need to worry about what this means for the institution of the presidency."

In its independent counsel statute, most recently reauthorized in 1994 (PL 103-270), Congress has created a prosecutor whose connection to any of the existing branches of governments is tenuous at best, whose jurisdiction is almost impossible to control, and who is not accountable to any elected officeholder. Heretofore the statute has generally been criticized by the party that holds the White House, and praised by the party that does not. But in the wake of the Lewinksy scandal, it is receiving a more bipartisan, and largely negative, appraisal. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 2843.)

"I think you're going to see a strong bipartisan support now for narrowing the focus" of independent counsels, said Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz.

Sen. Fred Thompson, R-Tenn., whose Governmental Affairs Committee has jurisdiction over the statute, acknowledges he is troubled by the law. "Years before I got involved in politics I had concerns about this kind of statute," said Thompson, who was a Senate counsel during the Watergate hearings.

On the Democratic side, Sen. Patrick J. Leahy of Vermont is blunt. "The statute," he said, "is not going to be reauthorized like it is now. If there was a secret ballot today it would be eliminated."

Leahy said both Starr and Lawrence Walsh, the independent counsel in the Iran-contra affair, have undermined the law. He has been highly critical of Starr. In a Jan. 27 floor speech he called Starr's probe "the most partisan, unjustified, demeaning investigation that I can ever remember in my life."

ORIGINS OF THE LAW

Before the passage of the first independent counsel act (PL 95-521) in 1978, investigations of high government officials were carried out by Justice Department prosecutors. They were afforded a fair amount of autonomy and were given the title of special prosecutor. But they reported up a clear chain of command to the attorney general, and ultimately to the president.

The shortcomings of this system were demonstrated in the firing of Watergate Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox in the 1973 "Saturday Night Massacre." Cox was fired under orders from Richard M. Nixon by then-Solicitor General Robert H. Bork, but only after Attorney General Elliot Richardson and his deputy, William D. Ruckelshaus, resigned rather than carry out the order.

The first independent counsel statute (which has been reauthorized three times since) was the product of this historic event. The underlying themes of the legislation are that the president should not be able to fire someone who is investigating him or his administration, and that a conventional prosecutor would face a conflict of interest investigating his own boss.

The shortcomings of the current system, critics say, has been demonstrated by several independent counsels, whose investigations have expanded well beyond their original focus, lasted years, and sometimes involved innocent people or trivial charges.

Democrats tend to be most critical of Starr, whose 41-month investigation started as a probe into Clinton's Arkansas land deals known as Whitewater, and has since come to include the White House travel office, the FBI's handing of sensitive personnel files to Clinton aides, and the president's personal life. The cost of his probe hit $25.6 million last March 31.

Republicans are most critical of Walsh and his six-year, $48.5 million probe of the Iran-contra affair. Others that have been criticized include Donald C. Smaltz's probe of former Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy, and David M. Barrett's investigation of former Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros.

In the wake of the Lewinsky episode, lawmakers on both sides of the aisle are beginning to wonder if the old system of the Justice Department doing its own investigations was so bad. After all, Nixon's firing of Cox prompted a public outcry that proved to be the beginning of the end for him. Even Bork may have suffered for his role in the firing, when his 1987 nomination to the Supreme Court was scuttled by the Senate. (1987 Almanac, p. 271)

"Having Justice examine some of these cases may turn out to be the least worst alternative," said Thompson.

Indeed, critics of Starr have been very much in evidence of late. They question how he has been able to take his investigation so far afield of his original mandate, why he started making secret tape recordings of Lewinsky's talks with friend Linda Tripp before getting approval from Attorney General Janet Reno, and why he used such a covert tactic perhaps more appropriate to nabbing some mob boss than a 24-year-old former intern.

Starr may well have violated some unwritten canon of prosecutorial appropriateness. And if he, or anyone on his staff, leaked confidential material, that would constitute a crime.

But Starr clearly did not violate the terms of the act that created his position -- which is exactly why so many lawmakers are wondering if they have created a monster.

A WIDE MANDATE

Starr started with a mandate that was broad enough to accommodate the complex Whitewater scandal. That authority included the financial affairs of Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton and their business partner, James B. McDougal, that were related to any of three companies: Whitewater Development Corp., the Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association, or Capital Management Services Inc.

He also could pursue any obstruction of justice or perjury arising out of this. And he won a provision allowing him to expand his probe on his own, to some degree. Specifically, he was granted authority to "investigate other allegations or evidence of violation of any federal criminal law . . . by any person or entity developed during the Independent Counsel's investigation . . . and connected with or arising out that investigation."

Since the original charter, he has been given the authority to move into several other areas, including the FBI's "filegate" affair, the White House travel office, and, most recently, the Monica Lewinsky episode.

Under the statute, such expansions of jurisdiction are fairly easy to obtain so long as Starr has some evidence of criminal wrongdoing. He need only take his evidence to Reno. She can block his request only if she can conclude within 30 days, and after according "great weight" to his recommendations, that there are no "reasonable grounds to believe that further investigation is warranted."

This is the same standard used in deciding whether to appoint an independent counsel in the first place. In the case of expanding jurisdiction, however, the evidence comes not from the attorney general's limited preliminary investigation, but rather from a prosecutor with the powers to subpoena witnesses, enter plea agreements, grant immunity and make covert tape recordings, among other things.

If the reasonable grounds are there, the attorney general must forward the request to the three-judge panel that names independent counsels. There is no consideration given to whether the new area of inquiry is germane to the existing investigation.

If the attorney general wanted to avoid expanding an existing independent counsel's jurisdiction, her only option would be to appoint a new independent counsel to investigate the new evidence.

A second provision in the statute allows independent counsels to bypass the attorney general entirely in some cases. If the counsel can convince the three-judge panel that the new investigation constitutes a "related matter" the attorney general has no say. This happened in the case of Smaltz's investigation of Espy. Smaltz used this provision to get self-expanding language similar to Starr's. The Justice Department objected to this and was overruled.

The three-judge panel, in theory, could block a Starr request for expanded jurisdiction. The statute says that on receipt of a recommendation from the attorney general, the panel "may" expand jurisdiction. The panel has never blocked such a recommendation. Indeed, the Smaltz episode suggests a tendency to do the opposite.

Some Democrats charge the panel with being slanted against Clinton. Its chief judge, David B. Sentelle, is a former Republican Party chairman in Mecklenburg County, N.C., and is close to that state's two Republican senators.

Another, perhaps more likely, explanation for the panel's reluctance to block jurisdictional expansion is that it believes it does not have the powers to do so. Notwithstanding what the statute says, the panel takes the position that getting involved in jurisdictional issues raises constitutional questions.

"The Supreme Court has made it very clear that we have no supervisory control over an independent counsel," panel member John D. Butzner Jr. said at a gathering of judges last year. "And the reason for that is the doctrine of separation of powers."

CONVERGENCE WITH THE JONES CASE

If Congress has given Starr carte blanche to investigate Clinton, the Supreme Court gave him what may be his best material to work with. Paula Jones' civil case alleging Clinton sexually harassed her has cross-pollinated with Starr's criminal probe.

In deciding Clinton v. Jones, which examined whether a sitting president can face civil charges, the court in May sought to make a clear distinction between Clinton's private life before assuming office and his public function since.

But now, before her case has even gone to trial, Starr has asked for -- and is expected to receive -- Clinton's deposition in that case to use in his own investigation. The potential allegations against Clinton that have been suggested (obstruction of justice, perjury and suborning of perjury) all are criminal in nature, are directed at a sitting president and stem from a civil proceeding examining Clinton's life years ago.

Clinton, however, may have been given a break Jan. 29 when the judge in the Jones case, Susan Webber Wright, ruled that the Lewinsky material could not be entered as evidence in that trial. Legal experts speculated that if the Lewinsky material were barred in that case, it would be rendered useless to Starr as evidence of perjury or other criminal charges in Starr's case.

Had the Supreme Court gone the other way in Jones, it would have denied her a cause of civil action for four or eight years, and perhaps forever, since witnesses' memories would fade and evidence would disappear.

Yet legal scholars are increasingly questioning the ruling. Some say it was naive to think that the public president and the private, pre-presidential, citizen could be so neatly separated. Or they argue that the presidency is unique and in need of protection, even if that means the curtailing of the legal rights of Jones and other future civil litigants.

Given the cloistered nature of the court, it is tempting to call the ruling the product of insulation from the brutal ways of real world politics. But many scholars think that if the justices were influenced by anything it was more likely to be assertiveness than naivete. The Jones decision came during the same session last year as the rejection of three major congressional laws -- the Brady Law, the Communications Decency Act and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 1524)

If the Supreme Court has not given Clinton enough to worry about, a ruling in April by the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals significantly narrowed the president's ability to work confidentially with White House lawyers.

This case, involving whether some of first lady Hillary Clinton's notes were protected from subpoena in a case involving former Deputy Attorney General Webster Hubbell and the Rose Law Firm, greatly complicates Clinton's situation.

Under the ruling, the White House Counsel cannot claim attorney-client privilege if he works on Clinton's defense. That suggests that if both White House lawyers and Clinton's private lawyers meet to discuss defense strategy, they could be subject to subpoena. It also raises the possibility of White House staff having to respond directly to private, outside lawyers.

"It's going to make [Clinton's defense] a lot more expensive," said University of Pennsylvania law professor Geoffrey C. Hazard Jr. "You've got some very serious command and structure problems."

A ROLE FOR CONGRESS

But the decision in the Jones case, with the complicating fact brought by the 8th Circuit decision, would not matter so much if it was not for Starr's dogged investigation of Clinton and the statute that gave him the power to mount such a probe.

"The two are working together here, because you have depositions in the Clinton v. Jones case and you have an ongoing investigation by the prosecutor," said law professor Sargentich. "But the thing that is really actuating this is the independent counsel."

Much of the criticism of the 18 independent counsel probes to date has been that they have gone after well-intentioned officials on charges that are hardly important matters of state. McCain, for instance, cites the case against Cisneros, who is now under indictment on charges that he lied during an FBI background check about the stipend he was paying an ex- mistress.

"He was one of the finest men I ever knew in my life," mused McCain. "That man could have been president of the United States."

But with the unfolding Lewinsky drama, the focus has shifted to the presidency and the wisdom of Starr's role. Accusing the president of wrongdoing is an inherently political act that the founding fathers suggested should be reserved for Congress.

But Congress, in this case, has carefully avoided involvement in the scandal, leaving Starr to continue his prosecution with little accountability to elected officials.

And this is precisely the situation that Scalia warned of nine years ago when he argued against the independent counsel law.

"I fear," he wrote, "the Court has permanently encumbered the Republic with an institution that will do it great harm."

GRAPHICS: Jan. 22 about his investigation of President Clinton. (Reuters); Photo, Thompson is troubled by the law. (Scott J. Ferrell); Photo, Leahy.

4 of 12 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

Anti-Smoking Drive's New Target: Tobacco Marketing Overseas
Foreign Policy
Trade/Transportation/Commerce
Agriculture
Law/Judiciary/Supreme Court
Health/Education/Welfare
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0241; 289 lines)
Item Key: 2412
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

TOBACCO

Anti-Smoking Drive's New Target: Tobacco Marketing Overseas

>> Citing 'moral dilemma,' lawmakers contend export restrictions should be part of legislation dealing with industry settlement

By Rebecca Carr, CQ Staff Writer

In 1994, when the cash-strapped Romanian capital of Bucharest needed new traffic lights, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. stepped in and replaced them in exchange for permission to place its Camel brand image on every light.

When the light flashed green, motorists saw a silhouette of a camel.

But Bucharest is not the only overseas capital reaping the largesse of tobacco companies these days as they search for new overseas markets for their products.

A Madonna concert became the Salem Madonna Concert in Hong Kong in the early 1990s.

On the radio in Shanghai, an announcer urged, "ride through the rivers and mountains with courage. Be called a hero throughout the thousand miles. This is the world of Marlboro."

And a tennis championship in Malaysia became the Salem Tennis Open with ads featuring America's top tennis pros.

While some lawmakers see cigarette exports as a free-trade issue, a growing number in Congress view it as a moral question: As smoking rates decline in the United States, are the nation's cigarette makers merely exporting tobacco-related health problems overseas?

That question has members in both the House and Senate pushing for controls on cigarette exports as part of any comprehensive tobacco legislation stemming from the $368.5 billion settlement worked out between the tobacco industry and 40 state attorneys general last June. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 1442)

"This is an issue that ought to prick every member's conscience," said Ron Wyden, D-Ore., a member of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, the main Senate panel where tobacco legislation will be considered. "I am going to work hard to protect the kids in Bend and Bandon, Oregon, but I also want to protect the kids in Bangkok and Bangladesh."

Wyden said he wants to make sure that regulations on exporting cigarettes would be part of any tobacco bill. Specifically, he wants to see U.S. advertising restraints, such as a prohibition on televised cigarette ads, enforced worldwide. Wyden also wants to prohibit the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative from pushing tobacco products in the international market.

One key Republican is also concerned. Senate Commerce Committee Chairman John McCain, R-Ariz., said that the targeting of teenagers overseas is a "moral dilemma" that must be addressed with legislation, and he intends to do so when his committee begins tobacco hearings in February.

To date, the biggest stumbling block in winning congressional support for the tobacco settlement as it stands is the issue of granting partial immunity to the tobacco industry to protect it against civil lawsuits by smokers and former smokers. (Weekly Report, pp. 71, 123)

Export issues are not part of the settlement, despite attempts by several state attorneys general to insert them into the deal, according to interviews with several negotiators.

INDUSTRY OPPOSITION

Tobacco industry officials say the industry would balk at increased regulation of their products overseas, and it could seriously undermine their $368.5 billion offer."I don't buy the premise that we are exporting the health care problem overseas," said Scott Williams, a spokesman for the tobacco industry. "This would set a precedent. . . . We should not lose sight of the task at hand: to create a national tobacco policy and reduce teen smoking."

But lawmakers said in interviews that they intend to use the settlement as a starting point, not as a blueprint, for legislation. (See story, p. 231)

"Can we put the public interest ahead of the special interests of the tobacco industry?" asked Henry A. Waxman, D-Calif., a leading foe of the tobacco industry and member of the House Commerce Committee. "Our goal -- our only goal -- must be to pass legislation that protects our children. We don't need the tobacco industry's blessing to do this."

"I think it is going to be a real problem for this country if we don't do anything about the export problem," Waxman said. "I don't think we can morally defend this."

While U.S. consumption of cigarettes dropped by 17 percent over the last decade, the nation's cigarette makers increased their exports by 260 percent, according to World Health Organization statistics.

"I think we are exporting death," said Rep. James V. Hansen, R-Utah, co-chairman of the House task force on tobacco. "It is morally repugnant not to do something about this."

But Rep. Richard M. Burr, R-N.C., said he would fight any bill that restricted tobacco companies from exporting their products overseas.

"I don't think there are countries outside our borders that look to us to make their laws," said Burr, whose district includes the RJ Reynolds Tobacco Co. headquarters. "Now is not the time to start making laws for them."

NO RESTRICTIONS OVERSEAS

One of the reasons the tobacco industry has been so successful is that other countries lack restrictions on advertising.

Although the European community is prohibiting advertising as of this year, a ban in Malaysia did little to stop tobacco companies from putting their logos on everything from watches to safari outfits.

Holding an international edition of one of America's leading national magazines, Rep. Frank Pallone Jr., D-N.J., showed the audience at a Jan. 29 House Commerce Committee the difference. The famous Marlboro Man ad in the international edition had no health disclaimer as required in the United States.

"This is completely inexcusable," Pallone said. "A tobacco settlement without some global settlement would be akin to subjecting more children overseas to death."

But the tobacco companies contend that as long as they obey the laws of foreign countries, they have the right to venture into overseas markets.

When trade restrictions were lifted in Asia during the 1980s, international sales took off.

Philip Morris, for example, saw its foreign market surge by nearly 80 percent since 1990, compared with a 4.7 percent increase in its domestic sales. Foreign sales now represent more than half of all sales for Philip Morris and RJ Reynolds Tobacco Co., according to INFACT, a Boston-based corporate watchdog group. One of the reasons is that American cigarettes are highly desirable overseas because they are made with a higher-quality tobacco than local brands.

ASIA TARGETED

The result of growing foreign sales is increasingly being felt in Asia. In China alone, 50 million people who are now under age 18 eventually will die from smoking-related diseases, according to the research of Richard Peto, an epidemiologist at Oxford University in Great Britain.

Peto has estimated that lung cancer deaths in China will rise from 30,000 in 1975 to 900,000 by 2025, with all cigarette-related deaths reaching 2 million that year, five times the current level in the United States.

"Tobacco companies have permeated Asia, denying health evidence, obstructing national tobacco control action by marketing and promoting their products everywhere," said Judith Mackay, director of the Asian Consultancy on Tobacco Control in Hong Kong. "An American settlement that excludes the rest of the world or attempts to give the tobacco companies global immunity is unethical and will be ineffective from a public health perspective."

The effect of the increase in foreign markets is tracked by the

World Health Organization. Studies show that smoking is responsible for 3 million deaths per year worldwide, a number that will more than triple over the next three decades, said Derek Yach, chief of policy action coordination for overall global policy at the health organization in Geneva.

The World Health Organization has said that "calculations based on the increased rate of smoking in the developing world would show that deaths caused by smoking will soon wipe out gains made in preventing deaths from malnutrition and communicable diseases." This future health problem, the organization says, "will result in the loss of more lives than those lost from previous epidemics."

Yach sees this as tragic, particularly in Third World countries unequipped to deal with the medical cost of a growing health problem.

"There are many examples of how U.S. companies are exploiting weaknesses of other governments," said Yach, citing examples of marketing to youths overseas through tobacco company sponsorship of cultural, sporting and beauty events. "What is forbidden in the United States should be forbidden elsewhere."

FREE TRADE VS. CONTROLS

"From a policy standpoint, it is very difficult to legislate the behavior of foreign countries and their governments," said Williams, the tobacco industry spokesman. "You open all sorts of questions for other industries that could fall out of favor with a particular group in the United States."

This is not the first time that controversy has arisen over exporting American-made products overseas. In the past, there has been outcries over exporting pesticides and certain pharmaceutical drugs.

But Republican Rep. Harold Rogers of Kentucky, for one, thinks there are already enough restrictions on tobacco exports.

Just last year, a provision was attached to the Commerce, Justice and State Departments' appropriations bill, which Rogers oversees, that aimed to ensure that the Department of Commerce did not use taxpayer dollars to promote tobacco overseas.

"This is an international issue, and any comprehensive tobacco control legislation needs to address the smoking pandemic," said Rich Hamburg, the director of legislative affairs for the American Heart Association, one of the founding members of ENACT, a coalition of health care groups.

But Dr. Robert Graham, executive vice president at the American Academy of Family Physicians, said the United States cannot do much about what happens overseas.

Graham, whose organization also belongs to ENACT, said the most effective way to wage the fight against tobacco overseas is to lead by example.

"Can Congress get involved? I suspect they can. But when you are faced with an epidemic, the first thing you do is treat and start to prevent," Graham said. "And we do have an epidemic here in the United States."

WHAT CONGRESS CAN DO

Democratic Rep. Martin T. Meehan of Massachusetts, co-chairman of the House tobacco task force, said there are several places where Congress can get tough on exporting cigarettes overseas.

* Make permanent the provision sponsored by Democratic Rep. Lloyd Doggett of Texas that would prevent using taxpayer dollars to promote use of tobacco products overseas.

* Require tobacco companies to add warning labels to their products sold overseas.

* Push for funding for the World Health Organization to hold an international tobacco summit on tobacco much like the 1997 global warming conference in Kyoto, Japan.

"It is a moral issue," Meehan said. "The children in other countries should be just as important as the children in America."

Doggett said that by mid-February a group of lawmakers who are concerned about export issues would propose a series of initiatives, including labeling requirements overseas.

"Any tobacco legislation should be global, at least in the sense that we are not having these tobacco companies to pay penalties for having addicted our children by encouraging them to addict children overseas," said Doggett.

CIGARETTE SALES

(in billions of dollars)

International sales are now more than half of all cigarette sales for Philip Morris Companies Inc. and RJ Reynolds Tobacco Co., the two largest tobacco companies in the United States.

	Domestic	International
1984	10.4	4.8
1986	11.7	6.8
1988	13.8	9.9
1990	16.2	13

1992	18.2	16.5
1994	14.2	22.1
1996	17	27.7

SOURCES: Massachusetts Department of Health and Tobacco Industry Reports

GRAPHICS: from Bend, Ore., to Bangkok and Bangladesh. (Douglas Graham)

Clinton Succeeds in Slowing Scandal's Momentum
Government Operations/Exec Branch
Inside Congress/Lobbies
Politics/Elections
Banking/Economics/Labor
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0215; 285 lines)
Item Key: 2407
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

COVER STORY

Clinton Succeeds in Slowing Scandal's Momentum

>> Against great odds, the president gives a speech even his opponents praise; for a moment, at least, legislative proposals supersede tawdry allegations

By Jackie Koszczuk and the Congressional Quarterly Staff

If Bill Clinton survives what has become the greatest threat to his presidency, his Jan. 27 State of the Union address may well be viewed as the turning point back from the edge of the cliff.

The speech was remarkable not so much for what he said as for the chutzpah it took to say it. The address came at the end of a week of sensational news stories describing an alleged affair between the president and a 24-year-old former White House intern.

In 72 minutes, Clinton managed to remind the American people why they elected him twice, noting such successes as the first balanced federal budget in 30 years and the unbroken spell of economic bliss that has unfolded on his watch. (Text, p. 251)

With that, he tapped into the public's tendency to judge elected officials not on their personal foibles but on a cold analysis of job performance. At least temporarily, Clinton managed to switch the debate from the issue of his character -- which the public has long found wanting anyway -- back to the fundamental question of leadership. His message was loud and clear: If you like what I've done as president, keep me around. I'm going to do more.

Several national opinion polls conducted after the public had learned details of the alleged affair and the supposed attempts to cover it up showed Clinton's approval rating still soaring in the range of 58 to 60 percent. (Background, Weekly Report, p. 164)

In his speech, Clinton unveiled a variety of proposals designed to seize control of the national agenda. They included a promise to set aside surplus federal revenues to preserve the Social Security program, tax breaks for child care and a bill of rights protecting consumers from the new vagaries of managed care medical systems. (Fiscal policy, p. 229)

"I think the American people have come to the conclusion that they do not want to drive the president out of office just because he's not faithful to his wife, and they turn off all the rest of it," said Sen. Robert F. Bennett, R-Utah.

'A BOFFO PERFORMANCE'

Of course, Clinton's prospects could shift dramatically in the coming weeks if, for instance, Independent Counsel Kenneth W. Starr comes up with smoking-gun evidence that sets public opinion fatally against the president or forces him to resign rather than face a serious threat of impeachment by Congress. In that case, his State of the Union address will be remembered as a valiant last attempt to salvage his presidency.

But for the time being, he has managed to nudge open the door to political salvation a crack. Predictions by media commentators and former White House aides of a swift and ignominious end to his presidency proved to be grossly premature.

Even Republicans gave Clinton begrudging high marks for pulling off a politically potent speech against great odds. Though they objected to many of the new spending programs he outlined, some of them, for the first time since the scandal broke on Jan. 21, began to worry that Clinton might be able to rebound.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., said afterward that Clinton gave "a boffo performance."

"The guy is incredible in his ability to come in there and act like everything is just hunky-dory, like there's nothing going on in the world but that speech," Lott said. "He should almost get an Academy Award."

GOP pollster Frank Luntz, who in the early days of the scandal had been urging Republicans to hold their fire and let the lurid news accounts do their work for them, switched gears immediately after the speech. He said he now believes the GOP should engage. "I think you'll see Republicans beginning to ask questions and demanding answers," he said.

On the night of the speech, Clinton called on his most valuable political asset: the ability to connect with an audience, especially a television audience, and to appear to be a commanding leader who nonetheless feels your pain. He mentioned not a word of the scandal, instead adhering to a just-policy-please script that his staff had thoroughly scrubbed for words or phrases that could be even remotely misconstrued as relating to sex or the president's personal conduct.

The one phrase that escaped the vetting was the line, "A strong nation rests on the rock of responsibility." Although it was a mere introduction to Clinton's thoughts on welfare overhaul and was not meant to be an applause line, Republicans broke in with long and loud applause in an apparent dig at Clinton's personal sense of responsibility.

PLENTY OF APPLAUSE

Clinton hit on themes that struck at the anxiety Americans feel about the future despite the rosy economic times. A speech that many believed might somehow be marred by the scandal was instead repeatedly interrupted by applause and by Democrats leaping to their feet more than 35 times to show support for the president's proposals.

He declared that the nation must move beyond the "sterile debate between those who say government is the enemy and those who say government is the answer." He said he envisioned a "third way" in which government "is leaner, more flexible, a catalyst for new ideas, and most of all, a government that gives the American people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives."

Putting to rest weeks of speculation about what the White House would propose to do with an expected budget surplus, Clinton announced that all of it should be earmarked to shore up the Social Security program. Clinton drew huge applause and a standing ovation when he declared his simple, four-word answer to the question of how to use the surplus: "Save Social Security first."

He drew the biggest response of the night with a reference to the frustration many Americans feel with managed care plans that employ an army of non-medical personnel to keep costs down. "Medical decisions ought to be made by medical doctors, not insurance company accountants," Clinton said.

He called for a "Consumer Bill of Rights" for managed care patients to increase patients' access to doctors of their choosing and to emergency room care. (Weekly Report, p. 134)

That is a far cry from Clinton's massive health industry overhaul proposal in 1993, which, ironically, was decried by Republicans and health experts as too bureaucratic and too likely to take decision-making away from doctors. (1993 Almanac, p. 335)

Among a slew of other domestic initiatives, Clinton proposed raising the minimum wage from the current $5.15 an hour, an idea sure to ignite partisan warfare. Republicans in 1996 fought a 90-cent hike in the wage but were forced to capitulate after Democrats tapped public sentiment favoring the increase for low wage-earners. (1996 Almanac, p. 7-3)

Clinton also said he would send to Congress legislation to allow early retirees and laid-off workers to buy into Medicare, the federal medical insurance program currently available to Americans age 65 and older. And he outlined a plan to spend $21.7 billion over five years on expanding tax credits for child care and related programs. (Weekly Report, p. 77)

While proposing little that was new on the foreign affairs front, he delivered a strong warning to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, one of the rare instances in which he brought Republicans in the chamber to their feet. Addressing Hussein directly, Clinton said: "You cannot defy the will of the world. . . . You have used weapons of mass destruction before; we are determined to deny you the capacity to use them again."

Though the first half of the speech was forceful and focused on his major initiatives, the latter half devolved into a Clintonesque to-do list, a lengthy recitation of programs and initiatives that often makes even his allies fidgety.

Foreshadowing the battles to come in Congress, Republicans decried the speech as promising much more than a government living within its means could deliver.

Sen. Connie Mack, R-Fla., said, "It's a staggering expansion of government." Idaho Republican Sen. Larry E. Craig said, "You can't declare the era of big government over and come up with new multibillion-dollar programs."

By contrast, Democrats were delighted, especially the liberals who dominate the House Caucus and who have long felt Clinton has abandoned their constituencies. Some congressional Democrats also ventured defenses of the president in the face of the scandal, which many had been reluctant to do earlier.

House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt, D-Mo., who has tangled with Clinton on trade and the budget, said, "The president has made a very emphatic statement, and until there is credible evidence or facts to the contrary, he deserves the benefit of the doubt."

But members of the president's party still worry about his future and the impact it may have on the Democratic agenda. Sen. Bob Kerrey, D-Neb., said: "It takes the heart out of you. I've only been here a day and I'm already losing my motivation."

Rep. Bruce F. Vento, D-Minn., bemoaned allegations that have "cast a cloud over policy programs."

FIGHTING BACK

Clinton's speech was the highlight of a week in which the White House came out swinging, after several damaging days of fuzzy responses to allegations that he had had an affair with former intern Monica Lewinsky, then lied about it himself and encouraged her to lie about it as well. Both Clinton and Lewinsky reportedly denied the affair in depositions in a civil suit brought by Paula Jones, an Arkansas woman who says Clinton sexually harassed her when he was governor.

It was a marked reversal in both approach and psychology from the first few days of the scandal, when Clinton looked haggard and besieged and his aides seemed unsure of how to handle questions about his relationship with Lewinsky.

Clinton began the week with a brief but pointed denial of a sexual relationship with Lewinsky in 1996, who had by then become a full-time staff aide at the White House. "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky. I never told anybody to lie. Not a single time, never," he said Jan. 26.

With that out of the way, first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton took charge of her husband's public-relations makeover, appearing on television news programs to field questions. As she has in the past during embarrassing controversies over Clinton's alleged womanizing, the first lady became the nation's first believer in his version of events. And she blamed the allegations on attempts by right-wing extremists to weaken him. "We can't afford to have a president distracted," she said.

Other events began to turn in the president's favor.

The media, digging into Lewinsky's life story, found not the frightened ingenue her lawyer had described in repeated interviews, but a woman from a privileged Beverly Hills background who seemed to friends and acquaintances to be flighty, star-struck and prone to talking openly about her sexual relationships with influential men.

Also, as the case against Clinton was examined more closely from a legal point of view, it seemed weaker than it had when the scandal broke. At that point, with Lewinsky's girl-talk confessions captured on tape by friend and confidante Linda Tripp, who delivered the tapes to Starr, the independent counsel seemed to hold all the cards.

But absent corroborating evidence Starr is still seeking, the legal issue could boil down to little more than a his-word-against-hers case that would probably be too weak to prove Clinton had lied when he denied the affair with Lewinsky.

"Any perjury case is a tough case," said Victoria Toensing, a Washington criminal defense lawyer. "You just don't go on 'he said-she said.' You have to find corroborating evidence."

Toensing said circumstantial evidence can suffice to build a case in some instances, such as when a witness sees a pair go into a room together and stay there alone -- even if the witness does not observe the alleged act.

Former independent counsel James McKay, who investigated Attorney General Edwin Meese III and White House aide Lyn Nofziger during the Reagan administration, said: "If it's one person's word against another's, you have reasonable doubt built in right away. I think you will find that prosecutors won't bring a case in that kind of situation."

Starr is said to be in search of witnesses to support Lewinsky's claims, including presidential aides or Secret Service agents who may have seen the two together. Also under review is a document that Lewinsky allegedly gave Tripp that outlines how Tripp could lie to the grand jury about the events Lewinsky had confided in her.

Starr's difficulties were evident at week's end. Negotiations with Lewinsky's lawyers for her testimony broke down after Starr discovered that she was not offering prosecutors as much detail about her conversations with Clinton as she provided Tripp on tape, according to The New York Times.

Until the extent of the evidence gathered by Starr is known, the Lewinsky scandal continues to be a real threat to Clinton's presidency. Perhaps his most important solace comes from opinion polls that so far show the scandal having little impact on his job approval ratings.

"People do make a distinction between what someone does in his personal life and his ability to do his job," said Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. "However, if this involved perjury or obstruction of justice, which speaks to his role as president, the public has not come to any conclusion on that yet."

GRAPHICS: of the Union speech Jan. 27. (Douglas Graham); Photo, Flanked by Col. Robert Cabana, left, a space shuttle commander, and Dr. Harold Varmus, director of the National Institutes of the Health, Hillary Rodham Clinton waves to the crowd before her husband's State of the Union address January 27. (Douglas Graham)

6 of 12 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

If the Furor Subsides, Will There Be a Case?
Government Operations/Exec Branch
Law/Judiciary/Supreme Court
Politics/Elections
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0262; 97 lines)
Item Key: 2404
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---

--- ---

CQ ROUNDTABLE

If the Furor Subsides, Will There Be a Case?

By Sara Fritz, CQ Staff Writer

You hear it repeated everywhere: People saying they are not surprised that President Clinton may have had a sexual relationship with a 21-year-old White House intern, but they are horrified that he could be lying about it.

Likewise, Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr insists he chose to investigate the intern case not because he wanted to embarrass Clinton with allegations of sexual misconduct, but because he suspected the president is guilty of perjury.

You might conclude from these comments that lying -- not sex -- is the central issue in the scandal that currently threatens to engulf the Clinton presidency. But if Starr, the media and the public were primarily worried about Clinton's truthfulness, why have they waited until now to express their qualms about the president's behavior? Starr's four-year probe previously has yielded far more serious allegations of lying or obstruction of justice by the president and the first lady that failed to either stir public outrage or cause the independent counsel to bring charges.

In Starr's nearly forgotten investigation of the Arkansas land deal known as Whitewater, Clinton's former investment partner, James McDougal, told a grand jury the president lied under oath when testifying in a criminal trial. In the disputed testimony, Clinton swore that he was not present at a mid-1980s meeting at which Whitewater conspirators hatched a plot to defraud the federal government. McDougal claims Clinton attended the meeting. But the news that McDougal had called the president a liar -- just as Monica Lewinsky apparently has done -- did not cause even the slightest ripple in public opinion polls.

Nor did Starr charge Clinton with perjury based on McDougal's testimony, and the reason bears heavily on the current case. Even though the independent counsel's office was firmly convinced at the time that Clinton lied under oath in the Whitewater trial, a perjury case against the president would have relied almost entirely on the credibility of McDougal and his co-conspirator, David Hale. Both men would have been poor prosecution witnesses against the president. Both were admitted felons, and McDougal had previously told a contradictory story. This is why Starr has been seeking corroboration from McDougal's ex-wife, Susan, who went to jail rather than cooperate. Legal scholars say Lewinsky's secretly taped assertion that she has "lied all my life" would undermine her credibility as a prosecution witness.

Then there was the case of the Rose law firm billing records, which mysteriously showed up on a table in the White House months after the president's advisers failed to produce the documents in response to a subpoena from Starr. These billing records revealed that Hillary Rodham Clinton previously understated her role as a private attorney for McDougal's savings and loan. Discovery of the records prompted Starr to launch an investigation into whether Mrs. Clinton tried to cover up the nature of her legal work for McDougal by concealing the documents. He even summoned Mrs. Clinton to testify before a grand jury.

But no one was ever charged with obstruction of justice in connection with the unexplained disappearance and rediscovery of the billing records, and the public seemed unruffled by this apparent case of skulduggery at the highest levels.

Nor should we forget the obstruction-of-justice case that Starr has tried to build involving former Justice Department official Webster Hubbell. Last year, investigators discovered that some of Clinton's closest friends, including Washington lawyer Vernon Jordan, had arranged a variety of lucrative jobs for Hubbell after he came under investigation by the independent counsel several years earlier. Starr suspected the deals were intended to buy Hubbell's silence.

Yet no one has been charged in that case, either. Here again, the problem that prevented Starr from bringing obstruction-of-justice charges has a parallel in the Lewinsky controversy. Although Starr was able to trace the arrangements for Hubbell's income to Jordan and other Clinton confidantes, he has not been able to prove that anyone helping Hubbell explicitly demanded his silence in exchange for financial assistance. Such deals tend to be implied, not explicit. Even if Lewinsky will testify that Jordan tried to buy her off with a job, a corroborating witness may be hard to find.

It is curious that none of these earlier allegations of lying or obstruction of justice in criminal matters stirred as much hysteria as the suggestion Clinton lied in a civil suit about his sexual activities. It is easy to see why the public might deceive itself into thinking it is more offended by lying than adultery. But it is harder to understand how Starr, an expert lawyer, could anticipate building a case in the Lewinsky matter when he has failed to do so in these other circumstances.

As any lawyer knows, a string of unproven cover-up charges do not constitute a pattern of obstruction. If the shock of the sex scandal wanes, will Starr or Congress have the determination to pursue such a hard-to-prove case?

7 of 12 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

Rep. Schiff Says His Illness Rules Out a Campaign
Politics/Elections
Inside Congress/Lobbies
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0250; 167 lines)
Item Key: 2405

--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

RETIREMENT

Rep. Schiff Says His Illness Rules Out a Campaign

By Greg Giroux, CQ Staff Writer

Rep. Steven H. Schiff, R-N.M., who has missed most of the 105th Congress due to treatment for cancer, said Jan. 30 that he will not run for re-election this fall as planned because he has not recovered as quickly as he had anticipated.

"The rigors of a campaign demand more than I will able to devote this year," Schiff said in a statement, "and I must focus all of my time and strength on the task of getting better."

Schiff, 50, who has represented the Albuquerque-based 1st District since 1989, has been absent from Congress since March 1997 while he battled squamous cell carcinoma, a type of skin cancer that originated in his ear. He is in New Mexico undergoing chemotherapy.

Despite his illness, Schiff had been unwavering in his determination to run for a sixth term. On Jan. 28, Schiff spokesman J. Barry Bitzer described his boss as being "100 percent for re-election."

But Schiff's long absence from Washington had prompted speculation that his treatment would preclude another campaign. New Mexico Republicans had watched his condition with concern throughout the 105th Congress, and there had been talk of finding alternative candidates if Schiff's health should force him to retire.

The filing deadline is Feb. 10 for the June 2 primary.

Since 1995, Schiff has served as chairman of the Science Committee's Basic Research Subcommittee, a position through which he was able to influence federal spending priorities in areas of interest to his district, which is home to Sandia National Laboratories.

Schiff was a member of the four-person subcommittee of the House ethics committee that investigated Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., in the 104th Congress. Among other allegations, Gingrich was said to have made political use of charitable donations solicited to finance college courses. The House ultimately reprimanded Gingrich and assessed him $300,000 in costs for the investigation.

The retirement of Schiff -- who never faced any serious electoral threats after winning the seat with 51 percent in 1988 -- offers an opportunity for the Democrats in a district the Republicans have held since 1969.

The district is competitive on the numbers: By registration, Democrats outnumber Republicans by 49 percent to 37 percent in the 1st, which encompasses central Albuquerque and is nearly 40 percent Hispanic. President Clinton carried the district by five percentage points in 1996 and by seven percentage points in 1992.

Two Democrats had announced for the seat earlier in January: state Sen. Phil Maloof, a 30-year old scion of a prominent New Mexico family that built a fortune through banking interests, casinos and professional sports teams; and Gary Van Valin, president of Keystone International Inc., an Albuquerque management consulting firm.

Potential Republican candidates include: Robin Dozier Otten, superintendent of the state Regulation and Licensing Department; Heather Wilson, who heads the state Department of Children, Youth and Families; Albuquerque lawyer Alan Wilson; and state Public Safety Secretary Darren P. White.

Another prospective contender who had been leaning against running is state Sen. Ramsay L. Gorham. Some observers have argued that Gorham would be the strongest Republican candidate, should she decide to enter the race.

Departing the Hill Anticipated Vacancies

Anticipated Vacancies

California 9th (Democrat Ronald V. Dellums has said he will resign Feb. 6, 1998)

Vacancies

California 22nd (Democrat Walter Capps died Oct. 28; special election runoff March 10)

New York 6th (Democrat Floyd H. Flake resigned Nov. 15; special election Feb. 3)

Pennsylvania 1st (Democrat Thomas M. Foglietta resigned Nov. 11; special election May 19)

California 44th (Republican Sonny Bono died Jan. 5; special election April 7, runoff if necessary June 2)

Retiring From Senate (4)

Dale Bumpers, D-Ark. .

Daniel R. Coats, R-Ind.

Wendell H. Ford, D-Ky

John Glenn, D-Ohio

Retiring From House (16)

Harris W. Fawell, R-Ill. (13)

Vic Fazio, D-Calif. (3)

Elizabeth Furse, D-Ore. (1)

Henry B. Gonzalez, D-Texas (20)

Lee H. Hamilton, D-Ind. (9)

W.G. "Bill" Hefner, D-N.C. (8)

Scott L. Klug, R-Wis. (2)

Joseph M. McDade, R-Pa. (10)

Paul McHale, D-Pa. (15)

Mike Parker, R-Miss. (4)

Dan Schaefer, R-Colo. (6)

Steven H. Schiff, R-N.M. (1)

David E. Skaggs, D-Colo. (2)

Bob Smith, R-Ore. (2)

Louis Stokes, D-Ohio (11)

Sidney R. Yates, D-Ill. (9)

Running for Governor (4)

Sen. Dirk Kempthorne, R-Idaho

Jon Christensen, R-Neb. (2)

Barbara B. Kennelly, D-Conn. (1)

Glenn Poshard, D-Ill. (19)

Running for Senate (8)

Scotty Baesler, D-Ky. (6)

Jim Bunning, R-Ky. (4)

Michael D. Crapo, R-Idaho (2)

John Ensign, R-Nev. (1)

Bob Inglis, R-S.C. (4)

Mark W. Neumann, R-Wis. (1)

Charles E. Schumer, D-N.Y. (9)

Linda Smith, R-Wash. (3)
GRAPHICS:

Kasich's Quandary
Banking/Economics/Labor
Inside Congress/Lobbies
Trade/Transportation/Commerce
Politics/Elections
Government Operations/Exec Branch
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0231; 43 lines)
Item Key: 2389
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

Kasich's Quandary

By Andrew Taylor, CQ Staff Writer

As a potential Republican candidate for president, House Budget Committee Chairman John R. Kasich, R-Ohio, is in a bit of a bind. His party's political base wants to cut taxes, but he is the guardian of the status quo.

It is a status quo that Kasich worked years to help produce -- a historic 1997 balanced-budget pact that, under current projections, would produce a $14 billion surplus in 2001. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 2990)

Many of Kasich's colleagues, however, are already formulating plans to spend larger surpluses projected under more optimistic forecasts by private economists. But Kasich cannot support spending the surplus on tax cuts. If you're going to cut taxes, he says, shrink the government, too. "I'm in favor of a tax cut, but you've got to cut government at the same time," he said at a news conference Jan. 28.

Kasich's Senate counterpart, Budget Committee Chairman Pete V. Domenici, R-N.M., is taking a more permissive approach. A late convert to the GOP's tax-cut fever, Domenici said he supports using at least some of any future surplus to finance tax cuts. "We're going to use [any surplus] for two things: pay down the debt and reduce taxes," Domenici said.

Kasich caught heat from some conservative pundits for helping craft what they considered a budget deal that allowed too much spending and did not cut taxes enough. Domenici faces pressure from the right as well. He is in the shrinking moderate wing of a Senate Republican caucus that has grown steadily more conservative. This ideological -- and generational -- shift has put pressure on Domenici to embrace tax cuts. His heart may not be with such cuts. Some of his own aides acknowledge that Domenici, deep down, would probably just as soon leave the 1997 budget pact alone.

"Domenici has never been a real big tax cutter anyway," said a key participant in the GOP budget battles of 1995 and 1997. "He's more of a recent convert."

Clinton Budget Reaffirms Stand Against Broad GOP Tax Cuts
Banking/Economics/Labor
Government Operations/Exec Branch
Trade/Transportation/Commerce
Politics/Elections
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0228; 273 lines)
Item Key: 2387
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

THE BUDGET

Clinton Budget Reaffirms Stand Against Broad GOP Tax Cuts

>> Republicans vow to bar president's 'big government' initiatives, but divisions over use of projected surplus frustrate leaders

By Andrew Taylor, CQ Staff Writer

President Clinton's new spending and tax plans received a frosty reception from congressional Republicans, and it is not likely to get much warmer when Clinton's fiscal 1999 budget arrives on Capitol Hill on Feb. 2.

Clinton's State of the Union address set the stage Jan. 27 for a budget debate in which his proposals for greater federal aid for child care and education will collide head- on with an unimpressed Republican majority.

Clinton also gave his clearest signal yet that he will play hardball against any major GOP tax cut by casting it as a threat to the Social Security system.

Clinton's initiatives depend on a shaky $66 billion in revenues from a national tobacco settlement reached between the tobacco industry and 40 states. Prospects for the settlement have soured in recent weeks, leaving a potentially huge hole in Clinton's plans.

But the picture appears no better for Republicans. Despite their talk about another round of tax cuts, a combination of budget rules and an abbreviated congressional calendar has created hurdles that should block any ambitious plans for tax cuts or new domestic programs.

Preliminary signals suggest the annual budget blueprint will not deviate much from the path set out in last year's landmark budget pact (PL 105-33; PL 105-34). (1997 Weekly Report, p. 2990)

The debate will officially kick off when Clinton submits his budget. It will feature a president embroiled in scandal going up against an opposition party that has yet to pull its factions together.

Whatever the problems stemming from the sex allegations engulfing the White House, Clinton has assembled initiatives to increase spending and provide targeted tax cuts in areas such as child care and education that appear popular with the public. He also warned Republicans to hold off on any new broad-based tax cuts until Social Security's financial health can be fixed for the long term. (Clinton, p. 215)

Two years after declaring that "the era of big government is over," Clinton presented a poll-tested activist agenda of $40 billion to $50 billion in new domestic spending programs over five years. Subsequent polls indicate that the plans resonate well with voters, but Republicans vow they will not let the president breach tight caps on spending enacted in the 1997 budget deal.

Administration officials say the new spending will not break the caps, that it will be fully paid for by spending cuts or new revenues. But to finance many of the initiatives, Clinton is assuming tobacco-related revenues that would produce $10 billion in 1999 and $66 billion over five years. That is not a safe assumption. (Tobacco, p. 231)

Republican reaction to the Clinton agenda was decidedly chilly. Besides pledging to honor the spending caps, they vowed to rewrite many of the initiatives to give them a GOP tilt.

"I thought we had convinced the president and the president had made up his mind that he was committed to a smaller federal government," said House Budget Committee Chairman John R. Kasich, R-Ohio.

But Republicans have yet to unite behind their own agenda. Top GOP leaders have promised another round of perhaps modest tax cuts to follow on last year's tax law (PL 105-34), but enthusiasm among some of the rank and file is decidedly muted.

"I don't care about tax cuts," said Rep. David L. Hobson, R-Ohio.

The hottest topic in this year's debate is the tantalizing possibility of the first budget surplus in 30 years. It already has lawmakers making plans about what to do with it. But plans to devote some of the future surplus to tax cuts or new spending will prove difficult, especially in the short term.

Spending the surplus may sound good, but the nuts and bolts of the budget process, and Congress' desire to settle on a budget plan early in this election year, may quash any such plans.

And it is not only Clinton and Democrats who favor new spending. Republicans must also figure out what to do about the upcoming reauthorization of highway programs, on which they are divided. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman Bud Shuster, R-Pa., is leading an effort to spend much more on highways than is permitted under the current caps. (Weekly Report, p. 67)

Another contingent wants to use all or most of the surplus to reduce the $5.5 trillion national debt. Many of these Republicans are reluctant to support spending increases or tax cuts.

All told, the GOP has much work to do to assemble its budget agenda. "In our caucus, both House and Senate, you've got people who believe debt reduction is the No. 1 priority," said Sen. Connie Mack, R-Fla. "For others, it's tax cuts. And others even have got their own spending priorities. We've got to draw some conclusions pretty soon."

SURPLUS FEVER

The fire over this year's debate has been stoked by the prospect of the first budget surplus since 1969. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projects the deficit for the ongoing fiscal year at $5 billion and for fiscal 1999 at $2 billion.

But CBO estimates, as well as those from the president's Office of Management and Budget (OMB), have recently proved too pessimistic. So lawmakers are listening to private-sector economists who predict that a surplus of as much as $50 billion could appear in fiscal 1998. Many lawmakers are salivating.

Even if there is a fiscal 1998 or 1999 surplus, congressional budgeteers would still operate under budget rules that make it virtually impossible to use a surplus for tax cuts, at least without help from Democrats. The same budgetary fences that make it difficult for lawmakers to increase the deficit make it just as hard, procedurally, for them to spend any surplus.

Here's why: Under so-called pay-as-you-go (or PAYGO) rules extended last summer in the budget deal, any bill that would increase the deficit (or decrease any surplus) is subject to an objection, or point of order, on the Senate floor. It requires 60 votes to waive the PAYGO rule. "There are going to be a lot of disappointed people," said a top Senate Budget Committee staff aide. "They're going to lynch me when they find out about PAYGO points of order."

PAYGO means that if Republicans are going to pass a tax cut, they will have to find savings or offsetting revenue increases elsewhere in the budget. That might prove difficult.

At the same time, Senate GOP leaders such as Majority Leader Trent Lott of Mississippi and Budget Committee Chairman Pete V. Domenici of New Mexico promise to pass the annual budget resolution by the end of March -- much earlier than usual. If they are to meet that schedule, they have to make decisions soon. What they appear poised to devise is a budget blueprint that hews largely to last year's pact.

The tentative thinking, according to a senior House GOP aide, is to proceed with a "quickie, hold-the-line budget" resolution and not assume a tax cut in the short term. But later in the spring, if the budget picture brightens further and it appears that there will be a sizable 1999 surplus, Republicans would move ahead with a tax-cut bill. The assumption is that a considerable surplus would be too irresistible to leave alone. Enacting any bill would require trade-offs with Democrats.

House Republicans will hold a retreat Feb. 8-11 in Williamsburg, Va., to plot strategy; Senate Republicans met Jan. 30 in Washington.

POLL-TESTED AND POPULAR

Capitol Hill Democrats appear united behind most of Clinton's plans, many of which they helped devise. To build momentum, the White House leaked selected elements of Clinton's initiatives over the past few weeks.

Unfortunately for Democrats, Clinton's legal problems escalated at the wrong time. The scandal over his alleged relationship with a White House intern has sparked a media furor that threatens to drown out his budget message.

Nevertheless, several polls suggest that to the extent that people are aware of Clinton's agenda, they support it.

For example, a Pew Research Center poll taken Jan. 14-18 found that 33 percent of those surveyed would prefer that any surplus be dedicated to spending on domestic programs such as health, education and the environment. Another 32 percent preferred strengthening Social Security and Medicare; 22 percent favored retiring some of the national debt; and only 11 percent preferred tax cuts.

An NBC News poll taken Jan. 27 found that 77 percent of those who watched Clinton's speech supported the policies he outlined. Only 12 percent opposed them. "This agenda's more powerful than any one person's problems," said Sen. Richard J. Durbin, D-Ill.

Countered Sen. Craig Thomas, R-Wyo.: "Everybody's for child care. Everybody's for doing some of the things he mentioned. The question is: 'What's the role of the federal government? How do you best do it? Can it be better delivered by the states?' "

Perhaps the biggest surprise -- and the most potent political salvo -- of Clinton's speech was his admonishment to Congress to hold off on any major tax cut until the long-term solvency of the Social Security system is addressed.

"What should we do with this projected surplus? I have a simple four-word answer: 'Save Social Security first,' " Clinton said. "I propose that we reserve 100 percent of the surplus -- that's every penny of any surplus -- until we have taken all the necessary measures to strengthen the Social Security system for the 21st century." (Text, p. 251)

Clinton added that the administration would conduct forums around the country and host a White House conference on Social Security in December as a precursor to a legislative effort early next year. Many Republicans, including Kasich, applauded his decision to push for a Social Security fix.

But Clinton's edict also is a powerful weapon that has the potential to cut off any Republican bid to use a surplus to cut taxes. It signals that Clinton and Democrats are poised to attack a big tax cut as a threat to the sacrosanct retirement system. "I think the president makes [Republicans] face a choice -- cutting taxes or protecting Social Security -- and on that issue, he wins," said Sen. Richard H. Bryan, D-Nev.

Added Grover G. Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform: "He's not saying 'I want to reform Social Security.' He's saying 'I'll do anything to keep from cutting taxes.' "

Even as Congress must adhere to the just-released CBO numbers as it proceeds with the annual budget process, private-sector economists say a significant surplus will emerge as early as the current fiscal year.

Fluctuations in the economy are among factors that can turn deficit projections on their head, and the current outlook points to a 1998 surplus. For the 12 months from December 1996 through November 1997, the government ran a surplus of $2.4 billion. Moreover, the deficit for the first quarter of fiscal 1998 (October through December 1997) was $39.6 billion -- $19.6 billion lower than the first quarter of fiscal 1997.

The key to determining whether a surplus will occur in fiscal 1998 -- or whether it will be large enough to tempt Congress to spend it -- is the big surge in April tax receipts. Last year, the April surplus was a whopping $94 billion.

That number will not be available until late May. At that point, building a consensus to waive budget rules and pass a bill to spend the surplus would take unusually quick action and enthusiastic participation from the president and congressional Democrats.

GOP DISUNITY

Republican leaders are unified in wanting tax cuts, but the rank and file has doubts. "I'm part of the group that says, 'What surplus?' " said Rep. Christopher Shays, R-Conn. "My first preference is to institutionalize the balanced budget. We need to do that before we talk about additional tax cuts or more government spending."

Both House Ways and Means Chairman Bill Archer, R-Texas, and Senate Finance Chairman William V. Roth Jr., R-Del., have proposed using a portion of the projected surplus to cut taxes. In separate interviews, neither acknowledged that any tax cut would have to be financed by offsetting spending cuts. Asked whether he would produce required offsets or try to waive the rules (which needs 60 votes), Roth said, "We haven't looked at that yet."

As Republicans prepare for the budget debate, they face a challenging landscape: factions, a narrow House majority, and an opposition party poised to play the Social Security card.

Clinton has the easier job. His proposed budget assumes easy passage of controversial legislation to reap billions of dollars from the proposed tobacco settlement. The money would come from a combination of industry payments and penalties that are projected to increase the price of cigarettes by $1.50 per pack over the next decade.

Like typical budgets, Clinton's 1999 document will contain unrealistic cuts in some programs, and will unrealistically assume enactment of hardy perennials such as new revenues from closing tax loopholes. Political reality is not a litmus test for inclusion in the budget. "The president's budget doesn't have to get enacted," said Stanley Collender, managing director of Burson-Marsteller's Federal Budget Consulting Group. "It just has to come together mathematically."
GRAPHICS: the Union adddress. (Douglas Graham)

10 of 12 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 02/02/98

Long List of Its Own Trespasses Tempers Congress' Judgment
Inside Congress/Lobbies
Politics/Elections
Law/Judiciary/Supreme Court
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0223; 232 lines)
Item Key: 2411
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

INVESTIGATIONS

Long List of Its Own Trespasses Tempers Congress' Judgment

>> And further erosion of privacy for all has members wary of attacking president over sexual misconduct charges

By Sue Kirchhoff and Donna Cassata, CQ Staff Writer

Most lawmakers are keeping a safe distance from the inferno engulfing the White House after allegations that President Clinton had an affair with an intern and then asked her to lie about it -- fearing that if they venture too close, they too will get burned.

Publicly, members of Congress say they should not talk about the case because they do not know the truth or do not want to comment on an issue that is the subject of an ongoing legal investigation.

Behind the scenes, though, there is another worry -- that making judgments about the scandal would only serve to make issues of sexual behavior and marital infidelity a legitimate part of political discourse and further erode the ever-shrinking zone of privacy accorded to elected officials.

For some, the unstated feeling is "there, but perhaps for some very bad judgment and God, go I," said former Rep. Fred Grandy, R-Iowa (1987-95), president and chief executive officer of Goodwill Industries International Inc.

There are bound to be exceptions, especially if the scandal drags on without political cost to the president. Sen. John Ashcroft, R-Mo., in a speech Jan. 30 to the Conservative Political Action Committee in Arlington, Va., called on fellow party members to speak out.

"It is time for us to say that which we know to be right. To say, 'Mr President, if these allegations are true you have disgraced yourself, you have disgraced your office and the office of the presidency and you should leave,' " said Ashcroft, who is said to be considering a run for the presidency.

But for many members, wading into the mire could be politically perilous. The institution that could ultimately find itself in the position of deciding the fate of Clinton's presidency has itself been singed in recent decades by the combustible mix of sex and politics.

Allegations that Clinton had sex with former intern Monica Lewinsky invite comparisons to a 1983 scandal in which two House members were censured for having sex with pages and to the forced resignation of Sen. Bob Packwood, R-Ore., who quit in 1995 over charges of sexual misconduct, including some made by women on his staff. (1983 Almanac, p. 580; 1995 Almanac, p. 1-47)

"They've learned over the years that what starts with the president eventually trickles down to Congress," said Larry J. Sabato, a political scientist at the University of Virginia. "This is one kind of trickle-down that even Republicans don't want."

That is not to imply that Congress is mum simply because of a guilty conscience. The ambivalence also stems from political concerns. Republican leaders have made it clear that, for the time being, it is in the best interest of the party to lay low and let the White House twist in the wind.

WOMEN AND CLINTON

The issue is especially difficult for the four female Democratic senators who were first elected in 1992 after public outrage over sexual harassment charges against Clarence Thomas when he was nominated to the Supreme Court . Three of them now find themselves facing tough re-election battles at a time when the most prominent politician in their party is saddled with allegations of sexual misconduct.

Many female Democrats who pressured the Senate to firmly punish Packwood are now reluctant to criticize Clinton.

They drew careful distinctions between a consensual relationship that the president allegedly had with Lewinsky and complaints leveled against Packwood or the sexual harassment charge made by Anita Hill against Thomas. The allegations, they say, are not even similar to the complaints about retired Adm. Frank B. Kelso II, the Navy's top uniformed officer on whose watch the rowdy 1991 Tailhook convention took place. (Thomas, 1995 Almanac, p. 1-47)

"Anita Hill, Tailhook, Packwood -- all were allegations that took place in a coercive atmosphere. That's a little bit different than this," said Sen. Barbara A. Mikulski, D-Md.

Mikulski was one of seven women in the Senate -- five Democrats, two Republicans -- who in 1994 tried to block Kelso's retirement at the four-star rank. They failed to persuade a majority of the Senate. (1994 Almanac, p. 439)

Other Democratic women see differences between the allegations facing Clinton and sexual harassment.

"Women have a right to a hassle-free workplace. It's not the same issue here," said Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, D-N.Y.

The Lewinsky scandal does not involve charges of harassment, even though its disclosure has roots in the civil lawsuit brought by former Arkansas state employee Paula Jones, who accused then-Gov. Clinton of making unwanted sexual advances.

Some Republicans suggest that Democrats and their feminist allies are now paying a price for politicizing the issue of sexual misconduct through the Thomas and Packwood cases.

"When Paula Jones surfaced . . . she was called a bimbo and trailer trash by the very people that elevated Anita Hill to the top of the heap. You can't have it both ways," said former Sen. Alan K. Simpson, R-Wyo., who as a member of the Judiciary Committee was one of Thomas' strong defenders and Hill's harshest critics.

Rep. Marge Roukema, R-N.J., agreed, and suggested that women's groups now find themselves in a box.

"I do think character counts, and I think the so-called feminists are conspicuous by their absence," she said.

THE CULTURE OF CONGRESS

Some Capitol Hill insiders say the ethos of Congress is what drives the eros of Congress.

Lawmakers who come to Washington leave their friends, and often their families, back home. Twelve-hour days are not uncommon when the House and Senate are in session. The schedule is often just as hectic during recess, when members return to their states to face schedules jammed with meetings, speeches and fundraising events.

"There is a culture in this town of a marked absence of fidelity," said a Democratic aide. "It's like a college campus in that almost everyone is full-time in a small geographic area. This becomes not only their workplace but their social place. Barriers between work and social life begin to erode."

For many years, the male-dominated institution operated like an exclusive men's club where sexual dalliances were overlooked. But as society has recognized sexual harassment and as more women have entered Congress, lawmakers have tried to adapt.

In 1995, lawmakers voted to bring Congress under the same federal labor and anti-discrimination laws, including protections against sexual harassment, that applied to U.S. businesses. (1995 Almanac, p. 1-31)

Congressional employees are now allowed to bring such claims to court after mediation and counseling. The Office of Compliance does not discuss specific complaints, but an official at the office said she knew of no court claims.

In the unlikely event that the burgeoning scandal forces Congress to move on impeaching the president, some lawmakers who sit in judgment could face uncomfortable scrutiny of their own wanton behavior, dissolved marriages and personal reputations.

That occurred in 1991 as the Senate Judiciary Committee dealt with Hill's accusations against Thomas. The stony silence of one of the panel's senior members, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., was attributed to fears that a reaction would serve as a reminder of the Kennedy family's own foibles.

In addition to the senator's own problems surrounding the 1969 drowning death of Mary Jo Kopechne in Chappaquiddick, Mass., one of Kennedy's nephews was embroiled in a high-profile sex scandals: William Kennedy Smith was acquitted of raping a Florida woman in 1991.

If Congress passes judgment on the president's misdeeds, it could also face criticism that in the past it has not meted out tough enough punishment when members go astray.

In 1976, Rep. Wayne L. Hays, D-Ohio (1949-76), allegedly put his mistress, Elizabeth Ray, on the payroll even though she admitted she lacked any secretarial skills. Hays, the powerful chairman of the House

Administration Committee and chairman of the then-Democratic National Congressional Committee, was forced to resign from Congress.

Wilbur Mills, D-Ark. (1939-77), chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, had a publicized affair with striptease dancer Fanne Fox. In December 1974, Mills resigned his chairmanship, sought treatment for alcoholism and announced he would not seek re-election in 1976.

Also in 1976, several House members were embroiled in scandal. An aide to John Young, D-Texas (1957-79), said she was kept on his payroll primarily to have sex with him. Joe D. Waggonner Jr., D-La. (1961-79), was arrested and released on charges of soliciting a police decoy posing as a prostitute. Allan T. Howe, D-Utah (1975-77), was convicted for soliciting two policewomen posing as prostitutes. The House took no action. (1976 Almanac, p. 23)

That kind of tolerance for sexual misdeeds began to change in the 1980s as Congress started recommending stronger punishment for untoward conduct. The House censured Daniel B. Crane, R-Ill. (1979-85), and Gerry E. Studds, D-Mass. (1973-97), in 1983 for sexual misconduct with teenage pages. Crane had sex with a 17-year-old female page, and Studds had a sexual relationship with a 17-year-old male page, who may have been 16 when the affair began.

The House ethics committee had recommended a reprimand for the two, the least severe form of punishment the House can impose. But after an outcry that the penalty was too mild, the punishment was upgraded to a censure on the House floor. (1983 Almanac, p. 580)

In October 1989, the House ethics committee sent a letter of reproval to Rep. Jim Bates, D-Calif. (1983-91), for sexually harassing women on his staff. (1989 Almanac, p. 46)

That year, the Senate denied the Cabinet post of Defense secretary to former Sen. John G. Tower, R-Texas (1961-85), who faced allegations of womanizing. (1989 Almanac, p. 403)

In 1990, an ethics investigation of Rep. Barney Frank, D-Mass., led to a reprimand for his relationship with a male prostitute. (1990 Almanac, p. 103)

Faced with allegations of sexual misconduct, including reports that he had fondled a Capitol elevator operator, Republican Rep. Donald E. "Buz" Lukens of Ohio resigned from Congress in 1990. (1990 Almanac, p. 106)

With that history, lawmakers acknowledge that lashing out now would open some to charges of hypocrisy.

"The great teacher suggested we all are sinners. We all have sinned," said Rep. John Lewis, D-Ga. "Those without sin cast the first stone. None of us are perfect, even members of Congress."

GRAPHICS: talking to the Senate in October 1991 about

Clarence Thomas' confirmation. (File Photo); photo, Sen. Bob Packwood, R-Ore., gives his resignation speech Sept. 7, 1995. (File Photo)

Editor's Note
Defense
Foreign Policy
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0211; 20 lines)
Item Key: 2385
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

Editor's Note

By Sara Fritz, Managing Editor

The Senate will soon be considering the historic question of whether to approve a proposed expansion of NATO to include three new nations: Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Central to that debate are two important questions: Are these countries capable of being reliable allies? And, what kinds of demands will this new alliance impose on the United States?

In an effort to answer those questions, CQ's veteran defense reporter Pat Towell recently visited the three countries seeking NATO membership to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their militaries. His exclusive report from Eastern Europe will appear in the Weekly Report's Feb. 7 issue.

Alliance Demands 'Right To Choose'
Politics/Elections
Agriculture
Health/Education/Welfare
(WR 01/31/98 p. 0243; 123 lines)
Item Key: 2414
--- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
--- ---

Alliance Demands 'Right To Choose'

By Rebecca Carr, CQ Staff Writer

When Thomas Humber thinks about dying, he sees a battleground filled with special interest groups that think they know the cause.

Too much red meat. Too much salt. Too much caffeine and too many cigarettes, they cry.

It will be a battle that Humber, the 55-year-old president of the National Smokers Alliance, will relish. Relish, because it goes to the core of what his tax-exempt advocacy group seeks to protect: the liberty to choose what a person does with his or her own body.

Likening his argument to that of those advocating the right to choose abortion, Humber wants the government out of his life and the lives of his three million members nationwide.

"All of us engage in risky behavior," said Humber, carefully removing a cigarette from a sleek black crocodile case and lighting up. "I don't jump out of airplanes like the former president [George Bush], nor do I volunteer for the space program like the senator [John Glenn, D-Ohio]. We all engage in risky behavior whether we acknowledge it or not."

Founded in 1993 with the help of tobacco giant Philip Morris Cos., the alliance is pushing for the rights of smokers at a time when congressional support for the tobacco industry is lukewarm at best.

The industry is on the defensive as it attempts to push legislation it needs to carry out the $368.5 billion settlement it reached last June with the state attorneys general. (1997 Weekly Report, p. 1442)

Undeterred, Humber sees himself as the sole friend to smokers huddled outside their office buildings, smoking a cigarette in the cold.

The alliance is an advocate for the nation's smokers, estimated at 47 million by the health industry. Humber, a former executive with Philip Morris and Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., is the paid executive navigating the strategy for the smokers' group.

"As you look at the attack on smokers you find violations all over of the Constitution," Humber said.

Humber said smokers pay taxes, too, on cigarettes they buy, but government policies are "used against smokers to disenfranchise them even more from society."

Foes of the tobacco industry question Humber's assertion that the group's rights are being trampled on. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) does not see it as a cause unless a person's Fifth Amendment right to liberty is jeopardized.

That right guarantees that a person can engage in personal behavior as long as it does not harm anyone else, said Arthur B. Spitzer, legal director of the ACLU of the National Capital Area.

"We don't think personal possession of drugs, alcohol, cocaine or tobacco, should be a crime," Spitzer said.

EVERYONE DIES

"Look," Humber said, now on cigarette No. 5 during an hour-long interview, "our lives are our own." Humber knows he is likely to die prematurely from smoking. He knows the risks. "I don't want to get old. I intend to enjoy it. To me smoking is part of the pleasure of life."

In financial records filed with the Internal Revenue Service, the organization is described as a grass-roots group, "fighting excessive regulation and taxation of tobacco products at all levels of government and opposing discrimination of smokers in public places and the workplace."

But tobacco control groups question just how grass roots the alliance is.

Only a fraction (about $73,000) of the $9 million spent by the group last year came from membership dues, according to the financial documents. Tobacco foes suspect that the difference was paid by the tobacco industry.

Humber conceded that his organization received major contributions from several companies in the tobacco industry, but he said the money also comes from individual donations. The group is a tax-exempt organization allowed to do limited lobbying.

"It costs a great deal to defend oneself in the public policy process and I will never apologize to anyone for getting the resources we need to defend adult smokers," he said.

As for the accusation that the alliance is not the grass-roots group it purports to be, smokers "know it's real, they see it every day. They wouldn't attack us as viciously as they do if it were not real and it were not having an effect . . . "

But critics in the tobacco control community say the alliance is out to make sure smokers get their rights, not what is best for society.

"No one is advocating prohibition," said Robin Hobart, co-director of Americans for Non-Smokers' Rights, a tobacco control organization based in Berkeley, Calif.

Hobart's group has been keeping tabs on the alliance since its inception, arguing that it is merely a front for the tobacco industry to wage pro-smoking campaigns.

"Certainly the adult smoker has the right to choose the health impact he or she chooses, but they don't have the right to inflict that on other people," Hobart said.

Meanwhile, smokers' rights groups like Humber's appear to have won at least one battle. On Jan. 28, the California Assembly repealed a ban on smoking in most bars and gambling casinos. The ban, which went into effect on Jan. 1, will be considered by the state Senate in the next few weeks.

GRAPHICS: San Diego on Jan. 21, after the state banned smoking in most bars and casinos. The legislature is considering a repeal of the ban. (The Associated Press)

There are no more items to read.

You are in WEEKLY REPORT
Enter number(s), a command, or MENU

!==

Approximate Connect Time: 0 Hour(s) 3 Minute(s)
==================== ATTACHMENT 1 ====================
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IT39LOEHTS009ROU@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for nassif_r@a1.eop.gov; Mon,
02 Feb 1998 03:52:53 -0500 (EST)
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IT39LK0F8G00A6T1@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for
nassif_r@a1.eop.gov; Mon, 02 Feb 1998 03:52:46 -0500 (EST)
Received: from ns1.cq.com ([198.67.16.10]) by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)

with ESMTP id <01IT39JID9RO0013GQ@STORM.EOP.GOV> for nassif_r@a1.eop.gov; Mon,

02 Feb 1998 03:52:11 -0500 (EST)
Received: by ns1.cq.com; id DAA16750; Mon, 02 Feb 1998 03:43:21 -0500 (EST)
Received: from hub.cq.com(198.67.5.98) by ns1.cq.com via smap (3.2)
id xma016748; Mon, 02 Feb 1998 03:42:51 -0500
Received: from veeger.CQ.COM (veeger.cq.com [198.67.5.2])
by hub.cq.com (8.8.2/8.6.12) with SMTP id DAA29788 for <nassif_r@a1.eop.gov>;

Mon, 02 Feb 1998 03:57:22 -0500 (EST)
Received: from veeger.CQ.COM via Pony Express VMS Mail FPI (v9.5.0-moe002)
; Mon, 02 Feb 1998 03:50:04 -0500 (EST)
X-VMS-To: wins%"nassif_r@a1.eop.gov"
================== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==================

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-FEB-1998 17:04:09.00

SUBJECT: 1998-02/05 press briefing by McCurry and Campbell

TO: newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: 62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: usia01@access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY (usia01@access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK_N@A1@CD@LNGTWY (WOZNIAK_N@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TOIV_B@A1@CD@LNGTWY (TOIV_B@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SISSER_T@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SISSER_T@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_BD@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SMITH_BD@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SCOVILLE_B@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SCOVILLE_B@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RILEY_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY (RILEY_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MUSGRAVE_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY (MUSGRAVE_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MOFFETT_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY (MOFFETT_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MATSUI_D@A1@CD@LNGTWY (MATSUI_D@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JOHNSON_WC@A1@CD@LNGTWY (JOHNSON_WC@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRIBBEN_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY (GRIBBEN_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GERHARDT_K@A1@CD@LNGTWY (GERHARDT_K@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DICKEY_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY (DICKEY_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CROWLEY_P@A1@CD@LNGTWY (CROWLEY_P@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BARTHOLOW_T@A1@CD@LNGTWY (BARTHOLOW_T@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BARBUSCHAK_K@A1@CD@LNGTWY (BARBUSCHAK_K@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ANDERSON_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY (ANDERSON_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]
)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: princej@panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY (princej@panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]
)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. White Jr.@EOP (William H. White Jr.@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen@eop (Woyneab M. Wondwossen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman@eop (Peter A. Weissman@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angelina Walker@ovp@eop (Angelina Walker@ovp@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega@eop (Dag Vega@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June G. Turner@eop (June G. Turner@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Serena C. Torrey@eop (Serena C. Torrey@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: terri tingen@eop (terri tingen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni@eop (Jordan Tamagni@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur@OVP@EOP (Jonathan H. Schnur@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane A. Stumpf@eop (Diane A. Stumpf@eop [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aviva Steinberg@eop (Aviva Steinberg@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto@eop (Maria E. Soto@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Socarides@EOP (Richard Socarides@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian D. Smith@eop (Brian D. Smith@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jake Siewert@eop (Jake Siewert@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir@eop (Ruby Shamir@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G. Timothy Saunders@EOP (G. Timothy Saunders@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evan Ryan@eop (Evan Ryan@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet@eop (Peter Rundlet@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nelson Reyneri@eop (Nelson Reyneri@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole R. Rabner@eop (Nicole R. Rabner@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne@eop (Julia M. Payne@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carole A. Parmelee@eop (Carole A. Parmelee@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter R. Orszag@eop (Peter R. Orszag@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. O'Mary@eop (Michael A. O'Mary@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman@eop (Elizabeth R. Newman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan@eop (Steven J. Naplan@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney@eop (Sean P. Maloney@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Murchinson@eop (Jonathan Murchinson@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tamara Monosoff@eop (Tamara Monosoff@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap@eop (Elisa Millsap@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Estela Mendoza@eop (Estela Mendoza@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin@eop (Tanya E. Martin@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine N. Macy@eop (Christine N. Macy@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz@eop (Laura D. Schwartz@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne H. Lewis@eop (Anne H. Lewis@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham@eop (Sara M. Latham@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Freeman@eop (Sarah S. Freeman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Allison J. King@eop (Allison J. King@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan@EOP (Jonathan A. Kaplan@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason@eop (Julie E. Mason@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Teague@EOP (James M. Teague@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne I. Johnson@EOP (Leanne I. Johnson@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda@EOP (Thomas D. Janenda@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Russell W. Horwitz@eop (Russell W. Horwitz@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald Goldberg@eop (Donald Goldberg@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dario J. Gomez@eop (Dario J. Gomez@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adam W. Goldberg@eop (Adam W. Goldberg@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Grace A. Garcia@eop (Grace A. Garcia@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ben A. Freeland@eop (Ben A. Freeland@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen E. Finney@eop (Karen E. Finney@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen C. Fahle@eop (Karen C. Fahle@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards@eop (Anne M. Edwards@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido@eop (Dorinda A. Salcido@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Ikemiyashiro@eop (Diane Ikemiyashiro@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer@eop (Elliot J. Diringer@eop [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna E. Cushing@eop (Anna E. Cushing@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett@eop (Julianne B. Corbett@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre@eop (Nanda Chitre@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David K. Chai@eop (David K. Chai@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phillip Caplan@eop (Phillip Caplan@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley@eop (Barbara D. Woolley@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin J. Bachman@eop (Robin J. Bachman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs@eop (Patrick E. Briggs@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alexander L. Boyle@eop (Alexander L. Boyle@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry@eop (Marsha E. Berry@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Barreto@eop (Brian A. Barreto@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston@EOP (Kris M Balderston@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick Aylward@eop (Patrick Aylward@eop [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders@eop (Brenda M. Anders@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori E. Abrams@eop (Lori E. Abrams@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: usnwire@access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: INFOMGT@A1@CD@LNGTWY (INFOMGT@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (SYS)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: julie_green@ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY (julie_green@ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WEINER_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY (WEINER_R@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (DON)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TCSmith@dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY (TCSmith@dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: STOTT_D@A1@CD@LNGTWY (STOTT_D@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SHIH_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY (SHIH_J@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NAPLAN_S@A1@CD@LNGTWY (NAPLAN_S@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TDIXON@PR_L=AVUOEOB@MRP@LNGTWY (PR_U=TDIXON@PR_L=AVUOEOB@MRP@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MOLONEY_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY (MOLONEY_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MCGUIRE_A@A1@CD@LNGTWY (MCGUIRE_A@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MALONE_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY (MALONE_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HAAS_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY (HAAS_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRAY_W@A1@CD@LNGTWY (GRAY_W@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CUTLER_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY (CUTLER_L@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) ()
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BEAUBAIRE_D@A1@CD@LNGTWY (BEAUBAIRE_D@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BARTHOLOME_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY (BARTHOLOME_M@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BAKER_K@A1@CD@LNGTWY (BAKER_K@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: COGDELL_C@A1@CD@LNGTWY (COGDELL_C@A1@CD@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: meglynn@usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY (meglynn@usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood@eop (Debra S. Wood@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss@eop (Lowell A. Weiss@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Glen M. Weiner@eop (Glen M. Weiner@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman@eop (Michael Waldman@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr@eop (Thurgood Marshall Jr@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul A. Tuchmann@eop (Paul A. Tuchmann@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy W. Tobe@eop (Amy W. Tobe@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop (Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews@eop (Sylvia M. Mathews@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Sullivan@EOP (Michael J. Sullivan@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern@eop (Todd Stern@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth Steele@eop (Elisabeth Steele@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik@eop (Douglas B. Sosnik@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig T. Smith@eop (Craig T. Smith@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Silverman@EOP (Joshua Silverman@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert M. Shireman@eop (Robert M. Shireman@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield@eop (Judithanne V. Scourfield@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger V. Salazar@eop (Roger V. Salazar@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia N. Rustique@eop (Virginia N. Rustique@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Ruff@eop (Charles F. Ruff@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria Radd@eop (Victoria Radd@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter O'Keefe@EOP (Peter O'Keefe@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally P. Paxton@eop (Sally P. Paxton@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristen E. Panerali@eop (Kristen E. Panerali@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Orszag@eop (Jonathan Orszag@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden@eop (Neera Tanden@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis@eop (Mark D. Neschis@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell@eop (Michael V. Terrell@eop [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray@eop (Melissa M. Murray@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin Moran@eop (Kevin Moran@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl D. Mills@eop (Cheryl D. Mills@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: R. Scott Michaud@eop (R. Scott Michaud@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock@eop (Andrew J. Mayock@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus@eop (Laura S. Marcus@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa J. Levin@eop (Lisa J. Levin@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart@eop (Joseph P. Lockhart@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher J. Lavery@eop (Christopher J. Lavery@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger@OVP@EOP (Jim Kohlenberger@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen@eop (Catherine T. Kitchen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William R. Kincaid@eop (William R. Kincaid@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Kalbaugh@EOP (David E. Kalbaugh@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon P. Jennings@eop (Jon P. Jennings@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Jolin@EOP (Michele Jolin@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: david t. johnson@eop (david t. johnson@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson@eop (Maureen A. Hudson@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Hayes@eop (Richard Hayes@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter D. Greenberger@eop (Peter D. Greenberger@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason S. Goldberg@EOP (Jason S. Goldberg@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson@eop (Jessica L. Gibson@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines@eop (Jeremy M. Gaines@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler@eop (Carmen B. Fowler@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie A. Fernandes@eop (Julie A. Fernandes@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rahm Emanuel@eop (Rahm Emanuel@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas Matties@eop (Douglas Matties@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorian V. Weaver@eop (Dorian V. Weaver@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt@eop (Daniel W. Burkhardt@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Suzanne Dale@eop (Suzanne Dale@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michelle Crisci@eop (Michelle Crisci@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven A. Cohen@eop (Steven A. Cohen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrei H. Cherny@ovp@eop (Andrei H. Cherny@ovp@eop [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell@OVP@EOP (Joseph W. Cerrell@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bradley M. Campbell@EOP (Bradley M. Campbell@EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Allison Balderston@eop (Allison Balderston@eop [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button@EOP (Katharine Button@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lanny A. Breuer@eop (Lanny A. Breuer@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: antony j. blinken@eop (antony j. blinken@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark J. Bernstein@eop (Mark J. Bernstein@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes@eop (Beverly J. Barnes@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie@OVP@EOP (Eli G. Attie@OVP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen@eop (Jeannetta P. Allen@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sharolyn A. Rosier@EOP (Sharolyn A. Rosier@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release February 5, 1998

JOINT PRESS BRIEFING BY
THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN
AND
THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN

The Briefing Room

2:53 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, let's get the matter of attribution down, because it is different for some. Welcome to the White House Press Lobby, those of you who have not been here before. And we are briefing under Press Lobby rules, in which I shall be identified as the President's official spokesman, and I am on the record as the President's official spokesman, because I was doing it as a convenience to my colleague here, who has got a number of people who are on deadline. I'm trying to help him out. The Prime Minister's official spokesman is here with me and is well known to many of you by his correct, proper name, I think.

Let me just quickly tell you what the President and the Prime Minister have done since you last saw them during the photo opportunity. They had a working lunch in the Oval Dining Room that lasted approximately an hour and 40 minutes. Alastair can tell you a lot more -- we can refer you to by name.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: You certainly can.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: But you cannot -- I can refer to him by name, but you can't. (Laughter.) I think that's -- I rather enjoy this. I wish more of my briefings these days I could do under these ground rules.

The President started the working lunch by asking the Prime Minister a simple question on the subject of Northern Ireland: How can I be of help and how can we be of help? And the Prime Minister then gave a very good -- what the President described as a very thorough assessment of the situation with respect to the peace talks, how he sees things unfolding. I think I should let my colleague tell you more about that, but the President praised the Prime Minister's role and said that he had demonstrated an enormous amount of courage in advancing this process and in some of the decisions he has made.

They then turned to the subject of Iraq and probably spent the bulk of the time during the working lunch on Iraq. The President asked Secretary Albright to summarize her trip, and she gave a description both of her recent visits in the region and also her own assessment of the prospects for diplomacy. What they said to each other privately reflected very much what they told you publicly -- that they both together believe that it is far preferable to seek a diplomatic resolution of the current conflict, but that requires firmness, and it requires governments to continue to make very clear to Baghdad the need for compliance with mandates of the United Nations. And the President following the meeting said it was very clear to him there's absolutely no light between us at all on this subject.

The third item they talked about was Iran, specifically US sanctions law with respect to Iran and Libya -- the Iran Libya Sanctions Act -- and that was an opportunity to review more the processes that exist under that Act and to compare notes on the various views that the two governments have with respect to how we might best produce the kind of change that we all would desire to see with respect to the government of Iran.

At the end of the working lunch, the small group that had been meeting in the dining room -- and on the U.S. side that consisted of the Vice President, Secretary Albright, and Sandy Berger, the National Security Adviser -- they went back to the Cabinet Room and joined the expanded delegations who had been also having a working lunch nearby in the Roosevelt Room. And that session, I'll tell you briefly, was a good opportunity for many colleagues in the two governments to get to know each other better. We saw Gene Sperling and David Miliband bonding at one point, and wonking away with each other. (Laughter.) They were clearly enjoying themselves.

But there were other -- in addition to that, other working groups. Eric Holder, the Deputy Attorney General, was here, and was meeting with Jim Steinberg and talking to some of their counterparts about crime and the importance that crime will play in the agenda of the G-7, G-8 meetings in Birmingham later this year. And that indeed, as the President and Prime Minister came back to the Cabinet Room with the melodies of Elton John wafting from overhead, they talked -- they began with a preview of the Birmingham G-7, G-8 meetings that the Prime Minister gave. And I'll let Alastair tell you more about that, but the Prime Minister really shared his thinking about he sees the agenda developing and the kinds of work that we'll be doing later in the year.

They spent time on the subjects of global warming, with the President suggesting that it's important to have a strategy to continue to involve developing nations in the implementation of the Kyoto Conference. They spent time on the issues of crime and fighting crime and the way in which the international community can organize itself in the post-Cold War era to deal with the threats of terrorism, drug trafficking, and some of the other transnational threats we face from organized crime syndicates. And they spent a brief time on trade issues.

That meeting ended just a short while ago with the President noting it was time to go off to school and the Prime Minister noting that the school, like everything else here, seems to be named Blair, and the President suggesting that that was to make him feel quite at home while he is here in the United States.

My colleague.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Thanks, Mike, and apologies for the bizarre attribution. But until November I didn't even exist, so we're making progress.

Just to say by way of introduction, the Prime Minister is obviously delighted to be here, as he has made clear in the interviews you have seen today. He is a friend and an admire both of the United States and of President Clinton, and we're pleased that they're able to spend so much time together both to address the current pressing international issues but also the broader political questions that they both enjoy discussing.

As Mike said, although the lunch was overwhelmingly dominated by discussions of Iraq, they did start on Northern Ireland. And the Prime Minister briefed the President on the progress in the peace process. He was at the talks himself a few days ago, and he was able to say that despite what are real serious difficulties, there is still grounds to be optimistic. People are coming at this process from different directions but all determined to try and keep it moving forward.

He expressed his admiration and gratitude for the supportive role that President Clinton had played in this. And you may have seen the text we put out this morning of his remarks to the Irish Congressional lobby, in which he stated that again.

He briefed also on where the different parties were finding this process helpful and where they are finding it difficult and said again that the U.S. was able to play a supportive role with all the parties -- not just the Nationalists but the Unionists as well in keeping this process moving forward.

On Iraq I would say that they agreed on the strategy that can be summed up as educate, diplomatize, and prepare. On the education side, the President was aware of -- he expressed interest -- this document which we've just, I think, given out now that we published yesterday which was sent to all members of our parliament, which really -- I think anybody who reads it sees a compelling case for taking the tack that were taking on this at the moment.

I mean, the figures are appalling and this is just the stuff that's just been uncovered -- let alone what has not been uncovered. And I think there are facts in there which the more broadly they can be disseminated, the more people will understand why this issue is so serious and so worrying.

Now, they agreed that every possible diplomatic avenue has to be pursued. But, in the end, Saddam Hussein has got to comply with the UN resolutions. And they agreed as well that UNSCOM must have complete access, and that the integrity of UNSCOM has got to be preserved as a professional organization, accountable to the Security Council.

So the diplomacy will go on. But in the meantime there will be the necessary preparation for military action should that be necessary. And obviously they have agreed to stay in very close touch on that over the next period of time.

In the extended session, as Mike said, the Prime Minister briefed those present on our priorities both the G-8, where we're trying to make it less cumbersome than has been the case in the past by focusing on two issues in particular: the first is the whole issue of employability and what the Prime Minister often calls the third way in economic reform and the job creation, education, skills, welfare reform; and secondly, organized crime and the Home Secretary Jack Straw, who'd had a separate meeting earlier with Jim Steinberg on this.

He made a presentation on, in particular, Nigerian organized crime, but also the whole question of drugs and how that might be addressed within G-8. He then gave a brief exposition of our priorities as the current holders of the presidency of the European Union, in particular spelling out where we are on the process of enlargement and also the single currency.

And finally I will just say that we were pleased at the tribute that the Vice President made in the meeting to the role of our Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, without whom he said the Kyoto agreement simply would not have happened. And they agreed that there's work to be done in pushing that forward.

They were also -- they touched briefly on Bosnia and Lockerbie, both of which subjects they'll be discussing, we understand, in the car on the way to the school.

Q If force comes to be used, would Britain participate in any use of force?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, the Prime Minister said this morning that if the diplomatic approach fails and force has to be used, then that is something that the British government would support.

Q If I may, he made clear that he would back policy, but I'm asking if actual forces will be employed.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, there are British forces there now.

Q There are, but would they be used?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I don't think there would be much doubt about that.

Q How do the two leaders feel about the question of Iraq -- the fact that they seem to stand together on the willingness to use force if diplomatic approaches fail, that they seem to be standing apart from most of their allies on this.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, Mike can come again in a minute, but in the last two days, the Prime Minister has spoken to both Boris Yeltsin and President Chirac. And everybody is agreed about the absolute determination to make sure that Saddam Hussein is brought into line. And you could argue about the degrees of enthusiasm with which they might pursue those objectives. But on the objectives, there's no disagreement whatever.

Q Can I follow up on that?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Let me add on that, I think based on the Secretary of State's consultations that she has completed, while force is not encouraged, because diplomacy is encouraged, no one specifically suggested to her, as she reported after her trip, that force should be categorically ruled out as an option, and we take that as a significant posture by a number of governments that we've been in contact with.

It is no question that most governments prefer to see a diplomatic solution. That's not a surprise, because so does the government of the United States, and so, obviously, does the government of the United Kingdom. But diplomacy, as we've all suggested, has been running out. The option -- pursuing diplomatic options is beginning to dwindle, and that's why other options begin to come into focus, as they have been for us and for others.

Q For both you gentlemen, on tactical nuclear force, though, has that been discussed? Does Prime Minister Blair have a problem with that?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, I think that question arises because of some of the speculation that we were dealing with here a number of days ago. I think we made quite clear the posture of our government on that question. I'm not aware that that came up in their discussions today.

Q Can I just ask you both, without, obviously, going into the details of it, how much did they begin to think about the nature of military action and the way it might be employed? I mean, there's a good deal of argument, isn't there -- at least, air strikes, land strikes, whatever. While you might not tell us that, did they begin to get into some thoughts about how that would operate?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, as I said, the three -- there's an agreement upon this three-pronged strategy.

Q I'm talking specifically --

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Yes, but they're all unfolding at the same time -- educate, diplomatize, and prepare. So the preparations are being made, and should that path have to be followed, then I think they're pretty clear about what that would mean.

Q On the diplomatize one, was there any discussion of the further UN Security Council resolution, which I gather is being discussed at present?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, they would both be aware of what was happening on that, and so the answer is yes. I'm not up to speed of actually what's going on there now, but certainly there's a -- among the diplomatic activity, it does include activity at the UN.

Q What's the British government's view on whether any military action should be postponed until after the end of the Olympics?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: After the end of?

Q The Olympics. (Laughter.)

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I'm not aware that it was a --

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: That's the way I looked when I got that question. (Laughter.)

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I'm not aware that it was a factor in any discussions on the third prong of the three-prong strategy. However, we --

Q The IOC has made an appeal.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, fine. (Laughter.)

Q They must be chopped liver. (Laughter.)

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Somebody's made an appeal about Winnie the Pooh, as well -- (laughter) -- but that wasn't raised, either.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Alastair, as I suggested to --

Q We like him better than you. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I'm getting the impression.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, they like him better than me.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: While I can't speak for the other government, as I told many of you yesterday, we are well aware of the concern that's been expressed by the IOC, but we believe this matter, given the seriousness of the subject that we're dealing with -- and Alastair just outlined some of it -- chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction and the capacity to develop them by this government, we have to proceed very carefully and very prudently but with some sense of urgency. And our timelines and deadlines are not affected by those kinds of external events but what is best as we pursue our own national security interest in addressing this moment.

Q Mike, there's a report that 2,000 Marines are being sent to the Persian Gulf region. Can you tell us why they are being sent there and what this --

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I'm aware of that report, and I'm also aware that there has been discussions, as the Secretary of Defense has indicated -- there have been discussions with the President about what additional resources might be necessary in the Gulf. I'd prefer to leave details of any operational deployments to the Pentagon. They can make those available to you in due course.

Q Is the report true, if I could follow up on that?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, if it is true, it would be best for the Pentagon to tell you more about it because they can tell you authoritatively about the kinds of things that have been requested and that the Commander in Chief may or may not have approved, depending on what they tell you.

Q Could you in a general way just talk about why the forces there needed to be beefed up?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Again, General Zinni has made some recommendations that have come through the Pentagon and have been a part of the discussions, and there's some -- without getting into specific assessments of the military situation, there are some particular points that they wanted to address with their operational deployment -- for good reason. But I think you can learn a lot more about that at the point that the Pentagon is ready to brief on it, which I gather will be sometime fairly shortly.

Q Mike, don't today's comments from Boris Yeltsin make it sound as though as he is unalterably opposed to the use of military force against Iraq, more so even than his comments yesterday?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I mean, I briefed yesterday on the Prime Minister's phone call with Boris

Yeltsin. And again, I think what was interesting was the extent of agreement on the determination to make sure that Saddam Hussein complied with the resolutions.

Now, I'm not going to pretend that when it came to discussion to the third part of that strategy that there was absolute agreement because there wasn't. But having said that, there was agreement on pursuing those objectives. Now, we welcome the fact that the French and the Russians are able to make -- to pursue those objectives in different ways. And that may lead to something. Our Foreign Secretary today has welcomed some of the suggestions that have been coming out from the Russian side of things.

So, there can be progress, but I think the bottom line for us is that if the diplomatic path proves to be fruitless, then there does have to be the option of the threat of force and the reality of force if that fails.

Q These two governments are prepared to go ahead by themselves, if that's what it means?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, I think -- I would say that these two governments are absolutely determined that Saddam Hussein is brought into line and recognize that those diplomatic efforts have to be matched and backed up by the threat of force and force if necessary.

Q Mike, how would this three-pronged approach work out here? How would it manifest itself here, especially the educational component of it. Do we expect the President to step up his efforts to explain what's at stake to the people?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, we have tackled that somewhat differently. I think you have seen the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, others in our government, in a very careful way review for the American people what the stakes are as we address this provocation by Saddam Hussein.

We have been unmistakably clear in what we see as the threat posed by the ongoing programs that exist in weapons of mass destruction and the concealment and the deliberate lying by the government of Iraq with respect to information that they provided to the U.N. Special Commission.

So we believe that the American people have been following this situation carefully. They are well aware that 24,000 of their sons and daughters are in the Gulf region precisely because of the threat that we now face. And they've heard the President speak very clearly, most recently in the State of the Union, but as he did yesterday and as he will continue to speak, on why we think it's so necessary to see compliance by Iraq and why we must be prepared to consider other measures if they become necessary.

Q And what about the diplomatic avenue, Mike? Now that Secretary Albright is back, what course diplomatically is the U.S. --

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I think as many of you know, we have said -- we have said what Cohen is doing, right? Yes, I think Secretary Cohen is leaving directly from the state dinner here this evening to go to the region, where he'll conduct additional consultations and there will be other discussions. There are some discussions underway at the Security Council, as we indicated, but there will be very determined diplomacy in the days and weeks ahead, without specifying any timeline.

Q Congressman Gephardt this morning said that he hoped the administration would seek express approval from the Congress before military action is taken. What is your position on that?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I'm sorry -- I missed it.

Q Congressman Gephardt asked that you have -- that the administration come to the Congress and get explicit approval.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, the administration believes that we have ample authority in existing law to address the present crisis, but of course we would always welcome expressions of support from our Congress. And based on the briefings and the consultations and the dialogue we've had at high levels in recent days, we're confident that Congress is prepared to give that approval or expression of support in some fashion.

Q Mike, you just used the term "determined diplomacy in the days and weeks ahead." Does the word "weeks" literally mean that for weeks diplomacy will be given a chance to work?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I don't want to suggest anything about our timeline or suggest that there is any artificial deadline. We will be pursuing this matter in a very determined way day by day, and I'm not going to speculate on when the string may finally run out on diplomacy.

,

Q -- mood of the British and American people towards Saddam, why is the first prong necessary?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, because you may say that and people may have feel a general sense of distaste and the sort of guy that he is, but I think actually I would answer that by actually looking at the response within the British media today to the document that we put out yesterday. I mean, there were facts in there which I think did genuinely shock people. And I think when you go through them, this guy has got 600 tons of a chemical, one drop of which can kill, and 200 tons of which can wipe out the population of the entire world.

Now, you go through the stuff about 38,000 chemical weapons, 480,000 liters of live chemical weapons agents, six missile launchers -- this is the stuff that's been uncovered by the weapons inspectors.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: We are going to make that document available to US press people who may not have seen it.

Q Why didn't the Administration put out something like that -- have the same information?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: We did sometime ago. If you recall, last November we did put a declassified version that was similar. Recall Secretary Cohen, when he was on the TV with the bag of sugar, did a document that's similar. The President was impressed with this one, and has asked our intelligence community to look at that and see if there's some way we might be able to match that.

Q Mike, were you trying to suggest earlier that you felt that the education effort in the US so far has been sufficient? In other words --

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: No, I don't think it's sufficient. I said I think the American people are alert to the situation in the Gulf. They are aware of the problems the United Nations Special Commission has been having. They're well aware that we have a significant force deployed in the region. And I think that they're watching very carefully to see what the course of diplomacy brings and what other options might present themselves, and they will want to hear very clearly from the President, as we pursue, if we do pursue other measures, why they are necessary and what the risks are and what the probability of success are.

Q Under what authority does the President act? War Powers Act? Bush felt compelled to go to Congress and get a resolution, even though that act --

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I can get you -- they've briefed at the State Department in greater length on this, but the 1991 post-Gulf War resolution is the one that we believe provides authority under existing statute to address this situation. It authorizes US support to fulfill existing UN Security Council resolutions. We simultaneously believe that within those existing Security Council resolutions, there's authority for the international community to act to compel compliance by the government of Iraq.

Q Would it have been better if you got congressional approval?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I think it would be -- as I've said, we would welcome and be delighted with support from our Congress.

Q I don't mean just welcome, that he would really feel he has the strong authority.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Can I just add to that, as well, as was clear in Parliament yesterday, both the main opposition parties in Britain were absolutely four-square behind the position set down by the Prime Minister.

Q Is it right that you asked for a two- or three-week delay to allow diplomacy to act a bit longer before any action was taken?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: No.

Q Does Britain have a policy like we do of not going after the leader of another country, like our directive that says it's against the law?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I think, as the Prime Minister has made clear in the interviews that he's done, I mean, that is not the issue. I mean, I don't think anybody is -- I think there are very few people who wouldn't be pleased if Saddam Hussein were to disappear. But that is not the issue; the issue is making him and the Iraqi regime comply with the Security Council resolutions.

Q May I follow on that, please? I'm still confused about the mission and the purpose. Surely Saddam Hussein won't voluntarily give up this material. So how are you ever going to recover the material without getting rid of Saddam Hussein?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, we've made clear that we believe the purpose of our diplomacy and other measures that may become necessary is to thwart or limit Iraq's capacity to use or develop weapons of mass destruction, and simultaneously to limit his ability to project force and to threaten and intimidate neighbors in that region as he has previously.

We believe that is -- that there are ways in which diplomacy could accomplish those objectives but, failing success, there might be necessity for other measures to achieve those objectives. We've got a high degree of confidence that we could achieve those.

Q Do you honestly believe that he will turn over this material while he's still in power?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: There is nothing about the decisions that he has made or what he has done to date to believe he would do that. He has begrudgingly, reluctantly, only under duress been willing to allow the UN Special Commission to do the work it has done, to destroy the weapons capacity that it has destroyed. So I think that's why the international community and our two governments are well-advised to continue to bring enormous pressure to bear on him.

Q Does the Prime Minister have to notify Parliament before he launches an attack? You say he has backing of the major parties. Does he have to notify them before? Or does he notify them after the fact, in case an attack should come?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, I think he would observe any proprieties that had to be observed, and he would also ensure that there was political support for what we did, and both the British Cabinet and the British Parliament and British public opinion would be mobilized behind anything that had to be done.

,

But, as I repeat, the desire and the whole aim of the approach we laid out is actually to avoid that happening. But that in the end all depends on Saddam Hussein.

Q May I try another approach to this? Is it British policy/American policy that Saddam Hussein still has to stay in power as a counterbalance against Iran? Is that still on the books?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I don't believe --not being thoroughly familiar with the policy in the United Kingdom, but I can say on behalf of our government that has not been the policy of our government. And that has not been a view I've heard expressed within the councils of the President's senior foreign policy advisers.

Q Did the President and the Prime Minister talk about the lessons learned from the Gulf War from the last time around, and what were those lessons? And how would they intend to do things differently this time around?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, I think the short answer to your question is no -- that there was -- they were focusing on here and now and the near future. President Clinton obviously has more experience in this field than the Prime Minister does. But I can assure you the Prime Minister has gone into this whole issue in quite extraordinary depth. I mean, last weekend he's devoted virtually the entirety of the weekend to reading on this issue -- both its history, both the where we are, looking at all the options, looking at all the difficulties, looking at all the things that could go wrong. And he --

Q Is there an acceptance that it was a job half done last time around?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, I think that the Gulf War was concluded, and one of those conclusions was that Saddam Hussein agreed to do certain things. We're in this situation and this crisis now because some of those things he agreed to do, he's gone back on that. And I think that's why it now has to be addressed in whatever way.

Q Does the President still believe that the comments of the Speaker and the Majority Leader yesterday about how one of the goals of the military action should be the removal of Saddam Hussein. Does he believe that those comments are damaging to his efforts to hold an international coalition together?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: No, I think that the President welcomes free expression of views on this. We have had -- through our senior policy makers who have been on the Hill -- very detailed discussions on exactly these questions. We have raised questions of the leadership in Congress about how they would prepare to accomplish that kind of objective without deployment of ground troops in significant numbers, given the experience that we had in the Gulf War and given what the requirements were just to accomplish the objectives and the mission during the Persian Gulf war.

But I think it's healthy that we have that kind of debate back and forth. And I think we've been very clear about the purpose of our diplomacy, the environment in which other options would have to be considered. And we're very confident that we can have bipartisan support in Congress for those measures if the President pursues them.

Q Mike, it can't be helpful to have the President of Russia talking about world wars coming from this. Were there specific discussions between the Prime Minister and the President about diplomatic efforts to keep him from saying things like this?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I don't know specifically that I came up, but both delegations were quick to note that clarification had been made about those comments. Now, it had been suggested earlier that there clearly is a disposition against the use of force by the Russian Federation. And that's no surprise. They've been saying so publicly for some time. But there is a clear determination on the part of the Russian Federation, through the diplomacy they have conducted, through the efforts of Primakov, Posavalyuk, others, to send the message to Baghdad that they are required to comply with the mandates of the international community. We believe that they have extended that message in an unambiguous way to Baghdad, and that is helpful.

We would prefer, of course, that that would produce some result.

Q When the President was asked in the Oval Office whether he thinks a use of force would provoke world -- another world war, his exact words, I think, were, I doubt that it would. He doubts that it would?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, we have some -- if and when the Commander in Chief approves plans or deals with plans presented to him by military planners that involve military options, as you all know, we would have a high degree of confidence in the probability of success. We would have confidence that the planning was done in a way that would address the objectives that we had, and we have stated those for you very clearly. And world war is not among those objectives or outcomes foreseen in the pursuit of force.

Q Does the British Government also believe that --

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Just a second.

Q Let me just follow up. I'm not clear what forces might be out there that would engage in a world war.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: It's not clear to me either, so that's why it's hard for us to interpret the statement.

Q I wondered, does the British Government also believe that the Security Council resolutions already on the books provide sufficient authority to consider and launch a military strike?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: We're not out there yet, where we are with regards to the Security Council at the moment. As I said in answer to Peter a moment ago, that is one of the diplomatic channels that is being pursued. But I think that the -- as Mike said earlier, there is a bit of time on this.

And the other thing I would say is that one of the reasons -- to go back to the question -- the remark about the need for education on this, is that it's not like Kuwait, in a sense. Kuwait, you've got one country, another country invades that country. It's obvious that some huge wrongdoing is taking place. But the Prime Minister's view and the reason why he's so keen to get all these facts out is the potential for wrongdoing and the potential for the instability and the havoc and the damage and the destruction that can be wreaked by Saddam Hussein is far greater than what was done then.

And, therefore: educate, pursue all the diplomatic channels, but that threat of force has to be there and has to be realistic. And in going back to the question from this lady here, the lesson is that he has never responded to anything unless there has been that threat of force and, on occasion, the use of force.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: As much fun as we're having, we do want to pipe in the President and the Prime Minister at the proper point, so maybe just a few more.

Q Can the spokesman just say something about the financial dinner last night with Treasury officials and with Greenspan?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Right. Which they discussed, the Prime Minister briefed him. He had a 45-minute bilateral with Mr. Camdessus, where they discussed Asia, the single currency, and Third World debt. Asia, it's fair to say I think, took up the lion's share of the discussion. And the Prime Minister was very supportive of what the IMF is trying to do. He made it clear that he didn't agree with those attacks that there have been in Congress on the IMF. But also there was an agreement that more transparency was needed and also that continuing support had to be allied to reform -- reform of the recipient countries, reform of the IMF itself, greater openness and transparency, and also a better assessment of the way the private sector might help.

And then over dinner, they were joined by Mr. Rubin, Mr. Greenspan, Mr. Summers, and there was a very useful exchange of views. And I think we felt -- there were other Congressmen there as well -- and we felt there was a beginning of a dialogue there; that people who had been absolutely blind to any sense that the IMF could be a force for good, that maybe that was beginning to change. But there was also an agreement that the IMF can do its job better.

Q Mike, I'm still not clear why you were having discussions at the UN Security Council if you and presumably the UK government also believe that you already have enough authority from existing resolutions. Are you looking for more political support?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: It's more that that is another proper venue to review the status of diplomatic efforts. And that is the source from which the mandates that now exist on the government of Iraq emanate. So it's a proper place to have further discussions. I'm not aware that our government is pursuing any additional authority from the Security Council. But the Security COuncil has indicated it's remained seize d of the matter, and it's perfectly natural that dialogue continues at that venue.

Q Mike, can we take it from the remarks of the Prime Minister's spokesman that the matter of the extradition of Winnie the Pooh did not come up, and that it is now closed as an issue? (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Winnie.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Oh, right, Winnie the Pooh.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: As the President indicated to some of us, the notion that the United States would lose Winnie is utterly unbearable. (Groans.)

Q What does your counterpart say?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: See if he can top that.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I can't.

Q But wait, you can't escape that easily. What's the -- can you clarify the position of your government, since it seems that a member of the Prime Minister's own Cabinet is seeking to -- (laughter).

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Let me just -- no. Gwynneth Dunwoody (phonetic) is a respected and admirable Member of the Parliament; she is not a member of the Cabinet. (Laughter.) Had she been a member of the Cabinet, she would have been expressing a government position. The government position is that we admire the President and the United States, and we believe that they will look after and care for these animals, sufficient for them to rest here with the British people happy that they're well looked after. (Laughter.)

That's the first time Boris Johnson has taken a note in the entire briefing. (Laughter.)

Q This hour and 40, did this include --

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: No, I'm sorry. It was an hour and 40 minutes during the working lunch, and then they continued for roughly another half-hour in the expanded format in the Cabinet Room.

Q Are we going to give back the Grecian marbles? (Laughter.)

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Pass, just take a pass.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I think I'll take a pass on that.

Q Can you tell us about tonight's dinner? The guest list, who's performing, the venue.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: The First Lady's office, I think, is putting out sometime this afternoon an embargoed guest list. I believe they have already delivered both the menu, which sounds wonderful, and the entertainment is by Sir Elton John and Stevie Wonder.

Q Can we go?

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Hands across the ocean, when it comes to entertainment. And you can actually -- if you've listened carefully, been listening to the rehearsal underway upstairs. because they're doing this --- this is the first time, I believe, since 1979, that the President and First Lady have entertained on what we call the West Terrace, which is right above the Briefing Room here.

Q And it almost collapsed last time. The Prime Minister of Japan was there; it hadn't been used for years. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, given what we've been dealing with in this room, we'll think about that.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Hold on, can I just add something on the dinner? The Prime Minister, as part of the toast to the President, which he has to do, will be referring to the importance in history of people who entertained the troops, in which he concedes the Americans have got an even finer record than we have, and will be announcing -- just to show that we are not just about the new generation, and that we have broad political outlook as well, he'll be announcing that the Queen is being pleased to confer and honorary knighthood upon Bob Hope.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: You finally made some news. (Laughter.)

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: So that's all part of educate and all that.

Q He'll be there as well?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: No, he won't, he won't.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: The President has learned of this very gracious gesture by Her Majesty, and is quite delighted and will no doubt express gratitude on behalf of the American people.

Q We ought to name an airport for Her Majesty. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Helen, the last question.

Q Why is he getting knighthood?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: In recognition of his contribution to film, to song, and to the entertainment of troops in the past.

Q And when will this occur?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Well, I'm not sure about his health. It will be a ceremony of sorts, and that will be fixed up between -- through the -- over here.

Q How many Americans have had this honor bestowed upon them by the Queen?

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: I think the last one was Casper Weinberger. Is that right, Peter? Schwartzkopf? And I think it is an honorary knighthood, but I'm not sure if he they can call themselves "Sir."

Q I'd like to nominate Mr. McCurry for the next one.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: He will be going to a reformed House of Lords.

Q Mike, I'm assuming that you've found this quite a pleasant relief, after the harrowing last week or so in the briefing room.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Easy.

Q Do you expect the media troops to be any less -- any more combative tomorrow, come 11:00 a.m.?

Q Four 'o clock this afternoon.

Q Just you wait, Mr. Higgins. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: That's right, I think that's up to you. But I think our -- I think you will find your colleagues from the United States entertaining to watch tomorrow.

Q We haven't asked you about that yet, because we're waiting for the cameras at 4:00 p.m. We need you on the record.

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN: Oh, all right. I'll be back here after the speeches.

END 3:36 P.M.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: TheWhipNotice <TheWhipNotice@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV> (TheWhipNotice <TheWhipNotice@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-MAR-1998 17:28:31.00

SUBJECT: Whip Notice for Week of March 16, 1998

TO: THEWHIPNOTICE@MAJORITYWHIP.HOUSE.GOV (THEWHIPNOTICE@MAJORITYWHIP.HOUSE.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Floor Information: 57430
Legislative Program: 52020
WHIP NOTICE
WEEK OF MARCH 16, 1998

MONDAY, MARCH 16
HOUSE WILL MEET AT 2:00 P.M. -- NO LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

TUESDAY, MARCH 17
HOUSE WILL MEET AT 12:30 P.M. FOR MORNING HOUR
HOUSE WILL MEET AT 2:00 P.M. FOR LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
NO RECORDED VOTES ARE EXPECTED BEFORE 5:00 P.M.

Suspensions (6 Bills):
1) H.R. 2864 - Occupational Safety and Health Administration Compliance
Assistance Authorization Act of 1997
2) H.R. 2877 - A Bill to Amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of
1970
3) H.Con.Res. 238 - Authorizing the Use of the Capitol Grounds for a
Breast Cancer Survivors Event Sponsored by the National Race for the Cure
4) H.Res. 364 - A Resolution Urging the Introduction and Passage of a
Resolution on the Human Rights Situation in the People's Republic of
China at the 54th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights
5) H.Res. 373 - A Resolution Commending Democracy in Botswana
6) H.Con.Res. 235 - A Concurrent Resolution Calling for an End to the
Violent Repression of the Legitimate Rights of the People of Kosova

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18 AND THURSDAY, MARCH 19
HOUSE WILL MEET AT 10:00 A.M. FOR LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Suspensions (4 Bills):

1) H.R. 2696 - Vessel Hull Design Protection Act
2) H.R. 2294 - Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1997
3) H.R. 3117 - Civil Rights Commission Act of 1998
4) S. 758 - Lobbying Disclosure Technical Amendments Act of 1997

H.Con.Res. 227 - Concurrent Resolution Directing the President Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to Remove United States Armed Forces from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

H.R. 1757 - Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act Conference Report (Subject to a Rule)

H.R. 2870 - Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 (Subject to a Rule)

FRIDAY, MARCH 20
NO VOTES ARE EXPECTED

Members are reminded that votes will not be extended more than 2 additional minutes (17 minutes total). Conference reports may be brought to the floor at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

Sincerely,

Tom DeLay
Majority Whip

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: TheWhippingPost <TheWhippingPost@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV> (TheWhippingPost <TheWhippingPost@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-MAR-1998 18:27:27.00

SUBJECT: The Whipping Post for Tuesday, March 17, 1998

TO: THEWHIPPINGPOST@MAJORITYWHIP.HOUSE.GOV (THEWHIPPINGPOST@MAJORITYWHIP.HOUSE.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Anticipated Floor Schedule:
House Will Meet at 12:30 p.m. for Morning Hour
House Will Meet at 2:00 p.m. for Legislative Business
No Votes Are Expected Before 5:00 p.m.
Last Vote Expected: 6:00 p.m.
* One-Minutes
* Suspensions (6 Bills):
1) H.R. 2864 - Occupational Safety and Health Administration Compliance Assistance Authorization Act of 1997
2) H.R. 2877 - A Bill to Amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970
3) H.Con.Res. 238 - Authorizing the Use of the Capitol Grounds for a Breast Cancer Survivors Event Sponsored by the National Race for the Cure
4) H.Res. 364 - A Resolution Urging the Introduction and Passage of a Resolution on the Human Rights Situation in the People's Republic of China at the 54th Session of the United Nations
Commission on Human Rights
5) H.Res. 373 - A Resolution Commending Democracy in Botswana
6) H.Con.Res. 235 - A Concurrent Resolution Calling for an End to the Violent Repression of the
Legitimate Rights of the People of Kosova
* Special Orders
Wednesday's Forecast:
House Will Meet at 10:00 a.m. for Legislative Business
Last Vote Expected: Evening
Business Expected on the Floor:
* Suspensions (4 Bills):
1) H.R. 2696 - Vessel Hull Design Protection Act; 2) H.R. 2294 - Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1997; 3) H.R. 3117 - Civil Rights Commission Act of 1998; 4) S. 758 - Lobbying Disclosure Technical Amendments Act of 1997
* H.Con.Res. 227 - Concurrent Resolution Directing the President Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to Remove United States Armed Forces from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina
* H.R. 1757 - Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act Conference Report
(Subject to a Rule)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: TheWhippingPost <TheWhippingPost@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV> (TheWhippingPost <TheWhippingPost@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1998 20:35:57.00

SUBJECT: The Whipping Post for Wednesday, March 18, 1998

TO: THEWHIPPINGPOST@MAJORITYWHIP.HOUSE.GOV (THEWHIPPINGPOST@MAJORITYWHIP.HOUSE.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Anticipated Floor Schedule:
House Will Meet at 10:00 a.m. for Legislative Business
Last Vote Expected: 6 - 8:00 p.m.
* One-Minutes
* Suspensions (4 Bills):
1) H.R. 2696 - Vessel Hull Design Protection Act
2) H.R. 2294 - Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1997
3) H.R. 3117 - Civil Rights Commission Act of 1998
4) S. 758 - Lobbying Disclosure Technical Amendments Act of 1997
* Vote on Suspensions (rolled from Tuesday, March 17, 1998):
1) H.Con.Res. 152 - Expressing the Sense of Congress Regarding Northern Ireland
2) H.Con.Res. 235 - Calling for an End to the Violent Repression of the Legitimate Rights of the People of Kosova
* H.Con.Res. 227 - Directing the President Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to Remove United States Armed Forces from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Two Hours Debate)
* Possibly Consider H.R. 1757 - Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act Conference Report
(Rule Waives All Points of Order)
* Special Orders
Off the Floor:
Republican Conference. 9 - 10:00 a.m., HC-5 The Capitol

Thursday's Forecast:
House Will Meet at 10:00am for Legislative Business.Last Vote Expected By 6:00pm
Business Expected on the Floor:
* H.R. 2870 - Tropical Conservation Act of 1998 (Open Rule, One Hour General Debate)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1998 15:57:13.24

SUBJECT: 1998-03/17 press briefing by mike mccurry

TO: MEDIA AFFAIRS:
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kara Gerhardt (GERHARDT_K) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Glynn, Mary Ellen (meglynn@usia.gov@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sharolyn A. Rosier (Sharolyn A. Rosier@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (princej@panet.us-state.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: lori E. Abrams (ABRAMS_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Lori E. Abrams@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen (ALLEN_JP) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jeannetta P. Allen@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lori L. Anderson (ANDERSON_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Lori_Anderson@OA.EOP.GOV@INET) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brenda M. Anders (ANDERS_B) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Brenda M. Anders@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Eli G. Attie (ATTIE_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Eli G. Attie@OVP@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patrick Aylward (AYLWARD_P) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Patrick

Aylward@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (PIR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robin J. Bachman (BACHMAN_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Robin J. Bachman@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kyle M. Baker (BAKER_K) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Kyle M. Baker@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (BARBUSCHAK_K) (OA)
READ:17-MAR-1998 16:13:53.57

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (BARNES_BJ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Beverly J. Barnes@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian A. Barreto (BARRETO_B) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Brian A. Barreto@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew (BARTHOLOME_M) (OA)
READ:19-MAR-1998 14:23:30.50

TO: Todd A. Bartholow (BARTHOLOW_T) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David S. Beaubaire (BEAUBAIRE_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (David S. Beaubaire@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark J. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_MJ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Mark J. Bernstein@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Marsha E. Berry (BERRY_ME) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Marsha E. Berry@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Antony J. Blinken (BLINKEN_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (antony j. blinken@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alexander L. Boyle (BOYLE_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Alexander L. Boyle@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (PIR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lanny A. Breuer (BREUER_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Lanny A. Breuer@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (BRIGGS_P) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Patrick E. Briggs@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Katharine M. Button (BUTTON_K) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Katharine Button@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robin Bachman (Bachman_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Robin J. Bachman@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (Barbara D. Woolley@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bradley M. Campbell (Bradley M. Campbell@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Phillip M. Caplan (CAPLAN_P) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Phillip Caplan@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth A. Castellani (CASTELLANI_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Elizabeth A. Castellani@eop@lngtwy@eopm (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell (CERREL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Joseph W. Cerrell@OVP@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David K. Chai (CHAI_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (David K. Chai@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (PIR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Andrei H. Cherny (CHERNY_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Andrei H. Cherny@ovp@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nanda Chitre (CHITRE_N) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Nanda Chitre@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: S~even A. Cohen (COHEN_SA) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Steven A. Cohen@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (CORBETT_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Julianne B. Corbett@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michelle Crisci (CRISCI_M) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Philip J. Crowley (CROWLEY_P) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anna E. Cushing (CUSHING_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Anna E. Cushing@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lynn G. Cutler (CUTLER_L) ()
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lana Dickey (DICKEY_L) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (DIRINGER_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Elliot J. Diringer@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (CEQ)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melinda L. Dupont (DUPONT_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Melinda L. Dupont@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (Daniel W. Burkhardt@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Diane Ikemiyashiro (Diane Ikemiyashiro@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dorian V. Weaver (Dorian V. Weaver@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (Dorinda A. Salcido@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas Matties (Douglas Matties@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Anne M. Edwards@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Rahm Emanuel@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen C. Fahle (FAHLE_K) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Karen C. Fahle@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (FERGUSON_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jennifer Ferguson@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julie A. Fernandes (FERNANDES_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Julie A. Fernandes@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen E. Finney (FINNEY_K) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Karen E.

Finney@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (FOWLER_C) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Carmen B. Fowler@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ben Freeland (FREELAND_B) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Ben A. Freeland@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (GAINES_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jeremy M. Gaines@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Grace A. Garcia (GARCIA_GA) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Grace A. Garcia@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (PIR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jessica L. Gibson (GIBSON_JL) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jessica L. Gibson@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Adam W. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Adam W. Goldberg@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jason S. Goldberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dario J. Gomez (GOMEZ_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Dario J. Gomez@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Wendy E. Gray (GRAY_W) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter D. Greenberger (GREENBERGE_P) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Peter D. Greenberger@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: John Gribben (GRIBBEN_J) (OMB)
READ:17-MAR-1998 17:24:59.87

TO: Donald Goldberg (Goldberg_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Donald Goldberg@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard Hayes (HAYES_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Richard Hayes@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Russell W. Horwitz (HORWITZ_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Russell W.

Horwitz@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (HUDSON_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Maureen A. Hudson@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (JANENDA_T) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Thomas D. Janenda@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David T. Johnson (JOHNSON_DT) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (david t. johnson@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Leanne I. Johnson (JOHNSON_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Leanne I. Johnson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (JOHNSON_WC) (OA)
READ:18-MAR-1998 09:03:57.76

TO: Michele Jolin (JOLIN_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Michele Jolin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: James M. Teague (James M. Teague@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jon P. Jennings (Jon P. Jennings@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julie E. Mason (Julie E. Mason@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (KALBAUGH_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (David E. Kalbaugh@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (KAPLAN_JA) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jonathan A. Kaplan@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Allison J. King (KING_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Allison J. King@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (PIR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen (KITCHEN_C) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Catherine T. Kitchen@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sarah S. Knight (KNIGHT_S) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Sarah S. Freeman@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: James Kohlenberger (KOHLEN_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jim Kohlenberger@OVP@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sara Latham (LATHAM_S) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Sara M. Latham@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christopher J. Lavery (LAVERY_C) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Christopher J. Lavery@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne H. Lewis (LEWIS_AH) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Anne H. Lewis@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (LOCKHART_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Joseph P. Lockhart@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (Laura D. Schwartz@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lisa J. Levin (Lisa J. Levin@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christine N. Macy (MACY_C) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Christine N. Macy@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael D. Malone (MALONE_M) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Laura S. Marcus (MARCUS_LS) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Laura S. Marcus@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Tanya E. Martin (MARTIN_T) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Tanya E. Martin@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Doris O. Matsui@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas R. Matties (MATTIES_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Douglas R. Matties@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Andrew Mayock (MAYOCK_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Andrew J. Mayock@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne E. McGuire (MCGUIRE_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Anne E. McGuire@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brooke E. McManus (MCMANUS_B) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Brooke E. McManus@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Estela Mendoza (MENDOZA_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Estela Mendoza@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: R. Scott Michaud (MICHAUD_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (R. Scott Michaud@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elisa Millsap (MILLSAP_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Elisa Millsap@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Cheryl D. Mills@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julia Moffett (MOFFETT_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan C. Moloney (MOLONEY_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (megan moloney@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Tamara Monosoff (MONOSOFF_T) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Tamara Monosoff@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (PIR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kevin Moran (MORAN_K1) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Kevin Moran@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan Murchinson (MURCHINSON_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jonathan Murchinson@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa M. Murray (MURRAY_MM) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Melissa M. Murray@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr. (MUSGRAVE_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.@eop@lngtwy@eopmr (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sean Maloney (Maloney_S) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Sean P. Maloney@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael Terrell (Michael V. Terrell@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Steven J. Naplan (NAPLAN_S) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Steven J. Naplan@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark D. Neschis (NESCHIS_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Mark D. Neschis@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (NEWMAN_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Elizabeth R. Newman@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Neera Tanden (Neera Tanden@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael A. O'Mary (OMARY_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Michael A. O'Mary@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan Orszag (ORSZAG_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jonathan Orszag@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter Orszag (ORSZAG_P) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Peter R. Orszag@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kristen E. Panerali (PANERALI_K) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Kristen E. Panerali@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carol Parmelee (PARMELEE_C) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Carole A. Parmelee@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sally P. Paxton (PAXTON_S) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Sally P. Paxton@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julia Payne (PAYNE_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Julia M. Payne@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Timothy Dixon (PR_U=TDIXON@PR_L=AVUOEOB@MRP@OPUS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter O'Keefe (Peter O'Keefe@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nicole R. Rabner (RABNER_N) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Nicole R.

Rabner@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nelson Reyneri (REYNERI_N) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Nelson Reyneri@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Linda Ricci (RICCI_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Linda Ricci@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Renee C. Riley (RILEY_R) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cecilia E. Rouse (ROUSE_C) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Cecilia E. Rouse@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Charles Ruff (RUFF_C) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Charles F. Ruff@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter Rundlet (RUNDLET_P) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Peter Rundlet@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Virginia N. Rustique (RUSTIQUE_V) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Virginia N. Rustique@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Evan Ryan (RYAN_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Evan Ryan@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: G. Timothy Saunders (SAUNDERS_GT) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (G. Timothy Saunders@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jill A. Schuker (SCHUKER_J) Autoforward to: Steven J. Naplan (NAPLAN_S) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield (SCOURFIELD_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Judithanne V. Scourfield@eop@lngtwy@eop (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brooks E. Scoville (SCOVILLE_B) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (BROOKS SCOVILLE@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ruby Shamir (SHAMIR_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Ruby Shamir@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (SHESOL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jeffrey A.

Shesol@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: June Shih (SHIH_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (June Shih@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert M. Shireman (SHIREMAN_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Robert M. Shireman@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jake Siewert (SIEWERT_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jake Siewert@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joshua Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Joshua Silverman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian D. Smith (SMITH_B2) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Brian D. Smith@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian D. Smith (SMITH_BD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Craig T. Smith (SMITH_CT) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Craig T. Smith@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard Socarides (SOCARIDES_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Richard Socarides@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (SOSNIK_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Douglas B. Sosnik@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Maria E. Soto (SOTO_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Maria E. Soto@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (PIR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elisabeth Steele (STEELE_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Elisabeth Steele@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Aviva Steinberg (STEINBERG_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Aviva Steinberg@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Todd Stern@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Darby E. Stott (STOTT_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (darby_E._stott@oa.eop.gov@inet) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Diane A. Stumpf (STUMPF_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Diane A. Stumpf@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (DON)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mike Sullivan (SULLIVAN_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Michael J. Sullivan@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan Schnur (Schnur_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jonathan H. Schnur@OVP@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMR (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (Sisser_T) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Tracy F. Sisser@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Suzanne Dale (Suzanne Dale@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (Sylvia M. Mathews@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lisa Jordan Tamagni (TAMAGNI_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Jordan Tamagni@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (TCSmith@dol.gov@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Terri I. Tingen (TINGEN_T) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (terri tingen@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Amy W. Tobe (TOBE_A) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Amy W. Tobe@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) Autoforward to: Barry Toiv (Barry J. Toiv@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Serena C. Torrey (TORREY_S) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Serena C. Torrey@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Paul A. Tuchmann (TUCHMANN_P) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Paul A. Tuchmann@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx)
READ:NOT READ

TO: June G. Turner (TURNER_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (June G.

Turner@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Thurgood Marshall (Thurgood Marshall Jr@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dag Vega (VEGA_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (Virginia Apuzzo@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Michael Waldman@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Angelina Walker (WALKER_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Angelina Walker@ovp@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Glen M. Weiner (WEINER_G) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Glen M. Weiner@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert S. Weiner (WEINER_R) (DON)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter A. Weissman (WEISSMAN_P) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Peter A. Weissman@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lowell Weiss (WEISS_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Lowell A. Weiss@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (WONDWOSSEN_W) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Woyneab M. Wondwossen@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Debra S. Wood (WOOD_D) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Debra S. Wood@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
READ:17-MAR-1998 16:24:49.64

TO: Remote Addressee (William H. White Jr.@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (julie_green@ed.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usia01@access.digex.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD
MORE #485

-03/17
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release March 17, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING BY
MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

2:24 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Two points -- no, one point. Tomorrow, since some of you will be out in Las Vegas, the President --

Q You're not going?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not. I'll be monitoring developments back here on the East Coast.

Q At your listening post in your office.

MR. MCCURRY: Correct.

Secretaries Cohen, Rubin and Albright are going to be on the Hill tomorrow to talk about the supplemental request. They're going to link up at the House Triangle at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow, do a little availability and try to kick

-start the administration's
supplemental request. And I promised I would pass on a heads

-up to
all of you so you could alert your congressional colleagues to that fact, that we've got three Cabinet members up there pitching the supplemental.

Q At 12:30 p.m.?

MR. MCCURRY: At 12:30 p.m., House Triangle tomorrow.

Meanwhile, the President will be in Las Vegas and will be touring facilities at the Carpenters Joint Apprentice Training Center in Las Vegas, and attend a meeting of the AFL

-CIO Executive
Council.

Q Does he intend to gamble at all there?

MR. MCCURRY: No.

Q Is he a gambling man?

Q What does he do between --

MR. MCCURRY: We have arranged for the filing center to do that.

Q What does he do between 2:40 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.?

MR. MCCURRY: In the beautiful desert sun in the afternoon when he's got his good friend out there, when the weather is warm and the greens are beckoning --

BOTTOM EVEN
MORE #485

-03/17
Q He's going to play golf. (Laughter.)

Q Is that what he's doing?

MR. MCCURRY: Right.

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN
MORE #485

-03/17

Q That's a long way to go to play golf.

MR. MCCURRY: And now, Mr. Donaldson, you know why I'm not going out there.

Q That explains the 2:00 a.m. return home.

Q You ought to play golf, too, then.

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't played in a long time.

Q Does he bet a dollar a hole, or something like that?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know whether they play skins or what they do. Maybe, from time to time. I've never heard him talk about that very much.

Q He doesn't talk about everything that he does.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think they do a lot of -- they don't play skins and skats and stuff like that.

Q Who is the friend that you referred to?

MR. MCCURRY: I think -- is he playing -- his friend is the publisher of the paper out there he plays with a lot. I had heard that they were going to play, but I'll let your pool unravel that mystery tomorrow.

Q Mike, was it the President's idea to release the letters? And what's the tick

-tock on that? When did you all think about that and how did you find them?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, when some of us heard that there were such letters, many of us felt that that would be good to try to get out on the public record after her --

Q How did you hear there were such letters?

MR. MCCURRY: I heard about it, I guess, towards the end of last week.

Q Well, how? Who had gathered them?

Q Somebody went and looked for them, right?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that people were aware that there were letters from her.

Q Who had gathered them?

Q Who? Did Nancy Hernreich bring this to your --

MR. MCCURRY: The Oval staff. I don't know who, in particular.

Q Well, Mike, what drove the White House's decision to get these out and get these out much more quickly than you've got congressional testimony out?

MR. MCCURRY: Your broadcast, 60 Minutes, Bill.

Q And why?

MR. MCCURRY: Because she was on in front of however many millions of people and there was some desire to have information TOP ODD
- \p -

BOTTOM ODD
MORE #485

-03/17
on the public record that would place in some context information so Americans could understand the story.

Q The question is what you were asked this morning, why not put out the correspondence between the President and Monica Lewinsky?

MR. MCCURRY: A, I don't know if there is such correspondence. There may be, but I don't know the extent of it. B, for all the reasons that we have suggested in the past -- there's an investigative process underway and that they have been sought under subpoena by the Office of Independent Counsel. To my knowledge these materials have not been sought, but I don't rule out the possibility that the OIC will want to seek them at some point.

Q But the difference is the subpoena. One was subpoenaed and one was --

MR. MCCURRY: No, I think most -- the difference is that we had -- you know, it's a much more dramatic moment when someone goes on national television like that. And naturally, we wanted to help Americans understand the fuller context of the story.

Q But what could be much more dramatic than the first week when the Monica Lewinsky allegations broke?

MR. MCCURRY: We kept asking, as Mr. Bennett did last night, for people to just wait for additional facts to come forward. And additional facts are coming forward.

Q We're asking for additional facts, the letters of Monica Lewinsky --

MR. MCCURRY: And they're coming forward. The President's deposition is out there, among other things.

Q Why can't you just say you felt the need to defend yourself here, and so far, with Monica not speaking in public, you don't feel a need yet to defend yourself with her?

MR. MCCURRY: That's pretty accurate; I wouldn't dispute that, yes.

Q Well, why didn't you say that?

Q How much of the correspondence -- the total exchange of correspondence do we have? Do we have all of the President's responses?

MR. MCCURRY: My understanding is that it is the best the lawyers could do in the short time that they did look for this. They've assembled what they think is available through the records that they keep of the President's correspondence. That doesn't rule out that there may be additional things that they find that they have looked pretty well through what they think they can find.

Q When did they start? Because --

MR. MCCURRY: I can't tell you that. Maybe on all of these kind of like, how do they look for it questions, I think Jim Kennedy would be more useful than I can be.

Q Was the release of these letters intended to impugn Kathleen Willey's credibility by showing that she continued to write and call the White House?

MR. MCCURRY: The release of these letters were intended to provide additional information in which people could understand the context of this story.

Q What is that context?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the context of the story is that she wrote these types of letters in the time after the encounter she described on national television Sunday night.

Q One interpretation of those letters is being made that here was a woman who was broke and had lost her husband and was desperately trying to get a job, and therefore, was gilding the lily, as it were, in being so effusive trying to get a job.

MR. MCCURRY: I can't provide that interpretation. I don't know, in fact, that that was her motive or not.

Q What do you say to the suggestions that the release of the letter was a smear campaign?

MR. MCCURRY: I think it was factual information. We have not characterized these letters one way or another. People can read them and make whatever they want to of them. If they provide the interpretation that Mr. Donaldson just provided, that's their business. I'm not going to provide interpretation.

Q Do you think this investigation has wound down now to a war of public relations? And do you think the polls are showing the President still has some support?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know whether it has or not. It has gotten pretty far afield from the search for information relevant to a land transaction years and years ago, that's for sure.

Q -- that she might have tried to blackmail the President to get a job?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to -- I don't have any information that suggests that.

Q What do you know about the book deal?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know anything about it.

Q Have you taken a look at these polls --

Q -- interpretation is an equally plausible one is that you release information when it helps your case, you don't release it if it doesn't.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know whether the release of information -- there's some information about Monica Lewinsky that no doubt would be helpful to what the President has suggested in his strong denials.

Q Like what?

MR. MCCURRY: Some of the information that I know.

Q Have you taken a look at these polls? There are three network polls that say the President's approval rating is still very high; that more people believe Kathleen Willey than believe him about this incident; that most people, however, say it's all right from the standpoint of thinking the President should not be removed unless, all three polls say, he's lying, he's perjured himself.

MR. MCCURRY: Sam, as I said earlier today, I think that any poll you take at any moment in the aftermath of a big story is a snapshot. It may or may not reflect what public opinion is a week from now or two weeks from now or two months from now. I don't have any way of predicting which way it will go.

Q You mean his approval rating may be low two months from now?

MR. MCCURRY: Could be low, could be high. I think it probably will be based on the job he's doing on the issues that Americans are more interested in. For example, Medicare, which the President was working on today on Capitol Hill, which no one has asked a question about yet; the Northern Ireland peace process, which is an important one -- we're at a very critical moment, which you haven't asked a question about yet. I think people make their judgments based on things that are relevant to their lives.

Q I'll take the bait on health care.

Q But you said that you have this information -- the information you know about Monica Lewinsky that, in fact, would help the President's case. And you say you want to go on to these other issues. Well, why not come out with a full accounting, because then we could get beyond these questions?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I think maybe someday we will.

Health care.

Q Yes. There's now been a report that the Kennedy

-Kassebaum bill is not working. What does the President intend to do about that?

MR. MCCURRY: There are two specific things in the New York Times report, and the President addressed them earlier today. The first is insurers who provide incentives for insurance agents not to cover people. And the President, as you know, asked Secretary Shalala to send an instruction to state health insurance commissioners today on that.

The other is the problem of premiums, which is a problem and something I think we're going to have to continue to look at, which links back to what the President was on the Hill talking about today -- finding ways for people who lack coverage to be able to buy into coverage, for example, Medicare, when they need it.

Q But this proposal on Medicare specifically does not deal with affordability, it only deals with access, which is the same problem with Kennedy

-Kassebaum --

MR. MCCURRY: Medicare would be in many cases a much more accessible and affordable form of health insurance than private insurance arrangements for people who suddenly find themselves without coverage. But in any event, affordability is going to continue to be a problem and one that needs to be addressed in a variety of ways that the President suggested.

Q But that's not in the proposal now?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we don't have a comprehensive program ala 1994, you're correct. But we have been continuing to work at ways that you can address both access, quality and affordability.

Q On Northern Ireland, is the President going to encourage David Trimble this afternoon to meet with Gerry Adams?

MR. MCCURRY: The President will encourage Mr. Trimble, who he has great respect for, to take advantage of the venue that is available to them in the all

-party talks to directly air their
differences. Making peace is a delicate, difficult process. The Prime Minister -- the Taoiseach and the President today talked about the way in which human emotion and personalities play into a peace process, and how you have to overcome the natural barriers that people sometimes have to directly engage.

The President cited some of his own experiences with the Middle East peace process. But specifically, in understanding how difficult it is for people to make that great leap, the President would ask leaders like Mr. Trimble, as he has with Mr. Hume, Mr. Adams, Mr. McMichael, Lord Alderdice, and others, to take the enormous opportunity that exists through these talks, to build on the courage they've already demonstrated by using this venue to make peace, and to take the next necessary steps to come to an agreement that will allow them to resolve their differences, and to build a peace for all the people of Ireland.

And I think there are ways in which, in time, perhaps all the leaders, all the parties will find utility in having the kind of direct dialogue that this venue can afford.

Q But in time -- if they're going to meet the May referendum deadline, that's one thing they don't really have.

MR. MCCURRY: As the President said, the time is now.

Q -- is coming to New York to receive an award, and several members of the Congress have called on the White House to invite him to the White House. Have you made any decisions?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not aware of any scheduling of that. But we will check further with National Security Council staff.

Q Mike, can you answer the first question, which was, did the President want these letters out? Did he order that these letters come out? You said the lawyers looked for them. Who else was involved?

MR. MCCURRY: I just already told you on the tick

-tock
on the letters, please contact Mr. Kennedy. I'm sure the President knew that we were putting the letters out and I'm sure that he approved.

Q But you've told us that you knew about these letters.

Q Did the President have any specific reaction to his meeting with Gerry Adams last night?

MR. MCCURRY: We have refrained from doing any individual readouts of his meetings since the President does look forward to his meetings coming up. But he had a very productive meeting with Gerry Adams, the leader of Sinn Fein, last night. They talked in much the same spirit I just conveyed to Susan's question about the overall utility of the process, and the President -- his message, I think, could be summarized, in short phrase, to seize this moment. And it's the message he intends to convey to the other leaders when he sees them this afternoon.

Q Mike, how could the remarks of the President's lawyer last night on Larry King Live about a so

-called book deal be
anything other than an attempt to impugn Kathleen Willey's character?

MR. MCCURRY: He very carefully addressed that and was very careful on how he raised that issue during the show. And I think if you look carefully at it you will see it was not motivated in that fashion.

Q Mike, you said you made the letters public for Willey because in part, she went on national television and made her case. Are you saying that that's a legitimate reason that's driving the strategy in terms of how they respond to Monica Lewinsky and, in fact, if she went on national television, that perhaps the White House would be more --

MR. MCCURRY: There was enormous interest in her and there seemed to be utility in providing information that helped the American people have a broader context in which to understand this story. On other occasions, you yell at us when we don't make such information available. In this case, we were able to make it available and I'm not trying to characterize it other than to say it provides more context for people to understand the story.

Q Let me do a little more yelling about that. You told us that you and others learned about these Kathleen Willey letters, but when we've just now asked you about Monica Lewinsky letters, you said, well, I'm not certain -- I don't even know whether there are any. Surely, the same person can tell you whether there are Lewinsky letters who told you there were Willey letters.

MR. MCCURRY: The same people in the Legal Counsel's Office probably can assemble the same kind of material; that's correct.

Q Well, why haven't they?

Q Well, then, why not do it?

MR. MCCURRY: Because they choose not to because of the investigative process that's underway.

Q Because it would not be helpful -- may I just follow up -- because that would not be helpful to the President?

MR. MCCURRY: I can't speculate on their reason not knowing the content.

Q Could you describe, though, the decision to release them? Was this a decision by Ruff, a decision by the communications people?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm just not going to get into the tick

-tock -- I mean, everyone concluded it would be a good idea to have these out. It was a combination of people who work as advisors to the President?

Q Still think so?

Q What's the last update you had on Yeltsin's cold? On Yeltsin's health?

MR. MCCURRY: The contacts we've had through the embassy indicate that he is being treated for an acute respiratory problem, and we wish him well for a speedy recovery. We've gotten some anecdotal information about people that he has seen in recent days.

Q When was that?

MR. MCCURRY: He saw the conductor, Rostropovich, I believe over the weekend.

Q When was your last update? When was the last contact?

MR. MCCURRY: Probably embassy in Moscow, sometime yesterday I would imagine.

Q His respiratory problem sounds like a polite way of saying pneumonia.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't have anything to add to what President Yeltsin's spokesman's office have said in Moscow.

Q Are letters ordinarily filed in such a way that they could be retrieved if whatever correspondence a particular citizen's had with the President that they can be retrieved and look at the folder?

MR. MCCURRY: There are lots of different ways that correspondence gets managed and handled at the White House. I think it depends in part on whether the President sees it, whether the President responds to it. I don't want to try to provide one characterization.

Q Does he have the President's zip code that he keeps for personal correspondence?

MR. MCCURRY: I do not know the answer to that.

Q Mike, do you have any reaction to the Senate committee vote on IMF funding?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't -- see if we can get a response to that.

Q Mike, any reaction to Jean Kennedy Smith's decision to leave the ambassadorship in Ireland?

MR. MCCURRY: Has that been made public?

Q The President talked about it.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, she is very, very highly regarded by the President. She has been an enormously effective emissary on behalf of all America -- not only the administration, the White House, the President, but on behalf of the Irish American community and others who are so deeply interested in relations between our countries and in the prosperous relations that we enjoy with the Republic of Ireland.

She has extended her stay on occasion, partly at the President's request, just because there's been so much progress in exactly this peace process we have talked. And I know that all Americans will wish her well as she completes what has been an enormously useful term of service. If I understand correctly, she's going to be there for quite some time, and, of course, we will be looking to find someone who will be a worthy successor.

Q Mike, could you take the question of whether or not there is any Lewinsky correspondence and get us an answer?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll refer that to Mr. Kennedy.

Q Mike, I'm puzzled. You release one batch of correspondence and you won't even tell us if there is another one?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll refer to Mr. Kennedy the question if there is such correspondence.

Q The New York Times today reported that the Pentagon has been training Indonesian military forces since 1992, despite a congressional ban -- apparently, doing this under a loophole of the law. And the question raised by Representative Lane Evans in the Times today is curious to know why U.S. taxpayer dollars are being wasted on aiding and abetting of ruthless military organizations.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the Pentagon will tell you a lot more about the program under which this training is occurring. It is not a loophole, it is the joint combined exchange training that is done under law by the Pentagon. That program uses no foreign military assistance funds, which is the principal concern and the barrier that exists in current law with respect to Indonesia, because that's a program that operates, for example, under IMET funding -- that's the training that is military

-to

-military training that's done
usually as a form of assistance for the host government receiving the training.

This training involves special forces who have got unique skills that operate in

-country. They learn the language of
the country that they're operating in and the benefits flow to the United States for that kind of training. It is not a program that is designed to aid or to materially affect the military capability of the country that we're training with. It is actually another form of military

-to

-military cooperation and exchange. A great deal more on
this is being done at the Pentagon right now and I refer you to them.

Q Mike, can you talk about China's human rights record and also in connection with the Geneva meeting? And also, the President is going to talk about human rights in China during his visit?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll say in short summary of what many of you were told over the weekend, that we have seen some progress in areas related to human rights and we believe that as a way to encourage further progress in human rights we can work cooperatively through the exchanges that we are going to have with the People's Republic to advance our agenda. Thus the reason for our decision with respect to the human rights resolution in Geneva. But we will continue to press our concerns as we address them directly in the kind of high level exchanges that we believe have been fruitful as we advance dialogue on human rights and other questions.

Q Mike, what is the President going to be saying about worker training tomorrow? What's this about?

MR. MCCURRY: He's going to talk about the ways in which some of things we've identified in the State of the Union and in the budget can work to enhance economic growth and opportunities for workers to gain higher wages as we think about the post

-industrial
economy of the 21st century.

Q What's the audience going to be? Who's going to be there?

MR. MCCURRY: He's got a group at the Union Hall, the carpenter's apprentice program.

Q Mike, how close is the President to Nate Landow, and have they been in much contact with each other since last summer?

MR. MCCURRY: I can't answer. I can't -- obviously, he is one of many Democratic Party financial contributors. He's a former state party chairman. He's well known to many in the party. He certainly knows the President. I can't describe for you how close they are and what the last time they may have conversed.

Q Kathleen Willey wrote many times of her interest in an ambassadorship. And one of her letters there was a note from the President saying, is this what we did for Sheila Lawrence and can we do this for her. Do you have any idea --

MR. MCCURRY: That was that international fund of conservation or something? I don't know. Maybe Jim Kennedy can help you on that. Jim Kennedy is helping people on that.

Q Mike, does the White House have a view on whether the Judiciary Committee or a Select Committee should handle potential impeachment proceedings?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to speculate; no reason why I should speculate on that.

Q Mike, tomorrow the House is debating whether to invoke the War Powers Act in Bosnia. Can you explain whether or not -- or why the administration feels it's not necessary to get Congress's approval for what's --

MR. MCCURRY: There are a lot of reasons for it. They've been addressed by the State Department on advice of their legal advisory staff there, others in the administration. In short, the answer is that this is not operation that goes under the heading of war making because it is largely a peacekeeping mission that is fulfilling the objectives of the Dayton Accords, and the environment in which they are presumed to operate in country is one that does not represent an imminent threat of hostilities, even though it does involve risk and is dangerous, does not involve the immediate risk of hostilities directed against U.S. forces or other participants in the international force.

Q In your post mortem today, did you decide -- the White House decide that it was good to put out the letters or detrimental?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know that we had any kind of analysis that was that deep. We just thought it was a good thing for people to have access to additional information, and we made it available.

On the Senate vote on the IMF, there is a letter from Secretary Rubin to Chairman Stevens that expresses our views on the Senate vote and on the way in which the Senate addressed the question. We'll make that available.

Q Mike, on Nate Landow, what is the reason you can't talk about the President's relationship --

MR. MCCURRY: I just haven't inquired of it, don't know what his most recent contact was or what his relationship is.

Q Could you find out --

MR. MCCURRY: I can direct you to Mr. Kennedy.

Q Mike, Anita Hill today said that Mr. Bennett's use of those letters yesterday to impugn the credibility of Kathleen Willey reminded her of the way critics tried to impugn her credibility. Do you disagree?

MR. MCCURRY: Look, there are many people with many opinions that have flooded the airwaves. I'm not going to comment on each and every person's viewpoint. And she's entitled to express whatever viewpoint she has.

Q Mike, is it of concern to the White House that many of your supporters in the women's community get the wrong idea and think they were meant to scare her?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that we've worked very hard to make sure that they understand how carefully and prudently we are attempting to address this matter, and we hope that they see and appreciate what we're trying to do.

Q How have you tried to communicate that to them?

MR. MCCURRY: We've had a variety of contacts as we consult with them on a variety of matters.

Q Mike, on the tobacco deal, last week, Speaker Gingrich said that he is opposed to any limits on liability for the industry. And he said if the administration pushes a bill that has limits on liability, why wouldn't other industries, like the heart valve industry which is under litigation attack, want limits, and should they be given limits?

MR. MCCURRY: The Speaker will be happy to know we are not pushing legislation that codifies any liabilities. We have said that, while we don't advocate limits on liabilities, we certainly understand that some want them in any comprehensive tobacco legislation as a way of getting approval for and compliance with the requirements of that legislation; i.e., to head of protracted litigation in the courts that might jeopardize any type of comprehensive solution.

That's why we've always said that inclusion of limits on liability would not be a deal breaker for us, that we would have to examine what the whole legislation looked like to see if we were achieving our overall public health objectives. If we can get a program that gets the tobacco industry on a determined path of contributing to an effort to discourage children from smoking, discouraging 3,000 kids a day from starting to smoke, that that would be a good thing, and that the way in which you would achieve that and if it was consistent with all the principles that the President has outlined, including regulation by the FDA, limits on advertising, doing those things that will achieve the overall public health objectives, that the President can certainly see fit to consider and perhaps support the right kinds of limits on liability. But it would have to be in the context of what the overall legislation was.

Q To follow up on that, she's saying it should be a deal

-breaker, that you should be able to get legislation without limits on liability.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you may very well be, and we, of course, would prefer that if that's possible.

Q You said you had contacts with women's groups to -

-with women to try to show how carefully you're dealing with this. Did you contact any women on the Hill, any of the senators or congresswomen?

MR. MCCURRY: I did not, but there may well have been contacts like that through some of our staff here.

Q Did anyone talk to Patricia Ireland at all?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. I don't know who all -- but they, on any given issue, would be reaching out to a variety of constituency groups.

Q Some of these organizations have reported that people who either work now at the White House or used to, that worked with Kathleen Willey, have contacted reporters on an unsolicited basis to offer their experiences. Do you know if there was any attempt to encourage people to do that here?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not aware of any, have not heard any suggestion. To the contrary, heard it suggested that we ought to, since we are being very careful and very delicate in the way we're addressing this, that we should discourage people from making impromptu remarks on this subject. So if they're doing it, they're doing it on their own.

Q Mike, just a quick question -- were these letters were mailed or hand

-delivered?

MR. MCCURRY: Again?

Q The letters.

Q Were they mailed or hand

-delivered?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. Some of them, you get the impression that they may have been hand

-delivered. I don't know the answer to that.

Q Mike, the President suggested that he'd let the deposition speak for itself. Does this mean that he is backing away from his statement made that these were legitimate questions that at a later date he'll be --

MR. MCCURRY: Same question as yesterday and there's no change in the answer, that the President indicated in the future he may well address this, but he's going to wait and see how things unfold in the future.

Q Given the fact that the Paula Jones lawyers released Kathleen Willey's deposition but not the cross by Mr. Bennett, and the President is talking about letting the depositions speak for themselves, do you think Mr. Bennett or the White House would be able to give us the cross by Mr. Bennett of Kathleen Willey?

MR. MCCURRY: That's a very good question. We may well -- since this is out minus the cross examination. Question's for Mr. Bennett.

Q The last few days, Bob Bennett has been appearing on television in many places. And his appearances have drawn mixed reviews. Does the President think he's done a good, effective job for him, or is he disappointed to some extent?

MR. MCCURRY: The President thinks he's done a very good job in very difficult circumstances and very hostile questioning, sometimes with people who have already made up their minds and are not interested in making an impartial review of the facts.

Q How does he feel about you?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't talked to him about me.

Q So Mr. Bennett will continue to be someone that the President wants to speak for him?

MR. MCCURRY: He's a very good lawyer and he's done a very good job under circumstances that are difficult. And I think he's handled this matter -- the President believes he's handled this matter very effectively.

Q The President talked yesterday about the three incarnations of the story. Can you shed any more light on what the three incarnations are?

MR. MCCURRY: He was essentially referring to the Linda Tripp version, the Julie Steele version, the Kathleen Willey version and its many permutations and, of course, obviously, that he's got his own accounts, so there are at least four.

Q What are the many permutations of Kathleen Willey?

MR. MCCURRY: Whatever the different ones that she's given.

Q What different ones?

Q Wait a minute, Mike. What do you see as different? She gave a deposition and then she talked on television.

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not an authority on her different accounts, so I'm not going to attempt to address that.

Q Well, wait a minute. You can't suggest somebody's telling multiple stories and then back away from it.

MR. MCCURRY: I'm answering the question that was asked about what did the President mean on his three incarnations, and I gave you the answer.

Q You added the fourth.

MR. MCCURRY: The fourth was the President's version.

Q Well, what about her different permutations, because that suggest she's telling different stories? And then you say you don't know of that.

MR. MCCURRY: I thought -- there are three, there were Kathleen Willey, Julie Steele, Linda Tripp.

Q So you didn't mean to say that Kathleen Willey has many permutations?

MR. MCCURRY: I didn't mean to say that, no.

Q The Justice Department has been increasingly active in breaking up mergers of -- mergers of big corporations. If you go back and look at the legislative history of the antitrust law at the turn of the century, Congress intended to address the issue of corporate power. Sorry about this philosophical antitrust question, but is it the White House's view that corporations have too much power?

MR. MCCURRY: I think it's a good philosophical question that ought to be debated in maybe a seminar in antitrust law, but not here.

Q Mike, I want to go back to Gennifer Flowers, because I can't reconcile the President's statements. In 1992, he referred to Gennifer Flowers as "a woman that I didn't sleep with." Do you still maintain that's an accurate statement?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not aware of that statement. I don't know whether he said that or not.

Q He said it in New Hampshire -- "woman I didn't sleep with," "draft I didn't dodge," "pot I didn't smoke," --

Q Nightline, all over --

MR. MCCURRY: I'll go back and talk to some of my colleagues that were there in that capacity in 1992 and see if they've got anything on that.

Q You could just repeat what you had to say about it in 1992. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Thank you.

END 2:55 P.M. EST

#485

-03/17

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: The White House <Publications-Admin@Pub.Pub.WhiteHouse.Gov> (The White House <Publications-Admin@Pub.Pub.WhiteHouse.Gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JUN-1998 00:01:13.00

SUBJECT: 1998-06-19 Letter to Congress on Peacekeeping Efforts in Bosnia

TO: Public-Distribution@[198.137.240.100] (Public-Distribution@[198.137.240.100] [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Nashville, Tennessee)

For Immediate Release June 22, 1998

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT
TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

June 19, 1998

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

In my last 6-month report to the Congress I provided further information on the deployment of combat-equipped U.S. Armed Forces to Bosnia and other states in the region in order to participate in and support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led Stabilization Force (SFOR), which began its mission and assumed authority from the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) on December 20, 1996. I am providing this supplemental report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to help ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed on continued U.S. contributions in support of peacekeeping efforts in the former Yugoslavia.

We continue to work in concert with others in the international community to encourage the parties to fulfill their commitments under the Dayton Peace Agreement and to build on the gains achieved over the last 2 years. It remains in the U.S. national interest to help bring peace to Bosnia, both for humanitarian reasons and to halt the dangers the fighting in Bosnia represented to security and stability in Europe generally. Through American leadership and in conjunction with our NATO allies and other countries, we have seen increasingly rapid progress toward sustainable peace in Bosnia. We have helped foster more cooperative pro-Dayton leadership in Bosnia-Herzegovina, resulting in much improved performance by the parties in fulfilling their responsibilities to implement the Dayton Peace Agreement.

The United Nations Security Council authorized member states to establish the follow-on force in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1088 of December 12, 1996. On June 15, 1998, the Security Council extended the authorization for the SFOR for an additional period terminating June 21, 1999. The mission of SFOR is to deter resumption of hostilities and stabilize the security environment to facilitate the civilian implementation process.

The SFOR has successfully deterred the resumption of hostilities by patrolling the Zone of Separation, inspecting and monitoring heavy weapons cantonment sites, enhancing and supervising Entity Armed Forces (EAF) demining work, and, within existing authorities and capabilities, providing support to international agencies.

The primary way SFOR supports the civilian implementation effort is by contributing to a secure environment. The SFOR works closely with the International Police Task Force (IPTF), which was established on December 21, 1995, under Security Council Resolution 1035. With SFOR support, the IPTF has successfully created indigenous public security capabilities by reforming and training the local police. Both the SFOR and the IPTF, as a result, enhance public security in ways that promote civil implementation of the Peace Agreement. This collective approach works to make the implementation process progressively more self-sustaining without exceeding the SFOR's current level of intensity and involvement.

By contributing to a secure environment, the SFOR has fostered greater progress by civilian implementers, including helping to restore road, rail, and air transportation links, reforming racist and nondemocratic media, and supporting international preparations for supervision of the national elections in Bosnia-Herzegovina in September 1998. In addition, the SFOR has contributed to efforts to bring 31 persons indicted for war crimes into custody in The Hague.

The U.S. force contribution to SFOR in Bosnia is approximately 7,800 -- roughly one-third of the number of U.S. troops deployed with IFOR at the peak of its strength. The U.S. forces participating in SFOR include U.S. Army forces that were stationed in Germany and the United States, as well as special operations forces, airfield operations support forces, air forces, and reserve component personnel. An amphibious force under U.S. control is normally available as a strategic reserve in the Mediterranean Sea, and a carrier battle group remains available to provide support for air operations.

All NATO nations and 20 others, including Russia and Ukraine, have provided troops or other support to SFOR. Most U.S. troops are assigned to Multinational Division, North, centered around the city of Tuzla. In addition, approximately 3,000 U.S. troops are deployed to Hungary, Croatia, Italy, and other states in the region in order to provide logistical and other support to SFOR. Since December 1997, U.S. forces have sustained no fatalities.

A U.S. Army contingent remains deployed in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) as part of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP). This U.N. peacekeeping force, which includes some 350 U.S. soldiers, observes and monitors conditions along the borders with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Albania. The UNPREDEP continues to play a key role in preventing the spillover of ethnic conflict from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) into FYROM and the region. In doing so, it has helped FYROM become a bulwark against the southward spread of the conflict in the FRY. Several U.S. Army helicopters are also deployed to provide support to U.S. forces and may support UNPREDEP as required on a case-by-case basis. The Security Council voted December 4, 1997, to authorize an extension of the UNPREDEP mandate through August 31, 1998. We are currently exploring options regarding the extension of UNPREDEP's mandate in light of the growing violence and instability in Kosovo.

A small contingent of U.S. military personnel also served in Croatia in direct support of the Transitional Administrator of the United Nations Transitional Administration in Eastern Slovenia (UNTAES). These personnel were redeployed when the UNTAES mandate expired on January 15, 1998; a follow-on U.N. civilian police operation continues in the region.

I have directed the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in these operations pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, and in accordance with various statutory authorities. I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed about developments in Bosnia and other states in the region. I will continue to consult closely with the Congress regarding our efforts to foster peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

# # #

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Lee, Tom MAJ" <LEET@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> ("Lee, Tom MAJ" <LEET@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-JUN-1998 10:01:09.00

SUBJECT: FW: House Appropriations Bill Extract (HR4103)

TO: CD Drug Demand Reduction <DDR2@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> (CD Drug Demand Reduction <DDR2@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CD Division Chiefs <CDDIV@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> (CD Division Chiefs <CDDIV@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CD State Support Branch <StatePlans@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> (CD State Support Branch <StatePlans@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CD LNOs <CDLNO@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> (CD LNOs <CDLNO@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CD Command Team <CDCommand@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> (CD Command Team <CDCommand@cdmail.ngb.army.mil> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
The following is passed along FYI. It relates to CD only indirectly but is interesting reading none the less.

TJL
MAJ Thomas J. Lee
Plans, Actions & Policy Officer
NGB-CDX
703 681-0867 or DSN 761-0863
LEET@CDMAIL.NGB.ARMY.MIL

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Clark, Raymond - NGB-PL
> Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 1998 7:05 AM
> To: Anderson, Richard; Ayala, Jose; Baken, Denise; Bill Goss
(NGAUS);
> Bill Skipper; Cannon, Bob; Chesbro, Fred; Chris Small MAJ; Clawson, Gary;
> Dan Beck LtCol; Donohue, Daniel; EANGUS; Forsberg, Phillip; Hart, LTC;
> James, Robert; Jim Hudson; Kalber, Mark; Kougeas, Paula; Lee, Tom; Lenk,
> John; Levea, Rose; Lischke, Maureen; LTC Cedric Sheridan; Lund, Steve;
> Lynnette Hupman; Magee, Eric; Matt Urbaneck; McClure, Paul; Mickevicius,
> Theodore; Miller, Bruce; Montrey, Mark; Mosbey, John; Padilla, Joe;
> Parker, Rickmen; Sheridan, Cedric; Stine, Steve; Tom Beeson; Trapani,
> Paul; Vann, Paul; Williams, Kathy
> Cc: Beeson, Thomas W. LTC, NGB-ARNG; Bassett, Francine; Burris,

Richard;
> Hillestad, Mike; Hise, James; Jensen, Joanne; Johnson, Warren; Lagasse,
> Carol; Lawson, Peter; Loy, Kevin; Martin, Jan; McIntosh, Ann; Muzny,
> Marylin; Newton, Kenneth; Scraba, Mark; Tom, Randy
> Subject: House Appropriations Bill Extract (HR4103)
>
> Below is the extract of NG items from the HAC defense bill.
Enjoy!
>
> In addition, I've attached the complete bill for your reference
in
> text format.
>
>
> <<HR4103~1.doc>> <<HR4103RH.txt>>
>
> Raymond P. Clark
> Major, USAF
> Office of Policy and Liaison
> (703) 697-3688
>

- HR4103~1.doc - HR4103RH.txt==================== ATTACHMENT 1 ===================
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D42]MAIL45277277J.126 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

================= END ATTACHMENT 1 =================

==================== ATTACHMENT 2 ===================
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
{\rtf1\ansi \deff0{\fonttbl{\f16\froman Times New Roman;}{\f17\froman Symbol;}{
\f18\fnil Wingdings;}{\f19\froman Wingdings 2;}}{\colortbl;\red0\green0\blue0;\
red0\green0\blue255;\red0\green255\blue255;\red0\green255\blue0;\red255\green0\
blue255;\red255\green0\blue0;\red255\green255\blue0;\red128\green128\blue128;\r
ed255\green255\blue255;\red0\green0\blue128;\red0\green128\blue128;\red0\green1
28\blue0;\red128\green0\blue128;\red128\green0\blue0;\red192\green192\blue192;\
red0\green0\blue0;}\viewscale69\viewkind1\ftnbj \sectd\footery1129{\header \par
d \tqc\tx4320\tqr\tx8640 \plain\f16 H.R 4103, Defense Appropriations Bill, 22 J
une 1998\par \pard \tqc\tx4320\tqr\tx8640 \plain\f16 \par }{\footer \pard \tqc\
tx4320\tqr\tx8640 \plain\f16 Prepared by the National Guard Bureau\tab \tab \pl
ain\f16 \chpgn \plain\f16 \par }\pard \plain\f16 [DOCID: f:h4103rh.txt]\par \pa
r \par \par \par \par Union Ca
lendar No. 333\par 105th CONGRESS\par 2d Session\par
H. R. 4103\par \par [Report No. 105-591]\par
\par Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year \p
ar ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.\par \par \par
____\par \pa
r \par IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES\par \par

June 22, 1998\par \par Mr. Young of Florida, from the Commit tee on Appropriations, reported \par the following bill; which was committed t o the Committee of the Whole \par House on the State of the Union and or dered to be printed\par \par ____\par \par A BILL\par \par

\par \par Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year \par ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.\par \pa r Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the \par Unit ed States of America in Congress assembled,\par That the following sums are app ropriated, out of any money in the \par Treasury not otherwise appropriated, fo r the fiscal year ending \par September 30, 1999, for military functions admini stered by the \par Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:\par \ par TITLE I\par \par

MILITARY PERSONNEL\par \par Military Personnel, Army\p ar \par For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on \par deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all \p ar expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of \par tempora ry duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of \par the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided \par for elsewhere) , cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant \par to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), \par to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to \par the Department of Defen se Military Retirement Fund; $20,908,851,000.\par \par

Military Personnel, Navy\par \par For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on \par deposits, gratuities, permanent change of statio n travel (including all \par expenses thereof for organizational movements), an d expenses of \par temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for m embers of \par the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for \par elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant \par to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), \pa r to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to \par the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $16,560,253,000.\par \par

Military Personnel, Marine Corps\par \par For pay, allow ances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on \par deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all \par expenses thereof for or ganizational movements), and expenses of \par temporary duty travel between per manent duty stations, for members of \par the Marine Corps on active duty (exce pt members of the Reserve provided \par for elsewhere); and for payments pursua nt to section 156 of Public Law \par 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), t o section 229(b) of the \par Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of \par Defense Military Retirement Fund; $6,241,189,000.\par \par

Military Personnel, Air Force\par \par For pay, allowa nces, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on \par deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all \par expenses thereof for org anizational movements), and expenses of \par temporary duty travel between perm anent duty stations, for members of \par the Air Force on active duty (except m embers of reserve components \par provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments \par pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 \par note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Ac t (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), \par and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \par $17,201,583,000.\par \par Reserve Personnel , Army\par \par For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, tra vel, and \par related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under \par sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or

\par while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United \
par States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section \par 1
2310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve \par train
ing, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, \par and for
members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses \par authorized b
y section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for \par payments to the D
epartment of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \par $2,171,675,000.\par \par
Reserve Personnel, Navy\par \par For pay, allowances,
clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and \par related expenses for perso
nnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under \par section 10211 of title 10, U
nited States Code, or while serving on \par active duty under section 12301(d)
of title 10, United States Code, in \par connection with performing duty specif
ied in section 12310(a) of title \par 10, United States Code, or while undergoi
ng reserve training, or while \par performing drills or equivalent duty, and fo
r members of the Reserve \par Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized
by section 16131 of \par title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the
Department of \par Defense Military Retirement Fund; $1,427,979,000.\par \par
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps\par \par For pay, allow
ances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and \par related expenses for
personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active \par duty under section 10211
of title 10, United States Code, or while \par serving on active duty under sec
tion 12301(d) of title 10, United \par States Code, in connection with performi
ng duty specified in section \par 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or
while undergoing reserve \par training, or while performing drills or equivalen
t duty, and for \par members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and exp
enses \par authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for
\par payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \par $403
,513,000.\par \par Reserve Personnel, Air Force\par \par
For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and \par re
lated expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty \par under
sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, \par or while
serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, \par United States
Code, in connection with performing duty specified in \par section 12310(a) of
title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing \par reserve training, or whi
le performing drills or equivalent duty or \par other duty, and for members of
the Air Reserve Officers' Training \par Corps, and expenses authorized by secti
on 16131 of title 10, United \par States Code; and for payments to the Departme
nt of Defense Military \par Retirement Fund; $850,576,000.\par \par
National Guard Personnel, Army\par \par For pay, allowances, clot
hing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and \par related expenses for personnel
of the Army National Guard while on duty \par under section 10211, 10302, or 12
402 of title 10 or section 708 of \par title 32, United States Code, or while s
erving on duty under section \par 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of tit
le 32, United States Code, \par in connection with performing duty specified in
section 12310(a) of \par title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing tra
ining, or while \par performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and ex
penses \par authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and fo
r \par payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; \par $3,
413,195,000.\par \par National Guard Personnel, Air Force\par
\par For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and \
par related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under \par
section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, \par Un
ited States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of \par title
10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in \par connection with

performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title \par 10, United States C
ode, or while undergoing training, or while \par performing drills or equivalen
t duty or other duty, and expenses \par authorized by section 16131 of title 10
, United States Code; and for \par payments to the Department of Defense Milita
ry Retirement Fund; \par $1,372,997,000.\par \par
TITLE II\par \par OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE\par \par
Operation and Maintenance, Army\par \par
(including transfer of funds)\par \par For expenses, not otherwise provi
ded for, necessary for the \par operation and maintenance of the Army, as autho
rized by law; and not to \par exceed $11,437,000 can be used for emergencies an
d extraordinary \par expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of t
he Secretary \par of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of n
ecessity \par for confidential military purposes; $16,936,503,000 and, in addit
ion, \par $50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense \p
ar Stockpile Transaction Fund: Provided, That of the funds appropriated in \par
this paragraph, $596,803,000 shall not be obligated or expended until \par aut
horized by law.\par \par Operation and Maintenance, Navy\pa
r \par (including transfer of funds)\par \par For expe
nses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the \par operation and maintena
nce of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as \par authorized by law; and not to exc
eed $5,360,000 can be used for \par emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to
be expended on the approval \par or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and
payments may be made on \par his certificate of necessity for confidential mil
itary purposes; \par $21,638,999,000 and, in addition, $50,000,000 shall be der
ived by \par transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.\par
\par Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps\par \par For
expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the \par operation and main
tenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; \par $2,585,118,000: Provide
d, That of the funds appropriated in this \par paragraph, $45,415,000 shall not
be obligated or expended until \par authorized by law.\par \par
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force\par \par (includi
ng transfer of funds)\par \par For expenses, not otherwise provided for, ne
cessary for the \par operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized
by law; and \par not to exceed $7,968,000 can be used for emergencies and extra
ordinary \par expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secr
etary \par of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of \pa
r necessity for confidential military purposes; $19,024,233,000 and, in \par ad
dition, $50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National \par Defense
Stockpile Transaction Fund: Provided, That of the funds \par appropriated in t
his paragraph, $208,125,000 shall not be obligated or \par expended until autho
rized by law.\par \par Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide\
par \par For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the \par o
peration and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department \par of D
efense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law; \par $10,80
4,542,000, of which not to exceed $25,000,000 may be available \par for the CIN
C initiative fund account; and of which not to exceed \par $29,000,000 can be u
sed for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to \par be expended on the appr
oval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, \par and payments may be made on
his certificate of necessity for \par confidential military purposes: Provided
, That of the funds \par appropriated in this paragraph, $450,326,000 shall not
be obligated or \par expended until authorized by law.\par \par
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve\par \par For expenses, not otherw
ise provided for, necessary for the \par operation and maintenance, including t
raining, organization, and \par administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of

facilities and \par equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and tra nsportation; \par care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, suppli es, and \par equipment; and communications; $1,201,222,000: Provided, That of t he \par funds appropriated in this paragraph, $3,600,000 shall not be obligated \par or expended until authorized by law.\par \par Operation a nd Maintenance, Navy Reserve\par \par For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the \par operation and maintenance, including training, orga nization, and \par administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities an d \par equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; \par care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and \par equipment; and communications; $949,039,000: Provided, That of the \par funds a ppropriated in this paragraph, $400,000 shall not be obligated \par or expended until authorized by law.\par \par Operation and Maintenance, Marin e Corps Reserve\par \par For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessar y for the \par operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and \par administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and \pa r equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; \par care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and \par equip ment; and communications; $119,093,000: Provided, That of the \par funds approp riated in this paragraph, $2,100,000 shall not be obligated \par or expended un til authorized by law.\par \par Operation and Maintenance, Air Fo rce Reserve\par \par For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary fo r the \par operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and \pa r administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and \par equip ment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; \par care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and \par equipment; a nd communications; $1,735,996,000.\par \par Operation and Maintena nce, Army National Guard\par \par For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army \par National Guard, including medical and hospital tre atment and related \par expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operati on, and repairs \par to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehi cles; \par personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (ot her \par than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, \par for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders \p ar while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau \par regulat ions when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard \par Bureau; sup plying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized \par by law; and exp enses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of \par supplies and equi pment (including aircraft); $2,570,315,000: Provided, \par That not later than March 15, 1999, the Director of the Army National \par Guard shall provide a re port to the congressional defense committees \par identifying the allocation, b y installation and activity, of all base \par operations funds appropriated und er this heading: Provided further, \par That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $105,500,000 shall \par not be obligated or expended until authorize d by law.\par \par Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard\p ar \par For operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard, including \par medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal \par ho spitals; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses \par of f acilities for the training and administration of the Air National \par Guard, i ncluding repair of facilities, maintenance, operation, and \par modification of aircraft; transportation of things, hire of passenger \par motor vehicles; sup plies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by \par law for the Air National Guard; and expenses incident to the \par maintenance and use of supplies, mate rials, and equipment, including \par such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of\par the Department of Defense; travel expenses (ot her than mileage) on the \par same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on \par active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting \par units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulation s when \par specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; \par $ 3,075,233,000.\par \par Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer F und\par \par (including transfer of funds)\par \par Fo r expenses directly relating to Overseas Contingency Operations \par by United States military forces; $746,900,000: Provided, That the \par Secretary of Defe nse may transfer these funds only to operation and \par maintenance accounts wi thin this title, to the Defense Health Program, \par to procurement accounts, a nd to working capital funds: Provided \par further, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be \par available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the \par appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer \par authority provided in this paragraph is in addi tion to any other \par transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.\par \par United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces\par \par For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of \par Appeal s for the Armed Forces; $7,324,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 \par can be u sed for official representation purposes.\par \par Environm ental Restoration, Army\par \par (including transfer of fu nds)\par \par For the Department of the Army, $342,640,000, to remain avail able \par until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, up on \par determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, \par reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings \ par and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, \par tra nsfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other \par appropriatio ns made available to the Department of the Army, to be \par merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same \par time period as the app ropriations to which transferred: Provided \par further, That upon a determinat ion that all or part of the funds \par transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes \par provided herein, such amounts may be transf erred back to this \par appropriation.\par \par Environment al Restoration, Navy\par \par (including transfer of funds)\par \par For the Department of the Navy, $281,600,000, to remain availabl e \par until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon \par determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, \p ar reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings \par and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, \par transf er the funds made available by this appropriation to other \par appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be \par merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same \par time period as the approp riations to which transferred: Provided \par further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds \par transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes \par provided herein, such amounts may be transferr ed back to this \par appropriation.\par \par Environmental Re storation, Air Force\par \par (including transfer of funds)\par \par For the Department of the Air Force, $379,100,000, to remain \pa r available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air \par For ce shall, upon determining that such funds are required for \par environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, \par removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air \par Force, or for similar p urposes, transfer the funds made available by \par this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the \par Department of the Air Force, to be me

rged with and to be available for \par the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to \par which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all \par or part of the funds transferred from this a ppropriation are not \par necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amou nts may be \par transferred back to this appropriation.\par \par
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide\par \par (includ ing transfer of funds)\par \par For the Department of Defense, $26,091,000, to remain available \par until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of De fense shall, upon \par determining that such funds are required for environment al restoration, \par reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of uns afe buildings \par and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purp oses, \par transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other \pa r appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be \par merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same \par time peri od as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided \par further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds \par transferred from this appro priation are not necessary for the purposes \par provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this \par appropriation.\par \par Environme ntal Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites\par \par (in cluding transfer of funds)\par \par For the Department of the Army, $195,00 0,000, to remain available \par until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon \par determining that such funds are required for envi ronmental restoration, \par reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings \par and debris at sites formerly used by the Department o f Defense, \par transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to othe r \par appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be \par merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same \par tim e period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided \par further, Tha t upon a determination that all or part of the funds \par transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes \par provided herein, such am ounts may be transferred back to this \par appropriation.\par \par
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid\par \par For expenses relat ing to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and \par Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the \par programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 2547, and 2551 of title \par 10, United States Code); $56,111,00 0, to remain available until \par September 30, 2000: Provided, That of the fun ds appropriated in this \par paragraph, $8,800,000 shall not be obligated or ex pended until \par authorized by law.\par \par Former Soviet U nion Threat Reduction\par \par For assistance to the republics of the forme r Soviet Union, \par including assistance provided by contract or by grants, fo r \par facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and \par storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing \par prog rams to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, \par and weap on-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to \par the training and support of defense and military personnel for \par demilitarization and pr otection of weapons, weapons components and \par weapons technology and experti se; $417,400,000, to remain available \par until September 30, 2001.\par \par
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense\par \par For expenses , not otherwise provided for, resulting from unfunded \par shortfalls in the re pair and maintenance of real property of the \par Department of Defense (includ ing military housing and barracks); \par $850,000,000, for the maintenance of r eal property of the Department of \par Defense (including minor construction an d major maintenance and \par repair), which shall remain available for obligati on until September \par 30, 2000, as follows:\par Army, $219,688,00

0;\par Navy, $244,507,000;\par Marine Corps, $48,901,00
0;\par Air Force, $194,926,000;\par Army Reserve, $47,5
79,000;\par Navy Reserve, $21,055,000;\par Marine Corps
Reserve, $7,600,000;\par Air Force Reserve, $9,871,000;\par
Army National Guard, $37,535,000; and\par Air National Guard,
$18,338,000:\par Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragra
ph shall \par be obligated or expended until authorized by law.\par \par
TITLE III\par \par PROCU
REMENT\par \par Aircraft Procurement, Army\par \par
For construction, procurement, production, modification, and \par modernization
of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground \par handling equipment, sp
are parts, and accessories therefor; specialized \par equipment and training de
vices; expansion of public and private plants, \par including the land necessar
y therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and \par such lands and interests there
in, may be acquired, and construction \par prosecuted thereon prior to approval
of title; and procurement and \par installation of equipment, appliances, and
machine tools in public and \par private plants; reserve plant and Government a
nd contractor-owned \par equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for th
e foregoing \par purposes; $1,400,338,000, to remain available for obligation u
ntil \par September 30, 2001.\par \par Missile Procureme
nt, Army\par \par For construction, procurement, production, modification,
and \par modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground \par
handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized \par equ
ipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, \par inclu
ding the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and \par such lan
ds and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction \par prosecuted the
reon prior to approval of title; and procurement and \par installation of equip
ment, appliances, and machine tools in public and \par private plants; reserve
plant and Government and contractor-owned \par equipment layaway; and other exp
enses necessary for the foregoing \par purposes; $1,140,623,000, to remain avai
lable for obligation until \par September 30, 2001.\par \par Procuremen
t of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army\par \par For construction, p
rocurement, production, and modification of \par weapons and tracked combat veh
icles, equipment, including ordnance, \par spare parts, and accessories therefo
r; specialized equipment and \par training devices; expansion of public and pri
vate plants, including the \par land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purp
oses, and such lands and \par interests therein, may be acquired, and construct
ion prosecuted thereon \par prior to approval of title; and procurement and ins
tallation of \par equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and privat
e plants; \par reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment laya
way; \par and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes; \par $1,513,
540,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, \par 2001: Prov
ided, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \par $5,902,000 shall n
ot be obligated or expended until authorized by law.\par \par
Procurement of Ammunition, Army\par \par For construction, procurement,
production, and modification of \par ammunition, and accessories therefor; spec
ialized equipment and \par training devices; expansion of public and private pl
ants, including \par ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title
10, United \par States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing
\par purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and \par
construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and \par procureme
nt and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine \par tools in public
and private plants; reserve plant and Government and \par contractor-owned equi
pment layaway; and other expenses necessary for \par the foregoing purposes; $1

,099,155,000, to remain available for \par obligation until September 30, 2001: Provided, That of the funds \par appropriated in this paragraph, $45,700,000 s hall not be obligated or \par expended until authorized by law.\par \par

Other Procurement, Army\par \par For construction, procur ement, production, and modification of \par vehicles, including tactical, suppo rt, and non-tracked combat vehicles; \par the purchase of not to exceed 37 pass enger motor vehicles for \par replacement only; and the purchase of 54 vehicles required for physical \par security of personnel, notwithstanding price limita tions applicable to \par passenger vehicles but not to exceed $230,000 per vehi cle; \par communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spa re \par parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and \p ar training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the \par land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and \par i nterests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon \par pri or to approval of title; and procurement and installation of \par equipment, ap pliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; \par reserve plant an d Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; \par and other expenses ne cessary for the foregoing purposes; \par $3,101,130,000, to remain available fo r obligation until September 30, \par 2001.\par \par Air craft Procurement, Navy\par \par For construction, procurement, production, modification, and \par modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnanc e, spare parts, \par and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public \par and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such \par lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction \par p rosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and \par installa tion of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and \par private pla nts; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned \par equipment layaway; $7,599,968,000, to remain available for obligation \par until September 30, 200 1: Provided, That of the funds appropriated in \par this paragraph, $179,121,00 0 shall not be obligated or expended until \par authorized by law.\par \par

Weapons Procurement, Navy\par \par For construction, pr ocurement, production, modification, and \par modernization of missiles, torped oes, other weapons, and related \par support equipment including spare parts, a nd accessories therefor; \par expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary \par therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and \par construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and \par procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine \p ar tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and \par co ntractor-owned equipment layaway; $1,191,219,000, to remain available \par for obligation until September 30, 2001.\par \par Procurement of Ammuni tion, Navy and Marine Corps\par \par For construction, procurement, product ion, and modification of \par ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and \par training devices; expansion of public and private plants, i ncluding \par ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, Uni ted \par States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing \par p urposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and \par constr uction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and \par procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine \par tools in public and pri vate plants; reserve plant and Government and \par contractor-owned equipment l ayaway; and other expenses necessary for \par the foregoing purposes; $473,803, 000, to remain available for \par obligation until September 30, 2001: Provided , That of the funds \par appropriated in this paragraph, $21,835,000 shall not be obligated or \par expended until authorized by law.\par \par

Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy\par \par For expenses necessary for t

he construction, acquisition, or \par conversion of vessels as authorized by la
w, including armor and \par armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and
machine tools and \par installation thereof in public and private plants; reser
ve plant and \par Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procuremen
t of \par critical, long leadtime components and designs for vessels to be \par
constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and \par priva
te plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and \par interests
therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon \par prior to ap
proval of title; $5,973,452,000, to remain available for \par obligation until
September 30, 2003: Provided, That additional \par obligations may be incurred
after September 30, 2003, for engineering \par services, tests, evaluations, an
d other such budgeted work that must be \par performed in the final stage of sh
ip construction: Provided further, \par That none of the funds provided under t
his heading for the construction \par or conversion of any naval vessel to be c
onstructed in shipyards in the \par United States shall be expended in foreign
facilities for the \par construction of major components of such vessel: Provid
ed further, That \par none of the funds provided under this heading shall be us
ed for the \par construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.\par \par
Other Procurement, Navy\par \par For procurement,
production, and modernization of support equipment \par and materials not other
wise provided for, Navy ordnance (except \par ordnance for new aircraft, new sh
ips, and ships authorized for \par conversion); the purchase of not to exceed 2
46 passenger motor vehicles \par for replacement only; and the purchase of one
vehicle required for \par physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price
limitations \par applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $225,000 p
er \par vehicle; expansion of public and private plants, including the land \pa
r necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be \par acquire
d, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of \par title; and pro
curement and installation of equipment, appliances, and \par machine tools in p
ublic and private plants; reserve plant and \par Government and contractor-owne
d equipment layaway; $3,990,553,000, to \par remain available for obligation un
til September 30, 2001: Provided, \par That of the funds appropriated in this p
aragraph, $21,046,000 shall not \par be obligated or expended until authorized
by law.\par \par Procurement, Marine Corps\par \par
For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and \par modification
of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, \par and accessories th
erefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine \par tools, and installation t
hereof in public and private plants; reserve \par plant and Government and cont
ractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles \par for the Marine Corps, including t
he purchase of not to exceed 37 \par passenger motor vehicles for replacement o
nly; and expansion of public \par and private plants, including land necessary
therefor, and such lands \par and interests therein, may be acquired, and const
ruction prosecuted \par thereon prior to approval of title; $812,618,000, to re
main available \par for obligation until September 30, 2001: Provided, That of
the funds \par appropriated in this paragraph, $120,750,000 shall not be obliga
ted or \par expended until authorized by law.\par \par Airc
raft Procurement, Air Force\par \par For construction, procurement, and mod
ification of aircraft and \par equipment, including armor and armament, special
ized ground handling \par equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and acc
essories therefor; \par specialized equipment; expansion of public and private
plants, \par Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants
, \par erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing \par
purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and \par const
ruction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve \par plant and G

overnment and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other \par expenses neces sary for the foregoing purposes including rents and \par transportation of thin gs; $8,384,735,000, to remain available for \par obligation until September 30, 2001: Provided, That of the funds \par appropriated in this paragraph, $165,65 8,000 shall not be obligated or \par expended until authorized by law.\par \par

Missile Procurement, Air Force\par \par For construct ion, procurement, and modification of missiles, \par spacecraft, rockets, and r elated equipment, including spare parts and \par accessories therefor, ground h andling equipment, and training devices; \par expansion of public and private p lants, Government-owned equipment and \par installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and \par acquisition of land, for the foregoing purpos es, and such lands and \par interests therein, may be acquired, and constructio n prosecuted thereon \par prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Governm ent and \par contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary f or \par the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things; \p ar $2,191,527,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, \par 2001.\par \par Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force\par \par

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of \par ammunit ion, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and \par training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including \par ammunition facilities a uthorized by section 2854 of title 10, United \par States Code, and the land ne cessary therefor, for the foregoing \par purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and \par construction prosecuted thereon prior to ap proval of title; and \par procurement and installation of equipment, appliances , and machine \par tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Govern ment and \par contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for \par the foregoing purposes; $388,925,000, to remain available for \par obl igation until September 30, 2001: Provided, That of the funds \par appropriated in this paragraph, $5,298,000 shall not be obligated or \par expended until au thorized by law.\par \par Other Procurement, Air Force\pa r \par For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground \par guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and \par comm unication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts \par therefor, n ot otherwise provided for; the purchase of not to exceed 267 \par passenger mot or vehicles for replacement only; the purchase of one \par vehicle required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding \par price limitations applica ble to passenger vehicles but not to exceed \par $240,000 per vehicle; and expa nsion of public and private plants, \par Government-owned equipment and install ation thereof in such plants, \par erection of structures, and acquisition of l and, for the foregoing \par purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and \par construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of ti tle; reserve \par plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; \par $7,034,217,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, \pa r 2001.\par \par Procurement, Defense-Wide\par \par

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of \par Defense (othe r than the military departments) necessary for \par procurement, production, an d modification of equipment, supplies, \par materials, and spare parts therefor , not otherwise provided for; the \par purchase of not to exceed 346 passenger motor vehicles for replacement \par only; the purchase of 4 vehicles required f or physical security of \par personnel, notwithstanding price limitations appli cable to passenger \par vehicles but not to exceed $165,000 per vehicle; expans ion of public \par and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in s uch plants, \par erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the forego ing \par purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and \

par construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve \par pl
ant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; \par $2,055,432,000,
to remain available for obligation until September 30, \par 2001: Provided, Th
at not less than $109,455,000 of the funds \par appropriated in this paragraph
shall be made available only for the \par procurement of high performance compu
ting hardware: Provided further, \par That of the funds appropriated in this pa
ragraph, $92,566,000 shall not \par be obligated or expended until authorized b
y law.\par \par National Guard and Reserve Equipment\par \par
For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, \par ammun
ition, other weapons, and other procurement for the reserve \par components of
the Armed Forces; $120,000,000, to remain available for \par obligation until S
eptember 30, 2001: Provided, That the Chiefs of the \par Reserve and National G
uard components shall, not later than 30 days \par after the enactment of this
Act, individually submit to the \par congressional defense committees the moder
nization priority assessment \par for their respective Reserve or National Guar
d component.\par \par TITLE IV\par \par
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION\par \par Researc
h, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army\par \par For expenses necessary f
or basic and applied scientific research, \par development, test and evaluation
, including maintenance, \par rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilitie
s and equipment; \par $4,967,446,000, to remain available for obligation until
September 30, \par 2000: Provided, That of the funds appropriated in this parag
raph, \par $175,449,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by
\par law: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this \par he
ading, $10,000,000 shall be available only to commence a live fire, \par side-b
y-side operational test and evaluation of the air-to-air \par Starstreak and ai
r-to-air Stinger missiles fired from the AH-64D Apache \par helicopter: Provide
d further, That none of the funds specified in the \par preceding proviso may b
e obligated until the Secretary of the Army \par certifies the following, in wr
iting, to the congressional defense \par committees:\par (1) Engage
ment tests can be safely conducted with both \par Starstreak and Stinge
r missiles from the AH-64D helicopter at \par air speeds consistent wit
h the normal operating limits of that \par aircraft;\par (2
) The Starstreak missiles utilized in the test will be \par provided at
no cost to the United States Government;\par (3) None of the $10,0
00,000 provided will be used to \par develop modifications to the Stars
treak or the Stinger \par missiles; and\par (4) Both the St
arstreak and Stinger missiles can be fired \par from the AH-64D aircraf
t consistent with the survivability of \par the aircraft and missile pe
rformance standards contained in the \par Army's Air-to-Air Missile Cap
ability Need Statement approved by \par the Department of the Army in J
anuary 1997.\par \par Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, N
avy\par \par For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific resear
ch, \par development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, \par rehabili
tation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; \par $8,297,986,000,
to remain available for obligation until September 30, \par 2000: Provided, Tha
t funds appropriated in this paragraph which are \par available for the V-22 ma
y be used to meet unique requirements of the \par Special Operation Forces: Pro
vided further, That notwithstanding 10 \par U.S.C. 2366, none of the funds made
available under this heading may be \par used to conduct system-level live-fir
e shock tests on the SSN-21 class \par of submarines unless the Commander-in-Ch
ief of the United States \par Atlantic Command certifies in writing to the cong
ressional defense \par committees that such testing must be conducted to meet o
perational \par requirements for those submarines: Provided further, That not m

ore than \par $50,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading for \p ar feasibility studies and component research and development for future \par a ircraft carriers may be obligated until the Secretary of the Navy \par certifie s in writing to the congressional defense committees that the \par Navy has a p rogram in place to develop and install an infrared search \par and track device on CVN-77 upon its acceptance by the government: \par Provided further, That t he restriction in the preceding proviso does \par not apply to funds requested in the fiscal year 1999 President's budget \par and provided in this Act for de sign of CVN-77: Provided further, That \par of the funds appropriated in title IV of Public Law 105-56 (Department \par of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998), $213,229,000 is only for \par research, development, test and evaluation of coo perative engagement \par capability.\par \par Research, Development, T est and Evaluation, Air Force\par \par For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, \par development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, \par rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipm ent; \par $13,577,441,000, to remain available for obligation until September 3 0, \par 2000.\par \par Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defe nse-Wide\par \par For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of \par Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and \par applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced \ par research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary \par of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and \par oper ation of facilities and equipment; $8,776,318,000, to remain \par available for obligation until September 30, 2000: Provided, That not \par less than $340,44 6,000 of the funds made available under this heading \par shall be made availab le only for the Sea-Based Wide Area Defense (Navy \par Upper-Tier) program: Pro vided further, That funding for the Sea-Based \par Wide Area Defense (Navy Uppe r-Tier) program in this or any other Act \par shall be used for research, devel opment and deployment including, but \par not limited to, continuing ongoing ri sk reduction activities, \par initiating system engineering for an initial Bloc k I capability, and \par deployment at the earliest feasible time following Aeg is Lightweight \par Exoatmospheric Projectile (LEAP) intercept flight tests.\pa r \par Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense\par \par F or expenses, not otherwise provided for, of independent activities \par of the Director, Test and Evaluation in the direction and supervision \par of developm ental test and evaluation, including performance and joint \par developmental t esting and evaluation; and administrative expenses in \par connection therewith ; $263,606,000, to remain available for obligation \par until September 30, 200 0: Provided, That of the funds appropriated in \par this paragraph, $12,500,000 shall not be obligated or expended until \par authorized by law.\par \par

Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense\par \par For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the \par independent activities of t he Director, Operational Test and Evaluation \par in the direction and supervis ion of operational test and evaluation, \par including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted \par prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational \par testing and evaluation; and administrative e xpenses in connection \par therewith; $35,245,000, to remain available for obli gation until \par September 30, 2000: Provided, That of the funds appropriated in this \par paragraph, $6,000,000 shall not be obligated or expended until \pa r authorized by law.\par \par TITLE V\par \par

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS\par \par

Defense Working Capital Funds\par \par (including trans fer of funds)\par \par For the Defense Working Capital Funds; $94,500,000: Provided, That \par during the fiscal year 1999, in order to maintain adequate cash \par balances in the Defense Working Capital Funds, the Secretary of Defen se \par may transfer up to $350,000,000 from the National Defense Stockpile \pa r Transaction Fund to the Defense Working Capital Funds: Provided \par further, That the total of amounts so transferred during the fiscal \par year shall be transferred back to the National Defense Stockpile \par Transaction Fund not la ter than September 30, 1999.\par \par National Defense Sea lift Fund\par \par (including transfer of funds)\par \par

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and \par activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as \par established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 \par U.S.C. App. 1744); $ 673,366,000, to remain available until expended: \par Provided, That none of th e funds provided in this paragraph shall be \par used to award a new contract t hat provides for the acquisition of any \par of the following major components unless such components are \par manufactured in the United States: auxiliary eq uipment, including \par pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system co mponents (that \par is; engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cr anes; and \par spreaders for shipboard cranes: Provided further, That the exerc ise of \par an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previousl y \par appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new \par contract: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of \par l aw, of the funds available under this heading, $28,800,000 shall be \par transf erred to ``Alteration of Bridges'': Provided further, That the \par Secretary o f the military department responsible for such procurement \par may waive the r estrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis \par by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the \par House of Representative s and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies \par are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a \par timely basis and that such an acq uisition must be made in order to \par acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, \par That of the funds appropriated in this paragr aph, $3,800,000 shall not \par be obligated or expended until authorized by law .\par \par TITLE VI\par \par
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS\par \par Defense Health Program\par \par For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medic al and health \par care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law; \par $10,127,622,000, of which $9,725,235,000 shall be for Operation and \par maintenance, of which not to exceed two per centum shall remain \par avail able until September 30, 2000, and of which $402,387,000, to \par remain availa ble for obligation until September 30, 2001, shall be for \par Procurement: Pro vided, That of the funds appropriated in this \par paragraph, $62,200,000 shall not be obligated or expended until \par authorized by law.\par \par

Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army\par \par For expenses, no t otherwise provided for, necessary for the \par destruction of the United Stat es stockpile of lethal chemical agents \par and munitions in accordance with th e provisions of section 1412 of the \par Department of Defense Authorization Ac t, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for \par the destruction of other chemical warfar e materials that are not in the \par chemical weapon stockpile; $796,100,000, o f which $508,650,000 shall be \par for Operation and maintenance, $124,670,000 shall be for Procurement to \par remain available until September 30, 2001, and $162,780,000 shall be \par for Research, development, test and evaluation to r emain available \par until September 30, 2000.\par \par Drug Interdict ion and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense\par \par (includi ng transfer of funds)\par \par For drug interdiction and counter-drug activ ities of the Department \par of Defense, for transfer to appropriations availab le to the Department \par of Defense for military personnel of the reserve comp

onents serving \par under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United State
s Code; for \par Operation and maintenance; for Procurement; and for Research,
\par development, test and evaluation; $764,595,000: Provided, That the \par fu
nds appropriated under this head shall be available for obligation \par for the
same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation \par to which t
ransferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority \par provided in this
paragraph is in addition to any transfer authority \par contained elsewhere in
this Act: Provided further, That of the funds \par appropriated in this paragr
aph, $37,013,000 shall not be obligated or \par expended until authorized by la
w.\par \par Office of the Inspector General\par \par Fo
r expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General \par in carryi
ng out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as \par amended; $1
32,064,000, of which $130,764,000 shall be for Operation and \par maintenance,
of which not to exceed $600,000 is available for \par emergencies and extraordi
nary expenses to be expended on the approval \par or authority of the Inspector
General, and payments may be made on his \par certificate of necessity for con
fidential military purposes; and of \par which $1,300,000, to remain available
until September 30, 2001, shall \par be for Procurement.\par \par
TITLE VII\par \par RELATED AGENCI
ES\par \par Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fun
d\par \par For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and \p
ar Disability System Fund, to maintain proper funding level for continuing \par
the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and \par Disabilit
y System; $201,500,000.\par \par Intelligence Community Manageme
nt Account\par \par (including transfer of funds)\par \par
For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management \par Accou
nt; $136,123,000, of which $30,290,000 for the Advanced Research \par and Devel
opment Committee shall remain available until September 30, \par 2000: Provided
, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \par $27,000,000 shall be
transferred to the Department of Justice for the \par National Drug Intelligenc
e Center to support the Department of \par Defense's counter-drug intelligence
responsibilities, and of the said \par amount, $1,500,000 for Procurement shall
remain available until \par September 30, 2001, and $3,000,000 for Research, d
evelopment, test and \par evaluation shall remain available until September 30,
2000.\par \par Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Envir
onmental \par Restoration Fund\par \par For pay
ment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and \par Environmental Resto
ration Fund, as authorized by law; $15,000,000, to \par remain available until
expended.\par \par National Security Education Trust Fund\par
\par For the purposes of title VIII of Public Law 102-183, $3,000,000, \par
to be derived from the National Security Education Trust Fund, to \par remain
available until expended.\par \par TITLE VIII\pa
r \par GENERAL PROVISIONS\par \par Sec. 8001. No p
art of any appropriation contained in this Act shall \par be used for publicity
or propaganda purposes not authorized by the \par Congress.\par Sec. 8002.
During the current fiscal year, provisions of law \par prohibiting the payment
of compensation to, or employment of, any \par person not a citizen of the Uni
ted States shall not apply to personnel \par of the Department of Defense: Prov
ided, That salary increases granted \par to direct and indirect hire foreign na
tional employees of the \par Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not
be at a rate in \par excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for c
ivilian \par employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under
the \par provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a ra
te \par in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host \

par nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: Provided further, \par Th at this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign \par service n ational employees serving at United States diplomatic missions \par whose pay i s set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service \par Act of 1980: Pr ovided further, That the limitations of this provision \par shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of \par Defense in the Republic of Turkey.\par Sec. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall \par remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unle ss \par expressly so provided herein.\par Sec. 8004. No more than 20 per ce ntum of the appropriations in this \par Act which are limited for obligation du ring the current fiscal year \par shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year: \par Provided, That this section shall not apply to obliga tions for support \par of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training \par of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.\par \par (transfer of funds)\par \par Sec. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such \par action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval \par of the Office of Management and Budget , transfer not to exceed \par $2,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the De partment of Defense or \par funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for \par military functions (except military construction) between s uch \par appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with \par and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time \par peri od, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided, \par That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher \par priority items, b ased on unforeseen military requirements, than those \par for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for \par which funds are requested h as been denied by Congress: Provided \par further, That the Secretary of Defens e shall notify the Congress \par promptly of all transfers made pursuant to thi s authority or any other \par authority in this Act: Provided further, That no part of the funds in \par this Act shall be available to prepare or present a r equest to the \par Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unl ess for \par higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than \par those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item \par for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress.\par \par (transfer of funds)\par \par Sec. 8006. Dur ing the current fiscal year, cash balances in working \par capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to \par section 2208 of title 10, U nited States Code, may be maintained in only \par such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be \par made from such funds: Provided, That transfers may be made between such \par funds: Provided further, That tran sfers may be made between working \par capital funds and the ``Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense'' \par appropriation and the ``Operation and Maintenance '' appropriation \par accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secr etary of \par Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget , \par except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of \par Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in \par amou nts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in \par this Act , no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to \par procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless \par the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such \par obligation.\par Sec. 8007. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to \par initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 \par calendar days in sess ion in advance to the congressional defense \par committees.\par Sec. 8008. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be \par available to initiate: (1

) a multiyear contract that employs economic \par order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year of \par the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in \par excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement \par leading to a multiyear contract that employs econ omic order quantity \par procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the \par congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in \par advance of the proposed contract award: Provided, That no part of any \par appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a \par multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance \par proc urement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's \par liability : Provided further, That no part of any appropriation \par contained in this Ac t shall be available to initiate multiyear \par procurement contracts for any s ystems or component thereof if the value \par of the multiyear contract would e xceed $500,000,000 unless specifically \par provided in this Act: Provided furt her, That no multiyear procurement \par contract can be terminated without 10-d ay prior notification to the \par congressional defense committees: Provided fu rther, That the execution \par of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value \par analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual pr ocurement.\par Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for \par multiyear procurement contracts as follows:\par AV-8B aircraft ;\par E-2C aircraft;\par T-45 aircraft; and\par
Medium Tactical Vehicle Replacement (MTVR) vehicle.\par Sec. 8009. Wit hin the funds appropriated for the operation and \par maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant \par to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and \par civic assistance costs under cha pter 20 of title 10, United States \par Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic \par assistance costs incidental to authorized opera tions and pursuant to \par authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of ti tle 10, United \par States Code, and these obligations shall be reported to Con gress on \par September 30 of each year: Provided, That funds available for ope ration \par and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and \ par similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories \pa r of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, \par pursu ant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law \par 99-239: Provided further, That upon a determination by the Secretary of \par the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education \par programs con ducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the \par Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services \par at such facilities an d transportation to such facilities, on a \par nonreimbursable basis, for civil ian patients from American Samoa, the \par Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the \par Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.\par Sec. 8010. (a) During fiscal year 1999, the civilian personn el of \par the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end -\par strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year \p ar shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-\par s trength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the \par last d ay of such fiscal year.\par (b) The fiscal year 2000 budget request for the Department of \par Defense as well as all justification material and other doc umentation \par supporting the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense budget re quest \par shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) \par and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year \par 2000.\par (c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to milit ary \par (civilian) technicians.\par Sec. 8011. Notwithstanding any other p rovision of law, none of the \par funds made available by this Act shall be use

d by the Department of\par Defense to exceed, outside the 50 United States, it s territories, and \par the District of Columbia, 125,000 civilian workyears: P rovided, That \par workyears shall be applied as defined in the Federal Personn el Manual: \par Provided further, That workyears expended in dependent student hiring \par programs for disadvantaged youths shall not be included in this \pa r workyear limitation.\par Sec. 8012. None of the funds made available by t his Act shall be \par used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence con gressional \par action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending befo re the \par Congress.\par Sec. 8013. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be \par used to make contributions to the Department of Defense Education \par Benefits Fund pursuant to section 2006(g) of title 10, United St ates \par Code, representing the normal cost for future benefits under section \par 3015(c) of title 38, United States Code, for any member of the armed \par services who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act--\par (1) enlists in the armed services for a period of active \par duty of le ss than three years; or\par (2) receives an enlistment bonus under section 308a or 308f \par of title 37, United States Code,\par nor shal l any amounts representing the normal cost of such future \par benefits be tran sferred from the Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury \par to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 2006(d) of \par title 10, United States C ode; nor shall the Secretary of Veterans \par Affairs pay such benefits to any such member: Provided, That in the \par case of a member covered by clause (1), these limitations shall not \par apply to members in combat arms skills or to members who enlist in the \par armed services on or after July 1, 1989, under a program continued or \par established by the Secretary of Defense in fiscal ye ar 1991 to test the \par cost-effective use of special recruiting incentives in volving not more \par than nineteen noncombat arms skills approved in advance b y the \par Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That this subsection applies \par only to active components of the Army.\par (b) None of the funds appr opriated by this Act shall be available \par for the basic pay and allowances o f any member of the Army \par participating as a full-time student and receivin g benefits paid by the \par Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department o f Defense Education \par Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student i s credited toward \par completion of a service commitment: Provided, That this subsection \par shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option \par prior to October 1, 1987: Provided further, That this subsection \p ar applies only to active components of the Army.\par Sec. 8014. None of th e funds appropriated by this Act shall be \par available to convert to contract or performance an activity or function \par of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of enactment of \par this Act, is performed by more than t en Department of Defense civilian \par employees until a most efficient and cos t-effective organization \par analysis is completed on such activity or functio n and certification of \par the analysis is made to the Committees on Appropria tions of the House \par of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That this section shall \par not apply to a commercial or industrial type function of the Department \par of Defense that: (1) is included on the procurement list estab lished \par pursuant to section 2 of the Act of June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 47), \ par popularly referred to as the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act; (2) is planned to \pa r be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the \par blin d or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped \par indivi duals in accordance with that Act; or (3) is planned to be \par converted to pe rformance by a qualified firm under 51 per centum Native \par American ownershi p.\par \par (transfer of funds)\par \par Sec. 801 5. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the \par Department of Defen se Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred \par to any other appropriat ion contained in this Act solely for the purpose \par of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance \par agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization \par Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public La w 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2301 note), as \par amended, under the authority of this p rovision or any other transfer \par authority contained in this Act.\par Se c. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the \par purchase b y the Department of Defense (and its departments and \par agencies) of welded s hipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in \par diameter and under unless th e anchor and mooring chain are manufactured \par in the United States from comp onents which are substantially \par manufactured in the United States: Provided , That for the purpose of \par this section manufactured will include cutting, heat treating, quality \par control, testing of chain and welding (including th e forging and shot \par blasting process): Provided further, That for the purpo se of this \par section substantially all of the components of anchor and moori ng chain \par shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States \par if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the \par United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced o r \par manufactured outside the United States: Provided further, That when \par adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of \par Defens e requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service \par responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-\par by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on \par Appropriations that such an ac quisition must be made in order to \par acquire capability for national securit y purposes.\par Sec. 8017. None of the funds appropriated by this Act avail able for \par the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services \par (CHAMPUS) shall be available for the reimbursement of any health care \pa r provider for inpatient mental health service for care received when a \par pa tient is referred to a provider of inpatient mental health care or \par residen tial treatment care by a medical or health care professional \par having an eco nomic interest in the facility to which the patient is \par referred: Provided, That this limitation does not apply in the case of \par inpatient mental healt h services provided under the program for persons \par with disabilities under subsection (d) of section 1079 of title 10, \par United States Code, provided a s partial hospital care, or provided \par pursuant to a waiver authorized by th e Secretary of Defense because of \par medical or psychological circumstances o f the patient that are \par confirmed by a health professional who is not a Fed eral employee after \par a review, pursuant to rules prescribed by the Secretar y, which takes \par into account the appropriate level of care for the patient, the \par intensity of services required by the patient, and the availability o f \par that care.\par Sec. 8018. Funds available in this Act may be used to provide \par transportation for the next-of-kin of individuals who have been \par prisoners of war or missing in action from the Vietnam era to an annual \pa r meeting in the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary \par of Defense may prescribe.\par Sec. 8019. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the \par current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may, by e xecutive \par agreement, establish with host nation governments in NATO member states \par a separate account into which such residual value amounts negotiate d in \par the return of United States military installations in NATO member \pa r states may be deposited, in the currency of the host nation, in lieu of \par direct monetary transfers to the United States Treasury: Provided, That \par su ch credits may be utilized only for the construction of facilities to \par supp ort United States military forces in that host nation, or such real \par proper ty maintenance and base operating costs that are currently \par executed throug h monetary transfers to such host nations: Provided \par further, That the Depa rtment of Defense's budget submission for fiscal \par year 2000 shall identify such sums anticipated in residual value \par settlements, and identify such con struction, real property maintenance \par or base operating costs that shall be funded by the host nation through \par such credits: Provided further, That al l military construction projects \par to be executed from such accounts must be previously approved in a \par prior Act of Congress: Provided further, That ea ch such executive \par agreement with a NATO member host nation shall be report ed to the \par congressional defense committees, the Committee on International \par Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign \p ar Relations of the Senate 30 days prior to the conclusion and endorsement \par of any such agreement established under this provision.\par Sec. 8020. Non e of the funds available to the Department of Defense \par may be used to demil itarize or dispose of M-1 Carbines, M-1 Garand \par rifles, M-14 rifles, .22 ca liber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M-1911 \par pistols.\par Sec. 8021. No twithstanding any other provision of law, none of the \par funds appropriated b y this Act shall be available to pay more than 50 \par per centum of an amount paid to any person under section 308 of title \par 37, United States Code, in a lump sum.\par Sec. 8022. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated o r made \par available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any \par single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of t he \par Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: \par Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a \par ca se-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional \par defense com mittees that such a relocation is required in the best \par interest of the Gov ernment.\par Sec. 8023. A member of a reserve component whose unit or whose \par residence is located in a State which is not contiguous with another \par State is authorized to travel in a space required status on aircraft of \par t he Armed Forces between home and place of inactive duty training, or \par place of duty in lieu of unit training assembly, when there is no road \par or railr oad transportation (or combination of road and railroad \par transportation bet ween those locations): Provided, That a member \par traveling in that status on a military aircraft pursuant to the \par authority provided in this section is not authorized to receive travel, \par transportation, or per diem allowances in connection with that travel.\par Sec. 8024. The unobligated balance of t he amounts appropriated by \par section 8024 of the Department of Defense Appro priations Act, 1998 \par (Public Law 105-56), shall remain available until Sept ember 30, 1999 \par for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Ind ian \par Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): Provided, That contractors \pa r participating in the test program established by section 834 of Public \par L aw 101-189 (15 U.S.C. 637 note) shall be eligible for the program \par establis hed by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act.\par Sec. 8025. During the c urrent fiscal year, funds appropriated or \par otherwise available for any Fede ral agency, the Congress, the judicial \par branch, or the District of Columbia may be used for the pay, \par allowances, and benefits of an employee as defin ed by section 2105 of \par title 5, United States Code, or an individual employ ed by the \par government of the District of Columbia, permanent or temporary \ par indefinite, who--\par (1) is a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, \par as described in section 10101 of title 10, Unit ed States Code, \par or the National Guard, as described in section 101 of title 32;\par (2) performs, for the purpose of providing milita ry aid to \par enforce the law or providing assistance to civil authori ties in \par the protection or saving of life or property or prevention of \par injury--\par (A) Federal service under se ctions 331, 332, 333, \par or 12406 of title 10, or other provi sion of law, as \par applicable; or\par (B) full-time military service for his or her \par State, the Dis trict of Columbia, the Commonwealth of \par Puerto Rico, or a t erritory of the United States; and\par (3) requests and is granted- -\par (A) leave under the authority of this section; or\pa r (B) annual leave, which may be granted without \par regard to the provisions of sections 5519 and 6323(b) \par of title 5, if such employee is otherwise entitled to \par such annual leave: Provided, That any employee who \par req uests leave under subsection (3)(A) for service \par described in subsection (2) of this section is entitled \par to such leav e, subject to the provisions of this \par section and of the la st sentence of section 6323(b) of \par title 5, and such leave shall be considered leave under \par section 6323(b) of title 5 .\par Sec. 8026. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be \par a vailable to perform any cost study pursuant to the provisions of OMB \par Circu lar A-76 if the study being performed exceeds a period of 24 \par months after initiation of such study with respect to a single function \par activity or 48 months after initiation of such study for a multi-\par function activity.\par

Sec. 8027. Funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces \par Infor mation Service shall not be used for any national or international \par politic al or psychological activities.\par Sec. 8028. Notwithstanding any other pr ovision of law or \par regulation, the Secretary of Defense may adjust wage rat es for civilian \par employees hired for certain health care occupations as aut horized for \par the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by section 7455 of title 38, United \par States Code.\par Sec. 8029. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this \par Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the ope ration of the 53rd \par Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserv e, if such \par action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission b elow the \par levels funded in this Act.\par Sec. 8030. (a) Of the funds fo r the procurement of supplies or \par services appropriated by this Act, qualif ied nonprofit agencies for the \par blind or other severely handicapped shall b e afforded the maximum \par practicable opportunity to participate as subcontra ctors and suppliers \par in the performance of contracts let by the Department of Defense.\par (b) During the current fiscal year, a business concern whic h has \par negotiated with a military service or defense agency a subcontractin g \par plan for the participation by small business concerns pursuant to \par s ection 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) shall be \par given cr edit toward meeting that subcontracting goal for any purchases \par made from q ualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely \par handicapped.\p ar (c) For the purpose of this section, the phrase ``qualified \par nonprof it agency for the blind or other severely handicapped'' means a \par nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped that has \par been approved by the Committee for the Purchase from the Blind and \par Other Severely Handic apped under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. \par 46-48).\par Sec. 80 31. During the current fiscal year, net receipts pursuant to \par collections f rom third party payers pursuant to section 1095 of title \par 10, United States Code, shall be made available to the local facility \par of the uniformed serv ices responsible for the collections and shall be \par over and above the facil ity's direct budget amount.\par Sec. 8032. During the current fiscal year, the Department of \par Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exc eed \par $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, \ par United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only \par from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: Provided, That upon \par rec eipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be \par credited t o the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.\par Sec. 8033 . Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than \par $28,300,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of \par which $23,500,000 s hall be available for Civil Air Patrol Corporation \par operation and maintenan ce to support readiness activities which \par includes $3,800,000 for the Civil Air Patrol counterdrug program: \par Provided, That funds identified for ``Civ il Air Patrol'' under this \par section are intended for and shall be for the e xclusive use of the \par Civil Air Patrol Corporation and not for the Air Force or any unit \par thereof.\par Sec. 8034. (a) None of the funds appropriate d in this Act are \par available to establish a new Department of Defense (depa rtment) \par federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either a s a \par new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization \ par managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation \par consi sting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other non-profit \par entities.\par (b) Limitation on Compensation-Federally Funded Research and \par Developmen t Center (FFRDC).--No member of a Board of Directors, \par Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting \par Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid \par consultant to any defense FFRDC, ma y be compensated for his or her \par services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant, except \par under the same conditions, and to the same exte nt, as members of the \par Defense Science Board: Provided, That a member of an y such entity \par referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed t ravel \par expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel \ par Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.\par (c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds \par availabl e to the department from any source during fiscal year 1999 may \par be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, \par for charitable contributions, for construction of new buildings, for \par payment of cost sha ring for projects funded by Government grants, or \par for absorption of contra ct overruns.\par (d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the fun ds \par available to the department during fiscal year 1999, not more than \par 6,206 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for \par def ense FFRDCs: Provided, That of the specific amount referred to \par previously in this subsection, not more than 1,105 staff years may be \par funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs.\par (e) Notwithstanding any other prov ision of law, the Secretary of \par Defense shall control the total number of s taff years to be performed \par by defense FFRDCs during fiscal year 1999 so as to reduce the total \par amounts appropriated in titles II, III, and IV of thi s Act by \par $62,000,000: Provided, That the total amounts appropriated in tit les \par II, III, and IV of this Act are hereby reduced by $62,000,000 to \par reflect savings from the use of defense FFRDCs by the department.\par (f) W ithin 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of \par Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report \par presenting the spe cific amounts of staff years of technical effort to \par be allocated by the de partment for each defense FFRDC during fiscal \par year 1999: Provided, That af ter the submission of the report required \par by this subsection, the departme nt may not reallocate more than five \par per centum of an FFRDC's staff years among other defense FFRDCs until \par 30 days after a detailed justification fo r any such reallocation is \par submitted to the congressional defense committe es.\par (g) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the \par department's fiscal year 2000 budget request, submit a report \par presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to \par be allocated fo r each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year.\par (h) No part of the reduct ions contained in subsection (e) of this \par section may be applied against an y budget activity, activity group, \par subactivity group, line item, program e lement, program, project, \par subproject or activity which does not fund defen se FFRDC activities \par within each appropriation account, and the reductions in subsection (e) \par shall be allocated on a proportional basis.\par (i) Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the \par Secretary of Defen se shall submit to the congressional defense \par committees a report listing t he specific funding reductions allocated \par to each category listed in subsec tion (h) above pursuant to this \par section.\par Sec. 8035. None of the fu nds appropriated or made available in this \par Act shall be used to procure ca rbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use \par in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the \par Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United \par States or Canada: Provided, That these pro curement restrictions shall \par apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515 , American Society of \par Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and St eel Institute \par (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: Provided \par further, That the Secretary of the military department responsib le for \par the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by \par certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House \par of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are \par not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely \par basi s and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire \par capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That these \par restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the \par date of enactme nt of this Act.\par Sec. 8036. For the purposes of this Act, the term ``con gressional \par defense committees" means the National Security Committee of t he House \par of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, t he \par Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the \par Senate, and the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on \par Appr opriations of the House of Representatives.\par Sec. 8037. During the curre nt fiscal year, the Department of \par Defense may acquire the modification, de pot maintenance and repair of \par aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as th e production of components \par and other Defense-related articles, through com petition between \par Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and pr ivate firms: \par Provided, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the milita ry \par department or defense agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall \par certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct \ par and indirect costs for both public and private bids: Provided further, \par That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to \par com petitions conducted under this section.\par Sec. 8038. (a)(1) If the Secret ary of Defense, after consultation \par with the United States Trade Representa tive, determines that a foreign \par country which is party to an agreement des cribed in paragraph (2) has \par violated the terms of the agreement by discrim inating against certain \par types of products produced in the United States th at are covered by the \par agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind th e Secretary's \par blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of \par products produced in that foreign country.\par (2) An agreeme nt referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal \par defense procurement memo randum of understanding, between the United \par States and a foreign country p ursuant to which the Secretary of Defense \par has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in \par that country.\par (b) The Secret ary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on \par the amount of Departme nt of Defense purchases from foreign entities in \par fiscal year 1999. Such re port shall separately indicate the dollar \par value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to \par any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act \par of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to \par which the United States is a party.\par (c) For purposes of this section, the term ``Buy American Act'' \par means title I II of the Act entitled ``An Act making appropriations for \par the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending \par June 30, 1934, and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1933 (41 \par U.S.C. 10a et seq.).\par Sec. 8039. Appropriations contained in this Act that remain \par available at the end of the current fiscal year as a result of energy \par cost savings real ized by the Department of Defense shall remain \par available for obligation fo r the next fiscal year to the extent, and \par for the purposes, provided in se ction 2865 of title 10, United States \par Code.\par \par (including transfer of funds)\par \par Sec. 8040. Amounts deposited during the current fiscal year to the \par special account established under 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2) and to the \par special account established under 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1) are appropriated \par and shall be available until transferred by the Secret ary of Defense to \par current applicable appropriations or funds of the Depart ment of Defense \par under the terms and conditions specified by 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2)(A) and \par (B) and 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1)(B), to be merged with and to be available \par for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriat ion to \par which transferred.\par Sec. 8041. During the current fiscal yea r, appropriations available \par to the Department of Defense may be used to re imburse a member of a \par reserve component of the Armed Forces who is not oth erwise entitled to \par travel and transportation allowances and who occupies t ransient \par government housing while performing active duty for training or \ par inactive duty training: Provided, That such members may be provided \par lo dging in kind if transient government quarters are unavailable as if \par the m ember was entitled to such allowances under subsection (a) of \par section 404 of title 37, United States Code: Provided further, That if \par lodging in kind is provided, any authorized service charge or cost of \par such lodging may be paid directly from funds appropriated for operation \par and maintenance of th e reserve component of the member concerned.\par Sec. 8042. The President s hall include with each budget for a \par fiscal year submitted to the Congress under section 1105 of title 31, \par United States Code, materials that shall i dentify clearly and \par separately the amounts requested in the budget for app ropriation for \par that fiscal year for salaries and expenses related to admin istrative \par activities of the Department of Defense, the military department s, and \par the Defense Agencies.\par Sec. 8043. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds \par available for ``Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, \par Defense'' may be obligated for the Young Marines program.\par

Sec. 8044. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the \par D epartment of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery \par Accoun t established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense \par Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) \par shall be available u ntil expended for the payments specified by section \par 2921(c)(2) of that Act .\par Sec. 8045. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by \ par this Act, not more than $119,200,000 shall be available for payment of \par the operating costs of NATO Headquarters: Provided, That the Secretary \par of Defense may waive this section for Department of Defense support \par provided to NATO forces in and around the former Yugoslavia.\par Sec. 8046. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are \par available to the Departm ent of Defense for operation and maintenance \par may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of \par not more than $100,000.\par Se

c. 8047. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the \par appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working \par Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for \par the purpose of acquirin g a new inventory item for sale or anticipated \par sale during the current fis cal year or a subsequent fiscal year to \par customers of the Department of Def ense Working Capital Funds if such an \par item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense \par Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1 994 and if the purchase of \par such an investment item would be chargeable dur ing the current fiscal \par year to appropriations made to the Department of De fense for \par procurement.\par (b) The fiscal year 2000 budget request for the Department of \par Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation \par supporting the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense budge t shall be \par prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any eq uipment \par which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement \p ar appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed \par fiscal year 2000 procurement appropriation and not in the supply \par manageme nt business area or any other area or category of the \par Department of Defens e Working Capital Funds.\par Sec. 8048. None of the funds appropriated by t his Act for programs \par of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain avail able for \par obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds \par appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain \par availab le until September 30, 2000: Provided, That funds appropriated, \par transferre d, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency \par Central Servic es Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or \par subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended.\par Sec. 8049. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made \par available in this Act for the Defense I ntelligence Agency may be used \par for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense \par Intelligence Program intelligence communications and i ntelligence \par information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specifie d \par Commands, and the component commands.\par Sec. 8050. Amounts collect ed for the use of the facilities of the \par National Science Center for Commun ications and Electronics during the \par current fiscal year pursuant to sectio n 1459(g) of the Department of \par Defense Authorization Act, 1986, and deposi ted to the special account \par established under subsection 1459(g)(2) of that Act are appropriated \par and shall be available until expended for the operat ion and maintenance \par of the Center as provided for in subsection 1459(g)(2) .\par Sec. 8051. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used \pa r to fill the commander's position at any military medical facility with \par a health care professional unless the prospective candidate can \par demonstrate professional administrative skills.\par Sec. 8052. (a) None of the funds a ppropriated in this Act may be \par expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, \par in expending the funds, complies with the Buy A merican Act. For \par purposes of this subsection, the term ``Buy American Act' ' means title \par III of the Act entitled ``An Act making appropriations for t he Treasury \par and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30 , 1934, \par and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et \par seq.).\par (b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person h as been \par convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a ``Made in \p ar America'' inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United \par S tates that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in \par accor dance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether \par the pers on should be debarred from contracting with the Department of \par Defense.\par

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with \par appropria tions provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress \par that any en tity of the Department of Defense, in expending the \par appropriation, purchas e only American-made equipment and products, \par provided that American-made e quipment and products are cost-\par competitive, quality-competitive, and avail able in a timely fashion.\par Sec. 8053. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be \par available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consu lting services \par entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolic ited \par proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the \par pro curement determines--\par (1) as a result of thorough technical eva luation, only one \par source is found fully qualified to perform the p roposed work; \par or\par (2) the purpose of the contract i s to explore an \par unsolicited proposal which offers significant scie ntific or \par technological promise, represents the product of origina l \par thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or\par (3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of \par unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific \par c oncern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific \par conc ern is given financial support: Provided, That this \par limitation sha ll not apply to contracts in an amount of less \par than $25,000, contr acts related to improvements of equipment \par that is in development o r production, or contracts as to which \par a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been \par confirmed by the Senate, deter mines that the award of such \par contract is in the interest of the na tional defense.\par Sec. 8054. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) an d (c), none \par of the funds made available by this Act may be used--\par (1) to establish a field operating agency; or\par (2) to pa y the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or \par civilian employ ee of the department who is transferred or \par reassigned from a headq uarters activity if the member or \par employee's place of duty remains at the location of that \par headquarters.\par (b) The Secretary o f Defense or Secretary of a military department \par may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, \par if the Secretary determines, a nd certifies to the Committees on \par Appropriations of the House of Represent atives and Senate that the \par granting of the waiver will reduce the personne l requirements or the \par financial requirements of the department.\par (c) This section does not apply to field operating agencies funded \par within th e National Foreign Intelligence Program.\par Sec. 8055. Notwithstanding sec tion 303 of Public Law 96-487 or any \par other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to \par lease real and personal property at Naval Ai r Facility, Adak, Alaska, \par pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2667(f), for commercial, i ndustrial or other \par purposes.\par \par (rescis sions)\par \par Sec. 8056. Of the funds provided in Department of Defense \ par Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the \par following accounts in the specified amounts:\par ``Missile Procure ment, Army, 1998/2000'', $13,300,000;\par ``Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, \par 1998/2000'', $6,700,000;\par ``Other Procurement, Army, 1998/2000'', $24,000,000;\par ``Weapons Procurement, Navy, 1998/2000'', $2,000,000;\par ``Procure ment of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps, 1998/\par 2000'', $12,000,00 0;\par ``Other Procurement, Navy, 1998/2000'', $28,500,000;\par ``Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1998/2000'', \par $15,000,0 00;\par ``Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1998/2000'', $19,840,000; \par ``Other Procurement, Air Force, 1998/2000'', $4,160,000;\par ``Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 1998/\par 1999'', $18,000,000;\par ``Research, Development, Test and Evalua tion, Navy, 1998/\par 1999", $17,500,000;\par ``Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, \par 1998/1999", $34,370, 000; and\par ``Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, \par 1998/1999", $73,000,000.\par Sec. 8057. None of the fun ds available in this Act may be used to \par reduce the authorized positions fo r military (civilian) technicians of \par the Army National Guard, the Air Nati onal Guard, Army Reserve and Air \par Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed \par civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduc tion on military (civilian) \par technicians, unless such reductions are a dire ct result of a reduction \par in military force structure.\par Sec. 8058. N one of the funds appropriated or otherwise made \par available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to \par the Democratic People's Republi c of North Korea unless specifically \par appropriated for that purpose.\par Sec. 8059. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated in \par this Ac t are available to compensate members of the National Guard for \par duty perfo rmed pursuant to a plan submitted by a Governor of a State \par and approved by the Secretary of Defense under section 112 of title 32, \par United States Cod e: Provided, That during the performance of such duty, \par the members of the National Guard shall be under State command and \par control: Provided further, That such duty shall be treated as full-time \par National Guard duty for purp oses of sections 12602(a)(2) and (b)(2) of \par title 10, United States Code.\p ar Sec. 8060. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and \par mainten ance of the Military Departments, Unified and Specified Commands \par and Defen se Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, \par allowances and ot her expenses which would otherwise be incurred against \par appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the \par National Guard and Rese rve provide intelligence or counterintelligence \par support to Unified Command s, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence \par Activities, including the activ ities and programs included within the \par National Foreign Intelligence Progr am (NFIP), the Joint Military \par Intelligence Program (JMIP), and the Tactica l Intelligence and Related \par Activities (TIARA) aggregate: Provided, That no thing in this section \par authorizes deviation from established Reserve and Na tional Guard \par personnel and training procedures.\par Sec. 8061. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds \par appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the civilian medical and \par medical support personnel assigne d to military treatment facilities \par below the September 30, 1998 level: Pro vided, That the Service Surgeons \par General may waive this section by certify ing to the congressional \par defense committees that the beneficiary populatio n is declining in some \par catchment areas and civilian strength reductions ma y be consistent with \par responsible resource stewardship and capitation-based budgeting.\par \par (including transfer of funds)\par \pa r Sec. 8062. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be \par transfe rred to or obligated from the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance \par Revolving F und, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the \par total cost for the planning, design, construction and installation of \par equipment for the reno vation of the Pentagon Reservation will not \par exceed $1,118,000,000.\par Sec. 8063. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of \par Defense f or any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug \par activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the \par United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.\par (b) None of the fun ds available to the Central Intelligence Agency \par for any fiscal year for dr ug interdiction and counter-drug activities \par may be transferred to any othe r department or agency of the United \par States except as specifically provide d in an appropriations law.\par \par (transfer of fun ds)\par \par Sec. 8064. Appropriations available in this Act under the head ing \par ``Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' for increasing energy and \par water efficiency in Federal buildings may, during their period of \par ava ilability, be transferred to other appropriations or funds of the \par Departme nt of Defense for projects related to increasing energy and \par water efficien cy, to be merged with and to be available for the same \par general purposes, a nd for the same time period, as the appropriation or \par fund to which transfe rred.\par Sec. 8065. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used \par for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those \par pro duced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: Provided, That \par the Secr etary of the military department responsible for such \par procurement may waiv e this restriction on a case-by-case basis by \par certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House \par of Representatives and the Sena te, that adequate domestic supplies are \par not available to meet Department o f Defense requirements on a timely \par basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire \par capability for national security purposes.\pa r Sec. 8066. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds \par availab le to the Department of Defense shall be made available to \par provide transpo rtation of medical supplies and equipment, on a \par nonreimbursable basis, to American Samoa: Provided, That \par notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available to the \par Department of Defense shall be made available to p rovide transportation \par of medical supplies and equipment, on a nonreimbursa ble basis, to the \par Indian Health Service when it is in conjunction with a c ivil-military \par project.\par Sec. 8067. None of the funds in this Act ma y be used to purchase \par any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the U nited States, \par unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congression al defense \par committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to ac quire \par capability for national security purposes that is not available from \par United States manufacturers.\par Sec. 8068. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Naval \par shipyards of the United States shall be eligi ble to participate in any \par manufacturing extension program financed by fund s appropriated in this \par or any other Act.\par Sec. 8069. Notwithstandin g any other provision of law, each \par contract awarded by the Department of D efense during the current fiscal \par year for construction or service performe d in whole or in part in a \par State which is not contiguous with another Stat e and has an \par unemployment rate in excess of the national average rate of \ par unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall include a \par provision requiring the contractor to employ, for the purpose of \par performin g that portion of the contract in such State that is not \par contiguous with a nother State, individuals who are residents of such \par State and who, in the case of any craft or trade, possess or would be \par able to acquire promptly t he necessary skills: Provided, That the \par Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of this section, on a \par case-by-case basis, in the interest of national security.\par Sec. 8070. During the current fiscal year, the Army shall use the \par former George Air Force Base as the airhead for the Nationa l Training \par Center at Fort Irwin: Provided, That none of the funds in this Act \par shall be obligated or expended to transport Army personnel into Edward s \par Air Force Base for training rotations at the National Training Center.\p ar Sec. 8071. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit, on a \par quarterl y basis, a report to the congressional defense committees, the \par Committee o n International Relations of the House of Representatives \par and the Committe e on Foreign Relations of the Senate setting forth all \par costs (including in cremental costs) incurred by the Department of \par Defense during the precedin g quarter in implementing or supporting \par resolutions of the United Nations

Security Council, including any such \par resolution calling for international sanctions, international \par peacekeeping operations, and humanitarian mission s undertaken by the \par Department of Defense. The quarterly report shall incl ude an aggregate \par of all such Department of Defense costs by operation or m ission.\par (b) The Secretary of Defense shall detail in the quarterly repo rts \par all efforts made to seek credit against past United Nations \par expen ditures and all efforts made to seek compensation from the United \par Nations for costs incurred by the Department of Defense in implementing \par and suppor ting United Nations activities.\par Sec. 8072. (a) Limitation on Transfer o f Defense Articles and \par Services.--Notwithstanding any other provision of l aw, none of the \par funds available to the Department of Defense for the curre nt fiscal \par year may be obligated or expended to transfer to another nation or an \par international organization any defense articles or services (other t han \par intelligence services) for use in the activities described in \par sub section (b) unless the congressional defense committees, the \par Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, \par and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified 15 \par days in advance of suc h transfer.\par (b) Covered Activities.--This section applies to--\par

(1) any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement \par op eration under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of \par the Un ited Nations Charter under the authority of a United \par Nations Secur ity Council resolution; and\par (2) any other international peaceke eping, peace-\par enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation.\pa r (c) Required Notice.--A notice under subsection (a) shall include \par th e following:\par (1) A description of the equipment, supplies, or s ervices \par to be transferred.\par (2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or \par services to be transferred.\p ar (3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or \par supplies--\par (A) a statement of whether the inventor y \par requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces \par (including the reserve components) for the type of \par equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; \par and\par (B) a statement of whether the items proposed to \par be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how \par the President proposes to provide funds for such \par replacement.\par Sec. 8073. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense \par shall be obligated or expended to make a financial contribution to the \par United Nations for the cost of an United Nations peace keeping activity \par (whether pursuant to assessment or a voluntary contributi on) or for \par payment of any United States arrearage to the United Nations.\p ar Sec. 8074. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense \par under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under \par a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid \par by t he contractor to an employee when--\par (1) such costs are for a bo nus or otherwise in excess of \par the normal salary paid by the contra ctor to the employee; and\par (2) such bonus is part of restructuri ng costs associated \par with a business combination.\par Sec. 8075 . (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made \par available in this A ct may be used to transport or provide for the \par transportation of chemical munitions or agents to the Johnston Atoll \par for the purpose of storing or de militarizing such munitions or agents.\par (b) The prohibition in subsectio n (a) shall not apply to any \par obsolete World War II chemical munition or ag ent of the United States \par found in the World War II Pacific Theater of Oper ations.\par (c) The President may suspend the application of subsection (a)

\par during a period of war in which the United States is a party.\par Sec
. 8076. None of the funds provided in title II of this Act for \par ``Former So
viet Union Threat Reduction" may be obligated or expended \par to finance hous
ing for any individual who was a member of the military \par forces of the Sovi
et Union or for any individual who is or was a member \par of the military forc
es of the Russian Federation.\par \par (including transfer
of funds)\par \par Sec. 8077. During the current fiscal year, no more than
$7,000,000 \par of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ``Operati
on and \par Maintenance, Defense-Wide" may be transferred to appropriations \p
ar available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to \par
be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which \par trans
ferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with \par support
and services for eligible organizations and activities outside \par the Depart
ment of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United \par States Code.\
par Sec. 8078. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United \par Sta
tes Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under \par the hea
ding ``Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" shall be considered \par to be for t
he same purpose as any subdivision under the heading \par ``Shipbuilding and Co
nversion, Navy" appropriations in any prior year, \par and the 1 percent limit
ation shall apply to the total amount of the \par appropriation.\par Sec. 8
079. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an \par appropriation accou
nt of the Department of Defense for which the period \par of availability for o
bligation has expired or which has closed under \par the provisions of section
1552 of title 31, United States Code, and \par which has a negative unliquidate
d or unexpended balance, an obligation \par or an adjustment of an obligation m
ay be charged to any current \par appropriation account for the same purpose as
the expired or closed \par account if--\par (1) the obligation wou
ld have been properly chargeable \par (except as to amount) to the expi
red or closed account before \par the end of the period of availability
or closing of that \par account;\par (2) the obligation is
not otherwise properly chargeable to \par any current appropriation ac
count of the Department of Defense; \par and\par (3) in the
case of an expired account, the obligation is \par not chargeable to a
current appropriation of the Department of \par Defense under the prov
isions of section 1405(b)(8) of the \par National Defense Authorization
Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public \par Law 101-510, as amended (31 U.S.
C. 1551 note): Provided, That \par in the case of an expired account, i
f subsequent review or \par investigation discloses that there was not
in fact a negative \par unliquidated or unexpended balance in the accou
nt, any charge \par to a current account under the authority of this se
ction shall \par be reversed and recorded against the expired account:
Provided \par further, That the total amount charged to a current \par
appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal \par
to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.\par Sec. 80
80. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall \par submit to the congr
essional defense committees by February 1, 1999 a \par detailed report identify
ing, by amount and by separate budget activity, \par activity group, subactivit
y group, line item, program element, program, \par project, subproject, and act
ivity, any activity for which the fiscal \par year 2000 budget request was redu
ced because Congress appropriated \par funds above the President's budget reque
st for that specific activity \par for fiscal year 1999.\par Sec. 8081. Fun
ds appropriated in title II of this Act for \par supervision and administration
costs for facilities maintenance and \par repair, minor construction, or desig
n projects may be obligated at the \par time the reimbursable order is accepted

by the performing activity: \par Provided, That for the purpose of this sectio n, supervision and \par administration costs includes all in-house Government c ost.\par Sec. 8082. The Secretary of Defense may waive reimbursement of the \par cost of conferences, seminars, courses of instruction, or similar \par ed ucational activities of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies \par for m ilitary officers and civilian officials of foreign nations if the \par Secretar y determines that attendance by such personnel, without \par reimbursement, is in the national security interest of the United \par States: Provided, That cos ts for which reimbursement is waived pursuant \par to this subsection shall be paid from appropriations available for the \par Asia-Pacific Center.\par Se c. 8083. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the \par Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of \par the National Guar d Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on \par a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard \par Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a \par case-by-case basis.\par (b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to \par funds ava ilable for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be \par available t o defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of \par the project und er that subsection. Such funds shall be available for \par such purposes withou t fiscal year limitation.\par Sec. 8084. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the \par Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determinat ion under section \par 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost -effective \par agreements for required heating facility modernization in the \ par Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: \par Provided, That in the City of Kaiserslautern such agreements will \par include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for \par municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: \par Provided further , That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and \par Ramstein Air Base, fu rnished heat may be obtained from private, \par regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the \par consideration of United States coal as an energy source.\par Sec. 8085. During the current fiscal year, the amoun ts which are \par necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Fisher Hou ses \par administered by the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air \pa r Force are hereby appropriated, to be derived from amounts which are \par avai lable in the applicable Fisher House trust fund established under \par 10 U.S.C . 2221 for the Fisher Houses of each such department.\par Sec. 8086. During the current fiscal year and hereafter, refunds \par attributable to the use of the Government travel card by military \par personnel and civilian employees o f the Department of Defense and \par refunds attributable to official Governmen t travel arranged by \par Government Contracted Travel Management Centers may b e credited to \par operation and maintenance accounts of the Department of Defe nse which \par are current when the refunds are received.\par Sec. 8087. Du ring the current fiscal year, not more than a total of \par $60,000,000 in with drawal credits may be made by the Marine Corps \par Supply Management activity group of the Navy Working Capital Fund, \par Department of Defense Working Capi tal Funds, to the credit of current \par applicable appropriations of a Departm ent of Defense activity in \par connection with the acquisition of critical low density repairables \par that are capitalized into the Navy Working Capital Fu nd.\par Sec. 8088. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3902, during the current \par fiscal year interest penalties may be paid by the Department of Defense \par fr om funds financing the operation of the military department or \par defense age ncy with which the invoice or contract payment is \par associated.\par Sec. 8089. At the time the President submits his budget for fiscal \par year 2000 a nd any fiscal year thereafter, the Department of Defense \par shall transmit to the congressional defense committees a budget \par justification document for the active and reserve Military Personnel \par accounts, to be known as the ``M -1", which shall identify, at the \par budget activity, activity group, and su bactivity group level, the \par amounts requested by the President to be approp riated to the Department \par of Defense for military personnel in any budget r equest, or amended \par budget request, for that fiscal year.\par Sec. 8090 . None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act \par may be used to pr ocure end-items for delivery to military forces for \par operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: \par Provided, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in \par development, prototyping, and test ac tivities preceding and leading to \par acceptance for operational use: Provided further, That this restriction \par does not apply to programs funded within t he National Foreign \par Intelligence Program: Provided further, That the Secre tary of Defense \par may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by cert ifying in \par writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of \par Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security \par intere st to do so.\par Sec. 8091. None of the funds made available in this Act ma y be \par obligated or expended to enter into or renew a contract with a \par c ontractor that is subject to the reporting requirement set forth in \par subsec tion (d) of section 4212 of title 38, United States Code, but has \par not subm itted the most recent report required by such subsection for \par 1998 or a sub sequent year.\par Sec. 8092. None of the funds made available in this Act m ay be used \par to approve or license the sale of the F-22 advanced tactical fi ghter to \par any foreign government.\par Sec. 8093. None of the funds appr opriated or otherwise made \par available by this Act may be made available for the United States Man \par and the Biosphere Program, or related projects.\par

Sec. 8094. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1552(a), of the funds provided \par i n Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, not more than the \par specified a mounts from the following accounts shall remain available \par for the payment of satellite on-orbit incentive fees until the fees are \par paid:\par

``Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1995/1997", $20,978,000;\par

``Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1996/1998", $16,782,400.\par Sec. 8095. None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used \par by the National Im agery and Mapping Agency for any mapping, charting, \par and geodesy activities unless contracts for such services are awarded \par in accordance with the qua lifications based selection process in 40 \par U.S.C. 541 et seq. and 10 U.S.C. 2855: Provided, That an exception \par shall be provided for such services tha t are critical to national \par security after a written notification has been submitted by the Deputy \par Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropri ations of the House \par of Representatives and the Senate.\par Sec. 8096. Funds made available to the Civil Air Patrol in this Act \par under the heading ``Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, \par Defense" may be used fo r the Civil Air Patrol Corporation's \par counterdrug program, including its de mand reduction program involving \par youth programs, as well as operational an d training drug reconnaissance \par missions for federal, state and local gover nment agencies; for \par administrative costs, including the hiring of Civil Ai r Patrol \par Corporation employees; for travel and per diem expenses of Civil Air \par Patrol Corporation personnel in support of those missions; and for \pa r equipment needed for mission support or performance: Provided, That of \par t hese funds, $300,000 shall be made available to establish and operate \par a di stance learning program: Provided further, That the Department of \par the Air Force should waive reimbursement from the Federal, State and \par local governm ent agencies for the use of these funds.\par Sec. 8097. The Secretary of De fense shall undertake a review of all \par distributed learning education and t raining programs in the Department \par of Defense and shall issue a plan to im plement a department-wide, \par standardized, cost-effective Advanced Distribut ed Learning framework to \par achieve the goals of commonality, interoperabilit y, and reuse: \par Provided, That the Secretary shall report to Congress on the results of \par this review and present a detailed implementation and budget p lan no \par later than July 30, 1999.\par Sec. 8098. None of the funds in t his Act may be available for the \par purchase by the Department of Defense of cross deck pendants for \par arresting aircraft on U.S. Navy aircraft carriers unless such cross \par deck pendants are manufactured in the United States from components \par which are substantially manufactured in the United States: Pro vided, \par That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet \par Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of \par th e military department responsible for the procurement may waive this \par restr iction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the \par Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the \par Senate that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire \par capability for national s ecurity purposes.\par Sec. 8099. None of the funds in this or any other Act shall be \par available to any Reserve Component to establish new activities t o \par perform depot level maintenance and remanufacture of any equipment in \p ar the Department of Defense inventory unless the Secretary of Defense \par fir st certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of \par Represent atives and the Senate, on a case-by-case basis, that (a) \par insufficient work load capacity is available at existing government or \par private sector depot maintenance facilities currently used by the \par Reserve Components for simila r work; and (b) an in-depth analysis has \par been performed comparing the cost of any proposed expansion of depot \par facilities versus the cost of performi ng the same work at existing \par depot facilities or by the private sector.\pa r Sec. 8100. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the TRICARE \par m anaged care support contracts in effect, or in final stages of \par acquisition as of September 30, 1998, may be extended for two years: \par Provided, That a ny such extension may only take place if the Secretary \par of Defense determin es that it is in the best interest of the \par government: Provided further, Th at any contract extension shall be \par based on the price in the final best an d final offer for the last year \par of the existing contract as adjusted for i nflation and other factors \par mutually agreed to by the contractor and the go vernment: Provided \par further, That notwithstanding any other provision of la w, all future \par TRICARE managed care support contracts replacing contracts i n effect, \par or in the final stages of acquisition as of September 30, 1998, may \par include a base contract period for transition and up to seven one-year \par option periods.\par Sec. 8101. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the \par total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $204,100,000 \par to reflect savings from revised economic assumptions, to be d istributed \par as follows:\par ``Aircraft Procurement, Army", $4, 000,000;\par ``Missile Procurement, Army", $4,000,000;\par ``Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, \par Army", $4,000,000;\par ``Procurement of Ammunition, Army", $3,000,000;\p ar ``Other Procurement, Army", $9,000,000;\par ``Aircr aft Procurement, Navy", $22,000,000;\par ``Weapons Procurement, Na vy", $4,000,000;\par ``Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps", \par $1,000,000;\par ``Shipbuilding and Conversion , Navy", $18,000,000;\par ``Other Procurement, Navy", $12,000,000 ;\par ``Procurement, Marine Corps", $2,000,000;\par `` Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", $23,000,000;\par ``Missile Procu rement, Air Force", $5,200,000;\par ``Procurement of Ammunition, A ir Force", $1,000,000;\par ``Other Procurement, Air Force", $4,90 0,000;\par ``Procurement, Defense-Wide", $5,100,000;\par ``Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army", \par $3,000,000 ;\par ``Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", \par $10,000,000;\par ``Research, Development, Test and Evaluation , Navy", \par $18,500,000;\par ``Research, Development, Te st and Evaluation, Air Force", \par $26,300,000; and\par ` `Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-\par Wide", $24,1 00,000:\par Provided, That these reductions shall be applied proportionally to each \par budget activity, activity group and sub-activity group and each \par program, project, and activity within each appropriation account.\par Sec. 8102. (a) Transfers of Vessels by Grant.--The Secretary of the \par Navy is aut horized to transfer vessels to foreign countries on a grant \par basis under se ction 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 \par U.S.C. 2321j) as follo ws:\par (1) To the Government of Argentina, the NEWPORT class tank \par landing ship NEWPORT (LST 1179).\par (2) To the Govern ment of Greece--\par (A) the KNOX class frigate HEPBURN (FF 1055); and\par (B) the ADAMS class guided missile destroye rs \par STRAUSS (DDG 16), SEMMS (DDG 18), and WADDELL (DDG 24). \par (3) To the Government of Portugal, the STALWART class ocean \p ar surveillance ship ASSURANCE (T-AGOS 5).\par (4) To the G overnment of Turkey, the KNOX class frigates \par PAUL (FF 1080), MILLE R (FF 1091), and W.S. SIMMS (FF 1059).\par (b) Transfers of Vessels by Sale .--The Secretary of the Navy is \par authorized to transfer vessels to foreign countries on a sales basis \par under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761) as \par follows:\par (1) To the Government of Bra zil, the NEWPORT class tank \par landing ships CAYUGA (LST 1186) and PE ORIA (LST 1183).\par (2) To the Government of Chile--\par (A) the NEWPORT class tank landing ship SAN \par BER NARDINO (LST 1189); and\par (B) the auxiliary repair dry do ck WATERFORD (ARD \par 5).\par (3) To the Governmen t of Greece--\par (A) the OAK RIDGE class medium dry dock A LAMAGORDO \par (ARDM 2); and\par (B) the KN OX class frigates VREELAND (FF 1068) and \par TRIPPE (FF 1075). \par (4) To the Government of Mexico--\par (A) the auxiliary repair dock SAN ONOFRE (ARD 30); \par and\par (B) the KNOX class frigate PHARRIS (FF 1094).\par (5) To the Government of the Philippines, the STALWART \par class ocean surveillance ship TRIUMPH (T-AGOS 4).\par (6) To the Government of Spain, the NEWPORT class tank \par landing ships HARLAN COUNTY (LST 11 96) and BARNSTABLE COUNTY \par (LST 1197).\par (7) To the T aipai Economic and Cultural Representative \par Office in the United St ates (the Taiwan instrumentality that is \par designated pursuant to se ction 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations \par Act)--\par (A) the KNOX class frigates PEARY (FF 1073), JOSEPH \par HEWES (FF 1078), COOK (FF 1083), BREWTON (FF 1086), \par KIRK (FF 19 87), and BARBEY (FF 1088);\par (B) the NEWPORT class tank l anding ships MANITOWOC \par (LST 1180) and SUMTER (LST 1181);\p ar (C) the floating dry dock COMPETENT (AFDM 6); and\par (D) the ANCHORAGE class dock landing ship PENSACOLA \par (LSD 38).\par (8) To the Government of Turkey--\par (A) the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile \par frigates MAHLON S. TISDALE (FFG 27), REID (FFG 30), and \par DUNCAN (FFG 10); and\par (B) the KNOX class frigates

REASONER (FF 1063), \par FANNING (FF 1076), BOWEN (FF 1079), MC CANDLESS (FF \par 1084), DONALD BEARY (FF 1085), AINSWORTH (FF 1090), \par THOMAS C. HART (FF 1092), and CAPODANNO (FF 1093).\ par (9) To the Government of Venezuela, the medium auxiliary \par floating dry dock bearing hull number AFDM 2.\par (c) Transfers of V essels on a Combined Lease-Sale Basis.--The \par Secretary of the Navy is autho rized to transfer vessels to foreign \par countries on a combined lease-sale ba sis under sections 61 and 21 of \par the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 279 6, 2761) and in accordance \par with subsection (d) as follows:\par (1) To the Government of Brazil, the CIMARRON class oiler \par MERRIMA CK (AO 179).\par (2) To the Government of Greece, the KIDD class gu ided \par missile destroyers KIDD (DDG 993), CALLAGHAN (DDG 994), SCOTT \par (DDG 995), and CHANDLER (DDG 996).\par (d) Conditions Relatin g To Combined Lease-Sale Transfers.--A \par transfer of a vessel on a combined lease-sale basis authorized by \par subsection (c) shall be made in accordance with the following \par provisions, which the Secretary shall include in the te rms of any \par agreement with the recipient country for such transfer of the v essel:\par (1) The Secretary may initially transfer the vessel by \ par lease, with lease payments suspended for the term of the lease, \pa r while simultaneously entering into a foreign military sales \par agreement for the transfer of title to the vessel.\par (2) The Secretary may not deliver title to the vessel until \par the purchase p rice of the vessel under such a sales agreement \par is paid in full.\p ar (3) Upon payment of the purchase price in full under such a \par sales agreement and delivery of title to the recipient country, \par the Secretary shall terminate the lease.\par (4) If the purc hasing country fails to make full payment of \par the purchase price in accordance with the sales agreement--\par (A) the sales ag reement shall be immediately \par terminated;\par (B) the suspension of lease payments under the \par leas e shall be vacated; and\par (C) the United States shall be entitled to retain \par funds received under the sales agreemen t in such \par amounts as necessary to cover the amount of leas e \par payments due and payable under the lease and all other \ par costs required by the lease to be paid as of the date \par of the sales agreement termination.\par (5) If a sa les agreement is terminated pursuant to \par paragraph (4), the United States shall not be required to pay \par any interest to the recipient country on any amount paid to the \par United States by the recipient c ountry under the sales \par agreement and not retained by the United St ates under the \par lease.\par (e) Funding for Certain Costs of Tra nsfers.--There is established \par in the Treasury of the United States a speci al account to be known as \par the Defense Vessels Transfer Program Account. Th ere is hereby \par appropriated into that account such sums as may be necessary for the \par costs (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of \par 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of the lease-sale transfers authorized by \par su bsection (d). Funds in that account are available only for the \par purpose of covering those costs.\par (f) Waiver of Requirements for Notification to Co ngress.--Section \par 516(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2 321j(f)), \par section 525 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Rel ated \par Programs Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-118; 111 Stat. 2412), \par and any similar, successor provision of law do not apply with respect \ par to the transfers authorized by this section.\par (g) Inapplicability of Aggregate Annual Limitation on Value of \par Transferred Excess Defense Articl es.--In the case of the transfer of a \par vessel authorized by subsection (a) to be made by grant under section \par 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 196 1 (22 U.S.C. 2321j), the value \par of the vessel transferred shall not be incl uded for purposes of \par subsection (g) of that section in the aggregate value of excess defense \par articles transferred to countries under that section in any fiscal \par year.\par (h) Costs of Transfers.--Any expense incurred by the United States \par in connection with a transfer authorized by this sectio n shall be \par charged to the recipient.\par (i) Repair and Refurbishment in United States Shipyards.--To the \par maximum extent practicable, the Secret ary of the Navy shall require, as \par a condition of the transfer of a vessel under this section, that the \par country to which the vessel is transferred ha ve such repair or \par refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the ves sel joins the \par naval forces of that country, performed at a shipyard locate d in the \par United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.\par (j) Expiration of Authority.--The authority to transfer vessels \par under this section shall expire at the end of the two-year period \par beginning on the da te of the enactment of this Act.\par Sec. 8103. None of the funds in this A ct may be used to compensate \par an employee of the Department of Defense who initiates a new start \par program without notification to the Office of the Se cretary of Defense \par and the congressional defense committees, as required b y Department of \par Defense financial management regulations.\par \par (including transfer of funds)\par \par Sec. 8104. Of the fund s made available under title II of this Act, \par the following amounts shall b e transferred to the Defense Working \par Capital Funds for the purpose of fund ing operations of the Defense \par Commissary Agency:\par ``Operati on and Maintenance, Army'', $338,400,000;\par ``Operation and Maint enance, Navy'', $255,000,000;\par ``Operation and Maintenance, Mari ne Corps'', $86,600,000; \par and\par ``Operation and Maint enance, Air Force'', $302,071,000:\par Provided, That the transfer authority pr ovided in this section is in \par addition to any other transfer authority cont ained elsewhere in this \par Act.\par \par (including tran sfer of funds)\par \par Sec. 8105. In addition to other amounts appropriate d in this Act, \par $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, is appropr iated for \par ``Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', for emergency and \ par extraordinary expenses associated with the accident involving United \par S tates Marine Corps A-6 aircraft on February 3, 1998, near Cavalese, \par Italy: Provided, That these funds shall be available only for the \par purposes descr ibed in this section: Provided further, That the entire \par amount is designat ed by the Congress as an emergency requirement \par pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency \par Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: Provided further, That the \par entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official \par budget request for a specific dollar amoun t, that includes designation \par of the entire amount of the request as an eme rgency requirement as \par defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of \par 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the C ongress: \par Provided further, That upon transmittal to the Congress of an off icial \par budget request as described in the preceding proviso, the amount \pa r requested as an emergency appropriation shall be transferred to ``Funds \par Appropriated to the President'', and notwithstanding any other \par provision o f law, this amount shall be available only for payments to \par persons, commun ities, or other entities in Italy only for reimbursement \par for damages resul ting from the expenses associated with the accident \par involving United State s Marine Corps A-6 aircraft on February 3, 1998, \par near Cavalese, Italy: Pro vided further, That notwithstanding any other \par provision of law, funds made

available under this section may be used \par to rebuild or replace the funicu
lar system in Cavalese destroyed on \par February 3, 1998 by United States airc
raft: Provided further, That any \par amount paid to any individual or entity f
rom the amount appropriated \par under this section shall be credited against a
ny amount subsequently \par determined to be payable to that individual or enti
ty under chapter 163 \par of title 10, United States Code, section 127 of that
title, or any \par other authority provided by law for administrative settlemen
t of claims \par against the United States with respect to damages arising from
the \par accident described in this section: Provided further, That payment of
\par an amount under this section shall not be considered to constitute a \par
statement of legal liability on the part of the United States or \par otherwis
e to prejudge any judicial proceeding or investigation arising \par from the ac
cident described in this section.\par Sec. 8106. No funds appropriated or o
therwise made available by \par this Act may be used to initiate or conduct off
ensive military \par operations by United States Armed Forces except in accorda
nce with the \par war powers clause of the Constitution (article 1, section 8),
which \par vests in Congress the power to declare and authorize war and to tak
e \par certain specified, related decisions.\par \par
TITLE IX\par \par EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS FOR INFORMATION SYSTEMS T
ECHNOLOGY AND \par SECURITY\par \par
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE\par \par Information Systems Techn
ology and Security Transfer Account\par \par (including tr
ansfer of funds)\par \par For emergency expenses of the Department of Defen
se relating to \par year 2000 conversion of information technology and national
security \par systems, for information technology and computer security/inform
ation \par assurance programs, and for related purposes, $1,600,000,000, to rem
ain \par available until expended: Provided, That funds made available under \p
ar this heading are also available for the purposes described above for \par el
ements of the intelligence community whose activities are funded in \par this A
ct: Provided further, That as required, the Secretary of Defense \par may trans
fer these funds to any account in this or previously enacted \par Department of
Defense Appropriations Acts: Provided further, That funds \par appropriated un
der this heading, or made available by transfer of such \par funds, to any inte
lligence agency or activity of the United States \par Government shall be deeme
d to be specifically authorized by the \par Congress for purposes of section 50
4 of the National Security Act of \par 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414): Provided further,
That of the amounts made \par available under this heading, $1,600,000,000 is d
esignated by the \par Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section
251(b)(2)(A) \par of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1
985, as \par amended: Provided further, That the entire amount shall be availab
le \par only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific \par
dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the \par reque
st as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget \par and Emerg
ency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted \par by the Presid
ent to the Congress: Provided further, That the \par President's request shall
specifically identify agencies, accounts, \par programs, projects and activitie
s to be funded and no funds shall be \par available until 15 days after the sub
mission of the request: Provided \par further, That the funds transferred shall
be merged with and shall be \par available for the same purposes and for the s
ame time period as the \par appropriation to which transferred: Provided furthe
r, That the transfer \par authority provided under this heading is in addition
to any other \par transfer authority available to the Department of Defense.\pa
r \par General Provisions--This Title\par \par Sec. 90
01. (a) Ensuring Year 2000 Compliance of Information \par Technology and Nation

al Security Systems.--(1) None of the funds \par appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may (except as \par provided in paragraph (2)) be obligated or expended on the development \par or modernization of any information technology or national security \par system of the Department of Defense in use by the Department of Defense \par (whether or not the system is a mission critical system) if that system \par does not meet certification level 1a, 1b, or 2 (as prescribed in the \par April 1997 publication of the Department of Defense entitled ``Year \par 2000 Management Plan'').\par (2) The limitation in paragraph (1) does not apply to an obligation \par or expenditure--\par (A) that is directly related to ensuring that a system \par achieves year 2000 compliance;\par (B) for a system that is being developed and fielded to \par replace before January 1, 2000, a noncompliant system or a \par system to be terminated in accordance with the May 1998 \par Department of Defense quarterly report on the status of year \par 2000 compliance; or\par (C) for a particular change that is specifically required \par by law or that is specifically directed by the Secretary of \par Defense.\par (b) Unallocated Reductions of Funds Not To Apply to Mission \par Critical Systems.--Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by \par this Act for mission critical systems are not subject to any \par unallocated reduction of funds made by or otherwise applicable to funds \par provided in this Act.\par (c) Current Services Operations Not Affected.--Subsection (a) does \par not prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds for current \par services operations of information technology and national security \par systems.\par (d) Waiver Authority.--The Secretary of Defense may waive \par subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis with respect to an information \par technology or national security system if the Secretary provides the \par congressional defense committees with written notice of the waiver, \par including the reasons for the waiver and a timeline for the testing and \par certification of the system as year 2000 compliant.\par (e) Required Report.--(1) Not later than December 1, 1998, the \par Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense \par committees a report describing--\par (A) an executable strategy to be used throughout the \par Department of Defense to test information technology and \par national security systems for year 2000 compliance (to include \par functional capability tests and military exercises);\par (B) the plans of the Department of Defense for ensuring \par that adequate resources (such as testing facilities, tools, and \par personnel) are available to ensure that all mission critical \par systems achieve year 2000 compliance; and\par (C) the criteria and process to be used to certify a system \par as year 2000 compliant.\par (2) The report shall also include--\par (A) an updated list of all mission critical systems; and\par (B) guidelines for developing contingency plans for the \par functioning of each information technology or national security \par system in the event of a year 2000 problem in any such system.\par (f) Capability Contingency Plans.--Not later than December 30, \par 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall have in place contingency plans to \par ensure continuity of operations for every critical mission or function \par of the Department of Defense that is dependent on an information \par technology or national security system.\par (g) Inspector General Evaluation.--The Inspector General of the \par Department of Defense shall selectively audit information technology \par and national security systems certified as year 2000 compliant to \par evaluate the ability of systems to successfully operate during the \par actual year 2000, including the ability of the systems to access and \par transmit information from point of origin to point of termination.\par (h) Definitions.--For purpose s of this section:\par (1) The term ``information technology" has the meaning \par given that term in section 5002 of the Clinger-Cohen A ct of \par 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).\par (2) The term ``nation al security system" has the meaning \par given that term in section 51 42 of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1452).\par (3) The term ``development or modernization" has the \par meaning given that term in paragraph E of section 180203 of the \par Department of Defense Financial Management R egulation (DOD \par 7000.14-R), but does not include any matter covered by \par subparagraph 3 of that paragraph.\par (4) The term ``current services" has the meaning given \par that term in paragraph C of section 180203 of the Department of \par Defense Financial Manage ment Regulation (DOD 7000.14-R).\par (5) The term ``mission critica l system" means an \par information technology or national security sy stem that is \par designated as mission critical in the May 1998 Depart ment of \par Defense quarterly report on the status of year 2000 compli ance.\par Sec. 9002. (a) Plan for Simulation of Year 2000 in Military \par Exercises.--Not later than December 15, 1998, the Secretary of Defense \par sha ll submit to Congress a plan for the execution of a simulated year \par 2000 as part of military exercises described in subsection (c) in order \par to evalua te, in an operational environment, the extent to which \par information technol ogy and national security systems involved in those \par exercises will success fully operate during the actual year 2000, \par including the ability of those systems to access and transmit \par information from point of origin to point o f termination.\par (b) Evaluation of Compliance in Selected Exercises.--In conducting \par the military exercises described in subsection (c), the Secreta ry of \par Defense shall ensure that at least 25 of those exercises (referred t o \par in this section as ``Year 2000 simulation exercises") are conducted so \par as to include a simulated year 2000 in accordance with the plan \par submi tted under subsection (a). The Secretary of Defense shall ensure \par that at l east two of those exercises are conducted by the commander of \par each unified or specified combatant command.\par (c) Covered Military Exercises.--A mil itary exercise referred to in \par subsections (a) and (b) is a military exerci se conducted by the \par Department of Defense, during the period beginning on January 1, 1999, \par and ending on September 30, 1999--\par (1) un der the training exercises program known as the \par ``CJCS Exercise Pr ogram";\par (2) at the Naval Strike and Air Warfare Center, the Ar my \par National Training Center, or the Air Force Air Warfare Center; \par or\par (3) as part of Naval Carrier Group fleet traini ng or Marine \par Corps Expeditionary Unit training.\par (d) Author ity for Exclusion of Systems Not Capable of Performing \par Reliably in Year 20 00 Simulation.--(1) In carrying out a Year 2000 \par simulation exercise, the S ecretary of Defense may exclude a particular \par information technology or nat ional security system from the year 2000 \par simulation phase of the exercise if the Secretary determines that the \par system would be incapable of performi ng reliably during the year 2000 \par simulation phase of the exercise. In such a case, the system excluded \par shall be replaced in accordance with the year 2000 contingency plan for \par the system.\par (2) If the Secretary of Def ense excludes an information technology \par or national security system from t he year 2000 simulation phase of an \par exercise as provided in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify \par Congress of that exclusion not later than two weeks before commencing \par that exercise. The notice shall include a list of each information \par technology or national security system excluded from the exercise, a \par description of how the exercise will use the year 2000 conting ency plan \par for each such system, and a description of the effect that conti

nued \par year 2000 noncompliance of each such system would have on military \p
ar readiness.\par (3) An information technology or national security system
with \par cryptological applications that is not capable of having its interna
l \par clock adjusted forward to a simulated later time is exempt from the \par
year 2000 simulation phase of an exercise under this section.\par (e) Defi
nitions.--For the purposes of this section:\par (1) The term ``info
rmation technology" has the meaning \par given that term in section 50
02 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of \par 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).\par
(2) The term ``national security system" has the meaning \par give
n that term in section 5142 of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1452).\par This Act may
be cited as the ``Department of Defense Appropriations \par Act, 1999".\par
Union Calendar No. 333\par \par
105th CONGRESS\par \par 2d Session\par \par H.
R. 4103\par \par [Report No. 105-591]\par \par _____
____\par \par
A BILL\par \par Making appropriations for the Dep
artment of Defense for the fiscal year \par ending September 30, 199
9, and for other purposes.\par \par ____
______________________________\par \par June 22, 199
8\par \par Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Un
ion \par and ordered to be printed\par \par }

================= END ATTACHMENT 2 =================

Union Calendar No. 333
105th CONGRESS
2d Session
H. R. 4103

[Report No. 105-591]

Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 22, 1998

Mr. Young of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

National Guard Personnel, Army

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $3,413,195,000.

National Guard Personnel, Air Force

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund; $1,372,997,000.

Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft); $2,570,315,000: Provided, That not later than March 15, 1999, the Director of the Army National Guard shall provide a report to the congressional defense committees identifying the allocation, by installation and activity, of all base operations funds appropriated under this heading: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $105,500,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard

For operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, including repair of facilities, maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law for the Air National Guard; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; $3,075,233,000.

Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, resulting from unfunded shortfalls in the repair and maintenance of real property of the Department of Defense (including military housing and barracks); $850,000,000, for the maintenance of real property of the Department of Defense (including minor construction and major maintenance and repair), which shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000, as follows:

Army, $219,688,000;
Navy, $244,507,000;
Marine Corps, $48,901,000;
Air Force, $194,926,000;
Army Reserve, $47,579,000;
Navy Reserve, $21,055,000;
Marine Corps Reserve, $7,600,000;
Air Force Reserve, $9,871,000;
Army National Guard, $37,535,000; and
Air National Guard, $18,338,000:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

National Guard and Reserve Equipment

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons, and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces; $120,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001: Provided, That the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective Reserve or National Guard component.

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense

(including transfer of funds)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for Operation and maintenance; for Procurement; and for Research, development, test and evaluation; $764,595,000: Provided, That the funds appropriated under this head shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, $37,013,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

General Provisions

Sec. 8004. No more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year: Provided, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Sec. 8023. A member of a reserve component whose unit or whose residence is located in a State which is not contiguous with another State is authorized to travel in a space required status on aircraft of the Armed Forces between home and place of inactive duty training, or place of duty in lieu of unit training assembly, when there is no road or railroad transportation (or combination of road and railroad transportation between those locations): Provided, That a member traveling in that status on a military aircraft pursuant to the authority provided in this section is not authorized to receive travel, transportation, or per diem allowances in connection with that travel.

Sec. 8025. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated or otherwise available for any Federal agency, the Congress, the judicial branch, or the District of Columbia may be used for the pay, allowances, and benefits of an employee as defined by section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, or an individual employed by the government of the District of Columbia, permanent or temporary indefinite, who--

(1) is a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces,

as described in section 10101 of title 10, United States Code, or the National Guard, as described in section 101 of title 32;

(2) performs, for the purpose of providing military aid to enforce the law or providing assistance to civil authorities in the protection or saving of life or property or prevention of injury--

(A) Federal service under sections 331, 332, 333, or 12406 of title 10, or other provision of law, as applicable; or

(B) full-time military service for his or her State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory of the United States; and

(3) requests and is granted--

(A) leave under the authority of this section; or

(B) annual leave, which may be granted without regard to the provisions of sections 5519 and 6323(b) of title 5, if such employee is otherwise entitled to such annual leave: Provided, That any employee who requests leave under subsection (3)(A) for service described in subsection (2) of this section is entitled to such leave, subject to the provisions of this section and of the last sentence of section 6323(b) of title 5, and such leave shall be considered leave under section 6323(b) of title 5.

Sec. 8041. During the current fiscal year, appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used to reimburse a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who is not otherwise entitled to travel and transportation allowances and who occupies transient government housing while performing active duty for training or inactive duty training: Provided, That such members may be provided lodging in kind if transient government quarters are unavailable as if the member was entitled to such allowances under subsection (a) of section 404 of title 37, United States Code: Provided further, That if lodging in kind is provided, any authorized service charge or cost of such lodging may be paid directly from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance of the reserve component of the member concerned.

Sec. 8057. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military (civilian) technicians of the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military (civilian) technicians, unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

Sec. 8059. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated in this Act are available to compensate members of the National Guard for duty performed pursuant to a plan submitted by a Governor of a State and approved by the Secretary of Defense under section 112 of title 32, United States Code: Provided, That during the performance of such duty, the members of the National Guard shall be under State command and control: Provided further, That such duty shall be treated as full-time National Guard duty for purposes of sections 12602(a)(2) and (b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

Sec. 8060. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Unified and Specified Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Unified Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP), the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP), and the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA) aggregate: Provided, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

Sec. 8083. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis. (b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

Sec. 8097. The Secretary of Defense shall undertake a review of all distributed learning education and training programs in the Department of Defense and shall issue a plan to implement a department-wide, standardized, cost-effective Advanced Distributed Learning framework to achieve the goals of commonality, interoperability, and reuse: Provided, That the Secretary shall report to Congress on the results of this review and present a detailed implementation and budget plan no later than July 30, 1999.

Sec. 8099. None of the funds in this or any other Act shall be available to any Reserve Component to establish new activities to perform depot level maintenance and remanufacture of any equipment in the Department of Defense inventory unless the Secretary of Defense first certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, on a case-by-case basis, that (a) insufficient workload capacity is available at existing government or private sector depot maintenance facilities currently used by the Reserve Components for similar work; and (b) an in-depth analysis has been performed comparing the cost of any proposed expansion of depot facilities versus the cost of performing the same work at existing depot facilities or by the private sector.