

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: [talking points] (2 pages)	10/26/1995	P1/b(1)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([Ireland and trip...])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/19/1995 - 11/03/1995]

2017-0759-F

ke5223

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 19 October 95 20:00

FROM Fetig, James L.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT BGlobe to See POTUS [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Schuker, Jill A.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Heads-up. McCurry has sent a schedule proposal for Jack Farrell to see the President prior to the Ireland trip. I have a wad of requests that have come in over the past weeks and months from press who want to interview the President prior to the UK/Ireland trip.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 24 October 95 08:46

FROM Peters, Mary A.

CLASSIFICATION ***** CLASSIFICATION NOT FOUND *****

SUBJECT New points on Trimble in Ireland guidance per Jim's request

TO Cullin, Brian P.
Fetig, James L.
Johnson, David T.
Naplan, Steven J.
Schuker, Jill A.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[OCT24GUI.DOC : 2128 in OCT24GUI.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 24 October 95 8:45

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** OCT24GUI.DOC
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

October 23, 1995

EUROPE
Bosnia/Croatia
Ireland
NATO Secretary General
NATO Enlargement
Turkey
Russia
CFE

MIDDLE EAST
Iraq Sanctions
Dole-Jerusalem Bill (to be provided later this afternoon prior to bill passage)
Algeria
Lebanon
Amman Economic Summit

ASIA
China

LATIN AMERICA

Cuba

AFRICA

Zambia

Nigeria

MISCELLANEOUS

South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone

Loose Nukes

UN Peacekeeping Personnel

Defense Appropriations

BOSNIA/CROATIA

Secretary Perry and Secretary Christopher seem to have backed away from the idea of a fixed 12-month time limit for the NATO-led implementation force that will implement a Bosnia settlement. What is U.S. policy?

ù Has been U.S. position that NATO-led operation to implement military aspects of Bosnia peace settlement should be of fixed duration. (This has also been accepted by our NATO allies in the concept of operations approved by NAC.)

ù We believe that we can accomplish the military aspects of the settlement in about one year.

ù However, we will not make a final decision about the duration until we see the final peace agreement and the completed NATO OPLAN for implementation.

ù The time limit of 12 months is being used as planning figure by NATO planners, but has not been formally adopted by the Alliance.

ù We also believe that one year will be sufficient time to establish a stable situation on the ground between Federation and Serb forces, which is one of the keys to the maintenance of peace following the departure of the implementation force.

ù We hope to create a stable balance through arms reductions, but this will also require some military support for Federation forces to ensure they have an effective self-defense capability.

What is your reaction to Yeltsin's statements that Russian force participating in the Bosnia implementation force (IFOR) will not accept NATO command, and that they should have a geographically separate zone? What is your reaction to French President Chirac's agreement to the Russian position?

ù We very much hope that, if we succeed in reaching a Bosnia peace settlement, Russia will participate in the international implementation force.

ù This would be consistent with the important role Russia has played in the diplomatic process, and would demonstrate the international community's broad support for the peace settlement.

ù In our view, the nature of the mission requires that NATO form the backbone of the implementation force, and that there must be a single chain of command and robust rules of engagement.

ù We also believe it would be preferable that NATO and Russian forces not be separated between Federation and Serb areas, but that they operate in more integrated fashion to demonstrate unity of effort and even-handedness toward the parties.

ù So we do have some differences that will need to be resolved with the Russians.

ù This will be a major topic of discussion with Yeltsin at Hyde Park. Hope to make

some progress in narrowing our differences, and prepared to be flexible in meeting Russian concerns.

ù But don't expect to resolve all issues today. Not operating under any artificial deadline.

ù (If pressed on Chirac:) French understand our position. They know that participation of U.S. forces in the implementation force will only be possible under NATO command, with no dual key. We wrote letter to Chirac to this effect last Friday

Diplomatic Track: Next Steps

ù Cease-fire remains in effect and fighting stopped throughout most of Bosnia.

ù Successful implementation of cease-fire should give further impetus to diplomatic efforts of our negotiators, with their Contact Group partners, for a political settlement.

ù Our negotiating team is in Washington completing preparations for proximity talks that will begin next Tuesday in Dayton, Ohio.

ù President will review preparations for peace talks with Russian President Yeltsin at Hyde Park, as well as Russia's role in the implementation.

ù President will meet in New York on Tuesday with Bosnian President Izetbegovic and Croatian President

Tudjman to encourage flexibility in the talks and underscore importance of strengthening cooperation within the Bosnian-Croat Federation.

(Additional background on proximity talks)

ù Proximity talks scheduled to begin October 31 at Wright-Patterson AFB in Dayton, Ohio.

ù Talks will be co-chaired by Holbrooke and EU negotiator Bildt. Each party will see

nd delegation able to make
prompt decisions and commitments.

ù Balkan parties will be represented by Presidents Izetbegovic, Tudjman, and
Milosev
ic.

ù Contact Group partners will participate along with the co-chairmen.

ù No set duration, but we hope to resolve all remaining issues in about two
weeks.

ù Proximity talks will be followed by a Paris peace conference. May be meetings
aft
er peace conference before
final settlement signed.

ù Also will be conference in London on implementation at some point after the
proxim
ity talks.

Peace Plan Implementation

ù NAC has approved a concept of operations for implementing settlement in B/H.

ù Based on this approval, detailed planning by NATO Military Authorities will
procee
d.

ù SACEUR General Joulwan briefed the President and his national security team
last w
eek on the state of
NATO'S plans.

ù Number of forces for operation not determined - will depend on peace
agreement mod
alities.

ù NATO briefed UN, UN Peace Force contributors, and interested PFP countries
this la
st week, underscored
that contributions by non-NATO countries would be welcome.

ù Russian Ambassador Churkin also attended "16-plus-one" meeting with NAC
last week
to discuss NATO's

implementation planning.

ù The concept of operations is broken down into 5 phases:

- Phase I: Preparation Phase. We are presently in this phase now.
- Phase II: Entry. Begin at signing of peace agreement. Military forces would deploy to area by sea and land.
- Phase III: Implementation. Deployment of forces in country to secure critical areas and man outposts.
- Phase IV: Transition to Peace. Initial robust forces would slowly drawdown over a year as peace agreement took affect.
- Phase V: Exit. Orderly hand over of commitments to appropriate civilian organizations and the withdrawal of IFOR and equipment.

(If asked whether we will seek Congressional authorization for U.S. participation in IFOR)

ù Last week, in letter to Senator Byrd, President said he would request that Congress pass a resolution expressing its approval for U.S. participation.

ù Our position regarding the President's constitutional prerogatives has not changed

(If asked whether we will pursue War Criminals)

ù IFOR mission is to implement the peace agreement.

ù Pursuing war criminals not part of the mission, but will take them into custody if we come into contact with them.

Military Stabilization

ù Our goal to establish stability on ground by time IFOR completes mission. This will be one of the keys to ensuring settlement does not break down after IFOR leaves.

ù Preference to establish balance of forces between Federation and Bosnian Serbs through arms control measures that provide for a "build-down."

ù Arms control by itself unlikely to achieve stable balance, so we are prepared to equip/train Federation forces to ensure they have effective self-defense capability.

ù Effort separate from NATO-led implementation force. First step: lifting of arms embargo.

New Ethnic Cleansing/Reports of Mass Graves

ù Very disturbed by recent reports of renewed campaign of ethnic cleansing by Bosnian Serbs. We condemn detention of massive numbers of non-Serbs in Banja Luka.

ù Concerned by mass graves in formerly Serb-held areas of western Bosnia.

ù Disappearance of large numbers of draft-aged men and establishment of concentration-camp conditions are repugnant and must cease immediately.

ù U.S. charge in Belgrade told Milosevic and high-level Serbian officials of indignation, demand Belgrade government do everything to halt these activities immediately, and demand Bosnian Serb respect for international humanitarian laws and Fourth Geneva Convention.

ù President, in speech on October 15, said we fully support International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in investigation of war crimes.

ù We actively support international organizations such like UNHCR and Red Cross in attempts to document fate and whereabouts of missing persons.

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND

General Points on peace plan implementation

ù Many issues remain to be resolved in negotiations. We have accelerated internal preparations for implementation of possible peace settlement.

ù American leadership critical to achievement of peace settlement and ensuring agreement is implemented successfully so conflict is ended for good.

ù Implementation's many aspects: 1) military implementation force (IFOR) to maintain cease-fire and ensure forces withdrawal by agreement requirements; 2) civilian efforts to safeguard human rights, assist in refugee return, 3) help establish political institutions and deliver humanitarian aid; and 4) regional economic reconstruction program.

ù Range of organizations involved in non-military aspects - the UN and its agencies, the OSCE, the European Union, and International Financial Institutions.

ù Believe military implementation mission must be NATO-led, single chain of command with robust rules of engagement. Strong/decisive NATO ground presence at early stage provides best deterrent.

ù Our position: implementation force deployed only if settlement accepted by parties. We will not impose peace.

ù Even after settlement, will be tensions among parties/possible violations by local elements.

ù NATO-led force must have Chapter VII mandate and robust rules of engagement to ensure settlement terms upheld, and provide capability for force self-defense.

ù IFOR likely include forces from non-NATO countries, connected to NATO command structure by liaison arrangements still being developed. Hope Russia and other PFP members will join IFOR.

ù Earlier this month, Secretary Perry discussed with Grachev approaches for Russian contribution to IFOR.

ù Deputy Secretary Talbott led an interagency delegation last week for follow-up talks with Grachev, Kozyrev and other senior foreign and defense ministry officials.

ù Some areas of common ground emerged, but important differences remain in command-and-control arrangements.

ù Russia has sent military team to SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe) to participate in peace implementation force planning.

ù NATO planners developing detailed OPLAN, built on previous planning for earlier peace plans and UNPROFOR withdrawal.

ù Until planning completed, and clearer sense of provisions of peace settlement, premature to speculate on size of overall force or U.S. contribution.

President stands by commitment (1993): contribute substantial number of U.S. ground forces to NATO-led force for implementation of peace settlement, in consultation with the Congress. (I pressed: Total number likely to be in the 60,000 range cited by Secretary Perry, including supporting forces as well as ground forces deployed to Bosnia.)

ù Too soon to predict what will be cost of U.S. contribution or length of the operation.

ù We intend to consult with Congress as NATO planning and our own thinking - evolve.

ù President met with Congressional leaders September 29 to discuss U.S. negotiating strategy for implementation of settlement. Secretary Christopher, Secretary Perry and Chairman Shalikashvili held detailed briefings for Congress last week.

Terms of the cease-fire

ù Cease-fire will last 60 days from October 12, or until completion of Proximity Peace Talks and Peace Conference, whichever is later.

ù Parties committed to ensure all military commanders issue and compel compliance with clear orders precluding all offensive operations, patrol and reconnaissance activities forward of friendly positions, all offensive weapon' firing including sniper fire, laying of additional mines, and creation of additional barriers and obstacles.

ù All parties ensure all civilians and prisoners treated humanely and all POWs exchanged.

ù Parties will cooperate with cease-fire monitoring activities of UNPROFOR.

ù All parties will provide free passage and unimpeded road access between Sarajevo and Gorazde along two primary routes for all non-military and UNPROFOR traffic.

September 26 New York Meeting

ù September 26 's New York meeting of Foreign Ministers of Bosnia, Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia produced important step for peace settlement in Bosnia.

ù Set of "further agreed basic principles" for settlement : three Foreign Ministers

spelled out in greater detail
constitutional structures of Bosnia: establishment of national parliament,
Presidenc
y & Constitutional Court.
New document builds on September 8 agreement in Geneva.

ù New document: they committed to holding free democratic elections under
internatio
nal supervision.

ù Parties agreed that central government has responsibility for conduct of foreign
p
olicy of Bosnia after
settlement. Still negotiating on other functions of central institutions --e.g. for
eign trade, monetary policy,
crime enforcement, etc.

September 8 Geneva Meeting

ù Three foreign ministers agreed to basic principles for further negotiations
toward
final settlement.

-- First time, all agreed Bosnia-Herzegovina continue as single state, with present
borders, and
continuing international recognition.

-- Consistent with Contact Group plan, all three agreed under the terms of a
settlem
ent,

Bosnia-Herzegovina will consist of two entities: the Federation established under
l
ast year's Washington
Agreements, and Bosnian Serb republic.

-- 51-49 parameter of Contact Group's territorial proposal basis for settlement,
sub
ject to
adjustments parties make by mutual agreement.

-- Two entities have right to establish relationships with neighboring states, but t
hese must be
consistent with Bosnia's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

-- Parties pledged to adhere to human rights standards, to ensure freedom of
movemen
t and right
of displaced to return to their homes, and collaborate on joint economic projects

to
promote links among all
Bosnia's peoples.

ù Agreements further testament to international community's resolve and
persistent d
iplomacy by our team,
supported by our Contact Group partners.

ù President said we strongly oppose the partition of Bosnia.

ù Geneva & New York agreements: B/H remains single state, retaining seat in
internat
ional organizations and
bilateral diplomatic relations with other countries in world, including U.S.

IRELAND

U.S. Role

ù We are committed to working with the two governments and the parties to help
in th
e search for peace.

ù Thankful there has been a year in which the guns and bombs are silent.

ù First time in a generation there is real hope for a lasting peace and a more prosp
erous future. People of
Belfast are finally living a normal life.

ù One can literally say that there are individuals walking the streets in Belfast al
ive today who would not be
had we not gotten involved. American engagement has been an essential
ingredient in
the search for
peace.

U.S. Meetings

ù We have had a number of contacts over the last several weeks about how to
move th
e peace process
forward.

ù Sinn Fein President Gerry Adams recently met with National Security Advisor

Anthon
y Lake. The Vice
President joined them for part of the meeting.

ù The Vice President and Mr. Lake met with UK Minister of State for Northern
Ireland
Michael Ancram.

ù On September 29, the President saw Irish Deputy Prime Minister, Dick Spring,
who w
as at the White
House for a meeting with the Vice President.

ù The Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Nancy
Soderbe
rg, recently conducted
a round of consultations with all parties in Ireland and the UK.

ù The National Security Advisor, Anthony Lake, held consultations in London
with the
British Government
on Bosnia, Northern Ireland and other issues October 16-19. While there, he also
me
t Northern Ireland
political leaders, David Trimble of the UUP and John Hume of the SDLP..

ù We are hopeful a way can be found to move things forward. Contacts with all
the p
arties are continuing.
We are not prepared to go into any detail.

NSA Lake's Trip to London

ù NSA Lake was in London week October 16-19. He was there for consultations
with th
e British
Government on Bosnia, Northern Ireland, the President's trip, and other issues.
Whi
le there, he also met
with Northern Ireland political leaders.

ù If asked: Mr. Lake was accompanied by Deputy NSA Nancy Soderberg and
Director for
European
Affairs Mary Ann Peters.

Twin Track

ù We see a basis for progress in the "twin-track" proposal to begin inclusive talks between the British and Irish Governments and the Northern Ireland political parties and to establish an international body to address the issue of decommissioning the paramilitaries' weapons.

ù We will continue to encourage all sides to be flexible and find a way to move the process forward.

British Stalling on Talks?

ù As we have said, we hope that momentum will have been restored to the process by the time the President visits Northern Ireland at the end of November.

ù We believe Prime Minister Major is committed to achieving a lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

Position on Decommissioning:

ù On decommissioning of weapons, we have said that parties observing the cease-fire "must take the next step and begin to discuss serious decommissioning." We have made clear to Sinn Féin and loyalists that we expect movement on this issue.

Senator Mitchell to Chair Commission on Decommissioning?:

ù The two governments and parties are discussing the proposal. Have not yet made a decision.

ù It's premature to discuss any U.S. Government or private citizen role until there is a formal decision.

Comments of new UUP leader Trimble on twin track?

-- Trimble's speech of October 21 represented no change in the unionist position of opposition to the twin track approach.

-- Our view is that twin track strategy of the British and Irish Governments offers the best prospect for moving the peace process forward.

-- Looking forward to working with Mr. Trimble as we have with the Unionists over the past year.

-- Looking forward to Mr. Trimble's visit to Washington next week.

If asked:

-- Details of Trimble's schedule not yet finalized.

Deportations [Irish groups mounting a campaign against deportation of former IRA members, some who are married to U.S. citizens and/or have U.S. children. U.S. law provides no flexibility in prohibiting permanent residency to those linked to terrorism. We are looking into possible legislative waivers.]

ù Issue recently brought to our attention.

ù Law provides no flexibility on many cases.

ù Staff reviewing issue.

NATO SECRETARY GENERAL

Claes Resignation

Q: Was Claes pressured into resigning?

-- No. Secretary General Claes came to this decision on his own.

Q: Do you have any comment on the charges against Claes?

-- It would be inappropriate to comment on an ongoing Belgian judicial proceeding.

Q: Does the Claes resignation hurt the Alliance?

-- We believe NATO is in excellent health. It has played a key role in our efforts to end the bloodshed and achieve peace in Bosnia as well as in reaching out to the new democracies in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union.

-- Secretary General Claes played an important role in providing strong leadership during these events. But he would be the first to tell you that NATO's true strength lies in the commitment of its 16 member nations to work together as Allies to ensure their mutual security.

-- This commitment remains as strong as ever, as has been demonstrated in recent months in Bosnia and will continue to be demonstrated in the months and years to come.

Q: Any news on a successor? Several names have been mentioned. How long will the process take?

-- No decisions have been taken on a possible successor.

-- We and our Allies will be actively discussing the subject in the coming days, but we do not want to speculate on how long the process might take.

-- In the meantime, Deputy Secretary General Balanzino will be Acting Secretary General.

NATO ENLARGEMENT STUDY AND RUSSIA

Reaction to NATO enlargement study?

-- We welcome NATO approval on September 20 of its landmark study on enlarging the Alliance.

-- The study, which sets out the "how" and "why" of enlargement, was presented on Thursday (September 28) in Brussels to members of the Partnership for Peace (composed of CEE and NIS countries, including Russia). The general reaction was highly favorable.

-- Individual presentations will also be made to members who request them. NATO will assess

the presentations and decide on next steps at its December 5 ministerial meeting in Brussels.

-- The study was commissioned by NATO Foreign Ministers meeting at NATO headquarters in December 1994.

-- The study is part of a gradual, deliberate process leading to the enlargement of the Alliance.

-- Our goal is to extend the security and stability represented by NATO into the new democracies that have arisen in Europe in the wake of the end of the Cold War.

-- By integrating them into NATO we hope to ensure the survival of their democratic and market economic reforms.

-- No decisions have yet been taken on whom to invite. Nor is there any timetable for when this will occur. Enlargement will only occur when NATO is satisfied that prospective members can contribute to the overall security of the Alliance.

-- The "how" part of the study sets out a number of steps that interested potential members must take in order to be considered for membership. These include political and military steps that contribute to the democratic goals and overall security of the Alliance.

-- We should stress that no Partnership for Peace members are a priori excluded from the possibility of becoming NATO members.

Russian Reaction to NATO Enlargement

-- In addition to enlargement, NATO is also pursuing establishment of a parallel relationship with Russia. This is being done in recognition of the important role Russia has to play in European security.

-- We are aware that Russia has concerns about NATO enlargement. Russian Ambassador

Churkin repeated these concerns following the enlargement briefing in Brussels on Thursday (September 28). We will continue working to overcome these concerns, which we believe are misplaced.

-- NATO enlargement is not aimed at Russia. NATO is a purely defensive organization. Our goal is to extend stability to areas of historic instability to ensure their future security.

-- Our purpose is to end the division of Europe, not to create new divisions.

-- At the same time, we have made clear to Moscow that enlargement will proceed in a gradual and transparent manner.

-- We strongly disagree with those who believe NATO should enlarge immediately just because Russia has concerns about enlargement.

-- Enlargement must be a deliberate process that takes into account our interests as well as those of our European partners and Allies.

NATO Adopts Go-Slow Approach on Enlargement

Can you comment on press reports from Williamsburg that NATO has adopted a go-slow approach to enlargement due to concerns over Russia? Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev even welcomed the reports.

-- As Secretary Perry has made clear, this is a false report. NATO has not adopted a go-slow

approach to enlargement but is pursuing the "gradual, deliberate and transparent process" leading to enlargement that was foreseen by the Alliance from the very beginning.

- There has been no acceleration or deceleration to the process.
- NATO's approach to enlargement is spelled out clearly in the NATO enlargement study which was approved by NATO on September 20 and presented to members of the Partnership for Peace in Brussels on September 28.
- No timetable exists at present, but NATO is committed to moving ahead. NATO expansion is not a question of "if"; that issue has already been resolved.

TURKEY

NYT Editorial on Arms Sales to Turkey

Q: Any comment on the NYT editorial on Tuesday (October 17) calling for the U.S. to halt arms sales to Turkey because of human rights abuses.

- We strongly disagree with the conclusions in the New York Times article.
- Turkey is a close NATO ally located in an extremely important and dangerous part of the world. The U.S. looks to Turkey for support for Operation Provide Comfort in northern Iraq and as a secular bulwark against the rising tide of Islamic fundamentalism in the region.
- For more than ten years, Turkey has been fighting against a ruthless Kurdish terrorist group, the PKK, in the southeastern part of the country.
- While Turkey clearly needs to work on improving its human rights record, we do not believe that cutting off financial assistance or halting military sales is the answer.
- Any such moves would be likely to have the opposite effect from the one intended

and could
seriously damage U.S. security interests in the region.

-- We support the ongoing efforts of Prime Minister Ciller to implement her
democrat
ization
program, which would address many of the concerns raised in the NYT editorial.

Turkish No-Confidence Vote and Demirel Postponement

Q: Any comment on Demirel's cancellation of his trip to Washington?

-- President Demirel postponed his working visit to Washington and his call on
Pres
ident Clinton
scheduled for October 18.

-- He had to remain in Ankara to perform his constitutional duties in the wake of t
he no
confidence vote against the Ciller government on Sunday (October 15) in the
Turkish
parliament.

-- Turkey and the United States have important business to conduct, and
President De
mirel
remains most welcome here at a mutually convenient future date.

-- (If asked) No date has yet been set.

Q: What is your comment on the defeat of Turkish PM Ciller in the vote of no-
confide
nce?

-- We are following developments with great interest.

-- President Demirel has subsequently asked Prime Minister Ciller to try to form
a n
ew
government. That process is now underway. It would be inappropriate to
speculate o
n the outcome.

Marcus Case

Q: Any comment on the Turkish court action October
12 on the case of Amcit Reuters reporter Aliza (a-LEE-za) Marcus?

- We are following this case very closely. Ms. Marcus is charged with "inciting racial enmity" in an article published under her by -line which was published in a Turkish newspaper.
- The article contained allegations that Turkish military authorities forcibly evacuated villages in southeastern Turkey to deny access to them by terrorist PKK forces.
- Her case came to trial in Istanbul on Thursday (October 12), but the court continued the case until November 9 after hearing arguments.
- We have expressed our deep concern over this case to the Turkish government and urged that the charges against Ms. Marcus be dropped.
- We will continue to work with Turkish authorities for a successful resolution to this case.

RUSSIA/NIS

Current Items

Kozyrev to be Replaced?

- Have seen same reports you have, including Yeltsin's remark that Kozyrev will stay on but needs strong deputy.
- Believe Russia, Yeltsin remain committed to engagement with West. For our part, remain committed to engagement with Russia; meeting at Hyde Park is indicative of that commitment.

Hyde Park Meeting

-- Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin holding working meeting at Hyde Park, New York today. Will review range of bilateral and other international issues.

Reaction to Decision to Use Multiple Routes for Exporting Caspian Oil

-- Welcome decision by Azerbaijan International Oil Company (AIOC) to develop multiple export routes from Caspian for transport of early oil extracted by AIOC.

-- Believe multiple routes will enhance AIOC's ability to export oil to Western and traditional markets by promoting competitive business practices in oil transport, increasing export capacity, and encouraging increased oil production.

-- All countries in region benefit from decision. Expect it to foster greater cooperation among countries in region, improving prospects for development and stability.

AIOC Decision a Loss for Russia?

-- Not at all. See this as win-win situation. Considerable early oil will be transported from Caspian through Russia. And multiple routes could increase Russia's own capacity to develop and export Russian oil.

General Items

U.S. Stake in Relationship

-- U.S. has vital stake in engaging Russia and supporting political, economic reform there. It matters greatly to us if Russia, other NIS are dictatorships or democracies, centrally planned or market-oriented economies.

-- Long-term strategy. Transformation underway will be complex, protracted. Struggle going on between those who support reform and those who oppose or fear change.

-- Engagement producing important successes: reducing nuclear threat, over 50% of Russian GDP now from private sector, no Russian troops in Central Europe or Baltics.

Cuts in/Conditions on Bilateral Aid

-- Have differences with Russians on important areas. Working hard to resolve these

-- But our assistance advances critical U.S. interests. It helps reformers succeed in building a democracy and a market economy, and it helps reduce nuclear threat to U.S. Not our interest to cut this assistance.

Russian Concerns about NATO Enlargement

-- Understand Russia has concerns about NATO enlargement process in deliberate, transparent manner that threatens no country and strengthens security and stability of Europe as a whole.

-- Russia a key player in building stable, undivided Europe. Our goal is to develop NATO-Russia

relationship in parallel with NATO's process of taking in new members. Robust NATO-Russia relationship in interests of U.S., Europe and Russia.

Iran Reactor Sale

-- President has discussed Bushehr reactor sale with Yeltsin. Vice President and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin have begun serious dialogue that is continuing.

-- Have made clear and continue to stress our opposition to any nuclear cooperation with Iran, given Tehran's ambitions to acquire nuclear weapons capability.

Chechnya

-- Have seen reports that Russians will resume peace negotiations October 24. Talks were suspended over recent Chechen attacks, including attempt to assassinate Russian force commander in Grozny. Condemn attacks like that, whose purpose is to undermine the fragile effort to find negotiated settlement.

-- Dispute in Chechnya can only be resolved by negotiated settlement. Urge sides to work together to implement military agreement and to find political solution.

CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE (CFE) TREATY

ù The United States and our NATO Allies have for some time been looking at ways to address Russian and Ukrainian concerns about the Treaty's "flank" limits.

ù Last [] month NATO presented a proposal to Russia in Brussels for a new approach to resolving this issue. Russia has reacted cautiously and will study the offer further.

ù The strategic picture has changed dramatically since the Treaty was signed in 1990. Neither the Warsaw Pact nor the Soviet Union exist. Forces once deployed by the USSR as far west as Eastern Germany have withdrawn to Russia. We are looking at ways to respond to those changes, while maintaining the key elements of the Treaty.

ù NATO has developed this proposal as it prepares for the CFE Review Conference, established by the Treaty for May, 1996. Our goal is to preserve the viability of the Treaty, which re

mains a cornerstone
of European security.

ù The "flank" issue does not concern the overall equipment limit for Russia and
Ukra
ine, but the restrictions
which the Treaty places on the amount of equipment permitted in certain regions.
Ru
ssia and Ukraine have
participated fully in the Treaty's implementation over the past three years, destroy
ing thousands of pieces
of Treaty-limited equipment and submitting to hundreds of inspections under the
term
s of the Treaty.

ù We and our Allies continue to reject completely the Russian idea of an
"exclusion
zone" in its Caucasus
region. There is no basis for such an "exclusion zone" in the Treaty.

ù Any solution must be acceptable to all Treaty parties. The forum for negotiation
will be the CFE Joint
Consultative Group in Vienna.

(If asked about statement by Senator Helms staff that Treaty changes are not
likely
to be approved "anytime
soon":)

ù Any agreement along the lines of the NATO proposal would require the
approval of C
ongress.

IRAQ SANCTIONS

Background: On October 17, President Zayid of the UAE called for the lifting of
UN
sanctions on Iraq. His
remarks were quickly echoed by the Secretary General of the Arab League and
the Qata
ri government.

Q: What is your reaction to recent demands from certain Arab leaders for the
lifting
of sanctions
on Iraq?

A: We remain strongly opposed to any modification of the current sanctions against Iraq until it is in full compliance with all United Nations Security Council resolutions.

With regard to the humanitarian problems in Iraq, we are convinced that these are problems created by the Iraqi regime, and not by the sanctions.

The United Nations has made provisions by which Iraq could sell oil to buy food and medicine for its population, but the regime has refused to exercise this option.

The Iraqi regime has purposely refrained from providing its population with the food and medicine they need to try to score propaganda points.

DOLE-JERUSALEM BILL

(To be Provided)

ALGERIA

Q: Any reaction to the upcoming Algerian presidential elections?

A: We have made clear our belief that Algeria's crisis can only be resolved through political dialogue between all elements who disavow violence and terror.

We hope that political developments, including elections, take place in a manner which

ich
contribute to this process of national reconciliation.

LEBANON

Violence in Southern Lebanon

Q: What is your reaction to the attack on Israeli forces in southern Lebanon?

A: We grieve with the Israeli people for the loss of life in this attack.

We urge an end to constant violence in southern Lebanon.

Q: Who is responsible for the attack?

A: We understand that the Iranian-backed Hizballah has taken responsibility for the attack.

This group has made it clear that it opposes the peace process.

Q: Isn't Syria behind Hizballah? How can we continue to include Syria in the peace process when they abet terrorists?

A: Hizballah is an Iranian-backed group. Syria does not control Hizballah.

However, because of the presence of large Syrian military forces in areas in which Hizballah operates, Syria does have the ability to influence its behavior.

We would urge Syria to use this influence to end Hizballah's employment of violence, and thereby increase the prospects for peace.

Q: What is the US position on the Israeli security zone in southern Lebanon?

A: It has long been U.S. policy to support a sovereign Lebanon, from all foreign forces.

Arrangements must be agreed upon which ensure the security of Israel's northern border.

We believe the best way to achieve these goals is through the peace process, in which negotiations between Israel and Lebanon would resolve these issues.

Lebanese Presidential Elections

Q: What is the US position on the extension of Lebanese President Hrawi's term of office?

A: This issue is best left to the Lebanese to decide.

Q: Did the Lebanese make the decision?

A: I'm not going to get into an analysis of internal Lebanese politics.

AMMAN ECONOMIC SUMMIT

Q: What is the significance of the Amman Economic Summit

A: The Summit is expected to greatly contribute to the economic integration of the region through the development of cross-national economic ties, and regional projects.

Economic prosperity will be an important aspect of peace in the Middle East and North Africa.

By facilitating this prosperity, the Summit will lay the economic foundations for a lasting peace.

Q: Where does the Middle East Development Bank (MEDB) stand? Are the Europeans opposed to the creation of the MEDB

A: The President strongly supports the creation of a soundly structured regional bank.

There is wide support for the MEDB from regional states and from key potential

ributors
such as Japan and members of the EU. Details remain to be worked out on some
issues
regarding the
Bank's structure and operations.

CHINA

Three Gorges

Background: An article in Friday's WSJ notes that an IWG has recommended to
Ex-Im B
ank that the Chinese
Three Gorges Dam project not be financed. The article extensively and accurately
qu
otes a memo signed by
Sandy Berger.

Points

-- NSC concluded that the USG should not offer commercial assistance to the
Three Go
rges
project because of environmental and human rights concerns related to the
project.

-- We have opposed projects with similar concerns at the World Bank and believe
our
policy
should be consistent in this case.

-- We believe any effort to provide commercial assistance would be taken to
court fo
r a
protracted period anyway.

-- We have significant concerns about the project's financial feasibility. We belie
ve that official
Chinese government estimates of cost may be far too low.

-- The decision is not binding on the Ex-Im Bank. The board will consider our
concl
usions and
base its decisions on the statutory requirements for financial, technical,
environme

ntal soundness.

-- The NSC conclusion does not preclude U.S. companies from doing business at Three Gorges.
It only extends to the role of the USG in the project.

CUBA

HELMS BILL

Background

Helms' Cuba bill passed by a vote of 74-24 after Title III, its most controversial provision -- which would have opened our courts to lawsuits against anyone dealing with expropriated property in Cuba -- was withdrawn. The Administration still has some problems with the bill, but the decision to remove Title III is a step in the right direction.

Points

-- From the outset of the debate on the Helms/Burton bills, we made clear the Administration was determined to work with Congress so that the legislation on which our Cuba policy is based could continue to enjoy wide bipartisan support.

-- The action on the floor of the Senate will help to advance this goal. We look forward to cooperation with the Congress to address those aspects of the legislation that still concern us.

-- The objective of Administration policy remains to promote a peaceful democratic transition in Cuba through an effective economic embargo and effective support for the Cuban people.

CASTRO VISA APPLICATION

Background: President Castro was granted a visa to come to the U.S. as head of the Cuban delegation to the special session of the UNGA to commemorate the UN's 50th anniversary.

Points

- ù President Castro applied for a visa on October 9 to attend the special session of the UNGA.

- ù After careful consideration of his application in light of the United States' obligations under the United Nations headquarters agreement and in accordance with U.S. law, the State Department has decided to grant President Castro a visa.

- ù Castro himself applied for and received visas in 1960 and 1979 to attend sessions of the General Assembly in New York.

CUBAN DEMOCRACY ACT

- The President decided to take a series of steps to invigorate the Cuban Democracy Act's (CDA) goal of promoting a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba.

- These steps are consistent with the spirit and the letter of the CDA and implement precisely what it calls for: Use the embargo effectively to put pressure on the Castro government and help those people and forces in Cuba that are struggling for democratic change.

- Nothing in these decisions reflects a weakening of our commitment to the embargo.

On the

contrary: Every element of the embargo remains in place and the means to enforce it will be strengthened.

At the same time, this Administration will reenergize its efforts to reach out to the Cuban people through the free flow of ideas and information and by strengthening the island's fledgling civil society.

ENFORCING THE EMBARGO

-- The President has directed that the office in charge of enforcing the embargo, the Office of Foreign Assets Control be significantly beefed up, both here and in Miami.

-- The Attorney General is also reviewing how best to enforce the provisions of the embargo.

-- If we are serious about going after those who violate the embargo, then we ought to make sure that we have rules that can be complied with. Today, many Cuban-Americans circumvent the travel rules and go to Cuba without a license. They do not do it to flout the law or because they do not believe in the embargo. They do it because of the time it takes to get the license and because in many instances time is of the essence. Therefore, the President has decided to provide a general license for Cuban-Americans to make an annual visit to Cuba for humanitarian reasons. This will help those who really need to travel on an urgent basis. It will cut down on violations of the embargo. And it will make enforcement of the law fairer and easier.

REACHING OUT TO THE CUBAN PEOPLE

-- We share the CDA's commitment to promote democracy in Cuba through the power of ideas and by reaching out to the Cuban people.

-- Our other decisions are designed to strengthen those on the island who can be agents of change: Human rights activists, dissidents, independent organizations.

-- First, the President has authorized the establishment of reciprocal news bureaus in Cuba and the U.S. Of course, we will not approve Cuban bureaus until a full range of US news bureaus are established in Cuba.

entry to Cuba. This decision will significantly increase the flow of news to and from Cuba, thereby helping the Cuban people escape their state's monopoly over information.

-- Second, we will allow U.S. NGOs to help their counterparts in Cuba in a variety of ways.

-- US NGOs will be authorized to provide support to human rights organizations and other NGOs in Cuba.

-- The USG will be providing a grant to Freedom House to work with Cuban NGOs to advance the cause of democracy.

-- We will allow the sale and donation of communications equipment -- such as fax machines, copiers, computers, etc. -- to Cuban NGOs who promote democratic values and respect for human rights.

-- Third, travel regulations will be amended to clarify who can and cannot go to Cuba.
a. Under these new regulations, transactions to finance tourist travel to Cuba remain prohibited. Like other elements of the embargo, this ban will be more strictly enforced than before. At the same time, the rules will make clear that travel for scientific, news-gathering, educational, cultural, religious purposes, or for the purpose of helping independent activities on the island, is permitted.

WESTERN UNION

-- Finally, the President has decided to authorize Western Union to set up offices here and in Cuba to send wire transfers more simply and at a lower cost to those who need to pay emigration fees or for family emergencies. The rules on remittances remain the same -- Western Union simply

y will make
transfers easier and cheaper.

ZAMBIA: FORMER PRESIDENT KAUNDA

(IF ASKED)

Q: Has the Government of Zambia arrested former president Kenneth Kaunda?

A: No. On the evening of October 17, government-run television announced that Kaunda had been asked to report to the police. This sparked minor rock-throwing disturbances in downtown and suburban areas of Lusaka, including near the University of Zambia, during the morning and afternoon of October 18.

These disturbances ended by the evening of October 18, and at mid-day on October 19, the government announced that the police had been instructed not to detain or arrest Kaunda.

Q: What is the security situation in Lusaka now?

A: The situation in Lusaka has now returned to normal. There have been no reports of disturbances elsewhere in Zambia.

In response to the disturbances on October 18, the U.S. Embassy in Lusaka issued an advisory for U.S. citizens to exercise caution and limit movements in and around Lusaka.

Q: Why did the police summon Kaunda?

A: This is not clear. There have been reports that police wished to question Kaunda with respect to violence in recent parliamentary by-elections; moreover, in recent days, government spokesmen have

publicly questioned Kaunda's Zambian citizenship, leading to speculation that he could be deported.

Q: What is the U.S. Government's attitude?

A: As the 1996 Presidential elections approach, the U.S. appeals to all parties to respect the democratic process, the constitutional rights of citizens, and to take steps to ensure that the election campaign is orderly, free and completely fair.

NIGERIA

Background: Nigeria announced on Tuesday, October 10, long prison sentences for those Nigerian military officers and civilians accused of coup-plotting including four life sentences, 15 years for former President Olusegun Obasanjo and human rights activist Beko Ransome-Kuti and 25 years for General Shehu Musa Yar'Adua. The Nigerian military regime has also moved several alleged coup plotters from Lagos to an ill-equipped and sub-standard prison in the northeastern part of the country.

Q: What is your reaction to Nigeria's decision to impose long sentences on former President Obasanjo and others?

A: The United States strongly condemns the long prison sentences imposed on those Nigerian military officers and civilians accused of coup-plotting including four life sentences, the 15 year terms dealt former President Obasanjo and human rights activist Beko Ransome-Kuti and the 25 year term imposed on General Yar'Adua. Their trials were conducted secretly, and the United States is aware of

no evidence to substantiate the charges.

Since the arrests began last March, the United States, the international community and a broad spectrum of Nigerians have consistently deplored the secret process that has resulted in the denial of due process and application of harsh sentences.

We also remain concerned about reports of maltreatment and the failure to afford regular medical treatment to those detained.

The United States reiterates its call upon the Nigerian Government to speed the transition to democracy starting by the release all political detainees immediately and unconditionally.

Q. What is your reaction to reports that several alleged coup plotters were moved from Lagos to substandard prisons.

A. The United States is deeply concerned about reports that the Nigerian military regime has moved several alleged coup plotters from Lagos to an ill-equipped and substandard prison in northeastern part of the country.

-- We remain concerned about reports of maltreatment and the failure to afford regular medical treatment to those detained.

Q: Will the United States impose additional sanctions?

A: The United States will keep all measures under review as it looks for progress in Nigeria's transition to democracy.

-- The United States reiterates its call upon the Nigerian Government to speed the transition to

democracy, starting by releasing political detainees.

SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR FREE ZONE

If asked about the October 20 U.S./UK/France announcement concerning signature of the Protocols to the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone:

ù Today, the United States, France and the United Kingdom jointly announced their intention to sign the relevant protocols of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty in the first half of 1996.

ù This Treaty, also known as the Treaty of Rarotonga, creates a nuclear free zone in the South Pacific.

ù The announcement today reflects a number of positive developments that have occurred recently, such as the extension of the NPT indefinitely and without condition and progress on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

ù I believe we can provide you with the text of the joint declaration and a fact sheet with more details.

[If asked: When will the United States sign the protocols to the Treaty? Will the United States wait until France completes its testing in the South Pacific before signing the protocols? Will the U.S., UK and France jointly sign the protocols?]

ù The U.S. will sign the protocols in the first half of 1996. Since we still have some work to do within the USG before we are in a position to sign the protocols, we have not yet decided on a specific date for signature.

ù I expect we will continue our close consultations with the British and French on this issue.

[If asked: How does this decision affect the U.S. position on the resumption of

nuc
lear weapons testing by France
and China?]

ù Our position on the resumption of nuclear testing by these countries is a matter
o
f record and has not
changed.

LOOSE NUKES

Concerning the beryllium case in Lithuania:

ù There was a case in Lithuania in 1993 involving the seizure of beryllium. The
Lit
huanian government alerted
us to this case and we cooperated with them fully.

ù For particulars, I would refer you to Lithuanian legal authorities.

(If asked/needed:)

ù In 1993, approximately four tons of scrap beryllium was stolen in Lithuanian.

ù While the material had been legally exported from Russia, it was later
discovered
that the approximately 8,000
pounds of beryllium was combined with less than 1/25 of an ounce of enriched
uranium

On the (possible) claim that senior Russian officials have been involved in
nuclear
smuggling:

ù We have no credible evidence of this.

On the Frequency of Nuclear Smuggling & the U.S. Response:

ù The vast majority of reported nuclear smuggling cases have been simple scams
or ha
ve involved material not
suitable for weapons use.

ù We cannot corroborate the other allegations in the 60 Minutes report.

ù The prevention of nuclear smuggling and the security of nuclear materials are top national security priorities. Last month, President Clinton strengthened our already robust efforts in this area with a Presidential Decision Directive which set out specific goals, objectives and priorities for each Department and Agency of the U.S. government.

ù Despite the fact that the vast majority of suspected cases of nuclear smuggling turn out to be scams, we take all reports seriously. The Department of State chairs an interagency response group which reviews every report and takes appropriate action. If necessary, U.S. law enforcement, intelligence, scientific, diplomatic and military resources can be brought to bear on very short notice.

ù For additional information, please contact the State Department.

(If needed/asked:)

ù The Departments of Energy and Defense, the FBI and the Customs service all have prepared talking points on their nuclear material security and anti-nuclear smuggling activities.) On our programs to prevent nuclear smuggling:

ù Keeping nuclear weapons and nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists and rogue states is a vital U.S. priority. As part of our overall nonproliferation policy we have been active on several fronts.

ù At the request of the Kazakhstani government, we airlifted over half a ton of vulnerable weapons-grade uranium -- enough to make dozens of nuclear bombs -- to a safe storage facility.

ù We are cooperating with Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus on projects to improve the security of nuclear materials. Cooperative projects with these nations are underway to improve the security of many

tons of materials at more than two dozen locations. One such cooperative project --
 a project at the Institute
 of Physics and Power Engineering in Obninsk -- was just concluded on
 September 21.

ù We are also cooperating with many additional nations -- including Lithuania --
 on
 efforts to improve border
 controls and police enforcement capabilities to detect and deter possible cases of
 n
 uclear smuggling.

ù We have reached an agreement with Russia under which 500 metric tons of
 highly enr
 iched uranium from
 dismantled Soviet-era nuclear warheads are being blended down to low enriched
 uraniu
 m not suitable for
 nuclear weapons, sold to the U.S., and burned in civilian nuclear power plants.

ù We have already reached agreement with Russia to end the production of
 plutonium f
 or weapons purposes.

ù The U.S. is also pressing for a multilateral Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty, as P
 resident Clinton urged at the
 1993 UNGA.

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL SERVING IN UN PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

Background: The Washington Post and Washington Times carry stories story on
 an Army
 medic stationed in
 Germany who refused to don UN insignia after his unit was ordered to deploy to
 Maced
 onia as part of the UN
 Preventive Deployment (UNPREDEP) operation. The Army has begun court-
 martial procedu
 res against Spc.
 Michael New for disobeying a lawful order. New's defense for his actions is: "I
 swor
 e allegiance to my country
 not to the UN."

On Friday, 46 House members wrote President Clinton a letter requesting "a full legal and constitutional analysis of the justification of your orders placing members of the U.S. armed forces under the 'command' of foreign UN offices, especially your orders to U.S. Army Spec. Michael New."

Points

-- Refer all questions relating to the specific case of Michael New to the Army Public Affairs office.

-- On current U.S. policy concerning placing U.S. troops under foreign or UN "command":

--- Under long-standing U.S. policy, most recently reaffirmed by the President in his May 1994 "Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations," the President retains and will never relinquish command authority over U.S. forces. On a case by case basis, the President will consider placing appropriate U.S. forces under the operational control of a competent UN commander for specific UN operations authorized by the Security Council. The UN operation in Macedonia is a case where the President has made this judgment.

-- If asked whether this policy is new or adopted only under the Clinton Administration:

--- There is nothing new about this policy. U.S. military personnel have participated in UN peace operations since 1948. American forces have served under the operational control of foreign commanders since the Revolutionary War, including in World War I and II, Operation Desert Storm, and in NATO since its inception.

-- Regarding questions relating to the letter by Rep. Dornan et al.:

--- The President has only just received the letter. He will respond to the request for a full legal and constitutional justification in the near future.

CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Background: On September 29, the House rejected by a wide margin the conference report on the FY 1996 Defense Appropriations Bill. As reported by the conferees, the bill would have provided for a \$243 billion defense budget for next year -- \$6.7 billion more than requested by the Administration. The bill's defeat in the House was attributable to a strong bloc of "pro-life" Members concerned by the watering down of the House-passed provision in the bill on abortion and other Members opposed to the increase in spending for programs such as the B-2 and National Missile Defense.

Points

-- Committed to maintaining best trained, best equipped, most ready armed forces in the world.

-- The Administration's budget protects readiness and ensures we are prepared to defend American interests.

-- Although the conferees did remove objectionable policy provisions and other unacceptable restrictions on my prerogatives as Commander in Chief and they did fund several important programs of priority interest to this Administration (e.g., Nunn-Lugar and TRP), I am very concerned by the

inclusion of almost \$7 billion for procurement and R&D spending we did not request.

-- With the defeat of the Conference Report by the House, the bill now goes back to the conference to be reworked. As the conferees consider how to revise the bill to improve its prospects of ever being enacted into law, it is important that they understand that absent a broader agreement with Congress that provides adequate funding for crucial domestic programs that are underfunded in other appropriations bills, the President will veto any defense appropriations bill that adds extra billions for defense programs not in my request.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. email	Mary Peters to Richard Saunders, re: [talking points] (2 pages)	10/26/1995	P1/b(1)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([Ireland and trip...])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/19/1995 - 11/03/1995]

2017-0759-F

ke5223

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 27 October 95 09:34
FROM Naplan, Steven J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: ireland sched. request for POTUS [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Dohse, Fred J.
Joshi, M. Kay
CARBON_COPY Baker, Jane E.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Gray, Wendy
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.
Schuker, Jill A.

TEXT_BODY

package 7543 was sent forward to replace the mis-formatted 7485 and 7486.

Nancy asked for it at a Saturday morning meeting 10/14. At her request I handed the originals to her. I gave the 8 copies and disk to Wendy and spoke with Ken the next day who said that it had left Nancy's desk and was rolling forward.

I've got a photocopy of the 7543 package and will hand-carry it to you right away.

From: Joshi, M. Kay
To: Dohse, Fred J.; Naplan, Steven J.
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; /R, Record at A1; Hilliard, Brenda I.; Schuker, Jill A.; @CROSS - Cross Hatches
Subject: RE: ireland sched. request for POTUS [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Friday, October 27, 1995 09:13 AM

Steve: Fred is on travel and will return late this evening. As Brenda's note says, nothing shows up in the system under 7543 -- there were two documents returned to Jill on October 11 that were sent forward in the wrong format and without proper clearances (packages 7485 and 7486). Those two SPs were regarding Print Media on UK and Ireland and TV Interviews re UK and

Ireland. We have not yet seen them come back from Jill.

If you have a copy of 7543, please send it forward and we may be able to track it down then.

Thanks.

From: Naplan, Steven J.

To: Dohse, Fred J.

CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; Hilliard, Brenda I.; Schuker, Jill A.; @CROSS - Cross Hatches

Subject: ireland sched. request for POTUS [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Thursday, October 26, 1995 08:01 PM

Back on October 14 Nancy verbally approved scheduling request 7543 for POTUS to do a roundtable with British/Irish media at the White House in advance of the Europe trip. (It already had McCurry's verbal approval as well.)

At the time the request was considered a bit late getting in.

I was told that Nancy has signed the package and that it had moved on to scheduling.

Today, Brenda Hilliard told me that there was no sign of 7543.

How do I proceed?

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 30 October 95 10:47

FROM Dohse, Fred J.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT POTUS Briefing Time for UK, Ireland and Spain [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Peters, Mary A.

CARBON_COPY Blinken, Antony J.

TEXT_BODY

Mary Ann, please prepare Scheduling Proposal(s) asking for briefing time with the President to cover his trip to UK, Ireland and Spain. Proposal should include speech prep time as well. Probably need 2 hours. Ideally, we want 30 minutes for speech prep on Tuesday or Wednesday, November 21 or 22, and a second 30 minutes the following Monday. I'd also like 45 to 60 minutes on Wednesday for briefing the trip schedule and other substance. Thanks.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 01 November 95 18:10
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT November 1 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bassett, Leslie A.
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Birkland, Andrea L.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Bradley, Amelia J.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Kevin J. Cadieux
Canty, Mary T.
Carter, Michael E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya

Clarke, Richard A.
Claussen, Eileen B.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Dymersky, Debra L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Eisenhower, James J.
Emery, Mary C.
Fairfax, Kenneth J.
Feeley, John F.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Flessas, Daniel
Frias, Angela M.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Froman, Michael B.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
Gardner, Anthony
Gates, Brian K.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gragg, Mark A.
Gray, Wendy
Grimes, Richard J.
Grummon, Stephen R.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harmon, Joyce A.

Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.
Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Jensen, Noelle B.
Johnson, David T.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kammerer, Kelly C.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Leary, William H.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Martinez, Alejandro
Stefan T. Mauzy
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Naplan, Steven J.
Neil, M. Elise
Noetzel, Jon C.
Norman, Marcia G.
Norris, John J.
Nuccio, Richard A.

O'loughlin, Kathrine
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Peters, Mary A.
Pifer, Steven K.
Kenneth M. Pollack
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Reade, Evan G.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Reed, George
Reznik, Victoria (NMI)
Rice, Susan E.
Roth, Stanley O.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schuker, Jill A.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Seeley, Charlotte P.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.

Tyler, John T.
Unrue, Michael M.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Whitworth, Frank (Trey) D.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Willis, Robin M.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Yorkdale, Glenn H.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[1101MCBF.DOC : 4614 in 1101MCBF.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 1 November 95 18:2

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 1101MCBF.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release November 1, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

F01

The Briefing Room

1:33 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: All right, should we begin today's White House news briefing?

Q We thought it had already begun. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: It has now begun, and I'm happy to entertain your questions.

Q Why did the President see Trimble?

MR. MCCURRY: The President saw David Trimble, who is the new leader of the Ulster Unionist Party, so that he could reaffirm the strong interest the United States has in a lasting settlement acceptable to the British-Irish governments and also the people of Northern Ireland. We have reached out to all the parties in an effort to understand better the peace process that is now underway. They exchanged views on the peace process. The President talked a little bit about his upcoming trip to Northern Ireland.

The President dropped by, I should point out, a meeting that the Vice President had arranged that included the President's National Security Advisor Tony Lake, and the Vice President's National Security Advisor Leon Fuerth.

Q Mike, why is that trip being expanded, days are being added to the front end?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not aware that days are being added to the front end. There was a day added -- there was a stop added to the end of the meeting so that we could go to Madrid and participate in the meeting of the E.U. Correct? That's the only change -- that was the only modification --

Q It was a four-day trip and now you're scheduled to be there on Monday through Friday.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't believe that's true, but you might want to check -- these guys have been working on the schedule.

Q Is the White House ready to accept the debt limit extension until November 29th?

MR. MCCURRY: The President is ready to have a meeting shortly with the bipartisan congressional leadership to discuss that subject.

Q Do you think this meeting is only about the debt -- this discussion only about the debt limit, or is this a -- could this be a broader discussion about the budget in general?

MR. MCCURRY: The President intends to talk about the debt limit issue which is the one that Senator Dole suggested we should raise at the conclusion of this meeting about Bosnia. I've heard that others have suggested they might want to get into additional issues, but the President's view remains clear, that in order to have any discussions about the budget, it is now up to the Republican majority in Congress to begin addressing the specific priorities the President has repeatedly laid before the Congress. There's no indication that that's happening, so I can't imagine there's going to be much of a budget discussion at this meeting.

Q Well, they did take a vote on this budget, though, didn't they?

MR. MCCURRY: Not a real one.

Q Well, it was recorded. How do you distinguish a real vote from some other kind of vote?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, they have not yet taken the President's budget proposal of June and seriously addressed those priorities reflected in that budget or the President's repeated insistence that they address those issues that he has defined as being central to his willingness to participate in a resolution of the current budget conflict.

Q Has the administration yet reduced that budget proposal to legislative language that could be so considered?

MR. MCCURRY: There has been absolutely no need to because there's been absolutely no willingness on the part of Congress to take up that legislation seriously.

Q Not even by the Democrats -- couldn't they have brought it up?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the Democrats have offered various amendments. They've tried to deal with the Republican majority using amendments that build on many of the ideas that are suggested

in the President's budget proposal.

Q So it has been considered?

MR. MCCURRY: They've -- the Democrats in Congress have shaped various alternative strategies, using in part some of the ideas recommended by the President.

Q If the Republicans come in and say, you know, we understand your concern about these five specific areas and we're ready to talk about them, does that represent addressing his priorities, and could that be the start of a budget discussion?

MR. MCCURRY: I mean, look, it depends on what they say. And we could chase around -- spend a lot of time here chasing around talking about a meeting that you're all going to get to think about after it's over.

Q Will we get to cover it?

Q Mike, Leon Panetta seemed to slam the door on a short-term debt limit increase when he was on the Hill today, and yet you were noncommittal in response to Wolf's question. Will the President buy into a November 29th extension, or not?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President addressed himself to that yesterday. We've got to extend this debt ceiling. The President would prefer that they do it until mid-January, which takes it beyond Congress' Christmas recess; it takes it beyond the period presumably needed to resolve these budget issues, and gives us time in which we can conduct the financial business of the United States government in an orderly fashion and also resolve the budget issues that are still on the table.

Q Would he veto a short-term extension?

MR. MCCURRY: There's no sense speculating on what he would sign or veto until we know whether there's even a willingness of the part of the congressional leadership to address that issue. And we'll know more about that later.

Q You haven't had a formal proposal --

MR. MCCURRY: He would veto -- specifically he'd veto -- I mean, he's made it clear that if they tie that to the budget priorities that the President considers unacceptable, he'll veto that.

Q That's not the question. Would he veto a short-term -

- I mean, how could he -- a freestanding short-term -- how could he do that?

MR. MCCURRY: Stand alone, free -- stand alone. We'd have to take a look at what it would -- but as the President said yesterday, if it's a reasonable proposal to extend the debt limit, he certainly would look at that and look that as Congress --

Q Was November 29 then proposed formally?

MR. MCCURRY: It has been suggested publicly by one Republican committee chair in the Senate. And we will know more about the disposition of the other Republican leaders following this meeting.

Q That one committee chairman, Senator Domenici, said this morning that he would go forward and support a short-term budget extension if the President --

Q You mean debt limit, don't you?

Q I'm sorry -- debt limit extension -- if the President

accepted a seven-year balanced budget with CBO estimates.

MR. MCCURRY: The President made it clear that we've got to resolve -- we can't let the United States government default. We've got to extend the debt ceiling. He's made it clear he's not willing to tie that imperative to misbegotten Republican priorities when it comes to the budget.

Q Whether he's going to tie it or not, is he willing to say that -- agree in principle in public to a seven-year budget proposal, balanced budget plan? I know he said those words, but to say -- which are the words specifically the Republicans want to hear, that, okay, now we're talking only about seven years and let's find out how to do it.

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to write -- I've said repeatedly here, I'm not going to write a budget for you standing here. The President's got very clear priorities when it comes to the budget. He's laid them out repeatedly. He's put a proposal before the Congress in June that outlines those priorities and makes it clear what he thinks we need to do. And now the question back to the Republicans is are you willing to take up those issues and deal with them in a straightforward, candid manner.

Q Are we going to do this all again after this meeting?
And if we are, could we do it then and not now and then?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that's a very timely suggestion on behalf of The New York Times. There's not much point in chasing it around now because --

Q So you're going to brief after the meeting?

MR. MCCURRY: We'll just -- we'll see. We'll see. You're going to, presumably, have some opportunity to talk to the leadership when they're done, and we'll see what they have to say.

Q But you wouldn't want their story to -- you wouldn't want them to get their side out without your last ups, right?

MR. MCCURRY: We'll see. We'll see.

Q Would you continue to rule out a photo op at the top of this meeting?

MR. MCCURRY: I wouldn't rule out a camera opportunity, no.

Q What's a camera opportunity?

MR. MCCURRY: Take pictures.

Q You mean stills only?

Q Why? Why, are you afraid of questions?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, Deborah.

Q Mike, on a different subject, would the President

veto the so-called partial -- bill that's being passed by the House today?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we are in discussions with members of Congress about the language. The President's concern here, as always, is making sure that policies that develop in legislative appropriations language are consistent with his view that abortion should be safe, legal and rare. In the case of third trimester abortions, they already are rare, but he is concerned that any legislative language protect both the life and the health of the mother, particularly when the health might face a serious threat. So we'll have further discussions with Congress and see where the language ends up.

Q Mike, wait a minute, I'm not clear. Was that a yes or a no?

MR. MCCURRY: It was a very clear answer.

Q Mike, you only addressed the issue of it being rare. You mentioned two other criteria. Does the President think that these should be allowed or not?

MR. MCCURRY: I said, we are working with the Congress to see if we can develop language that is consistent with the law and consistent with the President's view that abortion should be safe, legal and rare. And in the case of third trimester abortions, we are concerned that serious threats to the health of the mother be taken into account. And there are obviously some concern that the current language doesn't do that.

Yes, Paula.

Q Comments made by the Senate Minority Leader at lunch about the budget, are they consistent with the administration as far as --

MR. MCCURRY: I have no idea what he said.

Q Mr. McCurry, the general consensus is that the peace process in Northern Ireland is at a critical phase at this point in time, very critical phase. That's the impression one gets. Is there anything that the President can do at this point in time to move it along?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we can do what we believe we have been doing, which is to use the good offices of the President of the United States as well as our own diplomatic efforts to support a peace process that is critical to the people of Northern Ireland and which also reflects the peace process as initiated between the Republic of Ireland and the U.K.

Q Mike, would it be fair to say -- how would you describe the President's meeting with Trimble -- that he tried to

nudge the Unionists towards a more friendly position, that he tried to light a fire under the talks, or that he just said nice things to him?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I would concur in the assessment that the talks are at a fairly critical stage. I wouldn't describe in any great substantive detail the type of dialogue that we had other than to say that we have consistently reached out to all the parties because we are interested in a peace process that works, that is lasting, and that reflects the views of all the parties so that there can be a successful resolution of the conflict in Northern Ireland.

Q How does the White House feel about plans by some American families affected by the Lockerbie disaster to boycott Friday's dedication of the Lockerbie -- at Arlington Cemetery?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we are aware that this is a very emotional time for the families of those who lost loved ones in this tragic and outrageous attack upon civilians. But the memorial itself is being dedicated in the spirit of trying to heal the wounds of that conflict. It has been offered as a gift from the people of Scotland. The President has been encouraged to participate in the memorial by some of the family members, and he believes it is very right and proper to do so.

But we certainly understand the feelings of those who are dissatisfied that the two suspects who are under indictment have not been brought to justice. And indeed, it is the view of the United States government that we must continue to do everything possible to bring those suspects to justice. We have repeatedly pressed that issue. We have insisted that Libya not be granted any relief from the sanctions Libya now faces until it is in full compliance with the three relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. And that will be our posture until we are satisfied that justice has been done.

Q And you feel no more can be done at present?

MR. MCCURRY: That is not correct. We are always pressing to find ways in which we can bring additional pressure on the government of Libya to release the two suspects for trial in either Scotland or the United States, as required by U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Q Has the President met or talked with Director Deutch about the latest capers of the CIA?

MR. MCCURRY: He has been briefed on the actions that the Director of Central Intelligence reviewed yesterday publicly. He has also been briefed on the assessment of the Ames damage assessment team, and he is satisfied that the Director of Central Intelligence is putting in place those measures necessary to restore complete confidence in the nation's intelligence community.

Q On the D.C. funding bill, is the elimination of

federal abortion funding enough to prompt a veto?

MR. MCCURRY: That could, indeed, be enough to trigger a veto. We will examine the full scope of the legislation, but as Mr. Panetta suggested yesterday in an interview, the Senate-passed version is the only version that is acceptable. The House-passed

version is not. And any action in the conference committee to move far away from the Senate language would be a source of great concern to the President.

Q Going into this afternoon's meeting, one of the problems you have is a lot of the Republicans, especially the backbenchers, don't believe that default is a big problem. They met with some fairly heavyweight investors up there this morning who told them that the markets would shrug off a default as simply politically inspired. What does the President say to people this afternoon to counter that argument?

MR. MCCURRY: The President doesn't need to remind the congressional leaders of the facts. But what we are doing is doing what Treasury secretaries in the past have done, including Jim Baker and Nicholas Brady. We are outlining in very concrete detail for those members of Congress who need additional information what the consequences of default would be. And we hope that that will be persuasive.

And we repeatedly -- you all know the repeated efforts by Secretaries of the Treasury to remind members of Congress what the consequences of default would be. And we have sketched those out in some detail now in written correspondence between the Treasury Secretary and the Hill. And we'll clearly do more of that as necessary to help members of Congress understand what their obligation is in addressing the urgency of the debt ceiling matter.

Q You disagree with that analysis then.

MR. MCCURRY: Of course.

Q Mike, has the administration determined how much longer after the drop-dead date, so-called, of November 15th or whatever it is that the administration could continue to operate on a cash basis?

MR. MCCURRY: The Treasury Secretary has outlined what the pathway is, because there are some decisions that have to be made; there's some financing decisions that have to be made. Then, of course, there would become obligations due from -- in the form of Social Security payments and other things. But I believe the Secretary of the Treasury has been clear publicly what that schedule is. It began today with the postponement of an announcement about some auction sales. Next week there would have to be a delay in auction sales themselves. And then you get to the quarterly refinancing on November 15th, which presents a very major obstacle to proceed with the orderly conduct of the government's

business, should there not be an extension of the debt limit.

Q Michael, the Treasury Secretary and the White House have been wringing its collective hands for more than a week now on this issue. Wall Street has reacted with an audible yawn. How do you account for that?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that most -- I mean, I'm not a financial analyst, so I'm not really qualified to comment on the behavior of the markets, but I would suggest that most people cannot imagine that the Congress of the United States of America would allow this country to go bankrupt.

Q We've come close to it twice in the '80s and nothing happened.

MR. MCCURRY: And -- that's right. But we've been through this before, and everyone thinks this is, as the Speaker said the other day, Kabuki theater and it all works out in the end. There's no guarantee that it's going to work out in the end this time, given the posture that the President is in and the posture that the Congress is in.

Q Do you mean the President of the United States would rather see the country go into default than adopt some budget priorities that would reach a balanced budget that he doesn't care for?

MR. MCCURRY: That's correct. And that's what he's said. So the devastating impact of that budget on Americans is --

Q Worse than default?

MR. MCCURRY: -- is worse than default. That's correct. And he said so in his radio address on Saturday.

Q Mike, can you give some public assurances that this government is not going to be bugging the rooms of the negotiating parties at Wright-Patterson?

MR. MCCURRY: That's a question in a backhanded way about intelligence gathering, and we don't talk about that here publicly.

Q Democrats on the Hill --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sorry, Claire, I can't hear you.

Q The Democrats on the Hill, in addition to Republicans, are still complaining that the President is not making an adequate case for sending U.S. troops to Bosnia. Does the administration feel that it is, in fact, making a compelling --

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. The President addressed this in a very straightforward fashion yesterday. We've made it clear he will

continue to do so. We understand the importance of laying the facts about our responsibilities before the American people. And the President will do that as often as it takes to help both the Congress and the American people understand what he sees as the obligations we have in addressing the conflict in Bosnia when it comes to specifically implementing the peace.

But, again, remember the talks today in Dayton are focused on achieving a peace agreement that then can be enforced by the international community through NATO, and we are not there yet. The President asked yesterday that we do everything we can to encourage and hope for success the parties now gathering in Dayton, so that their talks can be successful. Because deployment of U.S. forces to support that peace can only happen and will only happen if there is a peace that is achieved at Dayton.

Q Is there something the President's going to do in the Bosnia portion of this meeting beyond what he said publicly yesterday?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, much of the discussion will reflect some of the things he said publicly yesterday, but he will review our strategy for the peace talks in Dayton. Two, he will review the current status of NATO military planning as it relates to an implementation force and, three, most likely will have some discussion about how best to seek and achieve the expression of support from Congress that he believes his policy will merit.

Q You mean, they're going to talk about what -- can you pass a non-binding resolution and what would be the right time to do it?

MR. MCCURRY: That seems to me a likely area of discussion, but we'll have to see whether that occurs.

Q What can you tell us, if anything, about the drug speech tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: It's undergoing some revisions right now. I really can't tell you much, but we'll see if we can follow up on that later.

Q Did the President brief you on his lengthy conversation with Ben Wattenberg, and what can you tell us about that?

MR. MCCURRY: He told me about it. He discussed it with me, but not at any great length. And if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Wattenberg has written a column about it that might be available.

Q Well, does the President --

Q Is this in connection with his book or --

MR. MCCURRY: It's about his -- the President had read his book.

Q Did he confirm those quotes, he's a new Democrat, and he's sorry for everything he did since he's been President, and he's going to change and --

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't asked him about any of it.

Q I kid you not. I'm summarizing it.

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't asked him about any of the specifics in the piece.

Q Could you explain what he meant by the President feels he was a cardboard cutout?

MR. MCCURRY: The President said that publicly before.

Q Some Republicans on the Hill are talking about moving to the next step on Bosnia with a cutoff of funds for deployment of any U.S. troops there. I assume --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sorry, Leo -- start that again.

MR. MCCURRY: Some Republicans on the Hill are proposing a rider to some appropriations bill that would cut off any money for use to deploy U.S. troops in Bosnia. I assume that if that were to happen, the President would veto such legislation?

MR. MCCURRY: It sounds -- I'm not aware of the specific rider you're talking about, but in the past, generally, we've taken the view that that type of unwarranted intrusion on the President's authority to conduct this nation's foreign policy does raise the likelihood of a veto.

Q So we will get a briefing here after the meeting?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I didn't commit to that. I said that we're going to just see what happens. You know, you're going to be able to talk, presumably, to some of those participating in the

meeting, and that may cover it. We'll see.

Q Is the meeting over here? Is it over in Jackson Square?

MR. MCCURRY: It's at the Oval Office, in the Oval Office.

Q It's still not clear to me if you're giving us a photo op at the top of this, in-house pool photo op.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that's because it's still not clear to me.

Q Then you were clear. (Laughter.)

Q What time does it start?

MR. MCCURRY: Say again?

Q What time does it start?

MR. MCCURRY: At 2:30 p.m.

Q How big a group, Mike?

MR. MCCURRY: My understanding is that it's -- the invited

are the Speaker, the House Minority Leader, the Senate Majority Leader, and the Senate Minority Leader. And then for the discussion of the debt ceiling issue, the Speaker has asked that Congressman Arney also be present.

Q Will Secretary Rubin --

MR. MCCURRY: And Secretary Rubin will join that discussion and Mr. Lake presumably will leave at that point.

Q What about other administration officials? Will Panetta, Rivlin --

MR. MCCURRY: Mr. Panetta will be there. Perhaps Pat Griffin as well.

Q Logistically -- you probably have no idea of the answer to this question, but do you have any idea about how long they're scheduled to go on each topic, when we might look for them outside?

MR. MCCURRY: I have no way of knowing.

Q What will be the purpose of his meetings next week with members of Congress? Bosnia?

MR. MCCURRY: He wants to continue that very good -- we had a very good session over at Jackson Place not long ago that just sort of described where we are initially. He had expressed an interest in continuing that format. He thought it was very useful. Many members of Congress who participated appreciated having an opportunity to hear from the President and the national security team outlining where we are, and the President expressed at that time some desire to keep that going.

Now, I imagine that they'll discuss today how best to continue consultations, but we might have a larger session like that Jackson Place meeting sometime next week.

Q Why did the President think that was successful if just Monday, then, a House majority voted to restrain his ability to exercise force --

MR. MCCURRY: That House vote, as I said yesterday, was about process, not policy. They're asking questions, and as they came out of the session, they all indicated --

Q But your process is your policy.

MR. MCCURRY: That's not true. We're working towards a peace agreement. We believe we have responsibility to enforce that peace, and that hasn't happened yet.

What news. This just in. Okay. I think we're going to be able to do at least stills.

Q Boo, hiss.

MR. MCCURRY: Good-bye.

END 1:52 P.M. EST

#128-11/01

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 01 November 95 19:15
FROM Vershbow, Alexander R.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Gardner, Anthony
CARBON_COPY Dohse, Fred J.
TEXT_BODY

Need to split difference here. Do first cut at briefer on 21st, mark it as "draft", complete background papers, bios etc. by earlier deadline. Explain to President at prebrief that there could be significant changes as final negotiations unfold.

From: Gardner, Anthony
To: Dohse, Fred J.; Peters, Mary A.; Vershbow, Alexander R.
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; /R, Record at A1; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
Subject: RE: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, November 01, 1995 05:15 PM

November 21 is a full two weeks before December 3. we went around this track once already, last year before the budapest trip when jim reed wanted the papers two weeks beforehand. finally we convinced him that that timetable did not reflect the reality that negotiations were continuing until much closer to the summit date. pushing for such deadlines simply results in half-jobs that require extensive rewriting and confusion later on; that's the real disservice. the UK-Ireland part could be printed separately so that it doesn't get held up. If November 21 is the firm deadline, that means I need to get State papers by the 15/16 latest in order to rework them and get everyone on board here as well as at USTR, NEC. that's before the Nov 20 GAC in Brussels which is going to discuss the initiative.

From: Dohse, Fred J.
To: Gardner, Anthony; Peters, Mary A.
CC: /R, Record at A1; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
Subject: RE: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, November 01, 1995 04:06 PM

I agree the Uk-Ireland book can be done separately from the U.S.-EU book/paper. However, waiting until Nov 27 or even Nov 24 is not acceptable. Don't forget that I have to get roughly 40 notebooks printed and distributed that contain the U.S.-EU material. With the Thanksgiving weekend, we would never make it if we waited until Nov 24 to start. (FYI: I plan on leaving for London the evening of Nov 25 in order to get on the

ground and work out last minute details before the President arrives.) We also do the President a great disservice if we don't have the book prepared for him to look at when we do the trip prebrief, which I'm trying to schedule for Nov 22, Wednesday before Thanksgiving. I'll need to get your input for the U.S.-EU book no later than noon on Nov 21.

That said, there will always be revisions, which we will work on the trip. But don't count on any time for additional formal briefing time with the President once the trip starts because there just won't be any except for an occasional 15 minutes here and there on the run. As I envision the Madrid portion of the trip unfolding, we may get 20-30 minutes of briefing time Sunday morning in Madrid before the President meets with Gonzalez and the EU crowd.

Mary Ann, as we discussed, I'd like to get the UK-Ireland book on Nov 17.
Thanks

From: Gardner, Anthony
To: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; Peters, Mary A.; Sens, Andrew D.; Vershbow, Alexander R.
Subject: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, November 01, 1995 12:02 PM

one point of information: does the briefing book for the US-EU Summit in Madrid on December 3 necessarily have to be turned in on the same date as the book for the UK-Ireland trip? There are several strong reasons why we prefer to turn it in a bit later. For one thing, the EU is having an important General Affairs Council Meeting on November 20 at which many of the key points of the transatlantic initiative will be discussed. We need to incorporate decisions taken at that meeting into the book. Therefore, we prefer to hand in the book toward the end of that week -- November 24 or even on the Monday November 27 (perhaps to US Embassy London). Mary Ann and I are meeting tomorrow on tasking list with folks from State for US-Spain bilateral portion and US-EU portion. List of topics has already been fairly well agreed and EUR has heads up to prepare papers for us by November 20.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 02 November 95 07:57
FROM Johnson, David T.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT November 2 News Summary [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bassett, Leslie A.
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Birkland, Andrea L.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Bradley, Amelia J.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Kevin J. Cadieux
Canty, Mary T.
Carter, Michael E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.

Claussen, Eileen B.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Dymersky, Debra L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Eisenhower, James J.
Emery, Mary C.
Fairfax, Kenneth J.
Feeley, John F.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Flessas, Daniel
Frias, Angela M.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Froman, Michael B.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
Gardner, Anthony
Gates, Brian K.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gragg, Mark A.
Gray, Wendy
Grimes, Richard J.
Grummon, Stephen R.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.

Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Johnson, David T.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kammerer, Kelly C.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Leary, William H.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Martinez, Alejandro
Stefan T. Mauzy
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Naplan, Steven J.
Neil, M. Elise
Noetzel, Jon C.
Norman, Marcia G.
Nuccio, Richard A.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Pease, Bruce E.

Peggins, John W.
Peters, Mary A.
Pifer, Steven K.
Kenneth M. Pollack
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Reade, Evan G.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Reznik, Victoria (NMI)
Rice, Susan E.
Roth, Stanley O.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schuker, Jill A.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Seeley, Charlotte P.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.
Turner, Joe T.
Tyler, John T.
Unrue, Michael M.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.

Whitworth, Frank (Trey) D.
Willis, Robin M.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Yorkdale, Glenn H.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[2NOVSUM.DOC : 1862 in 2NOVSUM.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 2 November 95 7:56

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 2NOVSUM.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY NEWS SUMMARY NOVEMBER 2, 1995

INTELLIGENCE

AMES: Post reports that Ames-related disinformation may have resulted in billions in excess, purposeless defense spending; Nunn criticizes CIA for failure to follow Aum cult. Editorial and Op/Ed in NYT on Ames disinformation.(WP1/15;NYT26/27)

AFRICA

BURUNDI: NYT reports that 250 Hutu were killed in northern Burundi last weekend, reportedly by government troops. (NYT 13)

EUROPE

BOSNIA: All papers report Christopher's warning to parties that they would not be forgiven for failure to negotiate a peace. Radios/NYT report Serb/Croat agreement to settle Eastern Slavonia peacefully, assert that U.S. is providing texts to the parties. Separately NYT reports disarray in Bosnian Serb leadership, desperation in Banja Luka. Washington Times asserts "Clinton hasn't sold" the need for American troops, cites Congressman Livingston on the probability of binding legislation emerging quickly. Strobe Talbott asserts failure in Dayton could ultimately lead to wider war.(NYT 8,9/WP1/WT1,10)

N. IRELAND: Post reports that the Ireland trip is on, but it will be "clouded" by problems in the peace process. Tone of article indicates administration had counted on the visit being boosted by ongoing peace talks. Context is report on yesterday's Trimble, Hume visits. (WP 32)

UKRAINE: NYT reports Ukrainian privatization program well behind schedule and meeting with little investor interest. (NYT 1)

CANADA: NYT reports Chretien's quick moves to make constitutional changes for Quebec finding little enthusiasm in the province. (NYT 3)

RUSSIA: Safire sees "purge" in election council's move against Yavlinsky's party. (NYT27)

ASIA

JAPAN: Perry apologizes for rape, rules out troop reduction. (WP 25/NYT7)

INDONESIA: NYT reports OPIC's decision to drop political risk insurance for Freeport/McMoran gold project, allegedly for environmental reasons; Freeport says there's no legal basis and considers the insurance still in effect. (NYT/D6)

NARCOTICS

COLOMBIA: NYT reports sharp increase in Colombian heroin deliveries through Miami inside mules' stomachs. (NYT 1)

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 02 November 95 09:26
FROM Gardner, Anthony
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Dohse, Fred J.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

ok. I'll get as much as possible done by the 21st. I didn't mean to be difficult. I know you're working against tough deadlines too.

From: Dohse, Fred J.
To: Gardner, Anthony
CC: /R, Record at A1; @EUROPE - European Affairs; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
Subject: RE: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, November 01, 1995 06:53 PM

Tony, I fully intend to print the UK-Ireland book separately and am treating the Madrid stop as a separate event. I'm willing to give you some extra time to take into account the meeting on Nov 20. However, getting your piece on Nov 27 -- the day the President and the front office departs for Europe -- simply is not workable. I would like to see your input on Nov 21 or as much of it as possible on that date.

If Sandy Vershbow agrees it is not possible to meet a Nov 21 deadline in light of the meeting on Nov 20, then I need your input as soon as possible after the 21st. Remember, once you get the input to me, it routinely takes 24-36 hours to get the document through all the chops and printed. It then takes us an additional 24 hours to put the books together and distribute them.

If we don't have your package in the President's hands over the long Thanksgiving weekend, then, given his aggressive schedule in UK and Ireland, he very likely won't have time to look at it until the morning of the summit. Its unfortunate the world isn't perfect, and I'm not trying to put unreasonable demands on you. I'm just identifying the parameters we face and expecting you to plan accordingly.

From: Gardner, Anthony
To: Dohse, Fred J.; Peters, Mary A.; Vershbow, Alexander R.
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; /R, Record at A1; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
Subject: RE: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Wednesday, November 01, 1995 05:15 PM

November 21 is a full two weeks before December 3. we went around this track once already, last year before the budapest trip when jim reed wanted the papers two weeks beforehand. finally we convinced him that that timetable did not reflect the reality that negotiations were continuing until much closer to the summit date. pushing for such deadlines simply results in half-jobs that require extensive rewriting and confusion later on; that's the real disservice. the UK-Ireland part could be printed separately so that it doesn't get held up. If November 21 is the firm deadline, that means I need to get State papers by the 15/16 latest in order to rework them and get everyone on board here as well as at USTR, NEC. that's before the Nov 20 GAC in Brussels which is going to discuss the initiative.

From: Dohse, Fred J.

To: Gardner, Anthony; Peters, Mary A.

CC: /R, Record at A1; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary

Subject: RE: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Wednesday, November 01, 1995 04:06 PM

I agree the Uk-Ireland book can be done separately from the U.S.-EU book/paper. However, waiting until Nov 27 or even Nov 24 is not acceptable. Don't forget that I have to get roughly 40 notebooks printed and distributed that contain the U.S.-EU material. With the Thanksgiving weekend, we would never make it if we waited until Nov 24 to start. (FYI: I plan on leaving for London the evening of Nov 25 in order to get on the ground and work out last minute details before the President arrives.) We also do the President a great disservice if we don't have the book prepared for him to look at when we do the trip prebrief, which I'm trying to schedule for Nov 22, Wednesday before Thanksgiving. I'll need to get your input for the U.S.-EU book no later than noon on Nov 21.

That said, there will always be revisions, which we will work on the trip. But don't count on any time for additional formal briefing time with the President once the trip starts because there just won't be any except for an occasional 15 minutes here and there on the run. As I envision the Madrid portion of the trip unfolding, we may get 20-30 minutes of briefing time Sunday morning in Madrid before the President meets with Gonzalez and the EU crowd.

Mary Ann, as we discussed, I'd like to get the UK-Ireland book on Nov 17.
Thanks

From: Gardner, Anthony

To: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary

CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; Peters, Mary A.; Sens, Andrew D.; Vershbow, Alexander R.

Subject: briefing book for US-EU Summit [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Wednesday, November 01, 1995 12:02 PM

one point of information: does the briefing book for the US-EU Summit in Madrid on December 3 necessarily have to be turned in on the same date as the book for the UK-Ireland trip? There are several strong reasons why we prefer to turn it in a bit later. For one thing, the EU is having an important General Affairs Council Meeting on November 20 at which many of the key points of the transatlantic initiative will be discussed. We need to incorporate decisions taken at that meeting into the book. Therefore, we prefer to hand in the book toward the end of that week -- November 24 or even on the Monday November 27 (perhaps to US Embassy London). MaryAnn and I are meeting tomorrow on tasking list with folks from State for US-Spain bilateral portion and US-EU portion. List of topics has already been fairly well agreed and EUR has heads up to prepare papers for us by November 20.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 02 November 95 11:46
FROM Hall, Wilma G.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: TL Schedule [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Bass, Peter E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Emery, Mary C.
Hall, Wilma G.
Peters, Mary A.
Veit, Katherine M.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Mr. Lake will be travelling with POTUS as follows:

Nov 16-21 - APEC Summit

Nov 27-Dec 3 - UK/Ireland/Spain Trip

I don't yet know what TL's plans are for Thanksgiving; he may take a brief respite between these trips away from Washington. Other than this, TL will be in Washington to best of my knowledge.

From: Peters, Mary A.
To: @NSA - Nat'l Security Advisor
Cc: /R, Record at A1
Subject: TL Schedule [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, November 02, 1995 11:32AM

Northern Ireland Office State Secretary Michael Ancram would like to come over and consult with TL before the President's trip to Ireland. Can you give me the dates when he will be out of town? Thanks

MS Mail

DATE-TIME 03 November 95 09:47
FROM Dohse, Fred J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Trip Questions [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Peters, Mary A.
CARBON_COPY Baldwin, Kenneth
TEXT_BODY

Don't have a time yet. KB is setting up mtg.

From: Peters, Mary A.
To: Dohse, Fred J.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: RE: Trip Questions [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, November 02, 1995 01:34 PM

What time Tues?

From: Dohse, Fred J.
To: Peters, Mary A.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: RE: Trip Questions [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, November 02, 1995 11:52 AM

All great questions that we'll need to discuss with NES next Tuesday when we get together with Lucie and Paige. I've already briefed NES on question number 1 and the others we need to work out with the schedulers.

From: Peters, Mary A.
To: Dohse, Fred J.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: Trip Questions [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, November 02, 1995 11:38 AM

Following are questions the British would like answered when possible:
Lucie will probably have to get decisions from the POTUS on some of them.

1. Northern Ireland Office quite anxious to co-host reception in Belfast.
I myself don't think it is necessary. What did you hear about this on your trip?

2. PM Major personally has had the idea of inviting the POTUS and First Lady to see "Sunset Boulevard" with them Tues eve (yes, Tues) followed by

supper with Andrew Lloyd Weber and some cast members. Would Clintons like to do this?

3. If they do go to the theater on Tues , in business attire, would the President be willing to have the state dinnner Weds night be formal attire (black tie)?

4. Since the wreath-laying is now set for 8:30 on Weds, PM and Mrs. Major would like to invite the Clintons to breakfast Tues morning also at 8:30. Just the four of them. Major would propose to accompany the POTUS to the wreath-laying and then they could walk back together to Number 10.