

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Catherine A. Cornelius (CORNELIUS_C) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-NOV-1995 11:25:42.46

SUBJECT: The President/First Lady's Trip to Europe

TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D) Autoforward to: Angus S. King
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:33:53.68

TO: Melinda N. Bates (BATES_M) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:42:56.06

TO: David S. Beaubaire (BEAUBAIRE_D) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:35:21.96

TO: Erskine Bowles (BOWLES_E) Autoforward to: Pamela B. Mada
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:25:07.60

TO: Jennifer D. Dudley (DUDLEY_J) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:45:44.38

TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman (BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:40:56.45

TO: Rebecca A. Cameron (CAMERON_RA) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:36:02.77

TO: Phillip M. Caplan (CAPLAN_P) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:36:48.08

TO: Laura Capps (CAPPS_L) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:24:55.30

TO: Ann M. Cattalini (CATTALINI_A) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:29:11.32

TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 07:31:02.43

TO: Catherine A. Cornelius (CORNELIUS_C) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:26:59.80

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:35:40.10

TO: Paul A. Deegan (DEEGAN_P) (OPD)
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:01:00.43

TO: DONALD K. DUNN (DUNN_D) (WHO)
READ:19-NOV-1995 20:16:19.20

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nicole Elkon (ELKON_N) (WHO)

READ:14-NOV-1995 11:56:22.68

TO: Paul K. Engskov
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:57:50.17

(ENGSKOV_K) (WHO)

TO: Janice A. Enright
READ:14-NOV-1995 19:53:26.41

(ENRIGHT_J) (WHO)

TO: Andrew Friendly
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:18:34.33

(FRIENDLY_A) (WHO)

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines
READ:20-NOV-1995 08:48:50.98

(GAINES_J) (WHO)

TO: Jason S. Goldberg
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:04:05.32

(GOLDBERG_JS) (OPD)

TO: Wendy E. Gray
READ:16-NOV-1995 18:13:44.90

(GRAY_W) (NSC)

TO: Julia R. Green
READ:20-NOV-1995 08:07:08.96

(GREEN_J) (WHO)

TO: John P. Hart
READ:NOT READ

(HART_J) (WHO)

TO: Ardenia R. Hawkins
READ:NOT READ

(HAWKINS_AR) (NSC)

TO: James A. Hawkins
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:37:22.28

(HAWKINS_J) (WHO)

TO: Wendy A. Heistad
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:31:16.31

(HEISTAD_W) (WHO)

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:37:00.94

(HERNREICH_N) (WHO)

TO: Brenda I. Hilliard
READ:20-NOV-1995 07:47:11.10

(HILLIARD_B) (NSC)

TO: Harold Ickes
READ:NOT READ

(ICKES_H) (WHO)

TO: Marilyn R. Jacanin
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:46:04.81

(JACANIN_M) (WHO)

TO: Kim Johnson
READ:NOT READ

(JOHNSON_KX) (WHO)

TO: M. Kay Joshi
READ:14-NOV-1995 15:43:55.43

(JOSHI_M) (NSC)

TO: Yusuf A. Khapra
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:32:00.11

(KHAPRA_Y) (WHO)

TO: Joshua A. King
READ:NOT READ

(KING_J) (WHO)

TO: David J. Lane

(LANE_D) (OPD)

READ:14-NOV-1995 12:01:32.80

TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman
READ:18-NOV-1995 12:53:28.66

(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)

TO: Bruce R. Lindsey
READ:15-NOV-1995 09:38:35.40

(LINDSEY_B) (WHO)

TO: Gordon Li
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:31:32.96

(LI_G) (WHO)

TO: Michael D. Malone
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:51:13.32

(MALONE_M) (WHO)

TO: Julie E. Mason
READ:NOT READ

(MASON_J) (WHO)

TO: Michael McCurry
READ:14-NOV-1995 20:48:23.98

(MCCURRY_M) (WHO)

TO: Patricia A. McHugh
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:27:27.22

(MCHUGH_P) (WHO)

TO: Kathy McKiernan
READ:20-NOV-1995 10:43:49.58

(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:57:32.46

(MELLODY_A) (WHO)

TO: Cathy L. Millison
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:37:00.61

(MILLISON_C) (NSC)

TO: Cheryl D. Mills
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:50:57.05

(MILLS_C) (WHO)

TO: Julia Moffett
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:27:13.38

(MOFFETT_J) (WHO)

TO: Linda L. Moore
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:45:09.47

(MOORE_L) (WHO)

TO: Ruby G. Moy
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:16:29.02

(MOY_R) (WHO)

TO: Lucie F. Naphin
READ:16-NOV-1995 15:28:39.50

(NAPHIN_L) (WHO)

TO: Erin A. O'Connor
READ:NOT READ

(OCONNOR_E) (WHO)

TO: Thomas O'Donnell
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:07:24.67

(ODONNELL_T) (WHO)

TO: Jennifer N. Palmieri
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:26:24.41

(PALMIERI_J) (WHO)

TO: DARREN MCDEW
READ:NOT READ

(PR_U=DMCDEW@PR_L=WHMOEOB@MRP@OPUS)

TO: Duncan McKenzie

(PR_U=DMCKENZI@PR_L=WHOPOEOB@MRP@OPUS)

READ:NOT READ

TO: DENNIS STUMP
READ:NOT READ

(PR_U=DSTUMP@PR_L=WHMOOEOb@MRP@OPUS)

TO: Elizabeth Vittori
READ:NOT READ

(PR_U=EVITTORI@PR_L=WHOPOEOB@MRP@OPUS)

TO: HAROLD HOWELL
READ:NOT READ

(PR_U=HHOWELL@PR_L=WHMOOEOb@MRP@OPUS)

TO: Charles Raderstorf
READ:NOT READ

(PR_U=CRADERST@PR_L=WHMOOEOb@MRP@OPUS)

TO: MICHAEL MUDD
READ:NOT READ

(PR_U=MMUDD@PR_L=WHMOOEOb@MRP@OPUS)

TO: Terry West
READ:NOT READ

(PR_U=TWEST@PR_L=WHOPOEOB@MRP@OPUS)

TO: Paige E. Reffe
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:11:19.98

(REFFE_P) (WHO)

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez
READ:14-NOV-1995 14:21:36.42

(RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)

TO: Seth R. Robinson
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:26:19.98

(ROBINSON_S) (WHO)

TO: Lee A. Satterfield
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:42:29.64

(SATTERFIEL_L) (WHO)

TO: Marsha Scott
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:36:46.79

(SCOTT_M) (WHO)

TO: Janna B. Sidley
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:28:50.91

(SIDLEY_J) (WHO)

TO: Stephen B. Silverman
READ:NOT READ

(SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)

TO: Wendy L. Smith
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:35:15.00

(SMITH_WL) (WHO)

TO: Patti Solis
READ:14-NOV-1995 13:00:58.04

(SOLIS_P) (WHO)

TO: Margo L. Spiritus
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:05:14.18

(SPIRITUS_M) (WHO)

TO: George Stephanopoulos
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:24:55.30

(STEPHANOPO_G) Autoforward to: Laura Capp

TO: Todd Stern
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:08:09.63

(STERN_T) (WHO)

TO: Virginia M. Terzano
READ:NOT READ

(TERZANO_V) (WHO)

TO: Jodie R. Torkelson

(TORKELSON_J) (WHO)

READ:14-NOV-1995 11:47:45.72

TO: Sheila D. Turner (TURNER_S) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Molly Varney (VARNEY_M) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:28:09.39

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
READ:14-NOV-1995 14:09:10.87

TO: Allison M. Wright (WRIGHT_A) (NSC)
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:37:28.88

TO: Cheryl S. Rodman (RODMAN_C) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:29:05.82

TO: Allison Wilkie (WILKIE_A) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 08:12:40.23

TO: David Mckinney (PR_U=DMCKINNE@PR_L=WHMOEOB@MRP@OPUS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Betty Currie (CURRIE_B) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:36:11.12

TO: Patrick M. Steel (STEEL_P) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:05:03.73

TO: Terry Steele (PR_U=TTSTEELE@PR_L=WHMOEOB@MRP@OPUS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lisa S. Villareal (VILLAREAL_L) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:26:38.44

TO: Holly B. Nichols (NICHOLS_H) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 09:39:26.94

TO: Laura A. Graham (GRAHAM_L) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 12:50:22.27

TO: Theresa F. Granger (GRANGER_T) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:27:14.61

TO: Susan Hazard (HAZARD_S) (WHO)
READ:14-NOV-1995 11:26:47.63

TO: Jane E. Baker (BAKER_JE) (NSC)
READ:14-NOV-1995 14:03:37.71

TEXT:

The President and First Lady are currently scheduled to travel to Europe (England, Ireland and Spain) from November 27- December 3, 1995.

Names of staff and guests which need to travel with the President and First Lady to support this mission must be submitted for consideration by COB Friday, November 17, 1995 via electronic mail or memorandum. When submitting your request for consideration please be sure to include the actual dates of travel you are

planning, the mode of travel (ie: Air Force One , Congressional Plane, Commercial Aircraft), and specifically how you support this mission.

Notice of approval will be sent to those who submit requests by COB Tuesday, November 21, 1995.

As always thanks for your help.

Catherine.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 20-NOV-1995 16:34:06.37

SUBJECT: 1995-11-20 McCurry Briefing

TO: Melissa M. Murray (MURRAY_MM) (WHO)
READ: 20-NOV-1995 16:42:20.24

TO: Allison Wilkie (WILKIE_A) (WHO)
READ: 20-NOV-1995 17:17:17.78

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (edowd@esusda.gov@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (mwolfe@mhl.js.mil@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (ttate@esusda.gov@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usia01@access.digex.com@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (releases@www3.whitehouse.gov@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dapice_n@www1.whitehouse.gov@inet) (OA)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dapice_n@www2.whitehouse.gov@inet) (OA)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@4=HOUSE
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT_GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@4=DW0

READ:NOT READ

TO: FAX (9-862-0340,William Safire) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:9-862-0340\C:William SafireR

TO: FAX (93345661,Sandy Torry) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:93345661\C:Sandy Torry\)
READ:NOT READ

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 17:56:26.84

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 10:39:51.26

TO: Alexis M. Herman (HERMAN_A) (WHO)
READ:28-NOV-1995 10:36:28.01

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 14:52:08.42

TO: Brenda Anders (ANDERS_B) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 05:33:53.87

TO: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ) (CEQ)
READ:20-NOV-1995 17:18:32.20

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 11:35:53.68

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 17:36:15.55

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 18:19:32.10

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik (LIZIK_C) (OA)
READ:21-NOV-1995 14:51:16.42

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (KALBAUGH_D) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 16:41:03.98

TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D) Autoforward to: Angus S. King
READ:20-NOV-1995 17:29:52.75

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 16:46:38.14

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (SOSNIK_D) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 18:31:45.09

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn (SHEORN_D) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 16:39:29.77

TO: Eleanor S. Parker (PARKER_E) (WHO)
READ:20-NOV-1995 16:39:59.86

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya READ:22-NOV-1995 17:26:01.68	(MONTROYA_E) (WHO)
TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman READ:20-NOV-1995 17:05:31.15	(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: G. N. Lattimore READ:NOT READ	(LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
TO: G. Timothy Saunders READ:20-NOV-1995 17:09:05.32	(SAUNDERS_GT) (WHO)
TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman READ:27-NOV-1995 09:40:46.47	(BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)
TO: Heidi Kukis READ:NOT READ	(Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
TO: James Kohlenberger READ:NOT READ	(Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
TO: Jason S. Goldberg READ:NOT READ	(GOLDBERG_JS) (OPD)
TO: Jeremy M. Gaines READ:NOT READ	(GAINES_J) (WHO)
TO: Jodie R. Torkelson READ:20-NOV-1995 17:03:40.53	(TORKELSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Johnathan H. Spalter READ:NOT READ	(SPALTE_J) (VPO)
TO: Jonathan M. Prince READ:21-NOV-1995 10:00:03.22	(PRINCE_J) (WHO)
TO: Joseph W. Cerrell READ:NOT READ	(CERREL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Address
TO: Joshua A. King READ:NOT READ	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: Joshua Silverman READ:20-NOV-1995 17:18:51.07	(SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
TO: Julia R. Green READ:20-NOV-1995 16:50:01.47	(GREEN_J) (WHO)
TO: Julie E. Mason READ:20-NOV-1995 17:04:10.79	(MASON_J) (WHO)
TO: Karen E. Finney READ:NOT READ	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Barbuschak READ:21-NOV-1995 07:32:34.75	(BARBUSCHAK_K) (OA)
TO: Kathy McKiernan READ:20-NOV-1995 17:31:10.12	(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS READ:20-NOV-1995 18:44:04.39	(HAAS_L) (OMB)
TO: Laura Capps READ:20-NOV-1995 16:41:26.96	(CAPPS_L) (WHO)
TO: Laura D. Schwartz READ:20-NOV-1995 17:11:39.29	(SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ:20-NOV-1995 16:33:35.14	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ:NOT READ	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Lori E. Abrams READ:20-NOV-1995 16:35:21.71	(ABRAMS_L) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ:NOT READ	(VOLES_L) Autoforward to: Remote Adresse
TO: Lorraine McHugh READ:20-NOV-1995 17:29:41.53	(MCHUGH_L) (WHO)
TO: Manager Infomgt READ:NOT READ	(INFOMGT) (SYS)
TO: Margaret M. Suntum READ:20-NOV-1995 16:34:24.25	(SUNTUM_M) (WHO)
TO: Marlene A. MacDonald READ:20-NOV-1995 16:42:40.13	(MACDONALD_M) (WHO)
TO: Mary Ellen Glynn READ:20-NOV-1995 16:33:04.38	(GLYNN_M) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ:NOT READ	(WALDMAN_M) (OPD)
TO: Natalie S. Wozniak READ:20-NOV-1995 16:40:37.95	(WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
TO: Peggy A. Lewis READ:20-NOV-1995 16:35:54.75	(LEWIS_P) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ:NOT READ	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Rica F. Rodman READ:22-NOV-1995 11:46:14.56	(RODMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Richard L. Siewert READ:NOT READ	(SIEWERT_R) (WHO)
TO: Richard Strauss READ:NOT READ	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Steven A. Cohen READ:21-NOV-1995 10:47:04.08	(COHEN_SA) (WHO)

TO: Susan P. Shepard
READ:21-NOV-1995 07:25:34.94

(SHEPARD_S) (OA)

TO: Virginia M. Terzano
READ:NOT READ

(TERZANO_V) (WHO)

TO: Walker, Angelina
READ:NOT READ

(Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)

TO: Wayne C. Johnson
READ:21-NOV-1995 08:37:47.44

(JOHNSON_WC) (OA)

TO: William C. Hornish
READ:20-NOV-1995 16:34:23.18

(HORNISH_W) (OA)

TO: Gordon Li
READ:20-NOV-1995 16:51:28.75

(LI_G) (WHO)

TO: Jill A. Schuker
READ:20-NOV-1995 17:25:45.83

(SCHUKER_J) (NSC)

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD

MORE #140

□

-11/20

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

November 20, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

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 BOTTOM EVEN
MORE #140
□
-11/20
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.

□
TOP EVEN
- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN
MORE #140
□
-11/20

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 Arney 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 President's 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.

TOP ODD

- \p -

BOTTOM ODD

MORE #140

□

-11/20

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

□

-ticks 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.

□

BOTTOM ODD

MORE
TOP ALL

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 --

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

□

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

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 TOP ODD - \p -

BOTTOM ODD

MORE

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. Exxon 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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 21-NOV-1995 15:59:03.45

SUBJECT: 1995-11-21 McCurry Briefing

TO: Melissa M. Murray (MURRAY_MM) (WHO)
 READ: 5-DEC-1995 10:08:29.27

TO: Allison Wilkie (WILKIE_A) (WHO)
 READ: 21-NOV-1995 16:00:20.20

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (edowd@esusda.gov@INET)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (mwolfe@mh1.js.mil@inet)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (ttate@esusda.gov@INET)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usia01@access.digex.com@inet)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (releases@www3.whitehouse.gov@inet)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dapice_n@www1.whitehouse.gov@inet) (OA)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dapice_n@www2.whitehouse.gov@inet) (OA)
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@4=HOUSE
 READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT_GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@4=DW0

READ:NOT READ

TO: FAX (9-862-0340,William Safire) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:9-862-0340\C:William SafireR

TO: FAX (93345661,Sandy Torry) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:93345661\C:Sandy Torry\)
READ:NOT READ

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:05:22.67

TO: Alexis M. Herman (HERMAN_A) (WHO)
READ:28-NOV-1995 09:39:46.94

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 19:10:23.36

TO: Brenda Anders (ANDERS_B) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 06:12:46.50

TO: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ) (CEQ)
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:29:45.34

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 11:36:15.77

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 18:28:33.75

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:46:44.74

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik (LIZIK_C) (OA)
READ:27-NOV-1995 08:04:42.17

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (KALBAUGH_D) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 17:01:49.72

TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D) Autoforward to: Angus S. King
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:13:56.55

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:27:41.29

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (SOSNIK_D) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 18:46:07.99

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn (SHEORN_D) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:06:38.41

TO: Eleanor S. Parker (PARKER_E) (WHO)
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:32:35.38

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya READ:22-NOV-1995 17:28:27.08	(MONTROYA_E) (WHO)
TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman READ:21-NOV-1995 17:47:58.78	(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: G. N. Lattimore READ:NOT READ	(LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
TO: G. Timothy Saunders READ:21-NOV-1995 16:13:57.00	(SAUNDERS_GT) (WHO)
TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman READ:27-NOV-1995 09:41:11.17	(BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)
TO: Heidi Kukis READ:NOT READ	(Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
TO: James Kohlenberger READ:NOT READ	(Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
TO: Jason S. Goldberg READ:NOT READ	(GOLDBERG_JS) (OPD)
TO: Jeremy M. Gaines READ:NOT READ	(GAINES_J) (WHO)
TO: Jodie R. Torkelson READ:21-NOV-1995 16:05:54.67	(TORKELSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Johnathan H. Spalter READ:NOT READ	(SPALTE_J) (VPO)
TO: Jonathan M. Prince READ:21-NOV-1995 17:34:29.20	(PRINCE_J) (WHO)
TO: Joseph W. Cerrell READ:NOT READ	(CERREL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Address
TO: Joshua A. King READ:21-NOV-1995 16:00:53.33	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: Joshua Silverman READ:21-NOV-1995 16:00:43.39	(SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
TO: Julia R. Green READ:21-NOV-1995 17:25:33.97	(GREEN_J) (WHO)
TO: Julie E. Mason READ:21-NOV-1995 16:06:48.71	(MASON_J) (WHO)
TO: Karen E. Finney READ:NOT READ	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Barbuschak READ:21-NOV-1995 16:08:39.45	(BARBUSCHAK_K) (OA)
TO: Kathy McKiernan READ:21-NOV-1995 16:42:42.29	(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS READ:22-NOV-1995 13:49:28.84	(HAAS_L) (OMB)
TO: Laura Capps READ:21-NOV-1995 16:22:51.56	(CAPPS_L) (WHO)
TO: Laura D. Schwartz READ:21-NOV-1995 16:26:21.64	(SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ:21-NOV-1995 16:13:28.78	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ:NOT READ	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Lori E. Abrams READ:22-NOV-1995 10:01:29.58	(ABRAMS_L) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ:NOT READ	(VOLES_L) Autoforward to: Remote Adresse
TO: Lorraine McHugh READ:21-NOV-1995 17:16:56.65	(MCHUGH_L) (WHO)
TO: Manager Infomgt READ:NOT READ	(INFOMGT) (SYS)
TO: Margaret M. Suntum READ:21-NOV-1995 16:02:53.65	(SUNTUM_M) (WHO)
TO: Marlene A. MacDonald READ:21-NOV-1995 16:32:38.45	(MACDONALD_M) (WHO)
TO: Mary Ellen Glynn READ:22-NOV-1995 10:28:25.55	(GLYNN_M) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ:21-NOV-1995 15:58:34.55	(WALDMAN_M) (OPD)
TO: Natalie S. Wozniak READ:21-NOV-1995 16:04:49.87	(WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
TO: Peggy A. Lewis READ:21-NOV-1995 16:32:50.91	(LEWIS_P) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ:NOT READ	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Rica F. Rodman READ:22-NOV-1995 11:46:07.35	(RODMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Richard L. Siewert READ:NOT READ	(SIEWERT_R) (WHO)
TO: Richard Strauss READ:21-NOV-1995 17:14:10.63	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Steven A. Cohen READ:21-NOV-1995 16:01:26.87	(COHEN_SA) (WHO)

TO: Susan P. Shepard
READ:22-NOV-1995 07:38:29.82

(SHEPARD_S) (OA)

TO: Virginia M. Terzano
READ:NOT READ

(TERZANO_V) (WHO)

TO: Walker, Angelina
READ:NOT READ

(Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)

TO: Wayne C. Johnson
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:35:32.29

(JOHNSON_WC) (OA)

TO: William C. Hornish
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:17:59.31

(HORNISH_W) (OA)

TO: Gordon Li
READ:21-NOV-1995 16:57:59.31

(LI_G) (WHO)

TO: Jill A. Schuker
READ:21-NOV-1995 15:58:41.26

(SCHUKER_J) (NSC)

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD
MORE

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

November 21, 1995

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 BOTTOM EVEN MORE

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

□

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

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 TOP ODD
- \p -

BOTTOM ODD

MORE

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 keys 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 "and 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.

□

TOP ODD

- \p -

BOTTOM ALL

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 22-NOV-1995 15:08:44.37

SUBJECT: 1995-11-22 Background Briefing on Trip to Ireland

TO: Melissa M. Murray (MURRAY_MM) (WHO)
READ: 22-NOV-1995 15:59:15.56

TO: Allison Wilkie (WILKIE_A) (WHO)
READ: 22-NOV-1995 15:35:12.51

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (edowd@esusda.gov@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (mwolfe@mhl.js.mil@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (ttate@esusda.gov@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usia01@access.digex.com@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (releases@www3.whitehouse.gov@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dapice_n@www1.whitehouse.gov@inet) (OA)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dapice_n@www2.whitehouse.gov@inet) (OA)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@4=HOUSE
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT_GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@4=DW0

READ:NOT READ

TO: FAX (9-862-0340,William Safire) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:9-862-0340\C:William SafireR

TO: FAX (93345661,Sandy Torry) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:93345661\C:Sandy Torry\)
READ:NOT READ

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 12:38:32.91

TO: Alexis M. Herman (HERMAN_A) (WHO)
READ:28-NOV-1995 10:39:33.41

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 15:49:25.16

TO: Brenda Anders (ANDERS_B) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 15:25:55.97

TO: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ)
READ:22-NOV-1995 15:10:19.11

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 12:57:42.14

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 16:33:58.80

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik (LIZIK_C) (OA)
READ:27-NOV-1995 08:07:50.64

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (KALBAUGH_D) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 15:10:14.57

TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D) Autoforward to: Angus S. King
READ:22-NOV-1995 15:12:41.16

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 15:20:19.59

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (SOSNIK_D) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 16:18:20.70

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn (SHEORN_D) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 15:59:34.27

TO: Eleanor S. Parker (PARKER_E) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 16:36:04.43

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya READ:22-NOV-1995 17:31:45.85	(MONTROYA_E) (WHO)
TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman READ:NOT READ	(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: G. N. Lattimore READ:NOT READ	(LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
TO: G. Timothy Saunders READ:27-NOV-1995 08:08:39.34	(SAUNDERS_GT) (WHO)
TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman READ:27-NOV-1995 09:43:04.98	(BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)
TO: Heidi Kukis READ:NOT READ	(Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
TO: James Kohlenberger READ:NOT READ	(Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
TO: Jason S. Goldberg READ:NOT READ	(GOLDBERG_JS) (OPD)
TO: Jeremy M. Gaines READ:NOT READ	(GAINES_J) (WHO)
TO: Jodie R. Torkelson READ:22-NOV-1995 15:51:25.55	(TORKELOSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Johnathan H. Spalter READ:NOT READ	(SPALTE_J) (VPO)
TO: Jonathan M. Prince READ:28-NOV-1995 09:46:47.69	(PRINCE_J) (WHO)
TO: Joseph W. Cerrell READ:NOT READ	(CERREL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Address
TO: Joshua A. King READ:NOT READ	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: Joshua Silverman READ:22-NOV-1995 15:25:12.33	(SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
TO: Julia R. Green READ:22-NOV-1995 15:07:06.61	(GREEN_J) (WHO)
TO: Julie E. Mason READ:22-NOV-1995 16:17:28.44	(MASON_J) (WHO)
TO: Karen E. Finney READ:NOT READ	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Barbuschak READ:22-NOV-1995 15:07:08.42	(BARBUSCHAK_K) (OA)
TO: Kathy McKiernan READ:25-NOV-1995 15:03:24.48	(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS READ:22-NOV-1995 16:33:19.47	(HAAS_L) (OMB)
TO: Laura Capps READ:22-NOV-1995 15:11:20.38	(CAPPS_L) (WHO)
TO: Laura D. Schwartz READ:28-NOV-1995 07:38:55.42	(SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ:27-NOV-1995 08:21:51.40	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ:NOT READ	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Lori E. Abrams READ:22-NOV-1995 16:19:21.46	(ABRAMS_L) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ:NOT READ	(VOLES_L) Autoforward to: Remote Adresse
TO: Lorraine McHugh READ:22-NOV-1995 15:14:41.05	(MCHUGH_L) (WHO)
TO: Manager Infomgt READ:NOT READ	(INFOMGT) (SYS)
TO: Margaret M. Suntum READ:22-NOV-1995 16:09:34.55	(SUNTUM_M) (WHO)
TO: Marlene A. MacDonald READ:22-NOV-1995 17:13:32.09	(MACDONALD_M) (WHO)
TO: Mary Ellen Glynn READ:24-NOV-1995 10:50:57.07	(GLYNN_M) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ:NOT READ	(WALDMAN_M) (OPD)
TO: Natalie S. Wozniak READ:22-NOV-1995 15:10:03.48	(WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
TO: Peggy A. Lewis READ:22-NOV-1995 15:11:26.28	(LEWIS_P) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ:NOT READ	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Rica F. Rodman READ:28-NOV-1995 09:19:57.91	(RODMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Richard L. Siewert READ:NOT READ	(SIEWERT_R) (WHO)
TO: Richard Strauss READ:28-NOV-1995 11:59:44.04	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Steven A. Cohen READ:NOT READ	(COHEN_SA) (WHO)

TO: Susan P. Shepard
READ:24-NOV-1995 07:39:09.06

(SHEPARD_S) (OA)

TO: Virginia M. Terzano
READ:NOT READ

(TERZANO_V) (WHO)

TO: Walker, Angelina
READ:NOT READ

(Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)

TO: Wayne C. Johnson
READ:22-NOV-1995 16:03:58.89

(JOHNSON_WC) (OA)

TO: William C. Hornish
READ:22-NOV-1995 16:57:15.59

(HORNISH_W) (OA)

TO: Gordon Li
READ:22-NOV-1995 15:19:13.22

(LI_G) (WHO)

TO: Jill A. Schuker
READ:22-NOV-1995 17:47:35.10

(SCHUKER_J) Autoforward to: Steven J. Nap

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD
MORE
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
BACKGROUND BRIEFING
BY
SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL

November 22, 1995

The Briefing Room

12:55 P.M. EST

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Basically I'll go through briefly the four stops that we're planning and tell you basically what we're trying to accomplish in each stop and then open it up for questions. I'd rather just go through the whole agenda first.

The first stop the President will make is in London. It will be actually his first visit to London as President, the first time he's gone to 10 Downing Street. The general tenor of the trip will be to underscore the importance of the alliance, the close working relationship of Prime Minister Major and the President, and the need to continue to work together on the full range of security and economic issues, which you all are very familiar with. I would expect the meetings with Major to focus quite a bit on Bosnia, the other range of issues -- NATO expansion, Middle East, Ireland. I think you all know the agenda pretty well. I'd be happy to take questions on that later.

In London, he will also be meeting with the opposition leader, Tony Blair, as he does in every major country that he goes to, he usually tries to do that. Again, they will touch base on the full range of issues that the time allots.

He will also be giving a major address in London at Westminster. And that will -- I think you should look at it as a fairly major foreign policy address. He will be emphasizing the need to advance our common agenda, building a bit on the sacrifices of World War II and his themes from his visit to the commemoration of the D

□

-Day in Europe, the need to continue those efforts to preserve the peace; we won the war, we need to win the peace, building a little bit on the themes that the children of our sacrifice and the need to mobilize support for building the peace equal to that, which was mobilized during the war.

He will also go into a little bit on the European security issues there. But the theme of that speech primarily will be the need for America's leadership in the world and the need to really have the champion of peace, building on Bosnia and whatever else is going on there.

He will also have a dinner that evening with Prime Minister Major. It will be some sort of 60

□

-some

□

-odd people, I think

-- a working dinner with Major. The next day he goes to Belfast, Northern Ireland. He is the first President, U.S. President to go to Northern Ireland. The trip itself is significant. His presence there should not be minimized as a historic event in itself. He's going there primarily to underscore the importance of the cease fire, BOTTOM EVEN MORE

to celebrate with the people of Northern Ireland the new era of peace there, to underscore and support their efforts for peace and to, again, see what we can do to help support the peace process in Northern Ireland.

□

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

His sheer presence in Northern Ireland in itself sends a strong message of encouragement to the people, will help remind them just how far they've come and give them encouragement to continue to build on the peace. He will be giving, again, what I would term an important address at a plant in the center of Belfast called Mackie's Plant. It's a manufacturing plant of machineries that has an interesting history. It's gone -- it had a difficult history of employment in the past, serious unemployment issues, discrimination issues. They are now back on the move, doing the right thing. They're equalizing their work force. Their employment is growing. We're going there to symbolize both the importance of investment to peace and the importance of trying to eliminate the problems of

discrimination in that area.

The text of the speech will primarily deal with the themes of trade and investment and America's role in the peace process in Northern Ireland. And probably in a -- a slightly broader context of what's happening in the world, putting Northern Ireland a little bit in the context of other global marches towards peace.

He will also go up to Londonderry/Derry, depending on which community you're in, to walk -- he'll give a slight -- a speech to the people of the city, walk the walls of the city a bit, and then have a reception with people from the city, as well as some Americans who will have flown over for an event, and announcing the endowment of a chair on behalf of Tip O'Neill on for the University of Ulster. The President will be there to announce that while he's up there.

Q What day are we at --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: This is Thursday. He will also, while in Belfast, visit an enterprise park in East Belfast, where he'll have a chance to talk to workers who are dealing with the issues day to day of employment in Belfast, so he can have a chance to talk to some real workers and get a sense what life is really like there. He will also light the Christmas tree for the evening, which is a historic event in Belfast in the season of peace. He will not be dressed like a Mighty Morphin Power Ranger. (Laughter.)

And then he will attend a reception hosted in his honor at Queens University to which we expect to invite a broad spectrum from Northern Ireland there. As far as meeting with political leaders in Northern Ireland, there is no firm schedule on that front yet. We are going to be working in seeing basically all the major political leaders.

I know there's a lot of questions as far as who and where and when, but we simply will just leave it right now. We are going to try and work in all of the major -- we will be seeing all of the major political leaders while we're there.

He spends the night in Belfast, which is again symbolic of how far Belfast has come, as well as underscoring our own interest in doing what we can to secure the peace.

Next morning, he goes and moves to Ireland for a visit there, again, his first visit as President to Ireland. He will be having a meeting with President Mary Robinson, again discussing sort of a range of issues. They'll do the traditional tree planting there.

He will then have a meeting also with Prime Minister Bruton, again they're to discuss a range of security issues. EU issues will probably be on the front of the agenda, since Ireland will assume the presidency of the EU in the second half of 1996. I assume Northern Ireland will on the agenda as well as humanitarian issues, European issues.

TOP ODD

- \p -

BOTTOM ODD

MORE

He will also touch base with the opposition leaders

there and give a speech to the citizens of Dublin. Expect this to be a fairly large sort of gathering of citizens outdoors in downtown

-
□

-let's see where are we now -- Dublin. And then he will also to parliament and give greetings to parliament. There is some traditional exchanges of gifts there. The remarks to parliament will again touch on the range of issues among us, although it should not be billed as a major foreign policy address; it's more sort of remarks/greetings.

He then will be the guest at a dinner hosted by the government that evening at Dublin Castle. And that pretty much covers the substantive part of the Ireland trip. From there he will go to Spain for a EU summit meeting with Gonzalez and Santer. He will also have bilateral meetings with Gonzalez and opposition leader Aznar. He will also see the King and Queen.

The purpose of the EU summit, I think you all are fully aware of, this one is somewhat more substantive and important in that it will be -- the President will be announcing a transatlantic initiative, which falls onto the agreement from the last EU summit under the French presidency. It's really an unprecedented action plan underscoring the U.S. commitment to Europe, underscoring the need for more cooperation, more specific action between us facing the new challenges of drugs and crime and the broadening agenda of trade issues.

He will be signing two documents while he's there. One is the new transatlantic agenda, and the second one will be an action plan. What the initiative is is really an ongoing, working relationship, rather than having two summit meetings where you agree on a common agenda, but there's no work in between them of putting these into effect. This has launched a work plan, action plan between the two communities, which I think will really have concrete results.

The agenda for this first one, the new transatlantic agenda, will focus primarily on four areas of common interest. And, you know, there's sort of a concrete action plan on all these. The first one will be, sort of generally, the promotion of peace, development and democracy dealing primarily with former Yugoslavia and Middle East issues.

Second is global challenges dealing with the crime, humanitarian aid, disease, the environment. That one is elevating to the agenda for the first time. These type of transnational issues, again, underscore the need for cooperation among these nations on dealing with the tough issues of crime, terrorism, drugs, as well as reflecting the need to share resources in all of our tightened budget eras.

The third issue will be trade, an action plan for further reducing the barriers to trade, ways to open markets, create jobs. He will basically launch a series of studies that will look at how to do that. Fourth is what they're calling a building block. It's basically a series of cultural and scientific exchanges. I think you can expect the bilateral meetings in Spain to cover again the range of security issues. Spain has 1,200 troops in Bosnia. I'm sure that will be a part of it. The Middle East, they've obviously

been very involved in the Middle East process since the Madrid summit -- got military bases there, and the trade issues.

And then the President comes home in time for the Kennedy Center honors on Sunday evening.

Q Where do the British

□

-Irish talks stand? I mean, are they totally stalemated, or is there some new initiative? And do we think that the IRA should disarm totally before the --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Let me give you just a quick summary of our Irish policy, which I think will cover most of those questions. This trip is very much reflective of this involvement. This President has been the first to really put Northern Ireland on the agenda of this office and between the UK and us. We have from day one, the President has asked us to take a look at Ireland -- Northern Ireland to see where we could be helpful, where we could help make a difference to move things forward, given our relationship between both the UK and Ireland.

He has put it on the agenda of the presidency as well as within the two governments. And I think we have managed to support those who take risks for peace in a way that has advanced the cause of peace in Northern Ireland.

We have reached out to those, such as Adams, who are trying to bring an end to the violence and those in the Unionist community who have a, I think, long

□

-held misperception that we have a special agenda or a Nationalist hidden agenda behind us. The U.S. role is not to push our agenda on them, but rather to support those who can move things forward on the basis of consent in Northern Ireland.

We have been working very hard over the last couple of years, and particularly over the last few weeks to try and see how we could be helpful to support moving things forward. We have endorsed what they call the twin

□

-track proposal by the two governments in Northern Ireland, which is basically a proposal to have preparatory talks of varying levels move forward at the same time that there would be an international body to address the issue of arms that has become an obstacle to moving towards all party talks.

There have been a lot of conversations over the last couple of days and weeks between us and the parties in Northern Ireland and the two governments to see how we could be helpful in moving things forward.

The current status is that the two Prime Ministers, Major and Bruton, have been writing and talking to each other over the last week or so in an effort to try and move things forward. We believe that is a genuine effort. They are truly trying to work through the remaining outstanding issues. I'm not in the position to go into what those issues are really, other than to say that I think they're honestly trying to move this forward. Helen asked what our

position on the decommissioning issue was. It has long been, and remains, that we have urged the parties to address seriously the issue of decommissioning of arms and continue to do so. That is included in the twin

□

-track process.

Q What specifically do we expect or do we hope this trip will produce on those talks?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I think for the press it's been -- I mean, I see a lot of stories of expecting basically Clinton to pull a rabbit out of a hat in Northern Ireland. And it simply is not going to happen. It is not clear to me whether the twin track is going to be launched before or after we get there. Our role is to continue to move it forward. I think it's difficult to predict whether Prime Minister Major and Bruton will be able to come agreement before we get there.

I think the important to remember here is what's happened in the last 15 months there. It's a truly changed society. People live normally. They can go out shopping or to the pubs without getting blown up. They can drive their cars without getting their cars searched at checkpoints. The military presence has been dramatically reduced. And for the first time life is becoming normal there.

That is not an insignificant change. Change is going to take time in Northern Ireland, but I think there is a process going there where the two governments are deeply engaged. And we can hope that it moves forward. I think anyone who's predicting what's going to happen is ill informed.

Q Do you consider Ian Paisley a major political leader?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes. I mean, on the leaders there, I think we will try and work in the leaders of the major political parties, certainly, and Paisley would be one of them. Beyond that, we're just really not able to go into -- we'll be sure and see them while we're there, if they will agree.

Q Can you tell me more about the economic component of the trip, particularly in the -- in Northern Ireland and Ireland, he's got a couple speeches and appearances at industrial facilities? But is this -- is this a specific selling mission? Are they taking any American businesspeople over there to try to close any deals, or is it just kind of general to help the peace process?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I would not expect us to be closing deals while we're there, but it will be a continuation of a process that we launched last May with the trade and investment conference, which is to put the full weight of the U.S. government behind efforts to promote trade and investment in Northern Ireland.

Ron Brown has been over there, Assistant Secretary Chuck Meissner, from the Commerce Department, has made several trips over there. We've had a continuing effort with those in the business community that expressed interest there.

There will probably be a delegation that comes with us, which would include some business leaders. Frankly, we're still working out that piece of it. But I think we would want to emphasize while we're there -- and the schedule reflects that -- the importance of trade and investment.

A lot of the violence is fueled by the economic deprivation there, and to the extent you can help alleviate much of the causes as you can help solidify the peace process.

Q Is Ron Brown going as part of the delegation?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I'd have to check.

Again, the actual delegation, I think we're not -- frankly, I'm just not briefed up on exactly who is going from the government yet.

Q Where do things stand on the international commission, and what role, if any, would George Mitchell play --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I'm really not in a position to discuss any role that George Mitchell would play since there's no commission yet.

Right now it's very much part of the twin track. There is agreement among the various governments that they would expect to invite a distinguished American to be involved in this commission. And beyond that until the twin track is launched, I think it's premature to get into it.

Q To what degree with the President's talks with Major focus on Northern Ireland relative, to say, Bosnia?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: It depends on where both of them are.

Q -- equal weight, or is he primarily focusing on --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I mean, I think it's always dangerous to give one weight to one country's interest over another country's interest and trying to weigh them. I think they're both important issues. Bosnia, obviously having just gotten the agreement, is going to be very much in their mind, and I'm sure they'll talk about Northern Ireland. I can't get into characterizing it.

Q On the EU transatlantic agenda you mentioned, EU is one party to it, but which is the other community you mentioned? Is it NAFTA, or what's the North American community that's the other side of this transatlantic --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: It's the United States and the European Union.

Q Just the U.S. and the EU?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Correct.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: They're shaking their heads yes.

Q Adams was very gloomy the other day -- (inaudible) -- about the prospects and saying that the process was almost at an end. Do you share this --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: We continue to believe that the gaps that exist between the various parties on the twin track can be bridged. And we believe the two governments are committed to doing what they can to launch it. I think we're still hopeful that it can move forward.

Q The telephone calls and the contacts that you've mentioned in the last days and weeks have obviously been at your level and at Anthony Lake's level. Is there a possibility that the President himself will be involved in this diplomacy in the next few days before he goes to Ireland? And if there is still no agreement, will he actually himself, involve himself in this trying to bridge the gap once he is in London and Belfast?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I mean, there's nothing scheduled at the moment for the President's involvement on this, but I certainly wouldn't rule it out if it were appropriate right now. I'm sorry, what was the second half?

Q Once he's in London and Belfast, might he himself continue this diplomatic effort to help bridge the gap?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes, I mean, I think -- you have to look -- this is not a shuttle diplomacy by the President of the United States on Northern Ireland peace process. So I think when you're characterizing this, you need to have a sense of reality there. Of course, it's going to come up in his meetings. It's very much part of the agenda. I think it's unrealistic to expect him to be negotiating the details of this. But he is there supporting the peace process there. It will come up in his meetings, and I think his presence there and his involvement there will continue to advance the peace process. But there is not a secret shuttle diplomacy going on behind this trip.

Q To flip the question over, have the British and Irish governments told the United States that there will definitely not be any kind of agreement while he's there next week?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: No.

Q -- specifically said -- ruled that out?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Absolutely not, no. No, I think they're genuinely trying to move it forward. And, no, it has not -- frankly, it hasn't been ruled in or out. I mean, it's linked less now to the President being there to the two governments trying to get it done.

Q With the Bosnia agreement -- (inaudible) -- is that -- is there a possibility that Bosnia will play a larger role in the speech to the British Parliament, because the speech as you described it sounds like something we've heard a lot of before?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Again, I think we have to -- I didn't go through everything that was going to be in the speech, but clearly when I talked about the -- a large part of the theme of the speech is going to focus on peace and U.S. leadership role in peace. And Bosnia is a large chunk of that message -- that unless the United States leads, the peace processes across the globe, are going to, you know, suffer. And Bosnia is the number one effort at the moment, so I think -- if I didn't make that clear the first time, certainly Bosnia is going to be a piece of it.

Q Is there a feeling that England or other European countries need to be bucked up as well as the U.S. Congress, as far as the idea of sending troops in? Is that part of the message?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I don't know if "bucked up" is the right point. I think the British government is fully committed to doing its part in Bosnia. I think overall the message there is that this is a major agreement that we're all going to have to do our part to support. That's going to include troops and money, frankly. Part of the discussions with the EU is certainly going to revolve around reconstruction funds. There's a major reconstruction fund to Bosnia that is going to have to take place, and the Europeans are going to do their part. But I don't think you should write the story that we're going there to pressure Major. I think he's fully on board.

Q How much of this trip is important in terms of the President's effort to convince Congress to go along with Bosnia? And do you expect that we'll see European leaders publicly say if U.S.

troops don't come, we're not going to be part of it either?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I think Bosnia is going to center very much on this trip, both in the meetings with Prime Minister Major, the EU summit on the reconstruction fund, and the message back here that this is an important leadership role. I think the Europeans clearly understand the need for American leadership in this role. And that message will help underscore to those in Congress who need to get that message as well.

Q Will they be sending the message that American leadership is a prerequisite for it happening at all -- I mean, American participation?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I think that's a negative way of putting it. I think they will underscore that it's important. I think we're trying to send the message that we're going to be there, there's not a question of that. So I'd flip it a bit.

Q What's the message of this trip to Irish Americans?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: To Irish Americans?

Q Who live in Boston. (Laughter.)

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: And New York.
(Laughter.)

Q Who read my paper. (Laughter.)

Q We feel your pain. (Laughter.)

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I think, first of all, this is not just an Ireland trip. And I think the message to the American people is that America needs to lead in the world, in every part of the world; and that unless you have an activist American president, American interests are going to suffer, whether it's Bosnia or elsewhere. On Northern Ireland, I think the message is that we are going to stay engaged in Northern Ireland to help secure the peace and to the extent they can help support peace and bring an to the violence. They should continue to do that.

Q How large is the reconstruction fund, and what is the U.S. contribution likely to be?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Luckily I'm going to pass all those questions to Mike, who's going to briefing later.

Q Is he going to look for any ancestors?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: He's going to be certainly looking out for people, whether or not they look like him, but he -- (laughter) -- he, as you know, he's got Irish roots -- the Cassidys, the Hayes, and the Ayers, and --

Q The Cassidys, the who?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Hayes and Ayers -- on both sides of his family. There's nothing formally planned with them. Frankly, the roots are pretty far back, but I'm sure that he will have a chance to touch base with his roots in some form, but there's nothing formally scheduled.

Q The British were unhappy when the President in the campaign talked about a peace envoy. Then they were unhappy when he let Adams in. Is there any element of fence mending with Major and the British --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Frankly, I think we're way past that. I think we've built a very good working relationship

with the British on the issue of Northern Ireland, consult with them regularly. I think you'll find, if you ask them, that they welcome our role and find it constructive.

So I don't really think there's a problem there.

Q Is Princess Di going to be at the luncheon?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Ask McCurry that question.

Q At the beginning of the briefing you didn't mention Saturday's schedule in Ireland. Has that been scrubbed?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: No, I just really want to just go through the sort of substantive events on the schedule, just in the interest of -- there are going to be some briefings later on, on exactly what the final schedule is. I'm just trying to go through the substantive events on the schedule, so --

Q -- to accompany the President?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Sorry?

Q Is Secretary Warren Christopher going to accompany the President?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I would expect so, yes.

Q He will accompany --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: At the moment, yes.

Q Is the First Lady going?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes.

Q -- he meeting with Princess Di while he meets with -- (laughter) --

Q Prince Philip.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Not that I'm aware of. I frankly have not -- I haven't really gone through what the First Lady -- for the most part, she'll be with the President.

Q There was a piece in the Irish Echo last week saying that efforts to establish the President's patrimony, particularly on the Cassidy side, were ultimately unavailing because they couldn't ever establish the vital transatlantic link between the -- is that --

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: That's my understanding. Frankly, I haven't spent a lot of time on the genealogy -- (laughter). That is my understanding of -- those who have attempted to really trace this back. I would not put a lot of money on whatever anybody tells you are the family trees here.

Q -- you know when he had a visit from the Mormons the other day if they -- they are genealogical experts in the extreme -- did they discuss this question at all?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I believe they did leave the President with some genealogical information on it. I have no idea -- I haven't looked at it -- I have no idea whether it's accurate. I would just caution all of you to, you know -- he's clearly from -- his ancestors are clearly from Ireland, beyond that I'd be skeptical about what you read.

Q Is Prime Minister Major going to be going to Belfast or Dublin?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Sorry?

Q Is Prime Minister Major going to be going to Belfast or Dublin with -- while he's there?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Not Dublin. He, I think, has -- it's his budget day that day in London, and it's not clear he's going to be able to join us. But it's not resolved yet.

Q Are you still hoping to get all the principal leaders in Northern Ireland together under one roof at the Queens University reception?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: We expect to invite a broad spectrum to the reception at Queens there and hope everyone comes.

□

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM ALL

Q -- receptions in different rooms for the Unionists and the Nationalists?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Not here.

Q Why is there a separate meeting with David Trimble, the leader of the Unionist party and not with any of the other leaders? I understand there's going to be a separate meeting with him.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Yes. I mean, as I said earlier, I think none of the actual -- none of the actual details have been finalized with anyone. And there was some information put out for planning purposes earlier that was just that. And I would leave it at that.

Q In the visit to Madrid, will the President discuss the possibility of a Spanish candidate to the NATO post?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: The issue of the NATO Secretary General is very much being discussed in many capitals. I think it's under discussion now. Whether it will be resolved by the time he gets there, it's really too hard to tell.

Q Is the U.S. blackballing anybody else?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: Again, I can buck that to Mike, so -- (laughter).

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

1:26 P.M. EST

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 22-NOV-1995 18:42:53.75

SUBJECT: 1995-11-22 Press Briefing by Mike McCurry

TO: Melissa M. Murray (MURRAY_MM) (WHO)
READ: 24-NOV-1995 12:30:55.56

TO: Allison Wilkie (WILKIE_A) (WHO)
READ: 26-NOV-1995 13:00:08.82

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (edowd@esusda.gov@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (mwolfe@mh1.js.mil@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (ttate@esusda.gov@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usia01@access.digex.com@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (releases@www3.whitehouse.gov@inet)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dapice_n@www1.whitehouse.gov@inet) (OA)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (dapice_n@www2.whitehouse.gov@inet) (OA)
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@4=HOUSE
READ: NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@4=DW0

READ:NOT READ

TO: FAX (9-862-0340,William Safire) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:9-862-0340\C:William SafireR

TO: FAX (93345661,Sandy Torry) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:93345661\C:Sandy Torry\)
READ:NOT READ

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 12:42:37.70

TO: Alexis M. Herman (HERMAN_A) (WHO)
READ:28-NOV-1995 10:42:52.13

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ:24-NOV-1995 10:36:56.76

TO: Brenda Anders (ANDERS_B) (WHO)
READ:26-NOV-1995 07:46:23.28

TO: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ) (CEQ)
READ:27-NOV-1995 09:56:33.81

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 12:57:49.01

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 12:59:29.79

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ:24-NOV-1995 08:15:51.07

TO: Cynthia J. Lizik (LIZIK_C) (OA)
READ:27-NOV-1995 08:16:57.51

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (KALBAUGH_D) (WHO)
READ:24-NOV-1995 09:07:06.34

TO: Donald A. Baer (BAER_D) Autoforward to: Angus S. King
READ:24-NOV-1995 12:06:19.50

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 07:56:35.93

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (SOSNIK_D) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 11:33:46.54

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn (SHEORN_D) (WHO)
READ:22-NOV-1995 18:44:24.00

TO: Eleanor S. Parker (PARKER_E) (WHO)
READ:27-NOV-1995 10:37:32.93

TO: Elizabeth A. Montoya READ:27-NOV-1995 16:08:53.92	(MONTOYA_E) (WHO)
TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman READ:NOT READ	(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: G. N. Lattimore READ:NOT READ	(LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
TO: G. Timothy Saunders READ:27-NOV-1995 08:13:37.47	(SAUNDERS_GT) (WHO)
TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman READ:27-NOV-1995 09:43:23.69	(BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)
TO: Heidi Kukis READ:NOT READ	(Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
TO: James Kohlenberger READ:NOT READ	(Jim Kohlenberger@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
TO: Jason S. Goldberg READ:NOT READ	(GOLDBERG_JS) (OPD)
TO: Jeremy M. Gaines READ:NOT READ	(GAINES_J) (WHO)
TO: Jodie R. Torkelson READ:27-NOV-1995 09:32:13.44	(TORKELOSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Johnathan H. Spalter READ:NOT READ	(SPALTE_J) (VPO)
TO: Jonathan M. Prince READ:28-NOV-1995 09:50:25.66	(PRINCE_J) (WHO)
TO: Joseph W. Cerrell READ:NOT READ	(CERREL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Address
TO: Joshua A. King READ:NOT READ	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: Joshua Silverman READ:24-NOV-1995 13:07:03.05	(SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
TO: Julia R. Green READ:23-NOV-1995 10:31:08.51	(GREEN_J) (WHO)
TO: Julie E. Mason READ:27-NOV-1995 08:16:23.38	(MASON_J) (WHO)
TO: Karen E. Finney READ:NOT READ	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Barbuschak READ:27-NOV-1995 07:57:17.77	(BARBUSCHAK_K) (OA)
TO: Kathy McKiernan READ: 4-DEC-1995 10:09:13.18	(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS READ:27-NOV-1995 10:43:48.00	(HAAS_L) (OMB)
TO: Laura Capps READ:27-NOV-1995 09:38:25.29	(CAPPS_L) (WHO)
TO: Laura D. Schwartz READ:28-NOV-1995 07:39:58.12	(SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ:27-NOV-1995 08:22:03.30	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ:NOT READ	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Lori E. Abrams READ:24-NOV-1995 09:35:45.28	(ABRAMS_L) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ:NOT READ	(VOLES_L) Autoforward to: Remote Adresse
TO: Lorraine McHugh READ:24-NOV-1995 09:24:37.20	(MCHUGH_L) (WHO)
TO: Manager Infomgt READ:NOT READ	(INFOMGT) (SYS)
TO: Margaret M. Suntum READ:NOT READ	(SUNTUM_M) (WHO)
TO: Marlene A. MacDonald READ:26-NOV-1995 14:48:17.51	(MACDONALD_M) (WHO)
TO: Mary Ellen Glynn READ:22-NOV-1995 19:03:55.59	(GLYNN_M) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ:NOT READ	(WALDMAN_M) (OPD)
TO: Natalie S. Wozniak READ:22-NOV-1995 19:00:22.32	(WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
TO: Peggy A. Lewis READ:27-NOV-1995 10:12:47.52	(LEWIS_P) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ:NOT READ	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Rica F. Rodman READ:28-NOV-1995 09:20:07.94	(RODMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Richard L. Siewert READ:NOT READ	(SIEWERT_R) (WHO)
TO: Richard Strauss READ:28-NOV-1995 11:59:57.26	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Steven A. Cohen READ:NOT READ	(COHEN_SA) (WHO)

TO: Susan P. Shepard
READ:24-NOV-1995 07:42:38.49

(SHEPARD_S) (OA)

TO: Virginia M. Terzano
READ:NOT READ

(TERZANO_V) (WHO)

TO: Walker, Angelina
READ:NOT READ

(Angelina Walker@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)

TO: Wayne C. Johnson
READ:24-NOV-1995 08:55:20.43

(JOHNSON_WC) (OA)

TO: William C. Hornish
READ:24-NOV-1995 09:09:29.65

(HORNISH_W) (OA)

TO: Gordon Li
READ:27-NOV-1995 08:34:17.52

(LI_G) (WHO)

TO: Jill A. Schuker
READ:22-NOV-1995 19:22:16.98

(SCHUKER_J) Autoforward to: Steven J. Nap

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD
MORE #142
□
-11/22

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
22, 1995

November

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

3:06 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Good afternoon, pilgrims. My tie? You're asking about my tie? I'm wearing this tie in honor of some very superb librarians who used to work for the Office of Technology Assessments Information Center. They are now no longer working there because the Office of Technology Assessment itself is no longer, and the assistant manager of the Information Center at the OTA library gave me this tie for Christmas.

Q And they had to sell all their clothes?
(Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Last Christmas. "She" being my wife, of course. I just thought that was apt commentary somehow or other.

Q So it's the tie that binds?

MR. MCCURRY: That's the tie that binds.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you a little bit about how next week is now shaping up.

On Monday evening at 8:00 p.m. the President will address the nation on the subject of Bosnia. He wants to both help Americans understand the importance of the peace agreement that has been achieved now in Dayton and also help Americans understand the unique responsibilities the United States of America will have as a result of this agreement.

In many ways we alone are in a position to help these parties enforce this peace. Of course, we will work with our NATO allies, as we previously discussed with you. But we have some unique responsibilities given our leadership role in NATO, and given our commitment to the security of Europe and to the stability of Europe. In two world wars Americans have shed blood and for exactly those purposes.

And now we have an opportunity, at minimum risk of loss of life, to protect the peace there. That will be fragile but will need to be nurtured. And it represents, as the President said yesterday, the best hope of ending a tragic conflict that for three and a half years has resulted in the loss of life for 250,000 people. And he wishes to discuss that with the American people Monday night.

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE #142

□

-11/22

That, of course, will of necessity delay our departure for Europe. I expect the President will be here in the White House Tuesday morning for meetings, both with his budget negotiators and also meetings related to Bosnia. So he'll be departing later in the day on Tuesday for Europe.

□

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE #142

□

-11/22

He will arrive very early Wednesday morning in London, and then proceed with a schedule that includes a wreath

□

-laying with

Prime Minister Major, a meeting with Prime Minister Major followed by a press availability, a speech to both houses of Parliament, a meeting with Tony Blair of Labor, a reception for the American community that will be hosted by U.S. Ambassador Admiral Crowe. And then he'll have a dinner and a reception that evening with Prime Minister Major.

On Thursday he will depart for Belfast.

Q No lunch with the Queen?

MR. MCCURRY: There's none now on the schedule.

Thursday he will depart for Belfast. He plans to speak at the Mackie's plant, I believe as previously scheduled on Thursday. He'll have a roundtable discussion with tenants and managers of the East Belfast Enterprise Park. He will then fly to Londonderry for remarks to the citizens of Londonderry and for receptions. He will return to Belfast for the Christmas tree

□

-lighting ceremony at City Hall, and
have a reception that evening at Queens University.

On Friday the President will depart for Dublin, have a tree

□

-planting ceremony with President Mary Robinson. He'll meet with Prime Minister Bruton, make remarks to the citizens of Dublin, remarks to the Irish Parliament, and then enjoy a dinner hosted by Prime Minister Bruton.

On Saturday, December 2nd, the President will depart for Germany. He will meet with U.S. troops stationed in Germany who will eventually be deployed to Bosnia as part of the U.S. contingent of the international implementation force. He will then, subject to further announcements as to place -- I don't know that we have identified exactly the place now. We're working with NATO and U.S. officials in Brussels and Mons to identify the location.

He'll then fly on Saturday evening to Madrid, have dinner with the King and Queen, and then on Sunday participate in both bilateral meetings with Prime Minister Gonzalez and then meetings of the U.S.

□

-E.U. summit as previously scheduled, returning to the White House in time for the event at the Kennedy Center on Sunday night.

That is a thumbnail of the schedule as we now know it. Obviously, we are working very quickly to finalize details. We'll be here tomorrow, Friday and into the weekend working out the final arrangements as we can. Probably Friday or Saturday provide updated information on the President's travel and on how that affects the press charter travel.

Q So what was basically dropped -- just most of the Tuesday morning --

Q The first day, it sounds like.

Q -- first day --

MR. MCCURRY: Some ceremonial events. Why don't -- I would like to ask, if you don't mind, ask the Deputy White House Press Secretary, David Johnson, to talk a little bit about some of the stops. Some of you had asked for a little bit of on

□

-the

□

-record

material that you could use connected to some of these stops. And why don't I let David handle that.

Q Before we do that, Mike, could I just ask a quick question? Is the President also planning on addressing the Joint Session of Congress on Bosnia?

TOP ODD

- \p -

BOTTOM ODD

MORE

#142

□

-11/22

MR. MCCURRY: There are no plans for that at this point. His plans for Monday evening are an Oval Office address to the nation.

Q How long would that be?

MR. MCCURRY: We are not certain of the length, but I'll give you more guidance on that as we get closer to Monday.

Q Who are the officials he's meeting with Tuesday before he takes off -- a Cabinet meeting?

MR. MCCURRY: He certainly wants to meet with his negotiators. Remember on Tuesday we will most likely begin some of the preliminary discussions with Capitol Hill folks to structure the dialogue about budget issues. And he'll want to meet with some of his negotiators on Tuesday morning. And as I said, we also holding the candle under -- open for meetings on Bosnia.

Q Have you asked the networks for time for this speech, and have they given it to you --

MR. MCCURRY: We have notified the major U.S. networks of the President's intent to address the nation on Monday evening. Given the subject matter, given the importance of this subject to the American people and to the American Congress, I suspect that there's not really a need to request the time. I imagine it will be made available. But we have notified the networks of the President's intent to make that address.

Q Do you know whether they have announced plans to carry --

MR. MCCURRY: It's -- just done that recently. I assume they have that under consideration now.

Q One quick front

□

-end logistical question, realizing a lot of this stuff is probably up in the air, but if he leaves late, late in the day Tuesday, I assume that means the press charter would probably leave Tuesday morning in lieu of Monday morning now -- that's the thinking, or --

MR. MCCURRY: That's a safe assumption, but the exact time we don't know. We would like to have as late a departure as possible on Tuesday for the press charter, but it would leave, to be sure, Tuesday instead of Monday.

Q -- that's my --

MR. MCCURRY: That's correct.

Q Are the budget talks now set to begin Tuesday instead of Monday as --

MR. MCCURRY: Why don't I come back to that. I think you -- several people have budget questions. We can get into that. Let me ask David Johnson to do a little more on the schedule.

MR. JOHNSON: I think Mike has covered much of the logistical side of the schedule. If it's helpful to you, I'll talk a little bit about what we hope to accomplish. The President believes this is an important opportunity to give expression to the strong transatlantic ties we have with the governments and the leaders that he will be visiting with while he's in Europe.

His first stop in the United Kingdom. This will be his first opportunity to visit London as President. He plans to meet with Prime Minister Major for full review of all foreign policy issues, concentrating on Bosnia, NATO and our efforts to craft a new European security architecture; talk, of course, about the Irish peace process; and also, because of our work with the United Kingdom and other regions of the world, also about the Middle East peace process.

As Michael mentioned, he's also going to take this opportunity to meet with the leader of the opposition, Tony Blair, something that he frequently does when he makes a visit abroad.

He will then go onto Belfast and be the first United States President to visit Belfast. He hopes and plans to affirm the administration's support for the United -- governments of the United Kingdom and Ireland's efforts to bring peace to Northern Ireland. We continue to believe that the twin

□

-track approach is the best process to pursue. And we believe that the governments are dedicated to pursuing peace through that twin

□

-track approach. We'll be affirming the administration's support for those who are taking risks to support peace, like in Northern Ireland and in the Middle East.

We're also going to be celebrating the 15

□

-month long
cease

□

-fire. We believe that there's been a radical change toward a normal life in Belfast and in Northern Ireland in the last 15 months; that there are people that are literally alive today because of the efforts that have been undertaken to pursue peace there.

And in the season of peace, the President wants to mark this visit by, as Michael said, visiting a plant where Catholic and Protestant workers work together, and also visiting some enterprises which reflect a new spirit of investment and the potential for prosperity that's there now because of the cease

□

-fire and the efforts toward the peace process.

He's also going to participate as the guest of the city of Belfast to light their Christmas tree, which I understand will be coming from Nashville, Tennessee, their sister city.

In Dublin, he's going to affirm the traditional ties of the United States with a modern Ireland, take the opportunity to confer with Prime Minister Bruton on a broad range of economic and security issues, in particular Bosnia, the Irish peace process, and the new European security structures.

After visiting our troops in Germany, he will proceed onto Madrid and have an opportunity to have dinner with the King and Queen. The main purpose of that stop in Madrid is for a United States

□

-European Union summit. He also plans to take advantage of being there to have a bilateral meeting with Prime Minister Gonzalez, where he will talk about security and economic issues, including Bosnia.

The highlight of the U.S.

□

-European Union will be the unveiling of the Transatlantic Initiative and the new transatlantic agenda; also a United States

□

-European Union action plan, which catalogs all the efforts we have underway between the United States and the European Union to pursue issues together, especially including the opening of markets in Europe for the products of the United States and to create jobs here.

Q What is twin -- the twin track? That is England and Ireland?

MR. JOHNSON: No, that is the effort to get talks underway at the same time as we pursue decommissioning.

Q I don't know if this is for you or for Mike, but what's the latest thinking on the President going to Paris, apparently within a very short time after he comes back from Europe?

MR. MCCURRY: On that there will be further diplomatic conversations back and forth around the alliance. There is work to be done on aspects of the agreement reached in Dayton yesterday. And they were reviewed with the President today for about 45 minutes by his national security advisers. The President attended a meeting, along with the Vice President, of the principals of the National Security Council. They had a very good discussion about the agreement reached yesterday in Dayton, a good briefing by Secretary Christopher, Ambassador Holbrooke and other members of the

negotiating team. The President asked a number of questions about aspects of the agreement, about how the eventual deployment of the implementation force would be impacted by several of the conversations held during Dayton over the last three weeks; gave some very precise instructions to General Shalikashvili about efforts now being made to finalize the operational plan that NATO will use to guide the mission in Bosnia. And they did discuss what the sequencing is of discussions that will lead to the concluding of the peace agreement.

As Secretary Christopher said yesterday, we anticipate that by mid

□

-December there will be a formal conclusion of the peace process with a signing in Paris. And we have active consultations underway now with European capitals about both the level of representation for that ceremony and the specific date. It is unlikely, in our opinion, that that will occur in a time that makes it possible for the President to attend any ceremony during his current trip. And then we'll just have to see how the schedule develops as we conclude these inter

□

-alliance discussions.

Q Mike, it seemed that the President was saying yesterday that he expected sort of one final, logistical briefing on how the troops would be deployed. Has he gotten that yet, and will he get it before he speaks to the nation on Monday?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he had -- he will have -- given the importance of the subject matter, he will have a number of briefings. He will -- he certainly asked a number of detailed questions today that were answered by General Wesley Clarke, who is Chairman Shalikashvili's representative during the talks in Dayton and who kept a hawk eye on the aspects of the diplomacy that might impact the military deployment eventually to come. General Shalikashvili, of course, offered his thoughts on aspects of the deployment.

The President also will look for an opportunity here from Secretary Perry, who will be in Brussels this weekend meeting with both U.S. officials and NATO military commanders. Secretary Perry, my understanding is, will have an opportunity to get a thorough briefing on the latest planning being done by the Supreme Allied Commander for Europe, General George Joulwan, who is also the top U.S. commander in Europe, as you know.

He'll also have an opportunity to meet with other senior U.S. military commanders who would be expected to play major roles in any U.S. deployment as part of the NATO contingent. Now, that will give the President, I believe, a lot of confidence in the planning. There has been a great deal of work done already.

It's clear from the discussion the President had this morning that extensive planning and preparation has already been underway. We talked about that from time to time in the past, and we've actually been in a position to provide fairly specific information already to Congress in response to some of their questions. But there will be additional questions and details that we'll be looking for in the coming days.

Q Is the planning complete, almost complete or still going on? I'm a little confused by this answer.

MR. MCCURRY: Very near complete. They briefed at the Pentagon yesterday. Certainly the U.S. elements of the force are well

□
-known -- the planning about how they would work the initial deployment, how personnel associated with an enabling force would set up some of the logistics and advance requirements. They've had site survey teams in Bosnia, in and out for the past several weeks, looking for locations for headquarters facilities and measures like that. So the planning has been extensive, detailed and comprehensive. They are now in the process of finishing up that plan. I would really prefer to leave it to General Joulwan's staff to provide further information on his plan because he, as Supreme Allied Commander, will have to submit the plan to the North Atlantic Council for ratification by political authority.

Q Just one follow
□
-up. At this briefing today did the President specifically ask that the number was still 20,000, and was he assured that it was?

MR. MCCURRY: The number is important to the President, to be sure. But it's the mission, the precision of defining the mission, the conditions under which the forces will be deployed, and then the so

□
-called exit strategy -- the way to measure to success, the way to understand when the job is done -- that the President devoted most of his attention to. The number in general terms hasn't changed much from the initial presentations we've made to Congress. The force itself on the ground in Bosnia is estimated -- estimated at this point at around 60,000, one

□
-third of which would come from U.S. forces, the balance from NATO forces and perhaps other participating nations as well. But there are other aspects of any deployment of this nature in theater, not necessarily on the ground in Bosnia in separation zones, but in theater that have to be accounted to. And at the proper point, I'll have -- we'll be having military folks who can brief on the exact nature of those deployments. You're already seeing, I think, from some of your colleagues reporting out of Brussels a fair amount of detail on the nature of the deployment, some of the units involved. And, of course, the President early -- or, I guess, a week from tomorrow will have an opportunity to learn much more and see some of the young men who will be deployed and also see and talk to their commanders.

Q When is he going to get some of this -- some of these briefings, especially the report from Perry? Does this change his weekend plans --

MR. MCCURRY: His weekend plans are the same. I think we are looking for a time on Monday, is my understanding, although since he will be here Tuesday morning, that's a possibility as well.

Q Does he anticipate a meeting with the bipartisan

congressional leadership on Monday?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't want to speculate on that. I wouldn't rule that out, but that would be subject to further conversations with folks on the Hill.

Q Mike, some members of Congress have said since the announcement of the agreement that they're not convinced or persuaded that vital American national interests are at stake in Bosnia. Does this -- does the President intend to make that a focus of his address on Monday?

MR. MCCURRY: He will, just as he did as he announced the agreement yesterday. But we have been very gratified with the reaction on the Hill so far. I make -- just make one -- quote one member of Congress by way of an example: You can make a strong case that if we can't end the killing, if we have a good clearcut command and control through NATO, if we have the commitment of our allies, and if there is a good plan for us ultimately withdrawing, then it's a reasonable risk.

Q Who said that?

MR. MCCURRY: That said by Speaker Gingrich yesterday as he encouraged members of Congress to keep an open mind on this and to hear the President out. We believe that's exactly the attitude that one should bring to these deliberations. And, of course, the President feels very -- very, very strongly that those are in a thumbnail sketch exactly the parameters of the mission. But the interests are those as he's defined it. These are -- it's enormously important to the security and stability of Europe, a continent upon which the United States has been willing to risk our lives in two world wars this century to protect and defend; it is enormously important to stop the killing and the bloodshed, which has, I think, horrified all Americans for the last three and a half years; and ultimately given the importance of our leadership role in NATO and in the enduring responsibilities that NATO will have to keep the peace in Europe, it is vital to our interest to participate in what will be one of the most important military undertakings that the alliance has ever attempted.

Q Is there any concern that some of the Serb elements, the rebels and so forth, and the Muslims are not going to go along? I mean, was it impressed on the leaders who were Dayton that they should go back and bring them into line, and that the U.S. would probably not be able to --

MR. MCCURRY: It is a source of very real concern that rogue elements who are not under effective command and control might launch their own expeditions. And that has been a critical part of the training that U.S. and NATO forces have undertaken in Germany to prepare for that contingency. On the other hand, the President took with great satisfaction the observation by all three presidents yesterday that they would -- were committed to this agreement. They understood that they have responsibilities associated with this agreement. And they would exercise their own authority to ensure compliance with the terms of the agreement.

We take those commitments very seriously by all three presidents. And we, of course, will be doing what we can in some of

the upcoming international conferences to ensure that they will be made good.

Q But, Mike, that only really works if Milosevic controls Karadzic and Mladic. I mean, how confident are you that he does?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, since August, it's -- your -- let me spend a second on that question. Since August, President Milosevic has made clear that he is authorized to speak on behalf of the Bosnian Serbs. And that has not been disputed by the so

□

-called leadership of the Bosnian Serb movement in Pale.

Now, I would remind you that there are many crosscurrents in the political dynamic that now exists in Serbian

□

-controlled Bosnia. And Karadzic and General Mladic both as indicted war criminals will not play a future in the political -- it will not play a role in the political future of Bosnia

□

-Herzegovina, as the agreement yesterday made clear, unless, of course, as indicted war criminals they submit to orders of the international war crimes tribunal, which I believe would require their appearance at The Hague.

Q You and the Vice President and other administration officials keep throwing out the term "minimal risk." What does minimal risk mean? Minimal risk of anybody getting hurt over there? Do you really think --

MR. MCCURRY: No, there's no -- there is no deployment of this nature that is risk

□

-free. And this is a part of the world that has seen enormous bloodshed and the most horrific atrocities of the 20th century since the Holocaust. But that being the situation, what the President and the military command of the United States stresses is they are taking steps and have taken steps throughout the course of this negotiation to minimize the risk that exists for those forces participating as part of this deployment. That's exactly the detail that went into the design and the structuring of the negotiations around the separation zones. That's why every hill, every valley was carefully mapped and discussed, not only between the parties but by U.S. military authorities that participated as part of our peace team.

There is not -- the American people will have to understand that -- and they, I think, are -- they are -- bring a lot of common sense to that type of discussion. You can never say there won't be casualties. You can never say that this will be a situation in which U.S. forces will not encounter hostility. But at the same time, we are confident that we have got two things going for this agreement. One, the commitment by the leadership, given by the three presidents, to do everything within their authority to ensure compliance; and, two, a very tough, precise, disciplined approach to the military planning that has gone into this deployment. And that

--

Q What's a minimal amount of casualties that you estimate that we can get away with?

MR. MCCURRY: It is no -- that is not something you define in numbers. You define in what the nature of the mission is and what the perceived risk is, and how you minimize that risk and ensure that commanders have the right type of rules of engagement to respond to any perceived threat.

Q But historically that kind of thing has been defined by numbers before -- before deployment.

Q -- casualty estimates --

Q Have you not defined that --

MR. MCCURRY: We are not -- that's not something you define in nature of casualty estimates. That is -- and that -- in any event, the planning that goes into that type of work is something that is done within the province of the military.

Q Mike, will the President make clear to the public on Monday that they should be prepared to have some troops die? And in the words of a news magazine cover this week, will he make the point that Bosnia and policing a peace agreement there is a cause worth dying for?

MR. MCCURRY: I think it is incumbent upon the Commander in Chief to make that case clearly, because everyone is well aware of the test that's often called the "mother test" -- what do you say to the mother of a young man who's lost his life in the pursuit of this peace agreement. But that is a risk that this President believes is well worth taking because of the enormous consequences at stake here. And one thing the President would remind people is the enormous horror of this war over the last three and a half years and the fact that over a quarter million human beings have lost their lives as these parties have allowed this conflict to rage out of control.

We now have the opportunity to bring peace, and we have the opportunity to see the peoples of Bosnia live in a civilized society if this peace agreement works and if it's fully implemented by the parties. That's an enormous undertaking, but it's one that is filled with an enormous amount of hope. And one thing the President is gratified is he's seen the comments coming from some of the young people who would be part of this deployment is how they're proud of taking on this mission because they know it's worth risking their own lives for.

Q Mike, you've spoken positively of the commitment expressed by the three presidents yesterday, yet right off the bat the Bosnian Serb members of the Milosevic delegation refused to sign all the documents and, as a matter of fact, were very critical and indicated their part might not go along with this peace agreement.

What happened to Holbrooke's assertion right from the beginning that there was the patriarch letter that he received from Milosevic, witnessed by the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch committing these Bosnian Serbs to, in effect, follow the orders of Milosevic?

If he is so committed and has both the legal and moral right to dictate to the Bosnian Serbs, why could he not yesterday in Dayton obtain their assent?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, President Milosevic made clear to U.S. negotiators that he has the authority to represent the Bosnian Serbs and that he would, at the time of the conclusion of this process and the formal signing of this peace settlement, be able to have the document witnessed and signed by proper, competent authority from the Bosnian Serbs.

You have to remember that this is a time of enormous political change undergoing in that Serb

□

-controlled portion of Bosnia. They are now subject to a new constitution. They face the prospects in several months of free and fair elections. And the people who have been associated with the past political and military leadership of Bosnia -- of the Serbian

□

-controlled part of Bosnia are no longer going to be part of that future.

So there is some uncertainty and there is some political dynamic that suggests, I would say confusion in the ranks of those Serbs who are now in Bosnia over who is in command. But that's why I think it's all the more important that President Milosevic, who is in a position of authority and who we know does have a great deal of authority over the Serbs in Bosnia, to carry out the commitments he has made to the United States.

Q But did you see yesterday's nonsupport by the Bosnian Serb element as at all a disturbing sign about how much you can rely on Milosevic?

MR. MCCURRY: No, we saw it as an example of the political changes that are about to happen in Bosnia

□

-Herzegovina as a result of the agreement reached yesterday.

Q Let me just ask you a question, if I may, on the mission. A lot of people on the Hill and elsewhere in the country, in reading the -- beginning to read the text of this peace agreement are asking the question, in terms of the mission of the GIs, besides patrolling the separation zones -- and that seems to be straightforward -- are they going to also have a mission to implement other parts of the peace agreement, particularly a return of refugees? What happens if a Serb refugee approaches a U.S. military unit and said, "Here's the peace agreement. I am entitled to go back to my village. Escort me." Will --

MR. MCCURRY: No, they -- that is not -- as we have already briefed members of Congress, as Dr. Perry has made clear, Admiral Owens, who participated in the briefing, he made clear -- that is not an aspect of this mission. That is the responsibility of the implementation force. The implementation force is handling the military aspects of separation of forces and then the patrolling of the exclusion zones of the separation zones themselves.

One aspect -- I encourage you to go through the agreement as it was reached yesterday because very detailed work was done on the question of refugee return, the right of displaced people to both vote in free and fair elections and to have a right of return to their homeplace. And the United States will now work with the proper international organizations to carry that out. There are discussions ongoing with humanitarian relief organizations that would help with that work.

Remember, the United Nations will still have a presence in Bosnia even with the rolldown of the UNPROFOR mission and the transfer over the international implementation force; there will still be a role for U.N. humanitarian organizations to play. And the agreement itself structures very specifically a commission on human rights that will address many of the questions related to the refugee population.

It's our view that is not a military mission assigned to the NATO forces that will be there to implement the peace, but it nonetheless is an important mission and it should be handled properly by the international organization.

Q So the military mission is strictly limited to separation of forces?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it's limited to those things that are properly defined by the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and that are approved by the Commander in Chief. And that -- some detail of that has been provided confidentially to Congress now. But the mission plan, as it's being well developed now, focuses on the military aspects of this assignment, not the humanitarian or the so

□
-called nation

□
-building parts of the exercise.

Q What is the Bosnian situation now due to the -- to your efforts to craft a budget agreement? Can you fight two huge major battles like this at the same time, or do you need to slow down on the budget? What do you give up in either case by having the President overseas for a good portion of this whole debate?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, what the President will be doing on this trip, as we just told you, is very directly related to the effort to help the American people understand the importance of this deployment in Bosnia, I think that we gain by having him in a setting where he can -- with Prime Minister Major, with Prime Minister Bruton, with members of the European Union, with the Spanish, who have been so heroic in their own participation in UNPROFOR -- we can reaffirm the importance to Europe -- all Europe -- of peace and stability in the Balkans. And that will send, I think, a very powerful message to the people of the United States. I suspect some of these leaders will also say that they are not able to do this without the participation and contribution of the United States of America. And that point, I think, will be made clear, too.

But as to the premise of your question, the President is fully confident that his negotiating team, which, remember, will only be starting on Tuesday, the initial discussions with members of

Congress, can carry forward his views as they go into that difficult negotiation. But he has, you know, no -- in fact, if anything, somewhat relishes the prospect of having two very important, major discussions with this Congress to carry out for the balance of this year.

On the one hand, we are having a very large debate about the role of the federal government and what it means to the American people and why we need it. On the other hand, we're having a very good debate about what it means to be a leader of the free world; what our commitment is to Europe; what the nature is of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and why the future of Europe is an intense, vital strategic interest to the United States of America. Those are two large, profound debates. And if anything, I see the President energized by the prospects of making that argument, having that debate, answering his critics; and also, ultimately, in both the case of balancing the budget and bringing peace to Bosnia, having a successful outcome.

Q Mike, when you said the President recognizes the risks involving in these rogue elements beyond command and control, but who's responsibility is it to deal with them should they act up, should they do something militarily? Is that the American responsibility?

MR. MCCURRY: If they are taking action that is direct violation of the terms of the agreement reached in Dayton, then it is the responsibility, in part, of the implementation force. But part of the agreement reached is the structuring of an international police force that would have law enforcement responsibilities as civil society is returned, we hope, to the people of Bosnia. So there are multiple responsibilities there, and, in fact, a great deal of detail in this comprehensive peace agreement to address situations exactly like that. But the enforcement of the military aspects of the agreement are the things that the commanders at NATO are focusing on, and that is their primary responsibility, and their primary responsibility to see that warring parties that have been in conflict, who are now committed to peace, honor that peace and honor that commitment.

Q Mike, Speaker Gingrich has said Congress is going to start hearings on Bosnia next week. One, what information do you have on the willingness and readiness of the three presidents who were in Dayton to come testify to Congress, and what do you know about the content of the hearings and who will testify?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know much. I really -- they are congressional hearings, so properly, you have to refer to members of Congress. I can tell you today we have spent some time briefing congressional staff. We concluded that, based on who was available on Capitol Hill today, that we'd pretty much handle most of this with staff level calls between the legislative affairs operation here at the White House, the congressional affairs operations at the State Department and congressional affairs at the Pentagon.

They have been in contact with staff members on Capitol Hill. Sandy Vershbow, who's been our key NSC point person on the subject of Bosnia, has been up on the Hill today to brief the leadership staff in person. We have also distributed fact sheets related to the Dayton agreement. And I believe in a short time, the

very thick package, which represents the agreement itself, is being distributed on Capitol Hill. Now, in most cases, a lot of the -- even the key legislative staff on Capitol Hill are not there. They're off for the Thanksgiving holiday. But we will follow up in coming days, beginning Friday and into next week, with those staff.

As to the hearings themselves, we are -- would welcome the opportunity to have a variety of our foreign policy principals testify in the appropriate settings. But to my knowledge, there have not been decisions made on Capitol Hill about the structure of those hearings. In any event, I'd have to refer questions about the timing of hearings and things like that to people on the Hill.

Q Because of the Bosnian troop situation, does that mean the President is having second thoughts about the veto on the defense bill, and have you gotten the GOP budget here yet?

MR. MCCURRY: No and no. The President still, as I've said before, has the Defense Department appropriations bill. As we indicated prior to the Dayton agreement, that bill is being held and examined as we look at it in light of the overall budget situation we have. Now, that has to be an element of any eventual resolution of the budget discussions between the Congress and the President, and it is effected by Bosnia in the sense that the estimated \$1.5 billion cost of a U.S. deployment, which we have told Congress about before, has to be considered in the context of whatever FY '96 defense appropriations exist. We then have to look at the issue of how money can be reprogrammed by Congress or, alternatively, how the administration might go about seeking a supplemental appropriation if necessary.

So all of that, I think, is part of a complicated budget picture that is affected by the coming negotiations. And one reason among several that the President has held that bill and will examine it as we make a decision between now and November 30th, which is the date by which he has to take action.

Q -- if he vetoed that before you could get another bill or a supplemental, do you have sufficient existing funds to begin and start carrying out the Bosnian deployment?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. The importance of the mission that we must undertake here will not be circumscribed by funding. We have responsibilities to our European allies; we have responsibilities to the people of Bosnia. And in the President's view, first and foremost, we have responsibilities to the people of this country to do what is necessary to protect the national interests.

And the President, as Commander in Chief, will take those actions. And never has funding inhibited the ability of a Commander in Chief to do what he needs to do to protect this nation's national interest.

Q Mike, I was struck a couple of times, you mentioned the U.S. role in two world wars. Is that specifically that sort of historical theme, something the President is going to touch on on Monday, and a be a theme of the administration's general --

MR. MCCURRY: He has touched upon it in the past. And every American knows that the first great world war of this century

began in Sarajevo. But we have shed blood on the European continent for the sake of peace and stability in Europe. And the most proximate threat to that peace and security now is the conflict in the Balkans, which if it is allowed to ignite again, runs the risk of spreading elsewhere in the Balkans and thus affecting the interests of some of our closest allies and NATO. It would run the risk of becoming a wider Balkan, if not European, conflict. And for that reason the President does believe it is manifestly in the interest of the United States to take these steps to implement the peace agreement that has now been reached with a great deal of courage by the parties that have been warned.

Q Mike, will Secretary Christopher be in Europe next week with the President? I ask only because Ms. Soderberg seemed to be -- hedged that a tiny bit --

MR. MCCURRY: My understanding was that his plans were to be there, but there are now a number of things happening in connection with the Dayton agreement, including the likelihood of a implementing conference on the civilian aspects of implementation and some of the humanitarian relief aspects I mentioned earlier in London early in December that might require the Secretary of State to juggle his schedule, too.

We are all committed to being deployed where we need to be in order both to make the case for this agreement to the American people and the American Congress and also to work with our European allies and the Russian Federation and others to make sure that it is properly implemented. So the Secretary of State might be instructed by the President to take on additional duties. Otherwise, of course, he'll accompany the President as he usually does.

Q Just to follow up on your answer to Mike's question, in the past you've always maintained the President doesn't constitutionally need Congress's permission, but you have suggested that it wouldn't be possible for him to do what he did with the rapid reaction force, in other words, to scrounge up money on his own, but this time he actually would need some kind of appropriated funds for this. Now, are you saying that's not the case anymore, and he could get money on his own?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I'm just saying when the Commander in Chief needs to act to protect America, he's going to do so and will figure out how to pay for it one way or another. But that's not the issue. The issue here is, as we've already submitted to the Congress November 13th in the letter from the President, a precise statement about how we would expect to go about funding. It would depend on the FY '96 appropriations. We would then have to make the decision on whether or not to seek a supplemental. We'd be fully prepared to do that.

But, look, everybody here knows we're in the midst of a very large discussion about the federal budget with Congress, and one way or another, the issue of the DOD appropriation comes into play in that discussion.

Q But what I'm asking you is certainly you will do -- you've determined whether you can get the \$1.5 bill in that you'll need for this without congressional approval, just like you found

whatever hundreds of millions of dollars you needed for the rapid deployment force. Have you determined that you can find the money -- the President has the authority to get the money himself?

MR. MCCURRY: I just said that we will -- if the President needs to act to protect America's interests, we'll figure out how to pay for it. Sure.

Q Gingrich and Dole and Domenici and Kasich have sent a letter to the President saying that under the terms of the agreement that he signed onto he needs to provide them with a balanced budget plan. Have you gotten that letter and do you --

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, we -- look, we have received that letter and it's -- it's a little dispiriting. It goes back to, rather than the spirit that brought compromise and the resolution of a budget conflict that reopened the government, this is sort of back to square one in the rhetoric and the negotiating tactics.

And, among other things, it contains statements that are just factually incorrect. The letter says that the President has not presented a balanced budget plan to Congress. He, of course, has. He did so in June they ignored it. If they had spent a little more time looking at the President's ideas in June, we could have averted a government shutdown that cost the American taxpayer we now estimate between \$700 and \$800 million.

And, even more discouraging, the Speaker of the House yesterday threatened exactly the same type of shutdown when he said that he's not going to wait; doesn't want the Clinton administration to believe that all you've got to do is say no to a balanced budget and somehow they have to give the President a lot of money on December 16th.

When he said that, he was more or less directly threatening to shut down the federal government again, and put us through all the enormous consequences of the shutdown that we just went through.

Q Of course, in fairness did the President do the same thing in his remarks when he said, "I'll do what I have to do"?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, let me just detail some of the costs of that shutdown. The OMB has got some other information that's available.

The monetary costs that OMB have now estimated as a result of the shutdown run between \$700 and \$800 million. Approximately \$400 million of that is payroll costs for the furloughed federal employees who will now be back paid. And the productivity and work from those employees is now, of course, lost.

I'd, rather than go through all the lists of things here that we've got -- I ran through as we began, went through the shutdown last week, what some of the consequences were. But they've now added it up and it's very discouraging.

You know, 400 individuals were delayed in enrolling in Medicare; the Social Security Administration had to turn away a lot of people who needed to have claims processed; 80,000 passport

applications have now been delayed; 80,000 students and their families have now seen their student loan applications delayed; 10,000 home purchases have been delayed because people didn't get their FHA mortgage loans, and that's about \$800 million worth of mortgage loan money.

Q Why do you think they sent this -- what is the -- I mean --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it is apparently -- it's apparently what amounts to another negotiating tactic to threaten the President with both -- either a shutdown or with some type of ultimatum prior to the beginning of discussions.

But as the President has said to them, both privately and publicly, he would prefer to get on with the good faith negotiations that will try to accomplish the objectives that the President and Congress have now agreed to. You know, they're coming back and saying, "Well, you're not going to accept our budget."

The President now cannot accept the budget that has been passed by Congress as a matter of law, because the test that has been put forward in the continuing resolution very specifically says that the President and Congress cannot agree to a balanced budget plan that doesn't provide adequate funding for Medicare, for Medicaid, that doesn't protect the environment, that doesn't have the right kinds of education investments for the future of our economy and that doesn't provide tax relief to working families.

So he of course, as a matter of law, has to veto the reconciliation bill. So, you know, its incumbent upon Congress now --

Q -- this agreement with Republican leaders is not a matter of law, is it?

MR. MCCURRY: It's an act of law signed by the President the other night as he provided continuing funding for the government in the period between now and December 15th.

So they are actually -- you know, I guess if you wanted to be overly hyperbolic about it you could say they kind of asked the President to break the law here, and he can't do that.

Now, what he can do is to, in a good faith way, come forward, work with this Congress to do what they agreed to do. They agreed to balance the budget in seven years and protect all those priorities that the President set forth and that they agreed to acknowledge.

And, you know, that's the purpose of these discussions and we're going to be serious about it; we're not going to send silly letters up to the Capitol Hill and ask them to do things that they know aren't going to happen.

And, by the way, if you need another reason why you can't accept what they've done so far, take a look at the Treasury Department's study today of the distributional effects of the reconciliation act as passed by Congress. The top 12 percent of

families with incomes of \$100,000 or more are going to receive 47.5 percent of the tax benefits in the legislation passed by Congress. Okay? So, in other words, almost half of the tax benefits of that legislation are going to the richest families in the country.

Now, that just isn't -- those are the wrong priorities. And, you know, even worse -- you want worse news?

Q Yes, please.

MR. MCCURRY: -- be thankful today.

Q -- briefing --

MR. MCCURRY: Okay. The earned income tax credit, the Treasury estimates that the congressional -- the plan passed by the Republican Congress is going to raise taxes by \$30.8 billion over seven years on the poorest working families in this country. At the same time they skew the other benefits towards the wealthiest families. That's just nonsense.

Now, that doesn't -- you know, if they're keen on reading the text of this agreement, you know, that they keep saying, well, we've got to follow the letter and spirit of this agreement; they just sent a letter to the President asking him to abrogate this agreement by accepting something that they know is not acceptable.

This document says that the balanced budget will adopt tax policies to help working families and stimulate further economic growth. The Treasury Department today proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that this Republican budget plan would be ruinous for the economy.

So we've got to start over in some sense. This reconciliation bill is not going to be acceptable --

Q What do you do next week?

MR. MCCURRY: What you've got to do is -- look, the President is going to -- the President will instruct his negotiating team in good faith to come forward with the members of Congress and do what they agreed that they're going to do. They're going to protect future generations. They're going to ensure Medicare solvency. They're going to provide adequate funding for Medicaid, for education, for agriculture, for national defense. And they're going to do that and balance the budget.

Q Well, logistically, what --

Q How about the coalition --

Q What do you do? Do you -- do you have anything schedule?

MR. MCCURRY: We go through -- we've been spending our time, rather than writing snippy letters, we've been spending our time working through these issues and finding out exactly how we're going to address each of these items. We've been having serious discussions here about how we're going to protect Medicare solvency,

how we're going to provide adequate funding for Medicaid. We've been working on the things that the Congress and the President have now agreed to do.

You know, maybe I -- you know, in fairness -- look, I should be fair here. (Laughter.)

Q Why start now?

Q Take back everything you said now.

MR. MCCURRY: The Speaker, the Majority Leader, Chairman Dominici, Chairman Kasich are out of town. And they deserve it. They've been working hard. And they worked hard with this President and got a good agreement. And they've got staff people up there on the Hill, and so maybe the staff has been up to mischief. Who knows? (Laughter.)

Q Do you think they sent it out unauthorized? Do you think this is an unauthorized letter?

Q Would they send that?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't -- it was -- because the letter had factual errors, we didn't take it so seriously as to call up to the staff and say, now, did you guys forge your boss's signature on this letter or what? (Laughter.) I'm being facetious, of course.

Q That's a sound bite.

Q Can I slip in a quickie, please, on another subject?

MR. MCCURRY: You've got the general drift where we are on the letter?

Q We're a little confused here.

Q That was pretty snippy.

MR. MCCURRY: No, look, look, this is negotiating tactics. I -- look, I assume --

Q What, what you just said or what they -- (laughter).

MR. MCCURRY: Both. What I just said, what they're letter said -- I mean, how much of this can the American people stand? We'll have to respond to this. Look, this is a letter. They dropped this in our mailbox. We'll probably send them some letter and drop it in their mailbox. But the point is the serious discussions to do what Congress and the President said they're going to do have to continue.

That's what the President's focused on. And he's been working seriously with his folks on how we're going to get this work done, how we're going to balance the budget in the time frame set up because it's going to be hard. It's not going to be easy to get this done, and the negotiations themselves are not going to be very easy. But the President has pledged to do it. He told the Speaker the

other night he would do it, and we're going to get on with it.

Q Can I slip in a quickie, please, on the French nuclear --

MR. MCCURRY: Want a quickie? (Laughter.)

Q Before Thanksgiving. (Laughter.) Yes, on the French nuclear test -- has the U.S. complained directly to Chirac? Is his state visit still on? And do you have any other original words to use other than --

MR. MCCURRY: No, I think that they expressed what has now become the ritual condemnation or concern about the test. There have been discussions about this again. What we've said on each of the nuclear tests conducted by the French is they run counter to the environment necessary to achieve a major objective that the international community has embraced for next year, the comprehensive test ban. But, nonetheless, we acknowledge and we remain encouraged by the fact that President Chirac is committed to that goal of achieving that test ban.

Q So why is being rewarded with a state visit --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have an enormous amount of work to do with the French, and --

Q And you like his wine.

MR. MCCURRY: No. They are -- look, they are a key European ally. They are working closely with the United States on Bosnia. We have regretted the test, but at the same time we acknowledge that they remain committed to the fundamentally important goal of a comprehensive test ban.

Q The CBO board of private economic advisers is scheduled to meet next week with June O'Neill with hopes of updating the August CBO estimates. If that's the case, if you can't get OMB -- (inaudible) -- assumptions, would an updated forecast from August be acceptable to the administration?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the letter that we got today, that I've now declaimed on at great lengths, says that they're not going to use the beneficial discussion at that meeting to update the statistics. It refers back to the August statistic. We think it's important to have outside consultations with experts that's required by the continuing resolution and the agreement. And to my knowledge, what I've -- I've heard our economists here say that the folks who are on that CBO panel are a respected group of economists who have opinions that matter and ought to be listened to.

And I hope the CBO folks will listen to them as we continue the discussion of how we get the right set of economic assumptions. That's what the Congress and the President are required under the agreement they've reached to get the right set of assumptions and they need to work to do that. I think it's encouraging that CBO is reaching out to outside experts. And at some point properly during these discussions, OMB and CBO will consult together about the right set of assumptions.

Q Back on Bosnia, the exit strategy. About six weeks ago Secretary Perry was quoted as saying that a year is as long as the Bosnian issue should last. I believe you indicated at that time

□

TOP ODD

- \p -

BOTTOM ALL

that that was the administration's thinking. Is it still the administration's thinking?

MR. MCCURRY: It is still the administration's view as set forth in the President's November 13th letter that is subject to his own judgment, based on the advice of his military planners that we believe that approximately 12 months would be adequate to accomplish the necessary tasks that are set forth to the implementation force, to allow the peace to become self

□

-sustaining;

although the President reserves the right to make a final judgment on that as he looks at the nature of the final mission plan as submitted to him by the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe; and as he measures very carefully what the details are in the requirements of the Dayton peace agreement.

Q Thank you. Happy Thanksgiving.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, let me -- one more. Mr. Knoller, you had one more. I'm having -- you know, I can't let you go.

Q -- minutes, you mark an hour at the podium.

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't been up here an hour. Have I been up here an hour?

Q Fifty

□

-six minutes so far.

MR. MCCURRY: I've been reading -- my friend, Nick Burns, over at the White House, I think has been going an hour just about on routine -- State Department -- an hour over routine, and I never had to do that over there.

You had other --

Q Would you expect the President, perhaps, to invite the congressional leaders over in advance of his address to the nation on Monday?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't -- we'll let you know further on that, if that develops. If we did so, we wouldn't want to spring that on the leadership, and we'd obviously have proper consultations with them in advance.

Let me say, with that being the last question, I am announcing a full lid. We are done for the day. And I wish all of you and yours a very happy Thanksgiving.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

4:03 P.M. EST

#142

□

-11/22