

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 20 November 95 16:49
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT November 20 McCurry Press Briefing[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Albers, Paul J.
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.
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 L.
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, Stephan 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
Mauzy, Stefan T.
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.
Munson, Robert 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
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 D.
Wiley, Mary C.
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 [[1120MCBF.DOC : 4119 in 1120MCBF.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 20 November 95 16:48

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 1120MCBF.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release November 20, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

F01

The Briefing Room

1:50 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I apologize for my tardy start today, but --

Q Why were you tardy?

MR. MCCURRY: I was tardy because the President, the Vice President and Mr. Panetta invited the White House staff and especially the interns to the South Lawn a short while ago just to thank everybody who endured the government shutdown over the last week. The President, obviously, thanked those who did a heroic job, especially the interns in the absence of full-time White House staff, but he also thanked those who weren't here. He made the point that even those who weren't here are absolutely essential to the functioning of the White House and essential to him as President of the United States. And he said that what we've been through in the last week is an experience that we don't care to repeat anytime soon.

He also told the staff that it was about something important. The fact that they missed a week of work, were not here to serve the President and serve the American people was because the President was consciously fighting with the Congress about priorities that are important to the American people. And he asked them to understand that and to put this last week in which they bore some of the burden of a shutdown in our government, put that in the context of a larger fight about priorities and programs which now continue.

Q It would have been nice to be able to cover that.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it was a private occasion, Helen, for the President and his staff.

Q Did that include the White House contract painters who don't get paid for the days they missed and work out of the White House all year?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know anything about that.

Q How many interns were involved in the White House who

worked through that?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't have a count. I think they filled in places where -- they did everything from helping staff phone calls, help -- get messages back and forth to people and really helped do a lot of duties that normally are left to full-time staffers.

Q Mike, I have this nice rapid response from the House Republican Conference in which they tell me that the White House blinked on this deal. And I wonder whether, in fact, your perception is the White House did blink.

MR. MCCURRY: One of the things the President stressed today is we shouldn't gloat over the agreement that was reached right now. It was the first time that the Republican leadership in Congress did acknowledge the President's priorities. And the President also instructed the staff not to make too much of the polls that show us doing very well. (Laughter.) Those things can go up -- they can go up, they can go down.

So I would imagine if the House Republican Conference is engaged in spin now, you'll see that, significantly, to my knowledge, the Republicans who spoke that night -- the Speaker, the Majority Leader and Chairman Kasich -- chose to put the focus on what lies ahead for the American people. That's what the President put his focus on and that's what matters most. We'll leave it to the political people on the Hill to conduct the spin wars.

Q Mike, Congressman Armev is upset because Mr. Panetta said today that we could balance the budget in seven years or eight years. They think that he's straying from the seven year - - commitment to seven years. Is it seven years, or is it eight years or is it indefinite?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the language that's in the document, as I've heard Republican leaders say, is very clear, and the commitment the President made in that language is clear -- they are going to balance the budget in seven years subject to the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office. But -- but -- the President and the Congress also have to agree that the balanced budget that is there upon derived protects those priorities the President has consistently stated.

Their key points went to process: numbers of years, who were going to make technical assessment. The Presidents top concerns went to the substance of a balanced budget: how we're going to balance the budget, what are we going to do for the nation elderly, for the veterans, for students, to protect the environment, what are we going to do about tax policies for working

people. And the President's main concerns in the discussions over the last 48 hours went to the substance of a balanced budget.

Now the President has pledged a good-faith effort to see if we can match those policies and priorities to the process that the Congress seems to be concerned about. And we'll have to see. That's going to be the subject, as you know, in the agreement of consultations between the Congressional Budget Office and the White House Office of Management and Budget, and we'll see where we end up there.

Q Can you do that? Can you do it in seven years, maintain the President's principles and have a \$245-billion tax cut like the Republicans want?

MR. MCCURRY: It's very clear that you cannot -- the

Congress and the President agreed to a very important series of tests last night about policies that matter to the American people: protecting Medicare and protecting our nation's environment, making investments in technology and in education so the economy will grow in the 21st century. The budget that has been passed by the Republican Congress does not do that. It will need to be substantially rewritten in order to meet the test that the congressional leadership and the President agreed to last night.

Q Do you believe you'll be able to achieve that?

MR. MCCURRY: You can be hopeful. It's a season for hope.

Q Specifically, as Armev seems to charge, are you reneging on the agreement?

MR. MCCURRY: No, absolutely not, and I don't know why the Congressman would suggest that.

Q Are the estimates of the CBO inviolate in your opinion, or do you reserve the right to reject them?

MR. MCCURRY: No, we reserve the right to alter them, subject to the consultations required in this agreement between the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget and outside experts.

As you all know, the agreement -- and this is important -
- pledges that the Congressional Budget Office will base their estimates on the most recent, current economic and technical assumptions. Now, that means the CBO needs to go back and look at

some of the assumptions in consultation with the OMB and with outside experts.

And I remind you that in the private sector now they are using growth forecasts that are considerably more optimistic than both the Congressional Budget Office estimates and the Office of Management and Budget estimates. So they have made a pledge in this agreement to visit that question, to consult and to come up with the best numbers so the policymakers, those in the Congress and those here at the White House who have to negotiate this balanced budget will have the best information available when they do so.

Q -- come up with the same numbers they have right now.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, in light of the commitment to use most recent current economic and technical assumptions, that's not likely.

Q Has the President talked either last night or today with either of the Republican leaders on the Hill personally, and does he have any plans to?

MR. MCCURRY: He did not, and he does not, to my knowledge. And I believe that they'll be preparing, as will the President, for a Thanksgiving holiday.

Q Has he talked to Walesa?

MR. MCCURRY: He has not. We, obviously, just in the last hour or so, saw the statement by President Walesa that concedes the election. Obviously, we congratulate Alexander

Kwasniewski on his victory. We note that this has not only been what appears to be a free and fair election, but importantly, in Poland which has now made a transition from totalitarianism to democracy, it is the second national presidential election. Both of these candidates, both President Walesa and Alexander Kwasniewski ran on a program of democratic market reforms, pledging to maintain Poland's commitment to integration with the West. And that is important. Those are promises that have been made to the Polish people, and they will be the basis of further discussions between Poland and European entities, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Q We're not concerned then about his heavy communist past?

MR. MCCURRY: It's not the background or the personal

experience of the candidates, it is the policies that they will pursue in the future. And on that point, President-elect Kwasniewski has been very clear on the policies they will pursue, and they, in the case of foreign policy, represent an element of consistency in the approach they'll take to some of the key questions related to European integration.

Q Before we get too far off the budget, can you just tell us when the President plans to veto the overall budget bill that was sent down to him?

MR. MCCURRY: No way of knowing, and it has not been sent down.

Q And also, what can you tell us about --

MR. MCCURRY: It hasn't been finally acted upon yet. As you know, it hasn't been finally passed yet.

Q And the next step in terms of the negotiations on the new budget -- they're supposed to go in on Monday. And is the White House going to help with Congress and pick a couple of people to negotiate? What can you tell us about it?

MR. MCCURRY: We've had discussions here at the White House this morning about how we will constitute the President's negotiating team. It will be led, as you would gather, by Chief of Staff Panetta. There will be others participating, and we look at what will clearly be a lengthy period of very difficult, serious negotiations. We've been meeting here this morning to formalize our own approach to the dialogue that's about to occur. I think it's correct, Rita, that we expect that no formal negotiations will begin prior to Monday when Congress returns from its recess. But how they will occur and what issues they will start upon remain in the air at this point.

We would hope that they would begin by going through the issues that Congress and the President have now identified as being absolutely critical. How we're going to protect future generations, how we're going to ensure Medicare solvency, how we're going to reform welfare, how we're going to provide adequate

funding for Medicaid, for education, for veterans, for agriculture, for national defense and for environmental protection -- those are the priorities the President has repeatedly laid out, and that is a good basis and a good starting point for the discussion that has to occur.

Q Republicans in the House, though, seem to be saying that they think it should be members only doing the negotiations,

opposed to people from the White House directly negotiating.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we don't have members of Congress here at the White House who serve on our staff, so unless they want to just solely negotiate with themselves, which I don't think would be a very fruitful approach, they'll have to involve White House staff.

Q They could negotiate with House Democrats who some of us think may or may not be in line with the President's thinking.

MR. MCCURRY: The agreement they reached last night requires that the President and the Congress agree on these elements of a balanced budget. Now, there may be -- it may be useful for members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to have conversations, but sooner or later they need to have negotiations with the White House.

Q Same issue. Would the President take part in some opening session on Monday before he leaves for Europe? Will he adjust his Europe schedule? And would he plan any address to the nation on what he would like to see in a balanced budget?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President has addressed the nation often on what he'd like to see in a balanced budget. I suspect we might, sometime between now and his departure for Europe Monday night, have some further opportunities to make his case. But we will have to see next Monday how the discussions begin to occur. And it's not clear at this point what the format will be.

Q In the list of things that you were talking about that have to be agreed upon you mentioned welfare reform. Is that now, as far as the White House is concerned, tied specifically to the budget? Because there was talk of separating that out.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it's not clear at this point how that will be -- whether or not it will be incorporated in the reconciliation, as you know. But it was identified by the President and Congress last night as being a high priority and it does have substantial impact. We continue to hope that there will be some way for a conference committee on the House to produce welfare reform that is to the President's liking. Unfortunately, as you know, it's been, if anything, moving in the wrong direction.

Q Mike, the Serbian delegation in Dayton is saying

flatly there will be a deal. Does that reflect what's going on out there? Will the President travel out there? And what is the state of play of a speech to the nation about committing troops?

MR. MCCURRY: The spokesman for all of the delegations participating in the talks in Dayton is the State Department spokesman, Nicholas Burns. I talked to him just a short while ago. He indicated to me he has indicated to your colleagues that there's nothing new to report at this point. They are still where they have been. There are several issues that are, not surprisingly, the toughest issues for the parties to deal with as they get very close to the finish line. And they are not resolved, and thus, there's no guarantee of a successful conclusion to these discussions.

They are, as Nick put it to me, now in extra innings, having at one point set 10:00 a.m. today as sort of the concluding point. But the mediators and those participating agree that they should continue their discussions. So we're watching it very carefully. The President has been getting regular updates from Secretary Christopher and from Ambassador Holbrooke as relayed by National Security Advisor Tony Lake, and we'll just have to see what the outcome is.

Q If there is an agreement will the President got out for an initialing ceremony?

MR. MCCURRY: That's not at all clear at this point.

Q Also getting back to Ann's earlier question, what impact will the resumption of the budget talks, the overall budget, on Monday have on the President's travel plans next week?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I just indicated the President plans to make the trip to the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom as it has originally been conceived and as has been discussed with some of you. We don't have a formal schedule we can announce at this point because plans do call for a departure Monday evening and return on the following Sunday at the conclusion of the European U.N.-U.S. summit meeting in Madrid.

Q For those of us who have -- of tick-tocks about how the agreement fell into place on Sunday, as of Friday night everything seems to have collapsed. Could you briefly take us through what the President and other key players in the White House did Saturday and yesterday to help put this thing together?

MR. MCCURRY: I forget where we were on Saturday. I can do yesterday, but my memory is a little clogged and hazy at this point.

Yesterday, as you know, there was a back-and-forth on the subject of how you address the question of the President's

priorities, how you address the question that the Republican

leaders in Congress were insistent upon -- seven years and CBO estimates. Various attempts during the day on Saturday to break through the barriers that existed on that language. I'd have to go back and look at notes to really understand better what happened on Saturday.

I can tell you yesterday Mr. Panetta and our negotiators went to Capitol Hill in the early afternoon. They met with Democratic leaders just to review what Mr. Panetta intended to put forward to the Republican negotiators -- principally, Mr. Kasich and Mr. Domenici -- and got support across the board on the Democratic side for two options. One was -- I think a lot of this you've seen recounted already -- but one was the sense of the Congress resolution. The other was a statement clearly in the negotiated language that would protect the President's priorities.

After an initial -- I'd say an initial negative reaction to the second option, which was language that would incorporate some of the President's priorities into this agreement, it's clear the Republican leadership reconsidered, and during the course of late in the afternoon prepared a response to Mr. Panetta's offer which is very similar to the final language as it was adopted. That language came here at approximately 4:00 p.m.-4:15 p.m. yesterday afternoon. The initial response from Mr. Panetta and those here at the White House was very encouraging. We all looked at the counter-offer that had come from the Republican leadership and said, well, this is a serious offer and it is something we might be able to work with.

Mr. Panetta departed after meeting here to get the consensus of everyone here on the language -- he departed to go to the Hill. He met with the Democratic leaders that he had been working with -- Senator Daschle, Minority Leader Gephardt -- but also with a cross-section of members of the House -- Congressman Stenholm, Condit, Miller, Obey, DeLauro, Senators Reid and Exon. He also had an opportunity, I believe, by telephone to talk and touch base with others. And it was clear on the Democratic side of the aisle there was a great deal of enthusiasm for this language because it gave Democrats and the President something we had been looking for, an acknowledgement by this Republican Congress for the first time that those priorities the President keeps laying before them are, indeed, important and will have to be reflected in a balanced budget agreement.

Having recognized that and having been shown a willingness to put that into some formal language, everyone agreed that Mr. Panetta ought to accept the offer. He met a short while

later with his Republican counterparts -- specifically, Senator Domenici, Congressman Kasich, and I believe there were other Republicans present as well. They met in Senator Dole's office. Our understanding is Senator Dole was nearby. And they suggested one or two modifications to the language which were quickly embraced. And then at approximately 7:00 p.m., I guess, the

Majority Leader went to the Senate floor and announced the agreement.

Q The President thanked Senator Dole and Senator Domenici and Congressman Kasich. Was he slighting Newt Gingrich again?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he wasn't. The Speaker clearly played a role.

Q Here we go again.

Q The Speaker played a role?

Q Does the administration plan to publish its way of getting to a balanced budget in seven years, or are you just going to go up there and work off the Republican budget and try to whittle it down to more acceptable terms?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we're not going to repeat the exercise that we attempted earlier this year where we came forward with a budget proposal that was not taken seriously or dismissed. So we have to do -- really, this negotiation has gone on quite some time now. It seems to be much more useful to start at the starting point of the language that was adopted in this agreement last night to really go seriously into the issues of how do we address Medicare solvency, how do we make sure there's adequate funding for Medicaid, how do we make sure that we've got proper funding for education, for environmental protection. Working through those issues will very quickly get you to answers on spending that then define other aspects of the budget. And quite obviously, we think, it's going to say something very quickly about the size of any tax relief that can be provided in the final budget.

Q So what was the answer to that question?

Q So you're not going to publish those -- you're not going to say \$90 billion for cuts for Medicare?

MR. MCCURRY: Look, we are now, beginning Monday, going to be in a serious negotiation. And as you can well imagine, we're not going to be negotiating publicly. We'll be doing it in the

meetings face-to-face with the Republican leaders.

Q Pretend that you didn't have anybody to negotiate with, you could just impose something yourself. How vivid a picture is there in the administration's mind of what a seven-year budget would look like if they could do it on their own?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've got a pretty good idea based on the work we did for our own budget proposal in June of what it would look like and how you would adjust it. But that's pointless to do that type of hypothetical exercise now. We're into a real negotiation with the Republican leaders who are working on budget issues and, ultimately, with the Speaker and the Majority Leader, and I'd rather deal in reality than hypotheticals.

Q Mike, you say you're working on the spending threat first before you determine the size of the tax cut?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I did not say that. I suggested that that would be, in our view, the right way to start, to go through those issues that were identified in the agreement last night and begin to pin down specifically how we're going to address those things that are sketched out in the agreement last night, because

once you answer those questions, once you know how you're going to protect future generations and how you're going to make sure Medicare remains solvent for however many years once you decide how you're going to have adequate funding for Medicaid, you begin to define a lot of the issues that are central in this debate. And I think our view is you also, as I say, get a pretty good sense of what the revenue side is going to look like.

Q You must have some bottom-line notions of what you want, and I'm wondering, for instance, in the EITC, whether no cuts in the EITC except for the fraud parts of that, that's one of your bottom line, not moving kind of --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you will have to understand that in the period of the next several weeks, we're not going to -- quote, unquote -- "give our bottom line" here through me. That would not be a very smart way to negotiate. We will do our best to accomplish those objectives the President has laid out. But he's made it very clear he doesn't want to see taxes increased on the working poor, and the proposed cutbacks and the trimbacks in the EITC clearly are in that category.

Q When are you going to get to talking again on the debt ceiling, and how confident is Secretary Rubin that he can keep going indefinitely, shuffling accounts --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the Treasury Secretary raised that point this morning -- in order to get the agreement on the continuing resolution that keeps the government open, we do not have any less or any less important concerns about the approaching debt ceiling issues. The Treasury Secretary has taken some steps, he's told you how long that can maintain the integrity and full faith and credit of the United States government. But it's clear that as we get into December, we face all the same issues and they need to come back and deal with those issues.

Q It's been about a year since the Summit of the Americas. Is President Clinton considering in the immediate future a trip to the South American countries? They are so critical in the growth of the economic markets, and yet, so forgotten, apparently.

MR. MCCURRY: He has not -- by no means, are they forgotten. We've had extensive diplomatic contacts throughout the region. On the President's staff, Counselor Mack McLarty has been in very close contact with governments in the region as they follow up on the summit action document. We maintain a very vigorous diplomatic approach to fulfilling the diplomatic objectives and recommendations outlined in the action plan adopted a year ago.

We also, as you know, have had a series of high-level visits with a number of countries in the region, and those will continue. They also, I think in many cases, will be carrying messages directly from the President reflecting his own concern about relationships in the region.

Q Mike, there's been a lot of talk about the President going to Dayton for an initialing ceremony, if it were to get to that. Is there any possibility that he would have to go to help seal the deal. Is his presence -- is that a possibility or is it Holbrooke --

MR. MCCURRY: It's just not at all clear at this point.

Q You said that you don't want to see any tax

increases on the working poor. Does that mean the administration might be willing to tolerate some reduction in the EITC as long as they're offset by --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to negotiate in public here now.

Q Mike, now that you've got protection of the environment as one of the guiding principles for a budget

agreement, does that strengthen the hand of the President in keeping ANWR close to oil --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, in the opinion of the White House, it certainly does. That is a very key concern of those who are worried about the protection of our environment, and it is hard to see how reopening the ANWR to drilling and exploration would be consistent to this agreement now reached by Congress and the President.

Q This morning you said you might have some figures by now on the government shutdown, the cost.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't. John Koskinen, who has been the OMB's point person in dealing with the agencies, has now put a formal request out to the agencies they want to develop for the President at his request a report on the consequences of the shutdown and the cost to the American people of this shutdown. They are assembling that data and it will come back here, we hope, in a matter of days. But as soon as it's available I'll make it available to you. I will say that we believe it will make a very powerful case that we should never do this type of shutdown again.

Q What's the status of appropriations still on the President's desk? Is Defense still on there, and is that a veto coming down?

MR. MCCURRY: Defense is here. It is being held while we examine the bill. It is the only pending appropriations bill on the President's desk that I'm aware of.

Q That leads to this other question. Warner said yesterday that there would be no money for troops in Bosnia if he vetoes this DOD bill. Do you have a response to that? He just said flat out, no --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, Senator Warner alone does not make that determination.

Q How much did your need to refocus on Bosnia play a role in wanting to strike a deal on the budget?

MR. MCCURRY: None to my knowledge.

Q Just another question about the tick-tock. When Leon Panetta sent up the offer with the list of priorities, was Veterans and Agriculture in that list?

MR. MCCURRY: They were not. They were specifically

added, I believe, at the suggestion of Congressman Stenholm, Congressman Condit and others who represent the views of the coalition. There were others who suggested that, too. I shouldn't say they were solely suggested by those members, but I think there was some concern across the Democratic ranks that they make those two additions.

Q Is the President going to sign or veto the highway bill that lifts the speed limit?

MR. MCCURRY: It has not been received yet. When it comes we'll study it carefully.

Q On Bosnia and a follow-up. I'm not clear, now that you're in extra innings, is there still a deadline to finish these talks --

MR. MCCURRY: That's a question that you really have to pose to Nick Burns out in Dayton.

Q Last week, regarding the defense appropriations bill, you said the \$7 billion that Congress added would probably not be acceptable to the President. Is the President now thinking maybe he should accept the difference?

MR. MCCURRY: Those remain the President's views, as reflected in our statement of administration policy.

Q How influential to the White House's readiness to sign the agreement were two factors: one, the increasing defection of Democrats, especially in the House, which jeopardized a veto; and, two, internal White House polls which perhaps were showing a growing bipartisan blame on both --

MR. MCCURRY: Slightly, and not at all.

Q Can you give us an idea of what's going to go --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, let me get on -- on the question of Democrats, it's important to note that one fact of life we were dealing with here is that many Democrats had voted, especially on the House side, for the coalition proposals offered by Congressman Stenholm. And many of them, fairly, in the White House's view, said we need to protect our voting records here. We are on record in support of this type of measure. And the language at various points being suggested Friday and Saturday, would have put them -- had they indicated their opposition, would have put them in conflict with their prior recorded votes. That's a situation we well understood.

I don't know that there was a real concern about defections. I think it was more -- I describe it more as being a desire on the part of the President, after conversations with the Democratic leadership, to do something to reopen the government.

What everyone was feeling was a very intense concern on the part of the American people and a sense that this was not the type of crisis that ought to be tolerated by elected leaders. And everyone felt a responsibility to find a way to bring it to an end. That was certainly true of Senator Dole, certainly true of Senator Domenici, became true of others on the House side. And I think it was really a determination to bring this crisis to an end so that we could set the table for the real discussion that has to happen.

All along we've said -- day after day I've told you here we want to take the budget issues that are fundamental in this debate and set them outside the context of crisis. And that's what happened yesterday and it's why the President is very satisfied with the outcome.

Q Mike, without going into what it should be like or income levels, or whatever, is the President still in favor of a middle class tax cut?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. He is still in favor of his Middle Class Bill of Rights and tax relief for working moderate income families that especially he has targeted on child care and educational opportunities that will help Americans get the skills they need to be productive and contributing members of the 21st century American economy in jobs that are higher paying.

Q How does the rest of the week play out? I mean, when do we get briefings on this trip of why he's going and so forth?

MR. MCCURRY: Right. We'll do a background briefing tomorrow at the conclusion of my briefing on the trip to the United Kingdom and Ireland. We'll have some additional -- most likely in the next two days, some additional follow-up work we can brief you on, on the budget issues. But beginning, hopefully, Wednesday afternoon, we'll be preparing for a short vacation that will be somewhat more relaxing than the last two or three weeks.

Q Details, details.

Q Does he go to Camp David for Thanksgiving?

MR. MCCURRY: His plan now is to go to Camp David for Thursday and Friday. I don't know for certain the plans for Saturday or Sunday, although at least one member of the First

Family has expressed a preference for staying up there through the weekend. But we'll have to see how that comes out.

Q What about tomorrow and Wednesday? What's he planning?

MR. MCCURRY: We're still working on schedule issues for Tuesday and Wednesday.

Q Despite the President's injunction against

gloating, the latest public polls as near as we can tell, do show a clear public predisposition to support the President's arguments. They say that they think he's more conscientious in trying to find a solution, blamed Congress, relatively speaking, quite a lot more than him for the shutdown. Does he feel, thereby, in any way vindicated for having made this stand?

MR. MCCURRY: To my knowledge, the President paid very little attention to anyone who came running in to see him with polls. He, frankly, didn't give a damn about the polls. And he said so, and he told the leaders that. He said, I don't care if my popularity goes down to five percent; that's not what this is about. And he made much the same point to members of the White House staff earlier and said, look, polls will go up and down. We've got a long ways until November of 1996, and no one ought to pay attention to polls because what we ought to pay attention to is how we are going to go through this debate now with members of Congress in which there are very real issues at stake and make sure that we do what we think is right for the American people. And that's what he's done all along. And you all can do all the polls you want to.

Q When did he say this to the leaders, about not caring if his popularity --

MR. MCCURRY: November 2nd. November 2nd he told them point blank, I don't care what my poll ratings are going to be and I don't care -- you have not come forward to address my priorities. You'll recall that I -- this goes back to a lot of briefing I gave you on that meeting that he had with the four leaders in the Oval Office on November 2nd. And he said to them exactly what was important in his view, which is that you need to acknowledge my principles in this debate. I have come forward and said, all right, balancing the budget is an objective we share; doing it in some time certain is an objective we share; providing tax relief to working families is something we share. And I have publicly, at some cost to myself in polls and popularity, said I will work with you on those objectives. But you have to acknowledge my priorities. And that had not happened until we got this agreement

last night.

Q Mike, there's something very strange that happens about every hour on the hour, a big blurb comes out from the House Republican Conference Committee explaining their part in all of this budget -- and they discuss it and they're always right and everybody else is always wrong. This happens so much. We don't see anything from the Democrats. And the same things happens on CNN quite a bit. Last night there were about four or five big, not attributed to anybody, big blurbs on CNN about how right the Republicans were on this thing. What's happened to the Democrats?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, they've been up there making a good case and we had the President here last night.

Q They are lacking in total leadership on the House floor and you know it.

MR. MCCURRY: The main blurb that caused me concern last week from the House Republican Conference was the one that put out direct phone lines here at the White House at a time when we were dealing with short staff. And to my knowledge, the House Republican Conference was not. We were dealing with a lot of phone calls they had directed down here. But even with the limited technological capabilities of those who were here, i.e. me, we did figure out how to hit the transfer button on the phones so we could send the calls right back to the House Republican Conference. (Laughter.)

Q -- because I could tell you something.

MR. MCCURRY: Sarah, I will inform Democrats far and wide that we need to do a more aggressive case of getting the President's arguments out there to the American people.

Q As regards telephones here at the White House, it takes an hour sometimes to get a normal query through the White House, and then you don't get any answer, you don't get callbacks. You people hide your telephones down here, and it's a shame.

MR. MCCURRY: I know in the last week a large part of that was because we were significantly short-staffed.

Q Well, I realize that, of course, but --

MR. MCCURRY: That's one of the reasons why we've established a comment line and worked out ways to --

Q Thank you -- thank you.

Q She's right. She's really right. The Republicans have -- she is definitely right.

Q Can you give us any sense of what kind of backlog --

MR. MCCURRY: Look, on the point of direct telephone lines, we try to assist those communities that we serve here. And I'd make the point that we don't -- we've got an office that handles public inquiries and public comments and we try to direct phone traffic to that. When we're dealing here in the Press Office with media inquiries, we try to keep those lines open.

Q Let me tell you what happens. What really happens. Anybody calls 1414, to use the old White House number, most of the time won't answer and it won't refer anybody to a person unless they know who it is. And if it's a press person, you can't get through to anybody at all. And when you call your office down here, your lower office here and ask to be referred to somebody that you could talk to and give a query, that they're the ones who

will handle it, they ought to get it, you can't get through.

MR. MCCURRY: I will see if we can't do a better job of making sure we get telephone calls going through to the people they need to get through to.

Q Can you give us a sense of the backlog of work that's here now? I mean, everybody came walking back in this morning, but you were those days without staffing in the White House. What kind of backlog of work is there?

MR. MCCURRY: There is -- office by office, there is a considerable backlog of correspondence. We have had -- we have wanted to be accessible to the American public so they could voice opinions, but we were short-staffed. A lot of that had to be recorded electronically, and we're going to take a lot of that commentary off the voice mail tapes and record it so the President will have the advantage of the thinking of the American people.

We've got -- in the critical areas of legislation and what was coming from the Hill, we were able to have accepted personnel handling a lot of that type of traffic, and certainly for anything that would involve emergency situations or national security, we had staff here on board that could handle those situations. So there's less of a backlog there.

Unfortunately, the kind of backlog that developed were in compiling the views of the American people, making sure that

that information was available to the President, and then the slowdown in processing material from agencies. You know, each agency now has to deal with the consequences of shutdown and the backlog of pending decisions or pending action matters. And as they get stacked up and as they get stacked up here at the White House, there is a bottleneck that develops.

Now, one of the things we're doing now is to attempt to analyze where that is and to make sure that people work hard to get it back. And one thing the President is encouraged by, a lot of people who were forced by result of this shutdown to stay at home over the past week, since they are getting paid for that period, a lot of them have made the commitment to stay here and try to erase that type of backlog as quickly as possible.

Q I just wanted to give you a chance to possibly elaborate on something you said earlier when you said the Speaker played a role. From a White House perspective, what role did he play?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he's the Speaker of the House and there would have been no agreement without his support.

Q What role do you think he played --

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. Mr. Panetta -- remember

that when the President, last Monday, a week ago, met with the Majority Leader and the Speaker, they didn't make much progress at that point on those discussions, but what they did do was designate Mr. Panetta, Mr. Kasich, Mr. Domenici and Mr. Szabo and Mr. Exon to follow up the discussions. That's who Mr. Panetta worked with principally. The discussions that then occurred between the Republican negotiators and their leadership you really have to ask of the Republican leadership.

Q You seem to be damning him with faint praise, though. Was his role overall helpful?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't mean to do that. I don't mean to do that. I just don't know -- I don't know what kind of conversations they had back and forth. I can't provide you a tick-tock on what internal deliberations they had on the Republican side as they dealt this with. But, clearly, there would have been no deal without the speaker.

Q December 15 seems an awfully short deadline to reach agreement on all these budget issues. In view of the public's experience with the shutdown in recent days and the heat both sides felt from the public to get this over with, what happens

December 15 if you need a little bit additional time? Do you think the chances are greater now that you could get a CR without getting a shutdown at that point?

MR. MCCURRY: We believe here at the White House that the experience of the last week, the loss of service to the American people and the concern and dismay of federal workers who want to do their job on behalf of the public, given that concern and given that dismay, we think that will be a powerful argument to not let this happen again.

But there is no guarantee of that. These are difficult issues that go to the fundamental difference that exists between the President and the Democratic party on the Hill, and the new Republic, the majority in this Congress. And those differences are deep. That we are able to bridge them in order to get a temporary measure and reopen the government, but we're now dealing with a balanced budget proposal. And the consequences of that deliberation are much more significant, much more long-term; the stakes are much higher. And whether or not we can resolve those issues amicably by December 15th is a very real question. There is no answer to it at this point. Obviously, on the part of the President, we hope that we can. We hope there will be the same kind of flexibility in reaching agreements that was shown when the Congress acknowledged the President's priorities last night. But we'll just have to see where we come out.

Q Would a 75 percent funding level be acceptable --

MR. MCCURRY: Look, just as -- I'm going to establish pretty much an ironclad rule here from now through December 15th,

I'm just not going to get into specific, substantive aspects of this negotiation day in and day out. They're going to have to do this work; they have to do it face to face. Those who are doing the negotiating will, as they see fit, brief publicly on it. But it's not wise for us here at the White House to speculate on what type of agreement might be reached if and when the negotiations begin.

Q There have been a few stories now about Senator Dole coming out against expanding NAFTA, new trade negotiations. There was a story in the Post yesterday that said that Dole is -- kind of intimated that Dole is pandering a little to the Buchanan conservatives who don't like NAFTA and who don't like trade. I'm wondering, is the White House satisfied with the level of Senator Dole's leadership on this?

MR. MCCURRY: We have not been closely monitoring Senator Dole's pronouncements on the campaign trail. I, frankly,

was unaware of those remarks, but I'll take a look and see if we've had any policy-related discussions on free trade agreements.

Q Mike, last week you took a question on whether the White House, in view of the acquittal of Billy Dale, was now prepared to offer some kind of back work credit or extra retirement pay or a new job. What's the answer?

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I am aware of, but I don't have a definitive answer. I'll keep working at it.

Q Will you try and get one?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll try, yes.

Q One area of sizeable difference between the administration and the Republican budget plan is Medicare and Medicaid budget baselines. Is that something that could be revisited, given the magnitude of the differences?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the baseline will be affected by the technical economic assumptions that are now going to be developed by the CBO in consultation with the OMB and outside government experts.

Q Do you have a new date for the Tokyo trip?

MR. MCCURRY: No. The Vice President did consult with the Japanese government as he represented the President -- by the way, the Vice President had an excellent series of meetings, was successful and very capable in representing the President at the APEC leaders summit. The President, in his brief remarks to the staff today, paid special note to the very fine role he played on short notice and the fact that he's spent I think a total of 20-plus hours on the airplane. But he got the job done. And among the things he did raise in his meeting with Prime Minister Murayama was the optimal date for the President's promised early visit to Japan.

Q Which was what?

MR. MCCURRY: They have not settled on a date. They're still reviewing different possibilities.

Q Mike, what's the President's position on the Hooters case? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I don't even -- I talked to a friend about

it, and I don't even know if he knows what it's about.

Q For the record, Mike, I'd like to thank April Mellody for the work she did for us last week. (Applause.)

MR. MCCURRY: That's very gracious and very -- let the record show that April Mellody did a good job under difficult circumstances representing all the essential employees of the White House Press Office. She has a very nice day off, and a very well-deserved day off.

Q She didn't get the thank-you from the President out on the South Lawn.

MR. MCCURRY: She, I think, was probably more happy to have the day off. But I think all of my -- I'm very happy all the staff is back here. I hope during the course of the last week you really came to understand a little bit more about indispensable everyone on the White House Press staff is to all of you.

Q Just to return to the budget agreement for just a second -- isn't it a fact that the CBO has the last word, is the final judge of the numbers? And if that's the case, what does the White House really gain?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it's interesting, by law they always are. They always have to score any final action by Congress, and that is the definitive statement on what the economic assumptions are for acts of Congress. So, in a sense, they were putting into law something that is already in law.

The key thing from our perspective is that they agreed that they would use the most recent current projections and they would do so in consultation with the OMB and with private experts on the outside. You see, our view is if they go to the private sector and talk to those who do the blue-chip forecasts, they will very quickly see a powerful argument in the economic academic community why we need to revisit some of the growth targets that they've been using heretofore. But, that is -- I heard Congressman Kasich make a point last night which I think is a good one -- that is the province of technical experts and economic experts who then make decisions, make judgments that can help policymakers make policy. And on that point, Chairman Kasich is 100 percent correct.

Q In that regard then, Mike, how do you start, how

does Panetta start next week to talk about policy differences without the underlying agreement about what you'd have to spend, discretionary spending, what you're going to have --

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know, and we can't -- I've offered to you some thoughts about what we think the sequences of issues should be, and that may, in fact, be a part of the initial dialogue they have to have with the Republican side. We can't suggest you that's necessarily the way things are going to go.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:38
P.M. EST

#140-11/20

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 20 November 95 21:02
FROM Veit, Katherine M.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT 9:30am mtg w/POTUS [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bass, Peter E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Hall, Wilma G.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

TL had asked that this mtg (prep for UK/Ireland trip) be put off to later in the day Tuesday. This was not possible due to possible POTUS/Press event. So we asked for a time Wednesday a.m. before TL departs. Schedule is looking at this possibility but would not be able to get back to us til Tuesday a.m.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 08:07
FROM Johnson, David T.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT What I know today [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Cullin, Brian P.
Fetig, James L.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
CARBON_COPY Johnson, David T.
TEXT_BODY

Bosnia: as of 0700, the company line is: "the talks are still ongoing, but they're at a critical stage." FYI only: US negotiators told the others last night that this was the last day, but keep in mind they told them the same thing Sunday and Monday. There may be a press conference and closedown

meeting sometime today, but don't bank on it.

Schedules: Tony has 0815 press coordination, 0830 sr. dir, 0930 speech prep for uk/ireland with the Pres, 1000 trip prep with the Pres., and a possible, but unlikely PC at 2:30.

Sandy has the above plus an 11:00 a.m. Haiti meeting in the sit room.

Remember Nancy briefs today at 2:00 on the trip, on background, in the briefing room.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 09:00
FROM Peters, Mary A.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SUBJECT FW: Ireland Trip ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~
TO Dohse, Fred J.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, May 16, 2017
By 102 NARA, Date 05/06/19
0017-0159-F

From: Vershbow, Alexander R.
To: Peters, Mary A.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: RE: Ireland Trip ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 1995 08:16 AM

Agree. They can always meet privately on impromptu basis if need arises

From: Peters, Mary A.
To: Vershbow, Alexander R.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: Ireland Trip ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~
Date: Monday, November 20, 1995 11:42 PM

As you have probably heard, we are on for the full schedule. Had to send the book forward because the briefing time was moved up to tomorrow morning.

Question: Because Major will have breakfast with the POTUS (with wives) and two or three other meals, as well as time walking to the wreath laying, I did not think we needed the usual private meeting before the expanded one. The issues -- NATO/Russia, Bosnia, Northern Ireland, Libya, etc., do not require a private setting-- in fact I would hate to have them talk together without being able to get a readout. Fred D says this is ok if you concur. What do you think?

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 09:37
FROM Maxfield, Nancy H.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SUBJECT 1.5(b) [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~] Events paper

TO Baker, Jane E.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Gray, Wendy
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, May 16, 2017
By *WPE* NARA, Date *01/29/19*
2017-0759-P

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY
[[EVENTS.DOC : 2372 in EVENTS.DOC]] Here is the Events paper listing everything in the book.

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE 21 November 95 9:36

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME EVENTS.DOC
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Reason: 1.5(b)
Declassify on: 11/20/05

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE

SUBJECT: Your Trip to UK and Ireland, November 27-
December 2, 1995

This briefing book contains memoranda on the events and your

individual meetings in the UK and Ireland, November 28-December 2, 1995.

Overview Memoranda

Schedule of Key Events

Scope Memoranda

Memorandum from the Secretary of State

Event Memoranda

UK

Arrival Ceremony

Breakfast Meeting with Prime Minister Major

Scenesetter -- No. 10 Downing Street

Meeting with American Embassy Staff

Lunch with Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II

Scenesetter -- Buckingham Palace

U.S. Hosted Reception at Ambassador Crowe's Residence

Scenesetter -- Winfield House

Wreath Laying Ceremony at Tomb of the Unknown Soldier

Scenesetter -- Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Westminster Abbey

Meeting with Prime Minister Major

Address to Parliament

Scenesetter -- Guild Hall, House of Lords

Meeting with Labour Leader Tony Blair

Tour/Meeting with Prince Charles

Scenesetter -- Windsor Castle

Dinner Hosted By Prime Minister Major

Reception Hosted by Prime Minister Major

Northern Ireland

Arrival Ceremony

Speech at the Mackie Plant

Scenesetter -- Mackie Plant

Tour by Car: the Peace Line/Falls Rd./Shankhill Rd.

Round Table and Tour East Belfast Enterprise Park

Scenesetter -- East Belfast Enterprise Park

Inauguration of Tip O'Neill Chair for Peace Studies

Scenesetter -- Guild Hall

Wall Walk

Scenesetter -- City Walls

American Ireland Fund Reception at Guildhall

Tree Lighting Ceremony

Reception at Queen's University

Scenesetter -- Queen's University

Meeting with David Trimble, UUP Leader

Ireland

Arrival Ceremony

Meeting with President Mary Robinson and Tree Planting Ceremony

Scenesetter -- Aras

Meeting with Prime Minister Bruton

Bank of Ireland Public Rally

Remarks to Parliament

Ambassador Smith's Residence

Radio Address with U.S. Embassy Staff

Dinner Hosted by Prime Minister Bruton

Scenesetter -- Dublin Castle

Meeting with Business Leaders/Investment Event

Dinner Hosted by U.S. at Dromoland Castle

Scenesetter -- Dromoland Castle

Press Papers

Press Q's and A's

Background Papers

UK

Political Overview

Economic Overview

Bosnia -- Status of Negotiating Track

Bosnia -- Status of IFOR Planning

Bosnia -- Status of Reconstruction Planning

NATO Enlargement and European Security Architecture

U.S.-Russia Overview

CFE

UK Views on U.S.-EU Relations and the New Transatlantic Agenda

U.S.-UK Civil Aviation Relationship

U.S. Economic Interests in the UK

Hong Kong

U.S.-China Relationship

Iran

Iraq

Middle East Peace Process

Libya and Pan Am 103

South Africa

Nigeria

UN Reform

Current Issues With Turkey

Cyprus Negotiations

Non-Proliferation Issues

Northern Ireland

Northern Ireland: Political Overview

Northern Ireland: Economic Overview

Status of the Peace Process and Cease-Fire

Decommissioning Commission/Panel
Northern Ireland: IRA and Sinn Fein
Paramilitary Prisoners
Investment in Northern Ireland
International Fund for Ireland
Washington Conference Fact Sheet
Northern Ireland: Demographics
Northern Ireland and "The Troubles" Since 1968

Ireland
Ireland: Political Overview

Ireland: Economic Overview
GOI/Unionist Relations
GOI/Nationalist Relations
U.S. Immigration Via and Visa Waiver Programs
Domestic Irish Opinion on the Peace Process
Irish Cross-Border Trade and Investment in Northern Ireland
U.S.-Ireland Trade and Investment
Ireland and the EU
Irish FM Spring and Cyprus
Irish Participation in PFP/WEU
Divorce, the Church, and Abortion in Ireland

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 10:15
FROM Gardner, Anthony
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Passports [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Wright, Allison M.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

don't have it with me. i'll bring it in tomorrow

From: Wright, Allison M.

To: Dohse, Fred J.; Gardner, Anthony; Joshi, M. Kay; Peters, Mary A.;
Vershow, Alexander R.; Soderberg, Nancy E.

CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; Baldwin, Kenneth; Gray, Wendy E.; Kessinger, Jodi;
Marshall, Betty A.; Maxfield, Nancy H.

Subject: Passports [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Tuesday, November 21, 1995 09:49 AM

For those mentioned in the TO portion of this message Schedule and Advance needs your passports asap today in preparation for the Ireland/London/Madrid trip. Admin nor Schedule and Advance has possession of them. I'm happy to stop by your offices and pick them up if necessary. Thanks for your help.

Allison

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 10:34
FROM Kessinger, Jodi
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Note from NES re: Irish Trip Roundtables [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Fetig, James L.
CARBON_COPY Baker, Jane E.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Gray, Wendy
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.

TEXT_BODY

Jim - You should stay involved since you're doing the trip. Looks good, who else has interviews on AF1?

From: Fetig, James L.
To: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
CC: /R, Record at A1; @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: Irish Trip Roundtables [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Monday, November 20, 1995 06:37 PM

Nancy: Wanted to bounce this by you. Evelyn has gone back to scheduling to try and get some time Wednesday for POTUS interviews to set up the Ireland/UK/Spain/EU trip. I should bow out of this. Got involved while everyone else was preoccupied with Japan.

Mary Ellen Glynn and I did a strawman last week that includes the following names. Jill can invite any list including all or none of these since none have been invited. The idea was a small print roundtable and a 30 min block for TV interviews. Jack Farrell has an exclusive scheduled on AF-1 according to Laurie McHugh.

Print: Martin Fletcher, Martin Walker, Jurek Martin, Rupert Cornwell, James Adams, Daniel Franklin, Conor O'Cleary, Dailia Millan (EFE - the Spanish news wire- WH correspondent).

TV: BBC Gareth Evans, ITN David Smith, RTE Mark Little, UTV, Reuters TV

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 11:58
FROM Peters, Mary A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Passports [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Wright, Allison M.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Accept your offer -- Im in room 368 thanks

From: Wright, Allison M.

To: Dohse, Fred J.; Gardner, Anthony; Joshi, M. Kay; Peters, Mary A.;
Vershow, Alexander R.; Soderberg, Nancy E.

CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; Baldwin, Kenneth; Gray, Wendy E.; Kessinger, Jodi;
Marshall, Betty A.; Maxfield, Nancy H.

Subject: Passports [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Tuesday, November 21, 1995 09:49 AM

For those mentioned in the TO portion of this message Schedule and Advance needs your passports asap today in preparation for the Ireland/London/Madrid trip. Admin nor Schedule and Advance has possession of them. I'm happy to stop by your offices and pick them up if necessary. Thanks for your help.

Allison

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 15:07
FROM Dohse, Fred J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT POTUS Prebrief for UK, Ireland and Spain [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Albers, Paul J.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Cullin, Brian P.
Feeley, John F.
Fetig, James L.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Froman, Michael B.
Gardner, Anthony
Johnson, David T.
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Munson, Robert A.
Naplan, Steven J.
Peters, Mary A.
Schmidt, John R.
Schuker, Jill A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY Baker, Jane E.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Dohse, Fred J.
Gray, Wendy
Harmon, Joyce A.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.
Sens, Andrew D.

TEXT_BODY

We have one hour for briefing the President on the UK, Ireland and Spain trip tomorrow, November 22. Our briefing will start at 0945, after Tony's daily time with the President. As it currently stands, we will follow the attached agenda.

[[POTUSBRF.DOC : 3933 in POTUSBRF.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT

FILE DATE 21 November 95 14:58
ATTACHMENT POTUSBRF.DOC
FILE NAME POTUS Briefing for UK, Ireland and Spain Trip

Briefing will be done in two phases:

ù Phase I -- speech preparation (first 30 minutes) in the Oval Office. Participants : POTUS,

Tony Lake, Nancy Soderberg, Don Baer, Sandy Vershbow, Tony Blinken.

ù Phase II -- review schedule and discuss specifics (second 30 minutes) in Cabinet Room.

oom.

Participants: POTUS, Tony Lake, Nancy Soderberg, Sandy Vershbow, Fred Dohse, Mike

Froman, Tony Gardner, Mary Ann Peters, David Johnson, Jim Fetig.

ù The Vice President and Leon Panetta will be invited to attend both sessions.

Time

(minutes)

Briefer

Subject

00-30

Tony Lake & Don Baer

Speech preparation

30-35

Fred Dohse

Overall Schedule

35-40

Tony Lake & Nancy

Soderberg

Trip goals and objectives

40-50

Sandy Vershbow &

Mike Froman

U.S.-EU Summit

50-60

Tony Lake

Summarize discussion

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 16:35
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT November 21 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Albers, Paul J.
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.
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 L.
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, Stephan 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
Mauzy, Stefan T.
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.
Munson, Robert 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
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 D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Willis, Robin M.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, William M.
Witkowsky, 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 [[1121MCBF.DOC : 4144 in 1121MCBF.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 21 November 95 16:30

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 1121MCBF.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release November 21, 1995

Fo

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:50 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Good afternoon, everyone. I am late because I want to report to you a conversation the President just had moments ago with Presidents Tudjman, Milosevic and Izetbegovic. The President, who at the time was having his weekly lunch with Vice President Gore, called all three Presidents in a call arranged by Secretary Christopher to thank them on behalf of the American people for the very hard work that they employed in the last several weeks in order to reach the agreement that's now been reached to settle the conflict in Bosnia.

The President told them that, "you've done an honorable, noble thing to give your peoples a future of peace, and we will support you. " The President also said that "the credit for this agreement goes to you, but responsibilities go to you as well." All three Presidents in one way or another both thanked the United States for its effort. At one point, President Izetbegovic referred to Ambassador Holbrooke and Secretary Christopher as "true heroes." But they also, all three, reaffirmed that they accept this agreement fully and honestly and that all three will do their very best to see that it is properly implemented.

The President said at another point in the conversation that he felt that this really represents the dawn of a new era for Bosnia. "All I ever wanted," the President said, "out of this was peace and prosperity for your people." He closed the conversation by explaining to the three Presidents that we are on the eve of the American holiday, Thanksgiving, and he described -- he had just recently read President Lincoln's very first Thanksgiving proclamation issued during the Civil War, and he described that to them and said how at this time of thanksgiving their agreement today on Bosnia would be especially meaningful to the American people.

The President has also now completed calls to all four congressional leaders -- to Speaker Gingrich, who he spoke to

shortly before his announcement this morning; to Senator Dole, Congressman Daschle and Congressman -- I mean, Senator Daschle and Congressman Gephardt. All acknowledged in one way or another that

the President will have to work very strenuously to make the case for the U.S. deployment as part of the implementation force. The President, of course, knew that. That is a given. And he will begin immediately to make that case.

We've already had extensive consultations with the American Congress, as you know. Those will continue. We expect once the NATO final operational plan is in place to be able to conduct a very extensive presentation to members of Congress, but even prior to that we'll be in a position to brief congressional staffs. I suspect that Ambassador Holbrooke, Secretary Christopher and others who were part of the discussions in Dayton will be in a position immediately to brief congressional staff. We'd like to get them to Capitol Hill as quickly as possible. Knowing that most members are back home in their districts but might likely be facing questions from the American public, we'll do everything we can to get them the information they need about the agreement itself to be signed today in Dayton, so they can answer questions from their constituents.

And then as we move into the next phase, which will be the deployment phase for the implementation force, we will brief them on the details of the operational plan that we expect to be finalized by the Supreme Allied Commander for Europe and then adopted by the North Atlantic Council, and then also the steps that would be required by the United States as part of that agreement.

That is all a process that will unfold over the coming weeks, as the President suggested to you this morning. And some aspects of the timing and the sequencing will still be worked out as the allies begin their deliberations in Brussels.

That's about all I have to report. Maybe you have questions.

Q Mike, a New York Times columnist today posed a question I realized I didn't have the answers to myself. He said that a number of times the President has expressed the idea that NATO and the European allies are counting on the U.S. to provide troops to this. And he said, you know, we don't really know when exactly the President made this commitment and the specific circumstances under which it was made. It may be something that's out there and I just can't remember, but I wondered if you could refresh how exactly that came about.

MR. MCCURRY: I can recall from the initial stages, back to February 17th, 1993, if I recall correctly, that the United States has made the point that a agreement reached in good faith by these parties, being implemented by the parties, the United States of America believed that it had responsibilities to assist them in

its implementation. That has been a commitment that the United States has had in one way or another from the very beginning of this administration.

It has been affected by the twists and turns that the diplomatic efforts have taken as we've attempted to work through the Bosnian crisis. But to my knowledge we have made clear from the very beginning of this administration that the United States would be willing to participate in a peace force or a force to implement a peace agreement subject to the agreement by the parties to reach that type of settlement.

Q Was there a specific agreement, a specific meeting or specific discussion that specifically triggered this commitment?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there was a very extensive review in the very earliest days of this administration of U.S. policy in the Balkans. One result of that were the efforts that were launched, then, in a sense, relaunched in the period between early 1993, mid-1993, and then going through 1994. But you all know that the history of the U.S. participation in the efforts to bring about this peace settlement that they have changed depending on both the circumstances in the conflict itself, what was going on on the ground, what level of fighting, and then the willingness of our European allies to use a more aggressive and robust effort to address some of the atrocities, some of the killing, some of the continued conflict.

So there have been various moments where the U.S. has been involved in various ways, but several things about our commitment have been steadfast. One, the President, as he has indicated, would never dispatch ground troops to Bosnia to be a part of the armed conflict there in a war situation. But, two, the United States would always be willing, working with its allies, to help implement a peace once the parties themselves reached an agreement that they were implementing and prepared to implement in good faith.

Q What specifically happens now? The President talked about reviewing the plan, then consulting Congress, giving them weeks, and that they would -- that full deployment wouldn't happen unless they approve. Can you give us a time check of what happens?

MR. MCCURRY: Just to tell you a little bit about just --

Q Did he say that, give it that characterization?

MR. MCCURRY: Say again -- what was the last?

Q Full deployment won't take place unless they agree.

Q He said complete -- his phrase was complete deployment.

MR. MCCURRY: The President has said all along that we

will seek an expression of support from the Congress for the implementation force and for the U.S. participation in that force. And, of course, we expect to make a very persuasive case for that, and we will give Congress a timely opportunity to provide that expression of support.

Now, where we are today, to answer the question -- at about 3:00 p.m., an hour from now, the parties will actually initial the agreements they've reached today. And they will then be released to the public. There will be some briefings by Secretary Christopher, by Ambassador Holbrooke, by others who have participated in the extraordinary effort to bring about this agreement. There will be, we believe immediately, efforts by the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General George Joulwan, to complete the details of an operational plan that would establish the parameters of the implementation force. That will then be submitted to both the President, who's indicated to you earlier that he would review that plan. It will also be submitted to the Alliance, to the North Atlantic Council, for its approval.

We believe that this should occur in a matter of days, not weeks. But it certainly will have to develop into a schedule that fits with the review that will be necessary by our treaty allies. That will happen, though, over the course of the coming week and perhaps into the following week.

Once that has been -- once that has happened, once the North Atlantic Council has approved a final operational plan, the President will be in the position then to evaluate it, to be absolutely confident at that point that he can then go present to the Congress the case for U.S. participation and to formally request the expression of support we've already indicated several times to Congress that we would seek.

Q Before all that happens --

Q And what -- the President, in a meeting with congressional leaders last week, they said, told them that he would give them a minimum of two weeks from when he formally presented and asked for. Is that still the time frame. And could it be more than two weeks?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, as the President indicated to you today, our desire is to cooperate completely with Congress as Congress reviews the plans as they are finalized by NATO and as they are submitted to the U.S. commander in chief. Based on our conversations, we fully believe that we will be able to work out a timetable for congressional consideration that the leadership feels is proper. I don't want to speculate; I think the President was right when he said it's a matter of weeks because the urgency of a deployment and to keep the momentum moving forward now that the parties have agreed to peace is imperative.

Q Did the President -- did he place some calls to

Chirac, Major, Kohl and Yeltsin?

MR. MCCURRY: He has not yet. I wouldn't rule out that he will be in touch with them. But remember, as participants in the Contact Group, each of those nations have had their own representatives in Dayton and, indeed, the members of the Contact Group all played important roles. The European Union negotiator, Carl Bildt, was a very significant force in the diplomatic effort to bring about this agreement. But each of those countries have got their representatives there; they're now in the process of briefing their capitals. I don't rule out the possibility of a further set of phone calls by the President, but the President will very shortly be in the position to have further direct conversations with the European Union in Spain, and I suspect there will be additional contact as well.

Q Was that a conference call this morning with the leaders -- I mean this afternoon?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he called them serially. He spoke to the Speaker just prior to his announcement.

Q A serial caller. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Sequentially. He placed calls to all four, and most of them are traveling. Senator Dole, I believe, was

--

Q No, I mean to the Croatian --

MR. MCCURRY: Senator Dole was, I believe, at an event in San Diego. I'm not sure exactly where he got Senator Daschle and Congressman Gephardt. The three Presidents were in the course of meeting with Secretary Christopher and Ambassador Holbrooke in Dayton. And the Secretary interrupted that call to put through the call to the President.

Q And will the President go to Paris for a signing ceremony?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have always said there --- they have now initialed various aspects of this agreement. There will be a peace conference at a time and place not now certain to formally conclude this peace agreement. That should happen soon, but there's not a time and place.

Q Could it happen here? Could it happen in Washington?

MR. MCCURRY: We don't have a time and place settled.

Q I thought it was supposed to be Paris.

MR. MCCURRY: Paris was speculated upon, but that is not certain.

Q Would the President go to that, Mike?

Q So is that a no, Mike, or a yes?

MR. MCCURRY: To what? What's the question?

Q To the question, which was --

MR. MCCURRY: Was it being signed?

Q No, was Clinton going to some signing ceremony on his European trip?

MR. MCCURRY: Clinton will go to a signing ceremony, most likely, but the time and place of that is not certain, and by no means is it certain it will be in the forthcoming trip.

Q The congressional negotiations or consultations you talked about, getting Chris and Holbrook back immediately. Are you talking about --

MR. MCCURRY: But I don't rule that out. (Laughter.)

Q Do you want to do some Christmas shopping? Are you talking about meetings tomorrow either here or no Capitol Hill with congressional leaders?

MR. MCCURRY: We hope tomorrow. We are now with our legislative affairs staff working to see which staffers are

available. Obviously and understandably, most members of Congress have now returned to their homes. But we feel it's urgent to get information about the agreement and the specifics of the agreement before the Congress, and we'll make every effort to have briefings on the Hill as early as tomorrow so they understand the parameters of the agreement itself.

Q Gingrich said he wanted to invited the three leaders to testify at hearings on Capitol Hill. Did that come up in the phone calls today with the President, and do you agree with that idea?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I don't know that the President at the time of the phone call was aware of that specific idea. All three have indicated that they appreciate the support we have. I've indicated and told you prior all three consider participation by the United States in the implementation force to be an indispensable part of this settlement. I believe that all three are prepared to make those views known. I believe you'll be hearing from them, if I'm not mistaken, very shortly.

Q Mike, despite all the President's talk about consulting with Congress and seeking an expression of support, does it remain his position that he has all the constitutional authority he has to deploy these troops on his own and that he does not or would not submit himself to prior congressional approval before sending them?

MR. MCCURRY: It remains his position that he has his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, as we've detailed that in the past. It also remains his very strong view that given the importance of this settlement to the people of the United States of America, given our interest in peace and security and stability throughout Europe, and given the importance of our long-lasting treaty commitments to our NATO allies, that the case for American participation in helping make this peace will be clear to the American people and, thus, also clear to the American Congress.

Q Mike, when is the earliest that American troops might be sent to Bosnia?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to give a haphazard answer to what is a very important question. It can't -- the deployment of a force that would actually be involved in some of the separation of forces and some of the monitoring of aspects of this agreement couldn't occur until we go through the process I've already detailed. We have prior indicated to Congress that there may well need to be pre-positioning of certain communications and logistics personnel. That's a separate matter. And the Pentagon

has briefed in some level of detail on what the initial logistics party would look like.

Q How many troops would that be?

MR. MCCURRY: I would leave it to the Pentagon in the days ahead to give you the details on that. They're talking about principally communications and logistics personnel that they indicated that might need to pre-position. But the extensive deployment of forces that would help implement this peace would go according to the sequencing that I just described to you.

Q Any plans that we'll see the President in a formal setting to talk about this?

MR. MCCURRY: No plans that I'm aware of. Of course, you saw the President earlier as he made the announcement.

Q What about the American people?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, the President -- it is a given that the President will be going before the American people to make a case about the urgency of U.S. participation in helping to implement this peace. The American people have questions about this. They know very little about the Balkans. But they know a lot about the horror and the bloodshed that they've seen for the last three and a half years. And they know that the United States is in a position to do something about that. What they're going to

want from the President as their Commander in Chief is precise information about how that's to happen. And the President will be making that available as the plans are approved and adopted by NATO. And he is confident that he can present to the American people the answers to the questions that they rightfully would have.

Q Mike, two things. I mean, by presenting to the American people, do you mean a television, formal television address?

MR. MCCURRY: That would be my best guess, yes.

Q And then, secondly, on the timing, I have this impression that the troops are supposed to go within two weeks after the Paris, or wherever it is, signing --

MR. MCCURRY: The precise timing of deployments and how that has happened have been reviewed by NATO military planners. I don't know that we've ever put that type of clock on it. But it's important that it happen, that it happen rather swiftly for reasons

that you've heard the Pentagon brief about, for reasons that folks in Brussels have also been briefed about. But again, the opportunity for timely consideration of the President's request for support will be available to the Congress.

Q Is it the President's intention to wait until after the formal signing before he goes on television?

MR. MCCURRY: I can't tell you right now when we would best make that case. In the President's mind, it's very clear he wants to go to the American people as soon as he's absolutely confident that we have every aspect of the mission buttoned up to his satisfaction and when he's confident that he can answer many of the questions that he would anticipate from them having heard from many of their representatives in the United States Congress.

Q You didn't quite nail this down. If Congress says no, votes no on an expression of support, will -- does the President intend to deploy --

MR. MCCURRY: I am not entertaining the question at this point because the President is confident that he will make the case to the American people on why it's necessary. And he will enjoy that support that he expects to get from the American people.

Q If the Congress is to get two weeks or more of time to consider its position following the completion of the operation plan, then it would seem that there's no way the signing ceremony, formal signing ceremony, wherever it's to be held, could coincide with the end of the President's trip.

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not -- don't know that I understand your question.

Q You just told us that starting today, it's going to take days and a maybe a week or 10 days for --

MR. MCCURRY: I didn't say any of that. I said we -- in a matter of days, we will be submitting, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe will be submitting to the North Atlantic Council an operation plan for final approval. When that happens, the President will also be in a position to have his own confidence that it represents the interest of the United States of America, and he can then both present it to the American Congress and, I presume, discuss it more directly with the American people. I'm not suggesting to you any date certain by which that will happen or ruling out the fact that some of that might happen in the course of the next couple weeks here. But we don't know at this point what that timing will be because some of it depends on the level of

consultation that's now begun with members of our Alliance.

Q But whenever the President finally signs off on the operation plan, it's at that point that Congress gets its two, three weeks, whatever period for review and expression of support, right?

MR. MCCURRY: Not necessarily. I said that when the President is confident that he can put that request before the Congress he will do so. I expect that that would happen roughly coinciding with approval by the North Atlantic Council, but they may not necessarily be at exactly the same moment.

Q Well, but since the President is due to return from Madrid on the 3rd, my question simply is can you squeeze all these things in between now and December 3rd.

MR. MCCURRY: We've managed to squeeze a fair amount in the last couple of days. So it's possible.

Yes.

Q Other than a formal signing, would there be anything to do at a peace conference? What else would have to --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there will be several things. One, the parties themselves can help the international community prepare for the obligations that we will have as we implement the peace by understanding fully their commitment to the peace itself. That is not an insignificant peace of business.

Secondly, there are many, as you'll see this afternoon, there are many aspects of this agreement that are quite detailed in what obligations there are for other international organizations. Just one example: the issue of arms control in Bosnia and how we measure out the relative forces of the various entities that will participate in this agreement. The Bosnia Croat Federation, the Bosnian Serb Republic -- those are all matters that could conceivably, and will according to this agreement, be addressed by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE.

So one aspect of a final concluding peace conference is to provide all the different participants in making this peace a reality, an opportunity to review the plan, to express their support, and to coordinate the activity that will go into making the peace.

Separate from the question of implementing the agreements itself, there is the large issue of rebuilding and reconstructive Bosnia. I expect, as some of you know, that there will be an implementation conference to be held, most likely, in

London, not necessarily at highest levels, but at a high diplomatic level, that would help address the question of how do we help the people of Bosnia return their war-torn country to some semblance of normalcy.

So all of those questions are important. They require international support, and these various conferences will be an opportunity for both Europe and other participants in the international community to come together and express their support for this peace process, and to get about the work of helping the parties themselves implement the peace.

Q The three sides that are going to initial this agreement, is their agreement contingent upon U.S. troop participation in the NATO force?

MR. MCCURRY: The agreement itself that they initialed, to my knowledge are not. But I would refer that question to the negotiators. I have not seen the final text of the documents I have. I would say as a practical matter that it's been clear from their comments privately and publicly over the course of the past several weeks that U.S. participation is an indispensable element of this agreement. If they were not confident the United States would be participating an implementation force, this peace agreement today would not have happened. That is abundantly clear.

Q Speaker Gingrich said that the President, in a telephone call, said that he was sorry about all of the confusion that might have been caused yesterday by Mr. Panetta over seven or eight years, and that really he's committed to seven years, and that Mr. Panetta's remarks about seven and eight yesterday were off base. Do you know anything about that?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know nothing about that. I believe I heard one side of the conversation, but unless there was a subsequent phone call -- I would have to hear that. But I believe we were very clear about that yesterday.

Q Will any American forces begin moving into --

Q Wait a minute. Are you saying that a budget discussion did not occur on the side of the conversation you heard?

MR. MCCURRY: Maybe we can try again and answer it for you, but I don't recall -- I think the discussion was brief. It

was focused on --

Q You mean today?

Q No, yesterday. He said he talked to Clinton yesterday --

MR. MCCURRY: I'll have to check on that and I will see. But I think I addressed that question very directly yesterday. We've got -- you all know what the text of that says. It says that you've got a commitment by the President and the Congress to balance the budget by a date certain, and you've got a commitment to address the priorities that the President was gratified were reflected in the concluding document. Those go together hand in hand, and one thing can't be agreed without everything being agreed to. We're in a situation now where the President's proposed a budget that meets the tests spelled out in what needs to be addressed as priorities, and the Congress has addressed the priorities that exist in terms of the number of years. They now have to come together and reconcile those two and balance the budget.

Q So as Mr. Panetta said, seven years might be fine, eight years might be fine?

MR. MCCURRY: The agreement is very clear as to timing, but it's also clear as to priorities, and the two have to go hand in hand.

Q Mike, does the President still plan to spend all of next week in Europe, or would he come back earlier to start selling this agreement? And, secondly, if he is in Europe all week, would we go visit U.S. troops?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't want to speculate on how this agreement might affect the President's schedule. I will say that many of the conversations he will be having, certainly with Prime Minister Major, certainly at the European Union sessions in Madrid, will very much be about the achievement today in Dayton and what comes next.

The President, in fact, began that work almost immediately, began thinking about what requirements there will be now to both prepare for the implementation of this agreement, to make the case forcefully to the American Congress that it's the right thing to do, and I wouldn't rule out that he would find various ways during the course of the trip in the coming days to address that and, hopefully, receive support for what we have achieved today from some of those that he will encounter during his foreign trip next week.

Q So is the trip still planned the President will leave Monday night and return Sunday night?

MR. MCCURRY: That's as planned, yes. If there is any need to adjust that, we will let you know -- usually, as we customarily do at the very last minute. (Laughter.) So all their entire life's screwed up.

Q Not to be out of bounds about it, but if you were a betting man, would you add a stop, or maybe subtract one from the President's schedule?

Q Golf game in Ireland?

MR. MCCURRY: I would know that we are -- we'll look at this schedule and do everything that's in the best interest of the President as he tries to advance these very important arguments.

Q Will any American forces go into Bosnia before the President completes his consultations with Congress?

MR. MCCURRY: The ones that I indicated. There will be some pre-positioning of communications and logistics personnel, as the President indicated to the Congress in his letter of November 13th.

Q Michael, what is being released today? Just the signed agreements or --

MR. MCCURRY: No, you'll see - I don't know how the agreements themselves are structured, but you'll see -- they will be able to today give you the formal text of the peace agreement. There are many aspects of this that have been negotiated over the last three months. For example, there is a constitution of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina. I'm not sure of the detail to which they've got texts of each of these available to the news media later today because there may be some problems in just getting true, conforming texts of these agreements developed. But they will intend to brief today on the contents of the new constitution for the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina. They will, of course, brief on the aspects of the territorial agreement itself, which was, as I believe most of you know, the most vexing issues that the parties faced right up until the 11th, 12th, and 13th and 14th and 15th hours.

They will brief on the very important and critical relationship of the obligations that all member nations face under the strictures of the International War Crimes Tribunal, how they apply to the parties and how they apply to individuals who might seek appointed or elective office in the new entity that's created.

They will also talk about, obviously, the implementation force and what commitments are extended to the parties, what obligations the parties have to the international implementation force. They will brief on arms control issues and the involvement of other outside organizations like the OSCE, as I indicated earlier. They'll also brief on the creation of the new Commission

on Human Rights, which will be an important element of safeguarding human rights and the right of displaced persons under the agreement as they've reached it. They will brief on election principles and how they will structure free and fair democratic elections for Bosnia-Herzegovina. And they will also talk about how military authorities, through a joint military commission, will address military issues that will arise between the three parties within the federation and the Bosnia Serb Republic, and then also how they interrelate to the forces that will be on the ground as part of the implementation force. Lastly, they will also brief on new requests for U.N. international police task force.

So I tell you all of that not to bore you, Mr. Williams -
- (laughter) -- but to point out this is an extensive, detailed, comprehensive peace agreement that offers what the President described as prospects for a new era for Bosnia. It is enormously significant given the detail and substance that went into the --

Q Could I just follow up?

Q Oh, no, please don't.

Q What can you possibly follow up with?

Q I have a follow-up, too -- sorry.

Q Here's the follow-up question. Is there anything that was left unresolved? Did they tie up every single conceivable loose end, or did they defer some of the more sensitive, vexing issues until a future date?

MR. MCCURRY: You will hear the parties tell you later that one issue has been submitted to arbitration, for arbitration within a year. That's the status of Brcko, and that relates to the territorial issue around the Herzegovina corridor.

Q That's the headline right there.

Q Maybe for you.

MR. MCCURRY: And as you hear the parties -- as you hear the parties brief on this agreement later today, you will understand the connection of that particular decision to the

ability to achieve an overall settlement.

Q Who will be the arbitrators of that decision?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm going to leave -- I've given you more than enough detail to handle you for the next four hours. I'm going to defer all further questions on this nonsense since some of you who are running out of patience --

Q And paper. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I will refer all further questions to

Secretary Christopher, Ambassador Holbrooke, Ambassador Bildt and Ambassador Ivanov, who will be briefing, I believe at 4:00 p.m.

Q Are they all going home today?

MR. MCCURRY: My understanding is that at least some of the parties plan to return to their capitals today.

Q Is that the only unresolved issue?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that's impossible -- it's impossible to say that. That is the one significant issue that has been left to further arbitration. There are a lot of what I would describe as implementation details as they go forward that will be addressed, and that's the importance -- we had in an earlier question, why have another peace conference -- that's the type of thing that can be evaluated and dealt with in subsequent meetings.

But there will be -- it's an enormously complex agreement. There will be, no doubt, lots of details that need to be addressed as the parties begin to implement. But that's the value of the process and the various bodies now established by this agreement, if it will actually help implement the peace.

Q In his calls with Republican leaders today, did the President ask them to hold off on criticism until after he makes his case to the American people?

MR. MCCURRY: He didn't. He knew they would make their own judgments on that. He made the case in brief form to each of them on why this represents a substantial achievement; on why it's a good settlement; on why it is in the interests of the parties; and most importantly, why it's in the interest of the United States of America to help the parties implement this peace. He gave them the argument and told them -- all four of these leaders are, I would say, briefed in detail on the conflict in Bosnia and on the

status of the talks. So the President in a shorthand way gave them how they reconciled certain critical issues.

Q Does he hope to have them there by Christmas, the troops?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to speculate on -- I've given you the best information I've got on the sequencing and timing of consideration and deployment. And I think there will be numerous briefings in the days ahead, both by NATO military authorities, by U.S. military authorities and I'm going to turn it over to military briefers to give you a good sense in the days ahead of how they would handle that.

Q Do the Bosnian and Serb leaders have to sign on to this?

MR. MCCURRY: They were represented in these discussions

by President Milosevic, and he was an authoritative interlocutor on their behalf.

Q But according to what the President said, that no one under indictment for war crimes can be a part of the political process in Bosnia, are they now out of the process so far as the United States or the other parties are concerned?

MR. MCCURRY: The agreement prohibits indicted war criminals who refuse to honor the orders of the International War Crimes Tribunal from holding military, elective or point of office in the newly-defined Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Q I don't know if you already answered or were asked this, but how was the issue of whether we would arm and train the Bosnian army resolved? Did they get the letter they wanted and where is that --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you'll get further briefings on that later. We've indicated -- as we indicated in the letter November 13th, that consistent with these agreements and consistent with the need for legitimate self defense, it will be necessary to lift the U.N. arms embargo on Bosnia-Herzegovina. And we expect that we will be working within the United Nations to achieve those objectives, subject to what you'll hear later today.

Q I'm talking about they wanted -- remember, they wanted specific --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm going to leave that -- there may have been substantive conversations in Dayton on that point that I'm not

aware of, so I should refer that to the briefers in Dayton.

Q Looking ahead to next week, what exactly -- could you summarize for us what exactly the President hopes to accomplish in Ireland?

MR. MCCURRY: I would -- I have not, Peter, because of the developments here -- if I can apologize, if there's a chance I could refer that to later? Is there anyone who absolutely needs to have that today?

Q No.

MR. MCCURRY: If I could -- I had intended to do that today, and we had intended to have someone from the NSC to brief this afternoon. But given the developments in Dayton we would like to refer that over until tomorrow, if that's okay.

Q On that point, did the developments in Dayton give the President any more hope that there could be some sort of last-minute advice from the Anglo-Irish track, or is that still pretty cold?

MR. MCCURRY: You mean on the theory that peace is breaking out all over and --

Q Whatever theory you might care to have.

MR. MCCURRY: No, I think the important thing is that -- the important development related to the Northern Ireland peace process is that the British government presented new proposals to Dublin last weekend. We understand that the two governments are actively engaged in dialogue on those proposals now and we certainly hope that there will be further progress in their own direct conversations prior to the President's departure. But there's no guarantee of that, and that will be up to the UK and to the Republic of Ireland.

Q Mike, just to nail down the notion of arbitration, I gather that would be compulsory arbitration, binding -- that the parties --

MR. MCCURRY: I can't -- I would have to refer that question to Dave, too, because how they structure the arbitration and how it would be carried out is something that I'll have to have them address.

Q Is it like --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to speculate, Leo, I'll leave that to them.

Q -- the President only one hour before the thing was sealed --

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, the President had just -- I'll do a little more color on that. The President, as he indicated, had his last conversation with Secretary Christopher -- it was at midnight last night. And the President said that he felt it looked pretty bleak at that point and he went to bed very much worried about a failure of these talks.

He woke up this morning really racking his brain for ways in which they might break the impasse that had developed on some key issue. I think, as many of you know, he had talked to President Tudjman yesterday in an effort only to have President Tudjman help on some aspects of the territorial configuration of the settlement, not because that was any -- not because President Tudjman at that point was any particular obstacle, but because he could be helpful in addressing some of the territorial issues that were still on the table at that point yesterday afternoon.

Many of them had been resolved as we went through the day yesterday. Those were not the issues that were still before the parties as of midnight last night. The President at 10 o'clock began a previously scheduled meeting with Tony Lake when the call came in from Secretary Christopher saying that they had got the --

Q What do you think tipped the balance with them?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm doing a little tick-tock for people if

you don't mind. He got the call both from Secretary Christopher and Ambassador Holbrook. He thanked them. After they said that they looked like they were going to reach an agreement he thanked them and members of their team for "an incredible piece of diplomacy." And they, all three, for a minute reflected the fact that three very capable U.S. diplomats gave their lives in an effort to achieve this moment, and they stopped and had a moment to remember them.

But they -- most of the rest of that call, though, very quickly turned to just the details, what needed to be addressed now, what were the next steps, what the President would pursue and what Secretary Christopher's day would hold as they went through and did.

Q Well, what actually made them finally come around in the last hour?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I have a good idea of what it was, but I think I should leave that to Secretary Christopher, who I'm sure will address that question later this afternoon.

Q Does the President still plan to veto the defense appropriation's bill, and would his view on the bill change due to developments in Bosnia?

MR. MCCURRY: We have received that bill. It's being held while we evaluate the bill. We are considering that bill in the context of the overall budget environment that we now face as we go into the negotiations next week.

Q How about in the context of Bosnia? There are some people on the Hill saying they would look more kindly on this if the President did not veto defense.

MR. MCCURRY: I will say only that we are evaluating that bill in the context of the overall budget environment that we're now in. And we were doing that prior 10:00 a.m. this morning.

Q Mike, do you have anything further on another issue we asked you about this morning, the transportation bill ?

MR. MCCURRY: It still has not, as of an hour ago, it still has not arrived here. We intend to consider it fully when it's sent to us by the Congress.

Q It's not exactly breaking the speed limit getting here, is it?

MR. MCCURRY: They kind of get down here in due course as defined by the Hill.

Q Mike, do you know when reconciliation might in due course get here?

MR. MCCURRY: I do not know. Do not have -- we haven't seen it and haven't had any indication that it's likely to come imminently.

Yes, one last one.

Q Does the President plan to make contact with British and Irish Prime Ministers before his visit next week?

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I am aware of. We have had some preparatory work being done both by our embassies and by some of our diplomats who have been over there. The President is satisfied that there has been good preparation work done for his visit. He's very much looking forward to the visits both in Ireland and in London, and he expects a full-ranging agenda in both occasion, obviously including the peace process, but also looking beyond all the questions that we've been talking about here this morning and all the issues that we face whenever we meet with our closest and friendliest European allies.

Q Mike, there are no secret parts to this Bosnian agreement, there are no secret side letters?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not the person to ask, as you well know.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:33
P.M. EST

#141-
11/21

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 16:50

FROM Dohse, Fred J.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT POTUS Brief for UK, Ireland and Spain [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Albers, Paul J.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Cullin, Brian P.
Feeley, John F.
Fetig, James L.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Gardner, Anthony
Johnson, David T.
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Munson, Robert A.
Naplan, Steven J.
Peters, Mary A.
Schmidt, John R.
Schuker, Jill A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY Baker, Jane E.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Dohse, Fred J.
Gray, Wendy
Harmon, Joyce A.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.
Sens, Andrew D.

TEXT_BODY Tony Lake gave up his briefing time to give us more time with the President.
the new agenda is attached. Please recognize that speech prep now goes
from 9:15-10:00 a.m., at which time POTUS, TL, NES & Sandy V. join us in
the Cabinet Room to continue our discussion.

[[POTUSBRF.DOC : 4102 in POTUSBRF.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 21 November 95 16:46

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

POTUSBRF.DOC
POTUS Briefing for UK, Ireland and Spain Trip

Briefing will be done in two phases:

ù Phase I -- speech preparation (first 45 minutes) in the Oval Office. Participants

: POTUS,

Tony Lake, Nancy Soderberg, Don Baer, Sandy Vershbow, Tony Blinken.

ù Phase II -- review schedule and discuss specifics (second 30 minutes) in
Cabinet R

oom.

Participants: POTUS, Tony Lake, Nancy Soderberg, Sandy Vershbow, Fred
Dohse, Mike

Froman, Tony Gardner, Mary Ann Peters, David Johnson, Jim Fetig.

ù The Vice President and Leon Panetta will be invited to attend both sessions.

Total Time
(minutes)

Briefer

Subject

45

Tony Lake Don Baer

& Tony Blinken

Speech preparation

5

Fred Dohse

Overall Schedule

10

Tony Lake & Nancy

Soderberg

Trip goals and objectives

10

Sandy Vershbow

Meeting with Prime Minister

Major

10

Sandy Vershbow &

Mike Froman

U.S.-EU Summit

10

Tony Lake

Summary/further action

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 19:08

FROM Peters, Mary A.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT New Ireland Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Cullin, Brian P.
Danvers, William C.
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

Bill, for your clearance --q and a on invitation to address Congress.'[[
GUINOV22.DOC : 4950 in GUINOV22.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 21 November 95 19:7

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** GUINOV22.DOC
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

November 21, 1995

EUROPE
Bosnia/Croatia
Trip to UK, Ireland and Spain
Ireland
France
NATO Secretary General
Russia
CFE
Poland
Albania
Turkey

FAR EAST
U.S.-Japan Relations
U.S.-China Relations

MIDDLE EAST

Israel
Pakistan
Algeria
Saudi Arabia

CENTRAL AMERICA

Honduras
Haiti

AFRICA

Nigeria

MISCELLANEOUS

DOD Equal Opportunity
Admiral Macke
Defense Appropriations
Tuna and Dolphins
POW/MIA

BOSNIA/CROATIA

Proximity Talks

ù Secretary Christopher informed President shortly before 1100 today that Presidents of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia reached a peace agreement to end the war in Bosnia.

ù Presidents of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia have made an historic and heroic choice for peace. People of Bosnia have chance to turn from the horror of war to the promise of peace.

ù Want to congratulate U.S. negotiators--Secretary Christopher, Amb. Holbrooke--for their extraordinary service. Their determination, along with European and Russian partners

rs, and
NATO's resolve, made agreement possible.

ù Agreement will preserve Bosnia as single, internationally recognized state,
within
its present borders.

ù State made up of two parts: Bosnia and Croat Federation and Bosnian Serb
republic,
with fair
distribution of territory.

ù Sarajevo will remain united.

ù Will provide for effective central government--including national parliament, a
pr
esidency, and
constitutional court, with responsibility for foreign policy, foreign trade, monetar
y policy,
citizenship, immigration, and other important functions..

ù Presidency and parliament chosen through free, democratic elections under
internat
ional supervision.

ù Bosnians will be first to hold rotating Presidency.

ù Refugees will be allowed to return to homes and people to move freely
throughout B
osnia.

ù An independent international commission and trained international civilian
police
force will monitor
human rights.

ù Those charged with war crimes will be excluded from political life

ù Parties have asked for strong international force to supervise separation of force
s, give them confidence that
each is living up to agreement.

ù Only NATO can do that job. US role, as leader of NATO, is essential.

ù NATO will rapidly complete plan for implementation force. President will
review f
inal implementation
plan before approving.

ù Force would be approximately one-third US, rest from NATO and some non-

NATO countries.

ù Plan calls for international humanitarian effort to provide relief, help rebuild, resettle refugees, monitor free elections.

ù NATO's mission will be clear and limited. Our troops will take orders only from SACEUR.

ù ROE will allow it to respond immediately to threats, violations.

ù There will be a reasonable timetable for withdrawal.

ù the present contingency plan is clear, limited, and achievable. Believes it minimizes risks to US troops and other troops.

ù President will promptly consult Congress after he receives plan. When he approves it, he will ask Congress to support American participation.

ù American leadership made this peace agreement possible; our leadership, together with Allies, is needed to make peace real and enduring.

ù President believes Congress should review agreement and hear assurances from the parties that the plan will be implemented in full and without violence.

ù President will work with Congress on a schedule for consultations after he approves the plan. Has already called Senate and House leaders.

ù Congress should be heard before a full deployment of US troops. But, as we've told Congress, early deployment of a small number of troops will be necessary.

ù Congress will have a period of weeks before agreement is signed, which would trigger deployment of troops.

ù The Parties have chosen peace, now America must choose peace. Our leadership made peace possible, and is needed now to make the peace real and enduring.

ù After Dayton, next steps: implementation conference in London; Paris international peace conference leading to ultimate signing of peace agreement.

ù Through intensive U.S./CG diplomacy, parties agreed Geneva (9/8/95)/New York (9/26/95) to settlement basic principles: Bosnia as single state; 51/49 basis for territorial solution; constitutional structure; democratic elections; and subsequently to cease-fire

If asked about US Citizen killed near Tuzla

ù We understand that an American citizen employed by the UN was found dead on Sunday near Tuzla, in northeastern Bosnia. Our Embassy in Sarajevo is seeking further information.

ù Pending notification of the family of the deceased, we will not comment further on this matter now.

Sacirbey's Resignation

ù Bosnian Foreign Minister Sacirbey left his post to make room for a broader representation in the Bosnian government as part of Dayton agreement on Federation. Believe resignation was an act of statesmanship on his part.

Equip and Train

ù Our goal to establish stability on ground by time IFOR completes mission. One key

is to ensure settlement
does not break down after IFOR leaves.

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

ù Arms control by itself unlikely to achieve stable balance, will see to it that multinational effort to equip/train
Federation forces ensures effective self-defense capability (DoD has details on contracting).

ù Effort separate from NATO-led implementation force; U.S. role not yet determined.
First step: lifting of arms embargo.

House Bill on IFOR

ù Action does not simply threaten the talks, it threatens peace.

ù President asked Congress to hold off passing a resolution until negotiations are concluded. There has been
significant progress in Dayton; this resolution could undermine that progress.

ù We are now engaged in intensive consultations with Congress, given prospect of U.S.
participation in
NATO-led force to implement a peace settlement.

ù It is in our interest to have broadest possible base of public support -- in both parties -- for U.S. role in

implementation of settlement if we achieve one.-- I will request expression of Congressional support
for U.S. participation in implementation of a settlement following an initial agreement at Dayton.

ù Those on Capitol Hill who supported this resolution need to understand that they will share the responsibility
for a failure to put together a peace agreement in Dayton in passing such a resolution.

War Crimes

- ù We support the additional indictments against Karadzic and Mladic for crimes against humanity after the fall of Srebrenica. Never advocated clemency for them at Dayton.
- ù Continue to condemn these gross violations of human rights.
- ù Led vigorous effort to uncover/publicize evidence of war crimes in Balkans.
- ù Shattuck three times raised issue with Serbs.
- ù War crimes indictments not negotiable.
- ù Stopping atrocities one of the main reasons for active U.S. role in the peace negotiations.
- ù Actively support investigating international organizations (UNHCR , Red Cross).

Russian IFOR Participation

- ù Hope Russians and other Partnership for Peace countries will participate. Any combat forces, however, must be under NATO command and control.
- ù Russia does not have a veto over IFOR operations.
- ù In any case, the agreements reached between Perry-Grachev have not been approved by NATO, yet.
- ù There have been no decisions made regarding the political relations with NATO.
- ù Talks are continuing and Perry will meet Grachev at the end of the month.
- ù Perry/Grachev reached agreement on Russian participation of IFOR. Russian forces will come under the operational command of a Russian general officer who will report to General Joulwan as overall commander of IFOR. The Russian Brigade will be folded into an American division which will exercise tactical control.

The Russians will retain national command over their forces as other nations that participate in IFOR.

ù Russia and U.S. may also participate in a special force that will deploy 30 days after IFOR. That force will work on transport, logistics.

ù Prefer NATO/Russian forces not separated between Federation and Serb areas.

Agreement on the Region of Eastern Slavonia

ù Transitional period of 12 months which may be extended for 12 months.

ù UN Security Council requested to establish a Transitional Administration.

ù UN Security Council requested to authorize an international force to deploy during the transitional period to maintain peace and security and assist in implementation of this agreement.

ù Transitional Administration shall help establish and train temporary police forces

ù All persons have the right to return freely to their place of residence in the Region and to live in conditions of

security.

ù Not later than 30 days before the end of the transitional period, elections for all local government bodies shall be organized by the Transitional Administration.

ù The Government of Croatia shall cooperate fully with the Transitional Administration and the international force.

If asked whether IFOR is to be the international force

ù The international force and its composition has not been determined. The UN Security Council must first authorize an international force. IFOR does not have a mission to implement an agreement in Eastern Slavonia.

Federation in Dayton

ù Secretary Christopher flew to Dayton November 9 to announce decisions that bring t
he Bosnian/Croat
Federation to life.

ù President Tudjman witnessed the signing. Izetbegovic and Zubak signed it. The
tw
o mayors of Mostar and
Mostar's EU administrator signed it.

ù The U.S. representative to the Federation, Daniel Serwer, played a key role in
neg
otiating this agreement.

Sanctions Relief

ù Izetbegovic and Milosevic requested immediate resumption of natural gas
deliveries
to both Bosnia and Serbia
on humanitarian grounds and as a confidence building measure.

ù Working with Contact group members for action at the UNSC under existing
humanitar
ian exemption.

ù This is a humanitarian gesture to provide heating fuel in response to severe
winte
r conditions.

ù Delivery is for two months.

ù Action is similar to one last year where relief was provided for humanitarian
reas
ons.

ù (If asked about sanctions suspension) This will take a full UNSCR and our
position
has not changed-we will
support suspension when there is a peace agreement.

Intelligence Sharing with the Bosnian War Crimes Tribunal

ù The U.S. intelligence community is not "sitting on" information that may be of
use
to the Tribunal prosecutor.

ù A coordinated Intelligence Community process in place since spring to manage hand
ling of requests for
information/classified responses to requests. We provide available information
even
in the absence of a
specific request.

ù U.S. has not withheld any intelligence with the intent to prevent the prosecution
of any war criminals including
Mladic and Karadzic.

ù Talks in Dayton have had no bearing whatsoever on our commitment to support
and as
sist the War Crimes
Tribunal in every way its efforts to bring war criminals to justice.

ù Reporting such information is time-consuming, but we make a strenuous effort
to re
spond as rapidly as
possible.

ù We will find a way to get the Tribunal the information it needs.

Peace Plan Implementation

ù NAC approved concept of ops for IFOR.

ù Detailed planning by NATO Military Authorities proceeding; Joulwan briefed
Presid
ent and national security
team on state of NATO'S plans.

ù Number of forces for operation not determined - will depend on peace
agreement mod
alities. Approximate
number would be 20,000 US, 40,000 non-U.S.

ù NATO briefed UN, UN Peace Force contributors, and interested PFP countries.
Contr
ibutions by non-NATO
countries would be welcome.

ù Churkin attended "16-plus-one" with NAC to discuss NATO's planning.

ù Concept of ops 5 phases:

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

War Criminals

ù IFOR mission is to implement the peace agreement.

ù Pursuing war criminals not in mission, but will take into custody if come into contact.

Military Stabilization

ù Our goal to establish stability on ground by time IFOR completes mission. One key is to ensure settlement does not break down after IFOR leaves.

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

ù Arms control by itself unlikely to achieve stable balance, prepared to help, as part of multinational effort, to equip/train Federation forces to ensure effective self-defense capability (DoD has details on contracting).

ù Effort separate from NATO-led implementation force. U.S. role not yet determined.
First step: lifting of

arms embargo.

New Ethnic Cleansing/Reports of Mass Graves

ù U.S. has/will continue to investigate and provide information to UN/War Crimes Tribunal regarding violations of international human rights and humanitarian law in a timely manner.

ù Shattuck documented evidence of Bosnian Serb atrocities. Last August, went to Central/Northeastern Bosnia, collected eyewitness accounts of mass executions, beatings, rape and other violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. Shattuck just returned to region to interview refugees in Zenica.

ù Albright presented to UN Security Council compelling evidence gathered by US. Evidence based on US intelligence and photographic intelligence, strongly suggested mass grave sites in Srebrenica.

ù Actively support international organizations like UNHCR and Red Cross to document fate and whereabouts of missing persons.

12-Month IFOR Time Limit

ù U.S. position: IFOR military aspects should have finite duration (NATO/NAC accepted)

ù Believe military aspects accomplished in about one year.

ù Will not make final decision on duration until final peace agreement/completed OPLAN.

ù 12 months NATO planning figure not been formally adopted by Alliance.

ù One year sufficient to establish stable ground situation.

ù Desire to create 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.

Dole and Gingrich Bosnia Letter

ù Administration wants to work with public and Congress so that we can have bipartis
an consensus if and when
a peace agreement is reached.

ù We are now engaged in intensive consultations with Congress, given prospect of U.S
participation in
NATO-led force to implement a peace settlement.

ù President will request expression of Congressional support for U.S.
participation
in implementation of a
settlement.

ù At sensitive point in our efforts to negotiate a political settlement to conflict in Bosnia.

ù We all share an interest in ensuring that settlement is one American people can su
pport.

ù This is issue of huge consequence -- for Bosnia, for NATO, and for U.S.
leadership

ù Whole world watching not only what parties do at Dayton, but how we, the U.S., wil
l deal with biggest
security challenge in Europe since WWII. Without American leadership, a peace
agree
ment is sure to fail.

ù Critically important that members of Congress and public keep an open mind over ne
xt few weeks as peace is
negotiated. We won't have a clear picture of the requirements and risks until
agree
ment is reached. When we
do, we will present details of our plan, and President will seek public and
Congress
ional support.

Points We Have Made

ù It is in our interest to have broadest possible based of public support -- in both parties -- for U.S. role in implementation of settlement if we achieve one. Want to hear your views.

ù Despite many hurdles to overcome, believe we have best chance in four years to reach settlement. U.S. leadership, so critical to achieving peace, will be critical to implementation as well.

ù Remain firmly convinced that only NATO can effectively enforce military aspects of settlement. NATO presence is essential to creating secure environment in which political and economic rebuilding can begin.

ù As leader of NATO, U.S. has to be involved. Our interests are very much at stake: Our engagement essential to prevent spread of conflict, achieve lasting peace.

ù First, and most important, there won't be a peace agreement unless NATO enforces it.

ù We believe the parties can reach a mutually acceptable peace settlement. But even if they do, they all recognize the need for an international implementation force to stabilize the situation and build confidence so that peace can take hold.

ù NATO is the only organization capable of playing this role.

ù Second, if NATO takes on the implementation mission but we do not participate, it will be the end of NATO and of U.S. leadership on transatlantic security issues.

ù Some argue that Bosnia is a European problem so the Europeans should take care of it. This may sound attractive, but the reality is that we have a deep interest in European security.

ù The United States was drawn into two world wars and a 50-year Cold War because of threats to security and stability in Europe. The lessons of history are clear -- U.S. leadership is essential for Europe to solve its

problems.

ù And third, the risks of participating in the implementation force must be weighed against the risk of an expanded war if the peace process fails.

ù The dangers of spillover are real.

ù The only way to prevent the spread of conflict and future massacres of innocents is to seize this opportunity when all parties may be willing to accept an agreement -- and to recognize that the only way to make the agreement stick is for NATO, with the U.S. in the lead, to provide the stability necessary in the first months after the settlement.

ù We will make sure terms of agreement are enforceable and that parties themselves accept the mission and robust ROE that NATO implementation force (IFOR) must have.

ù Let me emphasize a few key points:

ù IFOR will have carefully defined mission, clear chain of command with no "dual key," and authority to use force against any violation.

ù Forces will not be predominantly American: Europeans and other non-Americans will provide 2/3 of troops.

ù Hope Russians and other Partnership for Peace countries will also participate. Any combat forces, however, must be under NATO operational or tactical control.

ù We will have a clear exit strategy and will be careful to guard against mission creep.

ù Part of exit strategy 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.

- Preference is to establish balance of forces between Federation and Bosnian Serbs

through arms control
measures that provide for a "build-down."

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

- Effort will be separate from NATO-led implementation force and will need to be carefully managed to avoid

any risks to the IFOR and to avoid stimulating a regional arms race. First step: lifting of arms embargo.

ù Expect NATO mission can be completed in about a year, but need to see agreement and NATO plan before making such commitment.

ù International community can create opportunity for parties to make durable peace, but ultimate responsibility is theirs.

UK, NORTHERN IRELAND, IRELAND, EU SUMMIT TRIP

-- We are still planning to make this very important and historic trip..

-- This visit comes at an important time in Europe and we plan to discuss the full range of European security and economic issues.

-- In particular, as the first President ever to visit Northern Ireland, President Clinton will have the unique opportunity to celebrate the extraordinary changes in people's lives and the real hope for a lasting peace and prosperous future that 15 months of cease fire has brought.

Peace Talks

- Support the twin track proposed by the British and Irish governments.
- British and Irish governments are working hard to move the twin track forward and
I hope
they will be able to do so in the near future.

IRELAND

Invitation to President Robinson to Address Congress?

Background: ("Irish Voice" reports that Gingrich has refused to respond to request from members to invite Irish President Mary Robinson to address a joint session, saying the President has to make the request.)

- We think very highly of President Robinson , but it is our understanding that it is Congress that decides whom to invite to address a joint session.

U.S. Role

- We are committed to working with the two governments and the parties to help in the search for peace.
- Thankful there has been a year in which the guns and bombs are silent.
- First time in a generation there is real hope for a lasting peace and a more prosperous future.
People of Belfast are finally living a normal life.
- One can literally say that there are individuals walking the streets in Belfast alive today who would not be had we not gotten involved. American engagement has been an essential ingredient in the search for peace.
- We have had a number of contacts over the last several weeks about how to move the peace process forward.
- We are hopeful a way can be found to move things forward. Contacts with all

the
parties are
continuing. We are not prepared to go into any detail.

British Stalling on Talks?

-- Last weekend the British Government presented new proposals to Dublin; we believe the two governments are actively engaged in negotiating a way forward.

-- We believe Prime Minister Major has demonstrated that he is committed to achieving a lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

Position on Decommissioning:

-- 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 Fein and loyalists that we expect movement on this issue.

Senator Mitchell to Chair Commission on Decommissioning?:

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

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

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 and have asked them to explore the possibility of a private relief bill.]

-- Issue recently brought to our attention.

- Law provides no flexibility on many cases.
- Staff reviewing issue.

FRENCH NUCLEAR TEST

Q: What is the U.S. reaction to the November 21 French nuclear test?

A: The United States regrets this action.

We continue to urge all of the nuclear powers, including France, to refrain from further nuclear tests and to join in a global moratorium as we work to complete and sign a CTB Treaty in 1996.

In this regard, we take note of President Chirac's strong commitment to sign a CTB Treaty no later than the fall of 1996, and we will continue to work with France and all other states participating in the CTB negotiations to ensure that a CTB Treaty is ready for signature next year.

Q: Is the French decision to resume testing a set-back for the CTB negotiations?

A: Although we regret continued testing, we continue to believe we can conclude and sign a CTB Treaty next year.

Q: Has President Clinton discussed this issue with President Chirac? Has Chirac responded?

A: Yes, the President has made clear to President Chirac U.S. support for a global moratorium on testing as we work to complete the CTB.

President Chirac himself has described his decision to conduct a final series of tests as "irrevocable."

Q: Has the United States offered to assist France in simulating nuclear tests so tha

t France might
forgo further testing?

A: We have had a cooperation program with France in the nuclear area and we
will con
tinue to
work with France to ensure the safety and reliability of existing nuclear weapons
un
der a true zero yield
CTB Treaty.

Q: Why isn't the White House releasing a written statement? Are you softening
your
position on
French testing?

A: The French well understand our position on nuclear testing and their test
program

SUCCESSOR TO NATO SYG CLAES

-- Every member of NATO recognizes that the choice of the New Secretary
General wil
I have
significant impact on the future of the Alliance at this critical juncture in its hi
story.

-- As you know, it is a decision that requires the consensus among all 16
members of
the
alliance. We will continue to consult until we reach agreement with our allies on t
his very important
matter.

RUSSIA/NIS

Current Items

Yeltsin Heart Problem

-- President Yeltsin remains in hospital but taking on increasingly active
schedule.

Embassy

Moscow in touch with Russian officials; what Embassy has heard from them about Yeltsin in tracks with what Russian officials saying publicly.

December 17 Russian Elections to be Postponed?

-- President Yeltsin, Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and other Russian officials have said parliamentary elections will go ahead as scheduled December 17, and we expect elections to be held on that date. Regard these elections as important step in Russia's continuing process of building democracy.

Chechnya

-- Have seen reports of attack against Chechen Prime Minister Zavgayev (Moscow-backed). Condemn attacks whose purpose is to further set back peace effort in Chechnya.

-- While formal Russian-Chechen talks suspended, sides have held informal working meetings, and Moscow has reiterated its commitment to pursue 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.

General Items

U.S. Stake in Relationship

-- U.S. has vital stake in engaging Russia and supporting reform there. Matters greatly to us if Russia dictatorship or democracy, centrally planned or market-oriented economy.

-- 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 R

ussian

GDP now from private sector, no Russian troops in Central Europe or Baltics.

-- President's productive meeting with Yeltsin at Hyde Park on October 23

underscore

d stability,

inner strength of U.S.-Russia partnership.

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 in o

ur interest to cut

this assistance.

Perry-Grachev on Russia and Bosnia IFOR

-- Perry and Grachev agreed on November 8 on military framework under which Russian

combat

forces will participate in a Bosnia peace implementation operation. Warmly

welcome

this understanding,

as we consider Russian participation in Bosnia peace implementation important

and de

sirable.

(Defer to Defense for details)

Russian Concerns about NATO Enlargement

-- Understand Russia has concerns about NATO enlargement. Intend to manage enlargem

ent

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 continuing serious dialogue on issue.

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

CFE

-- Parties have achieved something thought unattainable a decade ago: over
50,000 p
ieces of
military equipment destroyed to establish a stable balance of forces in Europe -
dra
matically lower than
just a few years ago.

-- Consensus was also reached Friday among the 30 CFE parties on broad
outlines of s
olution to
the issue of the flanks, which preserves the integrity of the treaty and will not di
minish the security of
any state.

-- As part of that decision, parties agreed to work intensively to complete the task
of resolving
the flank issue as soon as possible.

POLISH ELECTIONS

-- Awaiting final results, though projections suggest that Aleksander Kwasiewski
(kvash-NYEV-skii) has narrowly defeated President Lech Walesa in yesterday's
electio
ns.

-- This appears to have been a free and fair elections, Poland's second direct Presidential elections since 1989.

-- Both candidates ran on platforms to maintain Poland's democratic and market reforms and to seek its integration with Western institutions.

-- We hope Poland's next president will carry out his campaign promises and maintain the reforms that have brought Poland so much success since 1989.

-- After a tough campaign, it will be important for Poland's next President to reach out to the whole country to bring people together.

-- Whatever the final outcome, Lech Walesa has a secure place in history as one of the democratic heroes of the 20th century. As leader of Solidarity and Poland's democratically-elected President, Lech Walesa led his nation through a dramatic, unprecedented and largely successful transformation. Poland, Europe, American and the world are better off for it.

-- (If asked re NATO membership) Countries aspiring to NATO membership need to be firmly committed to democracy, market economic reform and responsible foreign and security policies. Poland has made major strides in these areas and we hope its progress continues.

ALBANIA

Q: Any comment on the Washington Post story on U.S. defense cooperation with Albania?
?

A: We believe the current military relationship between the U.S. and Albania is in the interests of both countries.

Albania has been playing a responsible role in a very unstable region.

We hope our military cooperation can continue, but this will depend in great part on continued Albanian progress toward democracy and market economic reforms.

TURKEY: HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH REPORT

Q: What is your reaction to the Human Rights Watch Report, which discusses the Turkish military's use of U.S. weapons in committing human rights abuses and violations of the laws of war against the Kurds?

A: We have not had a chance to study the report, which was just released today, and are therefore reluctant to comment.

Human rights concerns are an important consideration in all our defense equipment sales worldwide, including to Turkey.

Last June, the State Department issued a report on alleged human rights abuses by the Turkish military which concluded that U.S.-origin equipment, which accounts for most major items in Turkey's military inventory, has been used against the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), a vicious terrorist organization which threatens Turkey's territorial integrity. Human rights abuses have occurred in those operations.

The report further noted that it was highly likely that such equipment was used in support of the evacuation and/or destruction of villages in southeastern Turkey.

The Turkish state has the right to defend itself against terrorism. The use of U.S.-supplied weapons in an internal struggle against terrorism is legitimate.

We have stated repeatedly -- both publicly and in our dialogue with the Turkish government -- that the conflict in Turkey's southeast cannot be solved solely through military means.

Enhancement of democracy for all Turkey's citizens will significantly improve the human rights situation in Turkey, notably in the southeast. The Turkish government and Parliament have taken important steps in this direction, which should continue.

[IF ASKED ONLY]

Q: Doesn't the report, in citing conversations with USG officials, prove that the U.S. has helped the Turkish security forces to violate human rights in the Southeast -- indeed, U.S.-supplied arms were used to violate the human rights of civilians -- while actually withholding important information on the severity of Turkey's human rights problem?

A: As I have stated, we cannot comment in detail about a report we have not yet seen

Nevertheless, the State Department reports annually and publicly on human rights concerns on all countries worldwide, including Turkey. The Turkey Human Rights Report makes very clear our deep concern about human rights violations there.

I also refer you to the State Department's special Report to Congress of June 1 of this year entitled "Report on Allegations of Human Rights Abuses by the Turkish Military

and o
n the Situation in
Cyprus."

Q: Do you agree with the report's recommendation that these abuses should lead to a cut-off of military assistance to Turkey?

A. We disagree emphatically.

Turkey is a long-standing NATO ally whose support is needed to resolve problems in Bosnia and Cyprus, contain Iran, maintain Operation Provide Comfort and the sanctions regime against Iraq, and to monitor the situation in the Caucasus and CFE flank issues with Russia, among others.

Continued American support for Turkey's security, both external and internal, there fore, helps to protect the United States and serves major U.S. interests.

Turkey also faces a major threat to its security from the PKK, whose avowed goal is the creation of a Kurdish state out of southeastern Turkey and portions of neighboring countries with Kurdish populations.

Q: What is your response to the report's charge that U.S. officials downplay human rights

violations which occurred over the past year, as well as those violations committed by the Turkish Army and Air Force, in order to protect their relationship with -- and arms sales to -- those entities?

A: I refer you to the annual human rights report and the special report of last June on Turkey. They provide a wealth of detail -- hardly a "down play" or "cover up."

[If pressed on views attributed to individual officers:]

As I have said, we have not seen the report, and I will not discuss what Human Rights Watch claims are the views of individual U.S. officers.

Q: What is your view of the 29 case studies, particularly the case in which suspected PKK guerrillas were pushed out of a helicopter to their death?

A: Again, we have not seen the report. For information on the specific case studies and the methodology that Human Rights Watch used, we refer you to Human Rights Watch.

That said, our June Report to Congress contained interviews with displaced villagers who recounted similar stories. Residents of southeastern Turkey have experienced, and continue to undergo, hardship and suffering.

We believe that the Turkish government has an obligation to assist displaced persons whose villages have been evacuated and burned, regardless of whether they were obliged to leave their homes by the PKK or government security forces. We understand that, in recent months, some villagers have returned to their villages. This is positive, but is barely a first step to assist the displaced.

FOR THE BRIEFERS INFORMATION ONLY:

The report claims to document some 29 incidents in which U.S.-supplied or co-produced weapons were involved in violations of human rights or of the laws of war during the period 1992-1995. It is based on interviews with eyewitnesses by Joost Hilterman, a HRW staffer. He has advised that he could not gain access to southeastern Turkey, but was able to find eyewitnesses in western Turkey upon which

ch to base the report.

As described, much of the material underscores and adds more detail to what was in our June report. The incidents reportedly document Turkish use of the full range of U.S. hardware: F-16's, attack and transport helicopters, tanks and APCs. It documents the presence of Turkish military with U.S.-supplied small arms, during village evacuations, beatings and torture.

Recommendations from the report include an end to military assistance due to a persistent pattern of human rights abuses (a recommendation HRW has made before), a hold on high profile arms transfers not specifically linked to the southeast [read ATACMs], end-use monitoring of how Turkey employs U.S. weapons, and formation within the Turkish military of an office with authority to investigate and punish abuses.

JAPAN

-- U.S. - Japan relations are fundamentally sound in all aspects, including security and trade.

-- We are working closely with the Japanese government to deal with Okinawa base-related problems and resolve them as quickly as possible. Joint Commission to start work tomorrow. Need to work calmly, cooperatively and carefully to deal with these issues.

-- Will reschedule state visit to Japan as soon as we can bring an end. This is a crucial relationship and a very successful one. We will work hard to ensure that it is restored to full vitality.

CHINA

-- Many challenges remain in our bilateral relationship with China, but we have a shared recognition that improving relations is in the overall strategic interest of both sides.

-- We have made important progress recently in dealing with disagreements, especially in handling trade disputes and preparing the way for China's eventual admission to the World Trade Organization.

-- Vice President Gore met with China's President Jiang in Osaka. He renewed the commitment to a policy of comprehensive engagement I had affirmed when President Jiang and I met in New York last month.

ISRAEL: JONATHAN POLLARD

Background: The Israeli government has now granted Israeli citizenship to Jonathan Pollard. The Israeli press is quoting Prime Minister Peres as stating that he will ask the President to act on the Pollard case when he meets with him December 11.

(If raised)

-- The President has stated previously that he will consider requests for clemency in the case of Jonathan Pollard as they are presented to him.

-- I have no further comment on this issue.

(If legal issues involving Pollard's parole status, etc. are raised)

-- I would refer you to the Department of Justice on such matters.

PAKISTAN: ISLAMABAD BOMBING

-- The United States strongly condemns the murderous attack on the Egyptian Embassy in Islamabad, Pakistan.

-- I have conveyed my outrage over this terrorist act to President Mubarak and Prime Minister Bhutto. I have offered my condolences for those killed and wounded in the bombing.

-- We are ready to work with the Governments of Pakistan and Egypt to help determine those responsible for this crime and bring them to justice.

ALGERIAN ELECTIONS

ù A large percentage of the eligible Algerian electorate turned out for the presidential vote on November 16. Preliminary results indicate that Liamine Zeroual was chosen to serve as President for a new five-year term.

ù The turnout in these elections offers hope that Algerians who seek a peaceful end to Algeria's crisis will participate in a political process to achieve that goal if given the chance to do so. President Zeroual's election is an opportunity to lay the foundation for such a process.

SAUDI ARABIA BOMBING AFTERMATH

Q: Have you identified the perpetrators of the bombing yet?

A: The full resources of the US government are being brought to bear on this investigation and we are determined to do everything possible to ensure that the perpetrators are identified and brought to justice.

However, the investigation is at a very early stage and we are not going to speculate on who may be responsible.

Q: What do you know about the Islamic Movement for Change, which claimed responsibility for the attack?

A: A number of groups have claimed responsibility for the attack. We are investigating all of these claims.

We are aware of the IMC and its stated opposition to the US presence in the Persian Gulf.

Q: What security measures are being taken to guard US personnel and facilities in Saudi Arabia?

A: The Saudi government and US agencies have responded quickly and effectively to improve security for US personnel and facilities, both government and private, throughout the Kingdom.

(If pressed:) I don't want to get into the details of the new security arrangements. That would be counterproductive.

Q: What contact has there been between the USG and the Saudi government?

A: Ambassador Mabius and his staff have been in constant contact with Saudi officials at all levels, including King Fahd and Crown Prince Abdullah.

At his meeting with the King, Ambassador Mabus passed on the President's appreciation for the tremendous effort the Saudis have made in the wake of the bombing.

Although Saudi Ambassador Prince Bandar was not in the US at the time of the bombing, we have been in contact with him and he has been helping expedite the movement of US equipment and personnel both to and from the Kingdom.

Q: Do you believe that the security of U.S. facilities in Saudi Arabia was lax before the bombing?

A: I think we should wait to hear what the experts say before making a judgment on that.

HONDURAS

Background: In July ten Honduran military officials were accused by judicial authorities of involvement in the 1982 abduction of several students; three were summoned to testify before the court but to date have failed to appear. On November 6 another five military officers (plus a sixth previously accused) were charged with committing human rights violations in a separate case. In a separate effort Human Rights Ombudsman Leo Valladares continues to investigate disappearances which took place in the 1980s; State Department is reviewing documents for release to Valladares and working with other agencies. On November 20 Honduran government and human rights groups assisted by U.S. experts began efforts to exhume

eight bodies which may be
the remains of leftists who disappeared.

Points

-- We support the Honduran Government's efforts to investigate past cases of human rights abuses and believe this process is a necessary step towards national reconciliation, the promotion of human rights and the strengthening of the democratic system in Honduras.

-- We are providing appropriate information requested by Honduran authorities as quickly as possible; some documents have already been provided.

HAITI

-- We have deplored the recent outbursts of violence in Haiti that followed the murder of two of Haiti's parliamentary deputies, but calm has returned and President Aristide is continuing the policy of reconciliation he has followed since his election.

-- Haiti has embarked on a democratic transition that has not always been perfect, but its forward movement and democratic course is certain. Several candidates are now running for the up-coming presidential elections following recent successful parliamentary elections.

-- The Haitian police force is in the process of taking full responsibility for law and order when the UN mission completes its work in February. We will continue to train and assist

them under a
five-year training agreement that is currently in force.

-- Representatives of our government have been working closely with President
Aristide and his
government to encourage and assist their economic transition and I expect
President
Aristide to move
forward on privatization of state-owned industries as he has promised.

NIGERIA

-- The United States is outraged over the gravely flawed judicial process which
led
to the
execution of Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight others.

-- These executions demonstrate to the world the Abacha regime's contempt for
even t
he most
basic international norms and universal standards of human rights.

-- We are working with our allies and partners to find ways to put broad,
internatio
nal pressure
on Nigeria and to move toward a democratic future and to respect the rights of its
o
wn citizens.

-- In this regard, the President consulted by phone last week with South African
Pr
esident
Mandela. Although no concrete measures emerged from the discussion, both
leaders ag
reed to pursue a
multilateral approach in applying pressure on Nigeria.

-- We are ruling nothing in and nothing out. But any sanction must have broad
inter
national
support to be effective.

Minority Promotions In Military

Background: A recent GAO report concluded that black service-members were statistically less likely to be promoted than their white peers, and women were more likely to gain promotion. The report reached no conclusions but recommended that DoD improve how it monitors promotions amongst different minority groups. DoD says it is already attempting to implement the GAO-recommended improvements.

Points

-- Support equal opportunity for all; refer to DoD for more specifics on the report.

MACKE

-- The President was shocked when he first heard of Admiral Macke's remarks. But he also noted that Macke had enjoyed a long career, serving his country with distinction.

-- They were unacceptably insensitive toward women and the victims of rape and brutal assault.

-- The President strongly support Secretary Perry's leadership in this matter, and the decision by Admiral Macke to retire immediately.

-- With our close ally we will move beyond this to build upon our 50 years of partnership that has given both our peoples great opportunity for peace and prosperity.

Background: On November 17, the House and Senate reached agreement on a \$243 billion defense budget for next year which is \$6.9 billion more than requested by the Administration. It added funding for additional B-2 Stealth bombers and National Missile Defense, as well as accelerated procurement of warships, aircraft and other weapons systems not requested by the Administration. Congress sent the bill to the White House over the weekend; a statement regarding it has not yet been signed by the President.

The bill (H.R. 2126) also included language prohibiting privately funded abortions at U.S. military hospitals overseas, except in the case of rape, incest or if the mother's life was endangered if carried to term. (Prior to this, privately funded abortions were permitted at U.S. military hospitals overseas for rape, incest, or elective abortions; government funded abortions have always been permitted when the mother's life was endangered if carried to term -- and continue to be permitted under the new bill.)

Points

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

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

-- Concerned by inclusion of almost \$7 billion we did not request, mostly for procurement and R&D programs, and with the bill's unfair treatment of overseas military personnel and their dependents with regard to the availability of safe abortion services.

-- The President has previously said that absent a broader agreement with Congress that

adequately funds crucial domestic programs in other appropriations bills, he will
 ve
 to any defense
 appropriations bill that adds extra billions for defense programs not in his request
 . Therefore, because
 there is no such agreement, the President will veto the Defense Appropriations
 Bill.

TUNA AND DOLPHINS

Q: What is the Administration's position on the Stevens-Breaux Bill, "The
 Internatio
 nal Dolphin
 Conservation Program Act?"

A: "The International Dolphin Conservation Program Act," which was introduced
 by Sen
 ator
 Stevens (R-Alaska) and Senator Breaux (D-LA) implements the Panama
 Declaration signe
 d by the United
 States and 11 other countries on October 4. This declaration strengthens the
 curren
 t international efforts
 to protect dolphins and the ecosystem as a whole in the Eastern Pacific Ocean.
 Othe
 r goals are to
 minimize the incidental catch of other species taken during tuna fishing
 operations,
 and to sustain fishery
 catches. Five major environmental groups have endorsed this landmark
 agreement. Th
 ey are Greenpeace,
 the Center for Marine Conservation, the Environmental Defense Fund, the
 National Wil
 dlife Federation,
 and the World Wildlife Fund.

The Administration supports the Panama Declaration and this bi-partisan
 legislative
 effort to secure long
 term protection of dolphins.

POW/MIA

Background: Defense DPMO (Defense POW/MIA Office) has a new work plan that sets new priorities for resolving cases. 567 have been declared "unrecoverable." The Hill is being briefed today. CNN and Washington Times have reported this.

-- This is in no way a legal finding nor is it a final declaration. Most cases remain open.

-- Is an evaluation based on review of and nature of the evidence. Most lost at sea or in way that suggests little or no chance of ever recovering remains.

-- A special panel must review this finding and make a final decision. That panel not yet formed.
Refer to DPMO.

-- All USG efforts continue to repatriate remains and resolve discrepancies with the Vietnamese.
This includes a trilateral commission with Laos to resolve cases there.

MS Mail

DATE-TIME 21 November 95 21:56
FROM Veit, Katherine M.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SUBJECT SRB's schedule card for 11/22-~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
TO Cicio, Kristen K.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY
[[DOC11.DOC : 5379 in DOC11.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE 21 November 95 21:56
ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME DOC11.DOC

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, May 16, 2017
By LD NARA, Date 6/12/97
2017-0759-F

SANDY BERGER 11/22/95 - WEDNESDAY
7:30AM CHIEF OF STAFF MEETING - CHIEF OF STAFF OFC
7:30AM 8:30AM (TL/BREAKFAST MTG)
8:15AM POSSIBLE TL/DCI & DDCI MEETING
8:30AM 8:45AM DAILY PRESS COORDINATION
9:15AM 10:45AM (P/BRIEFING-SPEECH PREP FOR UK/IRELAND TRIP)
10:45AM 12:45PM PC MTG (BOSNIA) W/POTUS DROPBY 10:45-11:45AM
1:00PM 1:10PM MTG W/MACK MCLARTY RE: SUMMIT ANNIVERSARY
1:30PM TL/MTG RE: HAITI (STROBE TALBOTT, JIM DOBBINS
DICK CLARKE)
2:15PM 3:00PM TL/INFLUENTIALS - ROOSEVELT RM (SCHUKER)
3:00PM STEVE SOLARZ RE: BOSNIA
3:30PM PRESS (WEEKLY) - (JOHNSON)
4:00PM DAVID ROTHKOPF RE: PERSONAL/VARIETY OF ISSUES
4:30PM 5:30PM MTG CHAIRED BY LAURA TYSON RE: MEXICO
& ARGENTINA - ROOSEVELT RM
5:15PM (TL/DPTS FOR HAITI - RON)