

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-OCT-1998 21:54:54.00

SUBJECT: 1998-10-15 briefing on budget agreement

TO: "/R=3\$/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mr.x.eop.gov (
"/R=3\$/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mr.x.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEEOB/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov (
"/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEEOB/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera ("Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrei H. Cherny ("Andrei H. Cherny"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angelina Walker ("Angelina Walker"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich ("Brian A. Reich"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher S. Lehane ("Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie ("Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger ("Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jodi R. Sakol ("Jodi R. Sakol"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell ("Joseph W. Cerrell"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lawrence J. Haas ("Lawrence J. Haas"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nathan B. Naylor ("Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia M. Ewing ("Patricia M. Ewing"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt ("Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: BARTHOLOW_T (BARTHOLOW_T@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BROPHY_S (BROPHY_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BUDIG_N (BUDIG_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cmbeach (cmbeach@msn.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adam W. Goldberg (CN=Adam W. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alexander L. Boyle (CN=Alexander L. Boyle/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock (CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne E. McGuire (CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Antony J. Blinken (CN=Antony J. Blinken/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aviva Steinberg (CN=Aviva Steinberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara Semedo (CN=Barbara Semedo/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bradley M. Campbell (CN=Bradley M. Campbell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Barreto (CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian D. Smith (CN=Brian D. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brooks E. Scoville (CN=Brooks E. Scoville/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (CN=Carmen B. Fowler/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carole A. Parmelee (CN=Carole A. Parmelee/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen (CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cecilia E. Rouse (CN=Cecilia E. Rouse/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Chandler G. Spaulding (CN=Chandler G. Spaulding/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (CN=Cheryl D. Mills/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine N. Macy (CN=Christine N. Macy/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher J. Lavery (CN=Christopher J. Lavery/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher K. Scully (CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig T. Smith (CN=Craig T. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dana C. Strand (CN=Dana C. Strand/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dario J. Gomez (CN=Dario J. Gomez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (CN=David E. Kalbaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David K. Chai (CN=David K. Chai/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David R. Goodfriend (CN=David R. Goodfriend/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David S. Beaubaire (CN=David S. Beaubaire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David T. Johnson (CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn L. Smalls (CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Bird (CN=Debra D. Bird/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood (CN=Debra S. Wood/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane A. Stumpf (CN=Diane A. Stumpf/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Ikemiyashiro (CN=Diane Ikemiyashiro/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dominique L. Cano (CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald Goldberg (CN=Donald Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorian V. Weaver (CN=Dorian V. Weaver/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Doris O. Matsui (CN=Doris O. Matsui/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas R. Matties (CN=Douglas R. Matties/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Drew W. Holzapfel (CN=Drew W. Holzapfel/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap (CN=Elisa Millsap/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth Steele (CN=Elisabeth Steele/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emory L. Mayfield (CN=Emory L. Mayfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Essence P. Washington (CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Estela Mendoza (CN=Estela Mendoza/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evan Ryan (CN=Evan Ryan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G. Timothy Saunders (CN=G. Timothy Saunders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Glen M. Weiner (CN=Glen M. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Grace A. Garcia (CN=Grace A. Garcia/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gregory B. Craig (CN=Gregory B. Craig/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Guy Smith (CN=Guy Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jackson T. Dunn (CN=Jackson T. Dunn/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Teague (CN=James M. Teague/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen (CN=Jeannetta P. Allen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Gribben (CN=John A. Gribben/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon P. Jennings (CN=Jon P. Jennings/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan E. Smith (CN=Jonathan E. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur (CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Orszag (CN=Jonathan Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph C. Fanaroff (CN=Joseph C. Fanaroff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield (CN=Judithanne V. Scourfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (CN=Julianne B. Corbett/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie A. Fernandes (CN=Julie A. Fernandes/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie B. Goldberg (CN=Julie B. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin Coleman (CN=Justin Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (CN=Karen L. Barbuschak/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kyle M. Baker (CN=Kyle M. Baker/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lanny A. Breuer (CN=Lanny A. Breuer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa J. Levin (CN=Lisa J. Levin/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa R. Dass (CN=Lisa R. Dass/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori E. Abrams (CN=Lori E. Abrams/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori L. Anderson (CN=Lori L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto (CN=Maria E. Soto/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis (CN=Mark D. Neschis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew (CN=Mark H. Bartholomew/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark J. Bernstein (CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry (CN=Marsha E. Berry/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martha Foley (CN=Martha Foley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew W. Pitcher (CN=Matthew W. Pitcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (CN=Maureen A. Hudson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maya Seiden (CN=Maya Seiden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael D. Malone (CN=Michael D. Malone/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Sullivan (CN=Michael J. Sullivan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell (CN=Michael V. Terrell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Jolin (CN=Michele Jolin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michelle Crisci (CN=Michelle Crisci/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mindy E. Myers (CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Misty L. Phillips (CN=Misty L. Phillips/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden (CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noa A. Meyer (CN=Noa A. Meyer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick Aylward (CN=Patrick Aylward/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (CN=Patrick E. Briggs/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glastis (CN=Paul D. Glastis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul E. Begala (CN=Paul E. Begala/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet (CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip J. Crowley (CN=Philip J. Crowley/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phillip Caplan (CN=Phillip Caplan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: R. Scott Michaud (CN=R. Scott Michaud/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rahm I. Emanuel (CN=Rahm I. Emanuel/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Renee C. Riley (CN=Renee C. Riley/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr. (CN=Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert M. Shireman (CN=Robert M. Shireman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Weiner (CN=Robert S. Weiner/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin J. Bachman (CN=Robin J. Bachman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger V. Salazar (CN=Roger V. Salazar/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally P. Paxton (CN=Sally P. Paxton/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra L. Tijerina (CN=Sandra L. Tijerina/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Knight (CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney (CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Serena C. Torrey (CN=Serena C. Torrey/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani (CN=Sheyda Jahanbani/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susanna B. McGuire (CN=Susanna B. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (CN=Tracy F. Sisser/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy Pakulniewicz (CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia N. Rustique (CN=Virginia N. Rustique/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (CN=Wayne C. Johnson/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy E. Gray (CN=Wendy E. Gray/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William C. Haymes (CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. White Jr. (CN=William H. White Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (CN=Woyneab M. Wondwossen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CUTLER_L (CUTLER_L@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DICKEY_L (DICKEY_L@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmilbank (dmilbank@tnr.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: FORDE_R (FORDE_R@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: INFOMGT (INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john.longbrake (john.longbrake@ms01.do.treas.sprint.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: julie_green (julie_green@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: klasky_helaine (klasky_helaine@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KTORPEY (KTORPEY@AOL.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: meglynn (meglynn@usia.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MOFFETT_J (MOFFETT_J@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NAPLAN_S (NAPLAN_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: OLCOTT_E (OLCOTT_E@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pub_Arch (Pub_Arch [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Releases (Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: releases (Releases@www3.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RICHETTI_S (RICHETTI_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RUBIN_E (RUBIN_E@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: skgmd (skgmd@umich.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_BD (SMITH_BD@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TCSmith (TCSmith@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tingen-terri (tingen-terri@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: usnwire (usnwire@access.digex.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wh-outbox-distr (wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK_N (WOZNIAK_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

October 15, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING BY
CHIEF OF STAFF ERSKINE BOWLES,
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF JOHN PODESTA,
OMB DIRECTOR JACK LEW,
AND CHAIR OF NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL GENE SPERLING

The Briefing Room

4:00 P.M. EDT

MR. BOWLES: Good afternoon. Last year at this time when we came before you, this team behind me came to talk to you about the passage of the first bipartisan balanced budget in over 30 years. It was an enormous achievement for the country, and certainly an achievement for the American people.

This year we faced a new challenge, and that was to make sure that the last budget of this century truly does prepare us to meet the challenges of the 21st Century. I think I can safely say that we have met those challenges.

The budget that the President submitted and has been

passed now truly does save Social Security. It also, while enabling us to continue to act in a fiscally responsible manner, makes sure that we go forward and continue to invest in education and training and early childhood programs. This budget includes funding for 100,000 additional teachers. It includes funding for after-school programs. It includes funding for child literacy, college mentoring, child care quality, teacher recruitment. It includes funding for 36,000 kids so they can go to Head Start and be prepared to enter school ready to learn. And it includes a 25 percent increase in charter schools, taking us a long way towards our goal of 3,000 charter schools. I think it truly is an investment in education that we can all be proud of.

It also includes an investment in a cleaner environment, with such funding as \$1.7 billion for the President's clean water plan. It also responds to our farm crisis. It responds to the financial turmoil in the world by full funding of the \$18 billion for the International Monetary Fund. It has a huge increase in our investment in research and development so that America can stay on the cutting edge of research and development and we can truly be competitive in the global marketplace. This is a budget that does prepare us for the 21st century.

Areas where we will continue to fight as we go forward in the future will be in the areas of campaign finance reform; we'll continue to fight for patients' bill of rights; we'll continue to fight for tobacco legislation so that kids won't be tempted to smoke.

We'll also fight for the school construction legislation, so that kids can have an environment to go to school in where they can really learn. We'll fight to make sure that we pass the President's child care initiative, and we'll try to make sure that once again we don't have another stealth attack on the environment.

All in all, I think we're all very pleased. The team behind me now, led by Mr. John Podesta -- who I'm sure you'll be seeing a lot more of in the future -- will be happy to answer questions for you.

Thank you.

Q This question applies to the statements on the South Lawn as well as Mr. Bowles' presentation there. You are essentially declaring a victory in the budget, but there are still other matters pending before Congress. Do you think there's any danger in this sort of sense of White House triumphalism at this moment, politically?

MR. PODESTA: I think that we have something to celebrate here this afternoon. We have fought very hard for the items in the budget. I think this session is wrapping up. And in addition to all the money issues that Erskine discussed, there are other issues that are coming to a head, but I think that this session

is ending very well, from our perspective.

Q Speaker Gingrich said you were now the White House Chief of Staff, or you would officially be named the White House Chief of Staff. Was he correct?

MR. PODESTA: I think, with all due respect to the Speaker, that's not his decision to make. (Laughter.) And I think when the President makes a decision, he'll have an announcement about that.

Q Is the President going to sign the U.N. dues bill? Apparently it's still attached to anti-abortion legislation.

MR. PODESTA: If they send it -- I took from the Speaker's statements earlier that they intend to send us a State Department authorization that has been passed previously that they've been holding on to, and we have said that we would veto that bill, and we will veto that bill.

Q Do you disagree with Congressman Gephardt, who called this the worst congressional session he'd ever seen?

MR. PODESTA: Well, I think he was probably referring to the fact that for over eight months they virtually did nothing except kill important initiatives that the President had proposed -- on the patients' bill of rights, on tobacco legislation,

on campaign finance reform. And I think that we've had a good eight days, after a very, very bad eight months.

Q Usually in the days after the agreement, we hear about these hidden elements that were put in the budget agreement at the last minute. I'm wondering if you can tell us any now that you know of ahead of time -- (laughter) -- to prepare the American people.

MR. PODESTA: I think we have to find them first. We have established a process, and I think that the Democrats in both the House and the Senate have asked that we enforce that process with Jack's people and others going through, line by line, word by word, the entire bill. As you know, it will be extremely lengthy. Given the number of bills that they had not completed action on in the appropriations area, there are a number of other issues that we have discussed. But we will be going through that bill -- that will take the remainder of today and probably into tomorrow to review what they call a readout. They will be reading this bill line by line, looking for extraneous matters that have not been agreed to.

They have obviously some prerogatives -- they are the appropriators and there are some issues that have been in the bills as they came out of conference committee in terms of projects and that sort of thing that really are within the province of the Congress.

Q Related to that, what affected the line item veto, the absence of it, have on these? How was it different this time?

MR. LEW: I think this year was much like past years -- there are many items in appropriations bills that are designated with rather specific terms. I think it was the case last year with the line item veto; it was certainly the case this year. I think we have to distinguish between the kind of projects that you're talking about and total extraneous matters.

This is the kind of a bill where you can put in major policy initiatives and almost have them go unnoticed. It's really those kinds of matters that our reading will be the precaution against. And we will be reading very carefully.

Q So you're saying that you might exercise line item veto, you just don't --

MR. LEW: We have no line item veto authority. The Supreme Court answered that question rather clearly. (Laughter.)

Q Why do you think Republicans gave in on so many issues?

MR. PODESTA: Well, I think we answered that question. I think the President and Vice President and Mr. Gephardt and Senator

Daschle answered that question out on the lawn. I think that we had put an agenda before them that was an agenda that was popular with the American public, and we stuck together. We fought very hard, we had our priorities straight, and eventually, I think they knew that they were going to -- in the face of the resolve that was shown by a united Democratic front, that they thought that the best way to complete their work and to end this session was to fund the priorities that we had laid before the people.

Gene might want to comment especially on the education agenda which we've been fighting for all year, but as I think you know, they did not put an education bill on the floor of the House until last week. And that bill contained a lot of goose eggs, in our opinion.

MR. SPERLING: I would just say that Bruce Reed and I came in, I guess, about a week ago, and went through, we thought, 12 or 13 priorities where we wanted dramatic changes from where the House committee was on Labor and Health and Human Services. That's the first page we put out there, and I think you see how dramatic the increases are -- almost an exact meeting of our budget request.

In issues that most profoundly and specifically affect average and often disadvantaged people's lives -- addition to smaller class size, the summer jobs -- and then brand new initiatives that the President has been pushing for -- the child literacy; that's bipartisan, but originated in America Reads -- the college mentoring,

the youth opportunities areas, the after-school program. So I think that this has not been uncommon that when we've been able to engage on a fight on education, the American public is strongly behind the President, and that's reflected in this outcome.

Q Gene, what's your reaction to the Fed's interest rate cut, and do you think it was far enough?

MR. SPERLING: Our philosophy on the American economy is that we should do our job, which is keeping fiscal discipline, investing in the American people and opening world markets, stabilizing the global economy. And Chairman Greenspan should do his job, and we respect his independence and don't comment on his actions.

Q Related to that, is there a point at which you could see the U.S. economy being in enough jeopardy that the President would have to consider a major tax cut as a stimulus to complement the Fed's rate reductions?

MR. SPERLING: There's been a very clear lesson over the last two decades, and that is that when there was huge borrowing in an effort simply to live beyond our means, to try to pump up consumption-oriented spending, it was not sustainable, did not lead to strong investment.

The strategy we've had has been an investment-led expansion. It's a simple recipe: Fiscal discipline has led to low long-term interest rates and significant investment and then expansion of our capacity, which has allowed for the sustainable growth we've seen, which brings unemployment low and brings more people into the workplace.

Our feeling is that the strong, strong presumption must be to stay with the economic strategy that works. Of course, we will be open-minded in the face of changing economic circumstances, but the strong presumption from the lessons of the last two decades is to stay with the fiscal discipline, investment in people and investment in private capital that has led to this investment-led recovery.

I should say that in December, we will have the longest peace-time expansion in history.

Q John Podesta, there's been a lot of speculation this year about whether the President has been weakened and distracted by the scandal away from some of these priorities. I wonder, with the Congress now leaving, on the one hand, you've got a lot of your budget priorities in hand; on the other hand, there are some things like the tobacco bill and patients' bill of rights that you were not able to get. So could you assess for us how that ended up playing out this year?

MR. PODESTA: Well, I think that the President laid out

a powerful agenda in the State of the Union. He's fought for it very hard all year, both on his domestic agenda and he has fought for his international agenda as well through the course of the year. And he's fought for stability in the international economic arena.

I think at the end of the day -- I think we have an interesting confluence of events with him here working on Middle East peace at the same time that we had these successes on the budget. I think that he retains his strength, his authority. And I think that the achievements that we've achieved over the course of this week demonstrate that he's led the country in the right direction in a way that is popular with the American public, and he'll continue to do so.

We did have some defeats this year, but those were defeats I think that were the result of Democrats being in the minority in the Congress and the Republicans' determination to kill a number of important bills on youth smoking -- again, we could go down the list -- on campaign finance reform, and the patients' bill of rights. We're going to come back.

As you know, Susan, he's been a guy who for the last six years has come back and fought and fought and fought for the things that are important to the American public. I think that's what the American people respect in him. And we're going to come back and we're going to try to -- we'll go back again to get a patients' bill of rights, to deal with the Social Security issue, and to come back

and fight again on school construction as soon as the Congress returns in January.

Q On school construction, it's likely, though, that the Republicans will want a major tax cut next year. If you fix Social Security early enough in the year and there is a surplus, would the White House be willing to consider an across-the-board tax cut?

MR. SPERLING: We've had a clear statement, philosophy on this, which is that all of the surplus should be reserved until we come up with a bipartisan plan for Social Security. Once that happens, if there is remaining surplus, we expect that there will be a very healthy debate in our country between whether that surplus should be used for debt reduction, Medicare, investing in education or tax cuts. And that's a debate that we think should happen after we've done -- completed Social Security.

On school construction, it is baffling to us that for two years in a row they have laid down on the tracks to prevent the federal government from doing anything to help what is certainly a crisis in terms of school construction. I think they've become farther and farther out of touch with people on education.

This school construction initiative -- talk about local efforts -- this is about empowering people at the local level who are

trying to do the right thing. They're trying to have a long-term bond investment in their schools, in modernizing their schools, people at the local level doing bond issues, trying to do the right thing. And this is the federal government giving them a little incentive. And the fact that it is rejected year after year is very puzzling, and it's one of the things that certainly will be a topic for this election.

Q Mr. Podesta, will there be any point in the next two weeks before the election that President Clinton will go out and campaign for members of Congress? I know he's got a few fundraisers scheduled, but will the President go out and campaign for Democrats running for Congress?

MR. PODESTA: I think that the President, over the next couple of weeks, intends to lay out the important issues that the American public need to consider as they go to the polls on November 3rd. But the President is not on the ballot and I think he's going to do the things that he thinks are important, and that includes, as you know, raising money.

Q But by staying here or by going out on the campaign trail will he be laying out these issues? That's what we're asking.

MR. PODESTA: Well, I think that --

Q Will he be doing them at rallies for Democrats, or

is he going to be doing them --

MR. PODESTA: I think that we'll be doing what we have been doing, which is to lay -- we'll do a certain amount of traveling; I think a lot of that is associated with fundraising. But we are going to be out speaking to the issues that the American people care about, and I think that will lay a predicate for what this election is all about. I think we've already seen it in the budget fight we've had over the last week and the agenda that the congressional Republicans have laid out, in contrast to the agenda that the Democratic Party has laid out.

Q Can you tell us where the dispute about contraceptives for federal employees stands at this point, and why haven't we heard the President address that issue publicly?

MR. PODESTA: We fought very hard for the Lowey language that was included by both the House and Senate in the bills, and we have reached a reasonable compromise on that issue and it will be included in the bill.

Q Can you address why the President hasn't addressed it yet? Can you tell us what the compromise is?

MR. LEW: The compromise language is consistent with past efforts to reach compromise on this to permit individuals who

have conscience issues to make their own decisions, but to not have the kind of broad language that was sought by the opponents of the amendment. The resolution is one that the supporters of the amendment, including ourselves, think is a fair one. And it's a very important step forward in terms of having a positive statement on the coverage of contraceptives in health insurance.

Q What about the census?

MR. PODESTA: Just to kind of step back a second, the provision requiring federal plans to have contraceptive services will be included in the bill. So we're very pleased with that. And I think it was done in such a way that restricted the -- the restriction on plans is, to the extent you're following that, only to religious-based plans.

Q What about the census? Can you talk about the census?

Q How hard did Republicans push for the major tax cut in the negotiations? And was the division between the House and Senate Republicans -- did that take a tax cut off the table in negotiations?

MR. LEW: I think well prior to the negotiations, the decision had been made that the tax cut that had been passed in the House simply couldn't get the votes in the Senate. And as a

consequence of that, it was sort of a foregone conclusion. There was no sign of a division between the House and Senate Republicans during negotiations. I think the issue was close.

Q On a couple of other issues, can you tell us where the issue of Amtrak funding is right now? How will that be resolved?

MR. LEW: Amtrak funding was not an issue in the final negotiations. It had been resolved in the context of the transportation conference, and it was an adequate funding level for Amtrak. It was just a tiny bit below our request, but one that we and supporters of Amtrak are comfortable with.

Q -- a dollar figure?

MR. LEW: I don't recall the dollar figure, but I'm happy to check.

Q Hello. I wonder, do you agree with me that the prosperity that this country is enjoying today is part because of the contribution of the national export -- carried out by the --Coordinating Committee? And I wonder, what is the reason that the President has not enjoyed the fast track authority they have given other Presidents. Are we going to wait until the next century to obtain that? What is your response?

MR. SPERLING: We clearly believe that the President

should have the traditional trade authority and we hope to be able to come back and work in a way that forms a new consensus where we can bring Democrats and Republicans together on an open market agenda that strengthens labor and environmental standards. That would certainly also include the Africa Free Trade Act, which we very much wanted to pass this year and we're disappointed that we did not, and we'll come back strong on.

Let me just say one other thing that -- strike a bipartisan note, which is that the situation in the international economy is much, much too important and serious and significant at this point for there to be partisan rangling. And so we very much appreciate the bipartisan effort, Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives, to pass the IMF. The IMF, as the President has said all year, passing IMF is critical for giving the opportunity to help stabilize the global economy. We appreciate the bipartisan effort that was made in the last couple of weeks to pass this, and we hope that will be a bipartisan spirit that will continue as we address other issues in the global economy.

Q And also, could you just explain if you do veto State Department authorization, will that affect the functioning of the State Department or -- authorization, it's not appropriation, so that doesn't --

MR. LEW: The answer to the second question is no.

On the census, the issue remains a point of controversy where we very strongly believe that statistical sampling would provide the most accurate form of modern enumeration. We feel that it something that is the right way to pursue.

There was an equally strong feeling on the other side that the decision should be to go with straight enumeration. The way it was resolved was to give the Court a chance to take up this case in the fall and to put a deadline of June 15th on the funding bill for the Commerce, Justice, State, Departments. What that will do is raise the issue in mid-June, after we believe the Supreme Court will have completed action on this, and at that time we remain committed to proceeding with statistical sampling. Obviously, the Court could rule one way or the other.

What we'll be doing between now and then is continue with the dual track which was the resolution last year. The provisions in this agreement provide a bit of additional funding, since the date is going to be June 15th, to allow both tracks to proceed, so whichever way it goes, we can have the most accurate census possible. But we remain one hundred percent committed to statistical sampling and we will be fighting for that, we hope after a favorable Supreme Court decision.

Q One of the priorities that the President didn't get this year is the tobacco bill, and I'm wondering -- one of the

criticisms, legitimate or not, of the White House was that you did not produce your own tobacco bill, and I'm wondering if next year you would consider that and whether or not you think there is still a prospect for comprehensive legislation.

MR. REED: Well, as you know, we did work together on a bipartisan basis with Senator McCain and others to develop a comprehensive bipartisan tobacco bill, which the administration endorsed and which had a majority of votes in the Senate, but was killed at the last minute by the Republican leadership. We're going to come back again and again on tobacco and we hope to get even more bipartisan support this time.

Q But are you going to come back with your own bill?

MR. REED: We haven't made a decision on that.

Q Do any of you know if the India-Pakistan sanctions made it into the budget bill, as well as three energy issues -- SPR, oil royalties and the North Korea heating oil?

MR. LEW: I can respond to some of the questions, and I'm not sure I understand what you're referring to. On the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, do you mean the emergency proposal that was pending in the Senate?

Q Purchasing more oil for --

MR. LEW: That is not in the agreement. Remind me what the other items were.

Q The India-Pakistan waiver --

MR. LEW: There was nothing in the negotiation at the end. I don't believe there was anything in the base bill.

Q The oil royalties delaying --

MR. LEW: There will be an eight-month moratorium.

Q Money to send heating oil to North Korea?

MR. LEW: Do you mean the KEDO agreement? That will be funded in the bill.

Q How much?

MR. LEW: \$35 million.

Q Gene, when you answered his question on fast track and you mentioned labor and environmental provisions, did you mean that the fast track bill should be changed to include more of those provisions to get Democratic support?

MR. SPERLING: I'm just stating the obvious, which is that last year we did not have enough of a consensus to pass that bill, and obviously, we would like to be able to work together to form a larger consensus.

Our position has always been clear since the President spoke in 1992. He has always supported opening markets while also protecting labor and environmental standards. That's not in disagreement. There's disagreements on the margins. Some would like there to be less emphasis on this; others would like there to be more emphasis. But I think it goes without saying that we obviously have to do better to build a larger consensus, and that's what we hope to do.

Q My question is for John Podesta. Do you have a sense that there was any goodwill engendered over these last days in the budget deal that will carry over into the impeachment inquiry, and have you seen any evidence of that yet?

MR. PODESTA: I thought you were going to ask me whether we were going to be able to solve the Social Security issue. (Laughter.) I think there was enough goodwill generated to approach that question, the question of Social Security, in a way that maintains a kind of bipartisan focus, which I know that Gene has worked very hard on all year. And it's, I think we -- it will be a top priority of ours to fix Social Security.

With regard to the impeachment question, frankly, it was never discussed around the table. And I think that whatever negotiations we carried on around the table were with -- really with the three leaders and it stuck with the substance. Whether their strategy of investigation and open-ended investigations is something they intend to pursue once they face the voters in November is something I think that Republican members of both the House and Senate will have to consider.

Thank you.

END

4:30 P.M. EDT

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: OLCOTT_E (OLCOTT_E@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-NOV-1998 19:58:15.00

SUBJECT: 1998-11/15 Lockhart press briefing

TO: "/R=3\$=/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mrx.eop.gov (
"/R=3\$=/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mrx.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEEOB/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov (
"/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEEOB/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera ("Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrei H. Cherny ("Andrei H. Cherny"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angelina Walker ("Angelina Walker"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich ("Brian A. Reich"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher S. Lehane ("Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie ("Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger ("Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jodi R. Sakol ("Jodi R. Sakol"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell ("Joseph W. Cerrell"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lawrence J. Haas ("Lawrence J. Haas"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nathan B. Naylor ("Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia M. Ewing ("Patricia M. Ewing"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt ("Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: BARTHOLOW_T (BARTHOLOW_T@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BUDIG_N (BUDIG_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cmbeach (cmbeach@msn.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adam W. Goldberg (CN=Adam W. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alexander L. Boyle (CN=Alexander L. Boyle/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock (CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne E. McGuire (CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Antony J. Blinken (CN=Antony J. Blinken/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aviva Steinberg (CN=Aviva Steinberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara Semedo (CN=Barbara Semedo/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bradley M. Campbell (CN=Bradley M. Campbell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Barreto (CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian D. Smith (CN=Brian D. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brooks E. Scoville (CN=Brooks E. Scoville/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (CN=Carmen B. Fowler/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carole A. Parmelee (CN=Carole A. Parmelee/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen (CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cecilia E. Rouse (CN=Cecilia E. Rouse/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Chandler G. Spaulding (CN=Chandler G. Spaulding/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (CN=Cheryl D. Mills/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine N. Macy (CN=Christine N. Macy/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher J. Lavery (CN=Christopher J. Lavery/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher K. Scully (CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig T. Smith (CN=Craig T. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dana C. Strand (CN=Dana C. Strand/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dario J. Gomez (CN=Dario J. Gomez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (CN=David E. Kalbaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David R. Goodfriend (CN=David R. Goodfriend/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David S. Beaubaire (CN=David S. Beaubaire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David T. Johnson (CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn L. Smalls (CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood (CN=Debra S. Wood/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane A. Stumpf (CN=Diane A. Stumpf/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Ikemiyashiro (CN=Diane Ikemiyashiro/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dominique L. Cano (CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald Goldberg (CN=Donald Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorian V. Weaver (CN=Dorian V. Weaver/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Doris O. Matsui (CN=Doris O. Matsui/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas R. Matties (CN=Douglas R. Matties/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Drew W. Holzapfel (CN=Drew W. Holzapfel/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap (CN=Elisa Millsap/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth Steele (CN=Elisabeth Steele/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emory L. Mayfield (CN=Emory L. Mayfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Essence P. Washington (CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evan Ryan (CN=Evan Ryan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G. Timothy Saunders (CN=G. Timothy Saunders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Glen M. Weiner (CN=Glen M. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Grace A. Garcia (CN=Grace A. Garcia/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gregory B. Craig (CN=Gregory B. Craig/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jackson T. Dunn (CN=Jackson T. Dunn/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Teague (CN=James M. Teague/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen (CN=Jeannetta P. Allen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Gribben (CN=John A. Gribben/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon P. Jennings (CN=Jon P. Jennings/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan E. Smith (CN=Jonathan E. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur (CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Orszag (CN=Jonathan Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph C. Fanaroff (CN=Joseph C. Fanaroff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield (CN=Judithanne V. Scourfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (CN=Julianne B. Corbett/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie A. Fernandes (CN=Julie A. Fernandes/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie B. Goldberg (CN=Julie B. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (CN=Karen L. Barbuschak/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kyle M. Baker (CN=Kyle M. Baker/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lanny A. Breuer (CN=Lanny A. Breuer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa J. Levin (CN=Lisa J. Levin/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa R. Dass (CN=Lisa R. Dass/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori E. Abrams (CN=Lori E. Abrams/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori L. Anderson (CN=Lori L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto (CN=Maria E. Soto/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis (CN=Mark D. Neschis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew (CN=Mark H. Bartholomew/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark J. Bernstein (CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry (CN=Marsha E. Berry/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martha Foley (CN=Martha Foley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew W. Pitcher (CN=Matthew W. Pitcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (CN=Maureen A. Hudson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maya Seiden (CN=Maya Seiden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael D. Malone (CN=Michael D. Malone/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Sullivan (CN=Michael J. Sullivan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell (CN=Michael V. Terrell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Jolin (CN=Michele Jolin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mindy E. Myers (CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Misty L. Phillips (CN=Misty L. Phillips/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden (CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noa A. Meyer (CN=Noa A. Meyer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick Aylward (CN=Patrick Aylward/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (CN=Patrick E. Briggs/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glastris (CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul E. Begala (CN=Paul E. Begala/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet (CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip J. Crowley (CN=Philip J. Crowley/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phillip Caplan (CN=Phillip Caplan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: R. Scott Michaud (CN=R. Scott Michaud/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Renee C. Riley (CN=Renee C. Riley/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr. (CN=Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert M. Shireman (CN=Robert M. Shireman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Weiner (CN=Robert S. Weiner/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin J. Bachman (CN=Robin J. Bachman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger V. Salazar (CN=Roger V. Salazar/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally P. Paxton (CN=Sally P. Paxton/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Knight (CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney (CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Serena C. Torrey (CN=Serena C. Torrey/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani (CN=Sheyda Jahanbani/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susanna B. McGuire (CN=Susanna B. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (CN=Tracy F. Sisser/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy Pakulniewicz (CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia N. Rustique (CN=Virginia N. Rustique/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (CN=Wayne C. Johnson/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William C. Haymes (CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. White Jr. (CN=William H. White Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (CN=Woyneab M. Wondwossen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CUTLER_L (CUTLER_L@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DICKEY_L (DICKEY_L@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmilbank (dmilbank@tnr.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: FORDE_R (FORDE_R@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRAY_W (GRAY_W@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: INFOMGT (INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: julie_green (julie_green@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: klasky_helaine (klasky_helaine@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KTORPEY (KTORPEY@AOL.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: meglynn (meglynn@usia.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MOFFETT_J (MOFFETT_J@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NAPLAN_S (NAPLAN_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Pub_Arch (Pub_Arch [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Releases (Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: releases (Releases@www3.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RICHETTI_S (RICHETTI_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RUBIN_E (RUBIN_E@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: skgmd (skgmd@umich.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_BD (SMITH_BD@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TCSmith (TCSmith@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tingen-terri (tingen-terri@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: usnwire (usnwire@access.digex.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wh-outbox-distr (wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK_N (WOZNIAK_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

November 5, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING
BY JOE LOCKHART

The Briefing Room

1:32 P.M. EST

MR. LOCKHART: Questions?

Q Joe, Henry Hyde said today that he wants the President to stipulate or deny facts in the Starr report. But if he denies the facts, the Republicans might be forced to call more witnesses and prolong the hearings. If he admits the facts, he risks perjury charges and liability in the Paula Jones

case. How does he respond?

MR. LOCKHART: The best way to do it is to actually get the letter, take a look at it, and make an assessment, and then respond.

Q You do not have the letter?

MR. LOCKHART: The letter, as I was walking downstairs, I'm told, was outside the gate someplace. So I assume the White House Counsel's Office -- since I sat and watched the previous briefing, it has arrived. But when I left them upstairs at about 1:00 p.m., they hadn't read it yet so I can't really comment on it.

Q This is not a new concept. The administration has been asked before about stipulating certain facts within the Starr report. Is Mr. Ruff, is Mr. Craig working on that content on that kind of approach?

MR. LOCKHART: We got the letter within the last 30 minutes, so I doubt any serious work has been done on it yet. But they will look at it, and I expect they will respond to the letter.

Q Has the President read the Starr report yet?

MR. LOCKHART: No.

Q Does he intend to?

MR. LOCKHART: No. I think he told you that himself directly.

Q Joe, would the President's lawyers be inclined to call their own witnesses before the committee? And if so, how many?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't know there has been any discussion of that. The first we heard of Chairman Hyde's plans today were when we saw it on television. I think the first the Democrats on the committee heard of Chairman Hyde's plans was when they watched it on television.

So we're now -- we have received the letter. We'll review what's in the letter. We'll make some decisions after we've had a chance to think about what the Chairman has laid out. And we'll let you know sometime in the future.

Q If I may follow up, are his attorneys considering drawing up their own witness list, calling their own witnesses?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not aware of what they're considering, but I'm certainly not going to do a public discussion here of what's on the table within our legal team.

Q What is your overall reaction to the scenario or the timetable?

MR. LOCKHART: I think you've probably heard more times than you want what we think about this. We've said repeatedly that we want this to be fair; we want it to be constitutional; we want it to be expeditious -- or, you know, finding similar words so we don't bore you to death.

But I think on the last point, expeditious, this is clearly a positive development. This in some ways adopts the kind of timing approach that the Democrats laid out earlier. I think there was some reporting that Thanksgiving might be the end date, but the Chairman, I think, said that he didn't want to be tied to one date. But it looks like a process that will be done promptly and expeditiously, so that's positive.

On the constitutional front, I still think there has not been a serious attempt to answer our concern that the standards of

impeachment, what you judge allegations against, hasn't been discussed. So we still feel like we've come up short there.

On fairness, I'm not sure that I can reach a conclusion at this point. I think it depends on how things play out. We have said in the past -- so it should come as no surprise -- that we thought that the Starr referral was one-sided, and we saw in subsequent releases of documents, as more, or most, interesting what was not in the Starr referral as opposed to how it backed up any claims that he might have made.

So if Chairman Hyde is looking for Mr. Starr to be the main and primary witness, I think fairness would dictate that there will be some access or release to the Democrats, and hopefully to the White House, of all the information he's compiled. So I think it's an open question.

But certainly on the issue of whether this gets done in a timely or expeditious way, this is a positive development.

Q Would you like to see other witnesses called, though? Is it fair to limit it just to Starr?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't think we have a sense yet of beyond a couple dates that the Chairman has laid out for both the CRS seminar and the subcommittee and then Mr. Starr's testimony. I don't think we have a sense yet of how that will be structured, what

subjects will be discussed, what he'll be asked about. So I don't think it's productive at this point to try to lay down any final judgment on what we might seek to do.

Q On the constitutional question, they're planning to have a subcommittee meeting to talk about this. Does that in itself satisfy the serious test that you identified, or is there something in particular that you will insist on seeing in that subcommittee hearing?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think that, as I said yesterday, that could be a potentially interesting session as far as it goes on the history. My understanding is they're going to be looking at judges, which I'm not sure how relevant that is, but the committee has a right to look at these issues. They will be looking at some precedent from the past as it pertains to the President.

But it's not a session, as the Republican majority has so defined, that looks at the standards by which they'll judge these allegations.

Q When you say that you'd like to see all the information that Starr has gathered, what are you referring to?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think if you remember, we've seen things in waves. You saw first the 445-page referral from Mr. Starr -- basically, the report he wrote based on the information. Then we

saw many thousands of other pages released that, again, what was most interesting to people here at the White House was information that was not included in the referral, information -- repeated statements that either contradicted, weakened, muddled some of the direct claims and assertions he made in the report.

Now, there are many more pages that did not get turned over. The Democrats have sought, with mixed success, the ability to see those and review those. And I think as a fundamental litmus test of whether this process is fair, which we have laid out from the beginning, will be if Mr. Starr is the witness, the one person who comes up and talks about the evidence -- and we certainly know what his view is, he wrote 445 pages on it -- whether they will have access -- whether we will have access to that underlying information.

Q Would you also like to see the information that he presented to Janet Reno?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think Mr. Conyers has spoken about that. He has requested that information. It's unclear whether he'll get it. I think Mr. Starr's staff has indicated that there may be some problems on that. But I certainly think that if Mr. Conyers is available -- is able to get that information, we'd be interested in that.

Q Joe, this is not the first time that you have said, we just learned about this, we just read it in the newspaper. Is

there some bad faith going on here --

MR. LOCKHART: I don't want to jump to the conclusion of bad faith. We have called for a nonpartisan or bipartisan process. And I don't know that it's particularly helpful that we find things out by reading them in the newspaper or seeing them on television.

I know that we didn't know about the announcement today. And in talking to counsel's office, I think, at least on the staff level among the Democrats, they found out from watching it. And I think what has damaged the effort to date has been the label that it has been partisan, that it hasn't been fair. And I think that allowing the Democrats on the Hill to participate -- I can understand when they're making decisions that they might not want to hear from us, but I certainly think there should be adequate consultation with the minority party on the Hill.

Q Joe, was there any reason to believe that the President might say more or stipulate, which is the legal term, more about his relationship with Monica Lewinsky than he has already said in the videotaped testimony?

MR. LOCKHART: I have no idea since I don't know what the questions are.

Q Joe, do you think it would be fair for Starr, during his testimony, to go into other matters that he's been

investigating, or would it just be appropriate for him to stick to the Lewinsky matter?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think that's something that clearly the Democrats, the minority party, and the majority party have to discuss on the Hill. And I think we are of the belief that we should have some sense of the subject matter that he's coming in to talk about. I don't think it should be something where any subject is open, that people should know, and people should have the ability to prepare in advance for this hearing, particularly if it's, as described by the Chairman today, the only or the primary witness.

Q Joe, the Chairman said that he was going to have Ken Starr testify on the 19th. Is the White House or the President's lawyers ready to go, or is there a chance they'll ask for a delay?

MR. LOCKHART: I haven't heard anything that would indicate to me that we would ask for a delay.

Q Do you have any objection to calling Ken Starr as a witness, given that he's already had the opportunity to express himself?

MR. LOCKHART: I can't -- I wouldn't explicitly object to that. We certainly do know what he thinks. He certainly has had a forum via the Government Printing Office, via the Internet, being

given your paper, every newspaper and television station in the country. We certainly know what his view of this is. But it's for the committee to make this decision, and I haven't heard any explicit view that would object to his testimony in this building.

Q When the Chairman says that he wants an investigation that's fair, honest, and expeditious, do you take Henry Hyde as a man of his word?

MR. LOCKHART: I certainly hope that that's the case. We certainly have -- in the past, we have a history, I think, of positive dealings with Chairman Hyde. The track record to date isn't good on this particular issue. I don't think you can go around the country and find many Americans who believe that, to date, they've met that standard, which sounds awfully familiar, the one that I've repeated here every day for the last four or five weeks. But we are hopeful that the atmosphere can change, and we can meet that criteria.

Q Mr. Hyde seemed to be saying he might bring additional charges if President Clinton doesn't cooperate with this query for a stipulation or a denial. Do you take that as a threat, or do you have any reaction to that?

MR. LOCKHART: It's very difficult to respond to something, when there is -- whether an explicit or implicit threat, about cooperating with something that you haven't seen yet. So I

don't take it very seriously.

Q Joe, have the lawyers at this stage made -- on principle, made a decision whether or not they would cooperate with making stipulations. In other words, has there been kind of a basic decision --

MR. LOCKHART: We have talked from here -- the President, the President's representatives, Mr. Craig, Mr. Ruff --that we plan to cooperate with this committee. And we expect the process to be fair, constitutional, and expeditious. I can't give you any guidance yet on a letter that they clearly haven't had a chance to review.

Q Any additional meetings scheduled? Any additional meetings between the White House lawyers and investigators?

MR. LOCKHART: Not that I'm aware of.

Q Ken Starr is going to --

Q The day the bottom dropped out. (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: Well, we have a very peculiar way of letting people know at the White House when their time has come. (Laughter.) David will be standing from now on. (Laughter.) That

could have been me. (Laughter.)

Q Is Ken Starr going to present his case to the committee? Is there any thought at all being given to the President himself making an appearance, giving his side to the committee in a personal way?

MR. LOCKHART: I haven't heard any discussion of that.

Q Joe, the acceleration, scaling down, or expedition of this inquiry coming just 48-hours after the mid-term elections --coincidence, connection, any link to the way it turned out?

MR. LOCKHART: The decisions on these matters right now are being made exclusively by the Republican majority in the House. And I think that goes to some of the things I've just said in response to other questions. I don't get the sense that the Democrats had a big say in going forward. I don't know whether they agree or disagree with this. You'll have to ask them. And I think I think I've given you sort of a mixed view from here. But there is just no way for me to know to what extent politics or political calculation has come into play beyond, I read the same things you read in the newspaper.

Q Well, should there be a link? Should the Republicans curtail the hearings in response to the vote?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think we have said all along that these should be fair and they should be constitutional. And it shouldn't be a partisan process. If they have reached that conclusion at a different point than we have, based on a different set of external stimuli, I'm not going to argue with it.

Q Joe, did the elections reduce the President's interest in settling the Paula Jones suit?

MR. LOCKHART: I have no way of judging that. I'd suggest you talk to Mr. Bennett.

Q Joe, to follow up on Peter's question of a moment ago, given the election, given the President's admonition this morning that he wants to move on, the country wants to move on, is his testimony before the committee now essentially off the table?

Does he no longer see that as even remotely necessary?

MR. LOCKHART: I think since the Republican majority sets the table, and they have set the table now with a very quick and perhaps one-witness testimony, you'll have to make your judgments based on what Chairman Hyde has said.

Q Joe, what effect will it have on the process if the President's going to be out of the country as it begins and as it reaches perhaps its most important point?

MR. LOCKHART: It means people like Jim Kennedy are

going to not only have to work during they day, they're going to have to stay up all night to tell us what has happened during the day.

(Laughter.) I can't judge an impact, except probably you will all have to stay up 24 hours a day.

Q The President's presence isn't necessary in the process, his presence in the city?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't believe so.

Q Do you think it's -- you're were talking about a fair process -- do you think it's fair to not have a chance to cross-examine the witnesses other than Ken Starr? I mean, is that an issue for you all? You all talked all along that the presentation of fact has been one-sided and there's been no opportunity for the adversarial process of cross-examination. Don't you want a chance to have some of the people up there?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, again, I have tried hard not to deliver a verdict on what we think of what happened half an hour ago. So it remains to be seen. I'm certain that the Democratic minority on the committee will be in conversations today, either at the staff level or among the Chairman and the ranking member, and we will in some way, shape, or form be involved. We're just going to have to withhold judgment on whether that process will ultimately be fair.

Q Do you think we'll have something later in the day?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't think so.

Q Joe, is the White House encouraged that so many lawmakers, both Democratic and Republican, are coming forward and saying a censure is not an appropriate remedy to this situation?

MR. LOCKHART: Our view on that is the same, no matter what people are saying.

Q What is that?

MR. LOCKHART: Which, to repeat again, I don't believe we're in a position to discuss or prescribe any remedy that either the House of Representatives or the Senate believes to be appropriate.

Q Joe, what's the administration's thinking behind sending Secretary Richardson out to Taiwan this coming weekend? Is it in return for -- well, to assuage Taiwanese concerns after the President's trip to China and what he said about the three noes?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think he will -- Secretary Richardson will be in Taiwan from November 9th to 11th -- I'm reading here from an announcement -- to attend the joint annual conference of the Washington based U.S.-ROC Business Council and its Taiwan

counterpart.

I think, as we've said before, our policy to Taiwan, the People's Republic of China, continues to be governed by the Taiwan Relations Act and by our three joint communiques with the PRC. The United States recognized the government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal government of China in 1979 and since then we've had unofficial relations with Taiwan. Secretary Richardson's trip is consistent with this framework.

Q Will he be meeting with any government officials there?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't have a -- let me get a better sense of his itinerary. It's not all here and I don't want to give you one snapshot that might mislead. We'll come back to you.

Q Joe, listening to the President today, he plans to put the patients' bill of rights at the top of his legislative agenda. What place on that agenda is occupied by fast track?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think the President -- I don't think -- I was in the meeting for the second half, but I don't think fast track came up. The President believes that as far as his overall economic policy, having the ability to negotiate trade agreements with other countries, with fast track as an important tool still remains.

Q The steel industry people are coming by this afternoon to complain about dumping of illegal -- illegal dumping of steel products. Would fast track, having that authority, would that take care of this kind of problem?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think we've said that fast track is an important tool in our overall economic policy, particularly with negotiating and opening markets around the world. Thirty percent of the jobs that have been created in this country are export -- directly related to our ability to export more, open markets around the world.

So I don't know that that's necessarily come up in the context of today's meeting. But I think overall the President believes that fast track -- having fast track authority is important and we'll continue to find ways to push for it.

Q So with the steel problem, how is this affecting the White House's view of free trade, of opening borders even more?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think in steel, as well as some other domestic industries, we recognize they are feeling the effect of the international financial crisis and the currency crisis around the world. We are committed to enforcing fully our trade laws. The President was pleased that Secretary Daley moved so quickly to expedite some of these dumping cases by putting more resources in so

they could be done and litigated more quickly. And we believe that our partners around the world have a role to play.

Take Japan, with stimulating their domestic economy and opening markets, and other economies around the world -- Europe and other places, for opening markets.

Q But how about domestic support in the Congress and among union leaders? This looks like -- this kind of episode seems to undermine support for any further free trade for the U.S.

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think there are certainly legitimate concerns from domestic industries, steel included, and that's one of the reasons, after a couple of meetings at the staff level, that the President wanted the chance to talk to both industry leaders and labor leaders that work in the steel industry.

Q Paula Jones' lawyers have said they're not going to stick around for the appeal. Do you read anything into that, as far as the future of the case is concerned or have any sense of how it might affect --

MR. LOCKHART: I came prepared for this one.

Q I saw you look with glee -- (laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: I was trying to decide how to answer this

question and Amy provided the perfect way earlier today, which is it's very difficult to decipher what's real and what isn't in this case. We woke up this morning with a story saying that they were withdrawing from the case, or considering withdrawing -- and I have no reason to believe that's true or not true.

Then later on today there was talk about an offer being accepted or rejected from the same lawyers. Then to top it off, there is a very good picture of Mr. Whitehead and Mr. Campbell and the caption reads, "President Clinton, Vice President Gore and Chief of Staff John Podesta are all smiles at the White House Wednesday after election returns showed that the once feared electoral disaster never materialized." So I think I'll just let it all hang out there and let others figure it out. (Laughter.)

Q Joe, Sandy Berger is going to Europe this weekend to consult with allies on Iraq. Why isn't Madeleine Albright doing that trip?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, the President's National Security Advisor had a previously scheduled trip to the region. The President asked him while there to get together with his counterparts to further explore and discuss the international community's opposition to Saddam Hussein's latest steps in ceasing cooperation with UNSCOM and to discuss the available options that remain available to the international community.

Q What is the White House response to the letter that was delivered to President Clinton by the Cuban American National Foundation asking the United States initiate a criminal process against Fidel Castro, using charges like the ones the Spanish are using against Pinochet?

MR. LOCKHART: I haven't seen the letter, so let me go and have them take a look to see if we've got one and we can get an appropriate response for you.

Q Joe, Chairman Hyde has said he may introduce other evidence beyond the Monica Lewinsky affair before the committee. If he does, would the White House still consider the hearing process judicious and fair?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I don't know that we've pronounced that we think it's judicious or fair. I think one of the things we've talked about is what the scope of it is. And I think that they should be clear in advance of what the scope is and this shouldn't be some sort of wild fishing expedition over a couple day period.

Q Dalai Lama is coming to town this weekend. Is there any plan for the President to meet him, and do you expect any kind of a breakthrough on the Tibet issue?

MR. LOCKHART: My understanding is that the Dalai Lama

will be visiting Washington between November 7th and 10th. We welcome his visit. We have great respect for him as a spiritual leader and spokesman for his people. As for meetings here at the White House, the schedule has not been set. We'll let you know within the next coming days if there is something to report.

Q Joe, Chairman Hyde has put the onus on the White House to expedite the hearings by stressing the need for cooperation. Are there limits to gaining the cooperation of the White House? I mean, where do you draw the line?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I'm not going to try to forecast or create problems, so I can tell you what we're willing to do and what we're not willing to do. We have said to the committee all along that we're willing to cooperate if they move forward in a way that's fair, constitutional, and expeditious. And as I said earlier, today's news, certainly, directly meets one of the concerns we've laid out. And we'll just have to keep an open mind as we go forward over the next days on the other issues that we've discussed.

Q Joe, one of the things that Mr. Hyde said today was that it was likely his committee would refer a bill of impeachment to the full House. Does that signify to you that he has, perhaps, preordained the outcome of this --

MR. LOCKHART: The Chairman has made comments to the news media about what he thinks the end result will be. He's made

comments about how politics impacts this process. So I think you can certainly, just by going out and gathering empirical data, draw some conclusion that there's an element of preordaining here. But we continue to keep optimism alive and hope that the process is not preordained, that it's real, and that it will be fair.

Q Just to be totally clear then, the door is open that the President might stipulate to some of these facts? I mean, you're not ruling anything --

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, we certainly need to look at the letter. I certainly think we'll respond to the letter.

Q Also, thank you for not naming that newspaper.

MR. LOCKHART: Okay. (Laughter.) Amy's idea.

Q Would you like to see the full House vote this year instead of next year on impeachment if it reaches that --

MR. LOCKHART: We'd like to find the most expeditious way to move forward. But the question implies that the committee's actions are preordained, and I don't think we should assume that.

Q Why has the White House said so little about Iraq over the last few days given that we're faced with yet another standoff there or possibility for --

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, I think -- I mean, the President took a question on it today, and Secretary Cohen has been in the region. And I think before we make many more public pronouncements, we want a chance for Secretary Cohen to come back, report to the President, have Mr. Berger do his trip to Paris this weekend. And there are serious discussions and talks ongoing in the United Nations on a new resolution laying out an unequivocal message to Saddam Hussein along the lines of the statement they put out last week.

So I think we have talked about it, and we will certainly have more to say once some of the things that are in play or in process now have a chance to complete themselves.

Q Joe, the markets were pretty dismayed when someone at the Labor Department put the monthly jobs report out on this web site a day early. Since that's one of the most important statistics released monthly, is the White House doing any follow-up on that?

MR. LOCKHART: I think, as you know, unemployment numbers, which were scheduled to come out tomorrow, were inadvertently put on a web site earlier today. I think the Labor Department and the BLS, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is looking into now how that happened and what they can do to prevent it. We have, obviously, inquired with them because we got some calls based on the numbers, which we didn't expect to be out until tomorrow. And I think Labor will take a hard look at how this happened and take

steps to make sure it doesn't happen.

Q What's your reaction --

MR. LOCKHART: And I won't mention a news organization that put some numbers up on Monday night that -- were they right?

Q They said D'Amato was going to win. (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: Anyone out there?

Q Do you have any reaction to the new numbers?

MR. LOCKHART: No -- (laughter) -- they're not out yet.

Q How about to the ABC numbers? (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: A couple of them were wrong.

The numbers have not been officially and we're going to continue to follow our one-hour rule of not commenting.

Q Out of curiosity, when the statistics are compiled, which organization in the White House was the first to receive it and when did they receive it and when does the President usually get the numbers?

MR. LOCKHART: My understanding is that the Council of Economic Advisors get the information late in the afternoon the day before. They prepare a document for the President, which is transmitted to the President late in the day. The practical effect of it is, I think, he generally sees it the next morning, as it's in his in-box, pile of things to look at.

Q This release also scooped the President in this case?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, it did. And he's very upset about that. (Laughter.)

Thank you.

END

2:03 P.M. EST

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-NOV-1998 19:45:01.00

SUBJECT: 1998-11/09 Lockhart press briefing

TO: "/R=3\$=/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mrx.eop.gov (
"/R=3\$=/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mrx.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera ("Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrei H. Cherny ("Andrei H. Cherny"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angelina Walker ("Angelina Walker"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich ("Brian A. Reich"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher S. Lehane ("Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie ("Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger ("Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jodi R. Sakol ("Jodi R. Sakol"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell ("Joseph W. Cerrell"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lawrence J. Haas ("Lawrence J. Haas"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nathan B. Naylor ("Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia M. Ewing ("Patricia M. Ewing"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheim ("Sarah E. Gegenheim"@lmgate3.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt ("Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: BARTHOLOW_T (BARTHOLOW_T@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BUDIG_N (BUDIG_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cmbeach (cmbeach@msn.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adam W. Goldberg (CN=Adam W. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alexander L. Boyle (CN=Alexander L. Boyle/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock (CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne E. McGuire (CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Antony J. Blinken (CN=Antony J. Blinken/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aviva Steinberg (CN=Aviva Steinberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara Semedo (CN=Barbara Semedo/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bradley M. Campbell (CN=Bradley M. Campbell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Barreto (CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian D. Smith (CN=Brian D. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brooks E. Scoville (CN=Brooks E. Scoville/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (CN=Carmen B. Fowler/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carole A. Parmelee (CN=Carole A. Parmelee/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen (CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cecilia E. Rouse (CN=Cecilia E. Rouse/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Chandler G. Spaulding (CN=Chandler G. Spaulding/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (CN=Cheryl D. Mills/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine N. Macy (CN=Christine N. Macy/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher J. Lavery (CN=Christopher J. Lavery/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher K. Scully (CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig T. Smith (CN=Craig T. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dana C. Strand (CN=Dana C. Strand/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dario J. Gomez (CN=Dario J. Gomez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (CN=David E. Kalbaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David R. Goodfriend (CN=David R. Goodfriend/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David S. Beaubaire (CN=David S. Beaubaire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David T. Johnson (CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn L. Smalls (CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Bird (CN=Debra D. Bird/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood (CN=Debra S. Wood/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane A. Stumpf (CN=Diane A. Stumpf/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Ikemiyashiro (CN=Diane Ikemiyashiro/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dominique L. Cano (CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald Goldberg (CN=Donald Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorian V. Weaver (CN=Dorian V. Weaver/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Doris O. Matsui (CN=Doris O. Matsui/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas R. Matties (CN=Douglas R. Matties/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Drew W. Holzapfel (CN=Drew W. Holzapfel/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap (CN=Elisa Millsap/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth Steele (CN=Elisabeth Steele/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringier (CN=Elliot J. Diringier/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emory L. Mayfield (CN=Emory L. Mayfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Essence P. Washington (CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evan Ryan (CN=Evan Ryan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G. Timothy Saunders (CN=G. Timothy Saunders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Glen M. Weiner (CN=Glen M. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Grace A. Garcia (CN=Grace A. Garcia/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gregory B. Craig (CN=Gregory B. Craig/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Guy Smith (CN=Guy Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jackson T. Dunn (CN=Jackson T. Dunn/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Teague (CN=James M. Teague/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen (CN=Jeannetta P. Allen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Gribben (CN=John A. Gribben/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon P. Jennings (CN=Jon P. Jennings/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan E. Smith (CN=Jonathan E. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur (CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Orszag (CN=Jonathan Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph C. Fanaroff (CN=Joseph C. Fanaroff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield (CN=Judithanne V. Scourfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (CN=Julianne B. Corbett/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie A. Fernandes (CN=Julie A. Fernandes/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie B. Goldberg (CN=Julie B. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin Coleman (CN=Justin Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (CN=Karen L. Barbuschak/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kyle M. Baker (CN=Kyle M. Baker/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lanny A. Breuer (CN=Lanny A. Breuer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa J. Levin (CN=Lisa J. Levin/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa R. Dass (CN=Lisa R. Dass/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori E. Abrams (CN=Lori E. Abrams/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori L. Anderson (CN=Lori L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto (CN=Maria E. Soto/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis (CN=Mark D. Neschis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew (CN=Mark H. Bartholomew/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark J. Bernstein (CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry (CN=Marsha E. Berry/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martha Foley (CN=Martha Foley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew W. Pitcher (CN=Matthew W. Pitcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (CN=Maureen A. Hudson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maya Seiden (CN=Maya Seiden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael D. Malone (CN=Michael D. Malone/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Sullivan (CN=Michael J. Sullivan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell (CN=Michael V. Terrell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Jolin (CN=Michele Jolin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mindy E. Myers (CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Misty L. Phillips (CN=Misty L. Phillips/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden (CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noa A. Meyer (CN=Noa A. Meyer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick Aylward (CN=Patrick Aylward/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (CN=Patrick E. Briggs/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glastris (CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul E. Begala (CN=Paul E. Begala/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet (CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip J. Crowley (CN=Philip J. Crowley/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phillip Caplan (CN=Phillip Caplan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: R. Scott Michaud (CN=R. Scott Michaud/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Renee C. Riley (CN=Renee C. Riley/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr. (CN=Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert M. Shireman (CN=Robert M. Shireman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Weiner (CN=Robert S. Weiner/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin J. Bachman (CN=Robin J. Bachman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger V. Salazar (CN=Roger V. Salazar/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally P. Paxton (CN=Sally P. Paxton/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Knight (CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney (CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Serena C. Torrey (CN=Serena C. Torrey/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani (CN=Sheyda Jahanbani/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susanna B. McGuire (CN=Susanna B. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (CN=Tracy F. Sisser/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy Pakulniewicz (CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia N. Rustique (CN=Virginia N. Rustique/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (CN=Wayne C. Johnson/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William C. Haymes (CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. White Jr. (CN=William H. White Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (CN=Woyneab M. Wondwossen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CUTLER_L (CUTLER_L@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DICKY_L (DICKY_L@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmilbank (dmilbank@tnr.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: FORDE_R (FORDE_R@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRAY_W (GRAY_W@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: INFOMGT (INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john.longbrake (john.longbrake@ms01.do.treas.sprint.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: julie_green (julie_green@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: klasky_helaine (klasky_helaine@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KTORPEY (KTORPEY@AOL.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: meglynn (meglynn@usia.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MOFFETT_J (MOFFETT_J@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NAPLAN_S (NAPLAN_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: OLCOTT_E (OLCOTT_E@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pub_Arch (Pub_Arch [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Releases (Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: releases (Releases@www3.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RICHETTI_S (RICHETTI_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RUBIN_E (RUBIN_E@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: skgmd (skgmd@umich.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_BD (SMITH_BD@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TCSmith (TCSmith@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tingen-terri (tingen-terri@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: usnwire (usnwire@access.digex.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wh-outbox-distr (wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK_N (WOZNIAK_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

November 9, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING BY

JOE LOCKHART

The Briefing Room

1:26 P.M. EST

MR. LOCKHART: One quick announcement. The President, tomorrow, will speak to -- I think the group meets annually, the Export Council -- his Export Council is in town tomorrow; he'll make remarks to them at a time and place that we'll let you know this afternoon. The speech will be about the importance of opening markets for U.S. products around the world and he'll talk a little bit about what he hopes his APEC trip to be all about. And that's tomorrow.

Q Is there any concern that during the middle of the APEC trip the Ken Starr testimony will occur before the House Judiciary Committee, that that could affect what's happening over in Malaysia?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I don't think so. The President has taken the view throughout the past year that he needs to focus on doing the people's business. I think as part of that is the important work he does overseas, both diplomatically, economically. So I don't see there's any issue created by his travel.

Q Joe, why did you cancel Guam on the front end of the trip?

MR. LOCKHART: We rescheduled Guam, as I said this morning, because of the tightness in the governor's race there.

Under Guam law, if a candidate does not receive 50 percent of the vote there needs to be a runoff. There are issues now that I think Governor Gutierrez has got something like 49.7, something very close to 50, but just short of it. So we expect that there will probably be a runoff; it would take place just after our visit. We thought it would be better to go after the election is decided so as not to inject ourselves into the race.

Q The President has been injecting himself in races all across the country for the last several weeks. You think he wouldn't want to miss an opportunity to help the Democrat win office.

MR. LOCKHART: Well, we've had this discussion before about the President's philosophy and whether he should go and whether he shouldn't. I think this trip to Guam is very important to the people. Presidents don't get to the territory that often. This is not like New York City or Chicago. I think it's important to the people, we'd rather go once the political situation is resolved, the election results are known, and that it can be done in a way that isn't seen as political.

Q Will he do a fundraiser while he's there?

MR. LOCKHART: Interesting idea. (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: Does he have any more details on the itinerary?

MR. LOCKHART: No, we're working that out now. I expect the departure to be sometime late Saturday and what we're working on is the back end, when we'll get back.

Q What's your assessment of the impeachment hearings so far today?

MR. LOCKHART: To tell you truth, I haven't seen very much of it. I think it's been sort of a walk down history's lane as far as what the history of impeachment is from various academics and constitutional scholars. From what I've seen on the reporting, there's been various views offered about the history of impeachment. I think it does not necessarily do what we were seeking to do and what some of the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee were seeking, which was a look at the standards judged against the allegations that have been raised. But I think it has -- all in all, it's probably an interesting session on impeachments and the various views of constitutional scholars.

Q Was the President disappointed in the Supreme Court decision on testimony, and will he now instruct Bruce Lindsey to answer the independent counsel's questions?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think you'll have to go to the

independent counsel to see if he has questions to ask.

Q Well, he's already asked them. Will the President direct Lindsey to now go ahead and answer them?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, again, I don't know that he has asked. If he has questions he wants to ask him, he should get in touch.

Q What's his view of the court decision?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think as his counsel, Mr. Ruff, expressed, there's some disappointment over that. We think that the President and, ultimately, the public, benefits from the ability to have frank, full and candid exchanges between the President and the White House Counsel and the lawyers here at the White House. That is something that we are somewhat disappointed about because I think this will inhibit those frank and full exchanges.

Q Can I follow up? If Kenneth Starr calls and says, we would now like to re-ask the questions that Mr. Lindsey declined to answer before, does President Clinton want Bruce Lindsey to answer those questions?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I assume if Mr. Starr has questions to ask of Mr. Lindsey, he will be in touch. But I'm not going to speculate on something that I don't know to be the case.

Q What they're talking about is only in the case where there's criminal conduct and his private behavior is at issue. It shouldn't have any effect on whether or not the President would have the right to confer with his attorneys on policy matters.

MR. LOCKHART: At least in this case it's in the prosecutor's eye of what is criminal behavior. So I think that there are some inhibiting impacts of this and we're disappointed that the court did not judge the case worthy to review.

Q This thing has gone through a number of court hearings and motions to get the court to intervene, the Supreme Court

and so forth. You've lost every single one of them. Does that suggest to you that this is a losing battle, that this is not, in either case, a privilege that is likely to be granted by the court now or in the future?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think the court has spoken. I think the dissenting view by two of the justices argued that this was a legitimate case for the court to look at and to review and not frivolous in nature, as some have suggested. But the court has spoken and the court has ruled. That doesn't mean we're not disappointed by it, but they have made their decision.

Q What about on the Secret Service protective function, the rejection of the administration's position on that?

MR. LOCKHART: Again, the court has spoken on that. As you well know, this is something that the Secret Service, as the experts, have chosen to assert and push for, and through the auspices of Treasury and the Justice Department. So I don't really have anything to say one way or the other on that.

Q Doesn't that turn them into spies?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the Secret Service is in a better position to discuss that. We've made it clear from the beginning that this was not something that we were involved in. I think the President has spoken to you on what may be the effect of the decision. But it's just not something we chose to be involved in the litigation. And, in fact, as you well know, there were those who argued on the other side who made the point that it would have been a stronger case if we had been involved.

Q Has he pushed away Secret Service agents?

MR. LOCKHART: I personally don't have the ability to answer that question.

Q But the argument was over that very thing, that the President would try to keep his distance from them and, therefore,

endanger his safety. Do you have any evidence at all the President has?

MR. LOCKHART: I personally have no evidence of that, but I have no ability to really, in a comprehensive way, answer that question.

Q You say that's why the President chose not to take a side on that. Then why did his attorney, Mr. Bennett, file in January of this year a motion saying President Clinton emphatically expresses his support of the Secret Service on that argument.

MR. LOCKHART: On which argument? I'm not familiar in what case Mr. Bennett filed.

Q This was January 26, 1998, in the Jones case, specifically his express support, saying, "we concur with the Secret Service, these materials are unconditionally privileged."

MR. LOCKHART: Well, we're talking about a litigation that took place post-January 26, and you know that we took no position on that. I haven't said that the President doesn't have views or his private attorney doesn't, but we took no position in the litigation that the Secret Service, with the Treasury Department and the Justice Department, moved forward with.

Q Joe, Tipper Gore is going down to Central America

tomorrow with Brian Atwood and a lot of congressmen and senators, at least a number. Can you give us who is going in the delegation if you have it?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't have the CODEL. We can get that for you, but I'll tell you that Mrs. Gore is traveling to Honduras tomorrow, November 10, to begin her Hurricane Mitch relief mission. She will make a statement when she arrives there and then proceed to survey the damage. She will spend most of her trip doing relief work, helping clean out schools and helping to develop shelter areas that families can take advantage of. She'll stay overnight in Honduras in the tents provided by the U.S. military. She'll then travel on to Nicaragua on Wednesday morning, November 11.

So we can get you the CODEL. I know that she's taking some people with her.

Q What do you say to complaints that the aid has been too slow in coming?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think this was a devastating disaster that hit Central American countries and I would point you to efforts from the U.S. government and the U.S. military that started almost before Hurricane Mitch had left the area -- I think October 19th we had pre-positioned assets and we were working very hard with the local governments and countries -- now, for almost three weeks on

this crisis.

Q Joe, has a decision been made to answer any or all of the 81 questions from the Judiciary Committee?

MR. LOCKHART: As we've said, I think we will reply to the Chairman's letter and answer questions, but I can't give you a precise timeline.

Q Did you just say, yes, questions will be answered?

MR. LOCKHART: I just said, yes, questions will be answered.

Q All of the questions?

MR. LOCKHART: I said questions will be answered. I don't know anything beyond that.

Q Joe, what effect do you think this shake-up in the Republican leadership will have on impeachment process?

MR. LOCKHART: Impossible for me to determine. We heard comments across the board over the weekend, on Sunday shows and in the paper. It's just literally impossible to determine whether this will embolden Republicans to seek a quick resolution or embolden some Republicans to try to drive forward, stretch this out and try to

pursue this for more partisan advantage.

Q What was the analysis of what Livingston had to say?

MR. LOCKHART: Again, I think his comments sought to leave all of his options open and I think he did that.

Q Joe, has the President seen the list of questions?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't know.

Q If you don't know that, let me ask -- let me pass to someone else. (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: Okay.

Q Joe, is it accurate that the President gave an interview to Hank Greenspun of the Los Vegas Sun a few days before --

MR. LOCKHART: Brian.

Q Brian.

MR. LOCKHART: Yes.

Q Because of the contributions that the Greenspun family has given, is there a danger that the President will be seen to be selling interviews or --

MR. LOCKHART: No. That's ridiculous. I think the President and the editor of the paper saw each other at the state dinner, had a discussion of an important issue that's important locally, the Yucca Mountain. The editor of the paper requested an interview and we complied the next day, before leaving for the trip we were on.

Q Well, did he get the interview as the result of being a news person or as a Democratic donor?

MR. LOCKHART: He got the interview as a result of being a news person who was interested in an issue that was important in the Senate race in Nevada.

Q How many other requests did you have for papers in the region?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not aware of any.

Q This was the only request --

MR. LOCKHART: It's the only one I'm aware of.

Q So all you have to do is ask?

MR. LOCKHART: Sometimes the only thing you have to do is ask.

Q The President was responsive because --

MR. LOCKHART: If anyone is asking, the answer is no.
(Laughter.)

Q Was it because of the nature of the subject?

MR. LOCKHART: That's my understanding, yes, that one of the important issues in that race in Nevada was the temporary waste disposal on Yucca Mountain. I think the President commented on a column that the newspaper editor had written, expressed his views. The editor requested an interview and it was granted.

Q Joe, on the 81 questions, does the President agree with Greg Craig that they're silly?

MR. LOCKHART: I haven't talked to the President about it, but I think that might be an accurate description of some of the questions, particularly ones that can be boiled down to something like, does the President know he's the President? I think he does.

Q Joe, Saturday the President issued a statement

easing sanctions against India and Pakistan. But it seems like this is benefiting only Pakistan, to make Mr. Sharif happy -- he's coming on December 2nd here -- because he's in trouble, or his job is in trouble economically back home. He might lose if he doesn't get something like this.

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I don't think I'd agree with your political analysis. But let me tell you what we believe was behind the decision. As you know, under the omnibus budget bill that was passed, there was a Brownback amendment that provided the President's some flexibility and authority to waive some of the Glenn sanctions on India and Pakistan. The President will exercise that authority to restore Export-Import Bank -- OPIC, which is Overseas Private Investment Corporation -- Trade and Development Agency, and also international, military, education, and training funds for both countries.

Because of the financial crisis in Pakistan, the President has also decided that the U.S. will work closely with its G-7 partners to permit lending by the multilateral development banks -- the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank -- to support an IMF program for Pakistan.

Q To follow up, Joe, according to the State Department and IMF and World Bank, the Indian economy is doing very well, but it is the Pakistan economy which is in trouble. Why India should pay for the mismanagement of Pakistan economy --

MR. LOCKHART: Again, I don't necessarily agree with your political analysis. And I think given the state of the economy and the issues that Pakistan faces, domestically and economically, this step is prudent and appropriate.

Q Before we leave that subject, why is the President doing that, and does it not dilute, badly dilute the nonproliferation message he was trying to send?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I don't think so. I think that there's obviously been some steps toward -- from both India and Pakistan on that issue. If you remember the U.N. General Assembly, there were positive statements made towards non-proliferation. So we think, as the President has often said, allowing him the flexibility in using these sanctions can often be more productive than the rigid implementation of these.

Q Is this a reward for actions they've already taken, or is it -- are we anticipating that --

MR. LOCKHART: Well, we certainly think that both countries have taken positive steps and made positive comments. We do anticipate further steps, though.

Q Also, Joe, just a follow-up. The President also said that if more progress is made by both countries, his visit may take place to India and Pakistan. So what kind of more progress are

you looking for?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, we're looking for more CTBT -- a signature on CTBT, moratorium on fissile material production, and adoption of restraints on nuclear-capable missiles and aircraft.

Q Joe, does the White House want to call witnesses before the committee?

MR. LOCKHART: I haven't heard any discussion of that.

Q The White House has talked about wanting to expedite this, wanting to move on. And, yet, you're telling us that you haven't heard any discussion about whether you even want to call witnesses, you don't know when the questions might get answered. What is the White House doing to expedite this process?

MR. LOCKHART: We, as I've said -- I mean, you can spin this around any way you want, Scott, but as I've said, we are working to respond to the Chairman's letter, answer the questions in a timely way. There were a lot of questions there. They weren't all just, do you think you're the President or not. And we will work as expeditiously as we can to work with the committee so that we can put this behind us.

Q Does the United States believe that the use of military force against Iraq would lead to an end to the weapons

inspections there?

MR. LOCKHART: I can't speculate on a potential policy decision that's yet to be made.

Q But is that part of our calculation in terms of whether we act?

MR. LOCKHART: There are certainly a lot of calculations that go into the presenting policy options and making policy decisions. But I'm not going to speculate or lay out what those are here.

Q How much time does the Iraqi government have before the President exercises military options?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, first off, as we told you yesterday, the President met with his team, but has asked for further information and has not made any decisions on any diplomatic or military options. I'm not going to get into timelines here. But our objective is the same, which is to have Saddam Hussein reverse course in allowing UNSCOM inspectors to do their work. He knows what he needs to do. And while I won't get into a timeline, I think both --the Secretary of State has said that the current standoff and flagrant violation, as Kofi Annan calls it, cannot go on indefinitely.

Q In previous crises with the Iraqi government, when we've asked about the timeline, Secretary of State Albright, for example, has said she's not talking about months, she's talking about weeks, as opposed to days. Are you talking about days, weeks, months? How long is this standoff, ballpark, going to last?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not going to ballpark a timeline or get specific on a timeline.

Q Joe, is there no desire to end this cycle?

MR. LOCKHART: End what cycle?

Q The Saddam Hussein cycle. We moved the military out there; it cost \$1.5 billion. Once we do that, he backs down, and then he does it again.

MR. LOCKHART: There's certainly a desire right now to get Saddam Hussein to reverse his decision to not allow -- or not cooperate with UNSCOM inspectors.

Q But how do you get him to do it once and for all, Joe? How do you break the cycle? How do you get Saddam to do it once and for all?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, those are certainly things that the President and the foreign policy team are looking at, but I can't

tell you that any decisions have been made.

Q Joe, to follow on that, short of knocking Saddam Hussein out of power, how do you expect bombing to get him to reverse the cycle?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, again, let me refer you to my previous non-answer.

Q Joe, on Iraq still, does the administration feel the need for a final ultimatum to Iraq? Would that be part of the use of force?

MR. LOCKHART: As we've said, the President had options put down in front of him yesterday. He's asked for more information on both diplomatic and military options, and I'm not going to detail what they might be.

Q Okay. I guess I'm just asking, though, before we've said, you have until "x" time to do this; otherwise, all options are on the table. Are we going to give Iraq an ultimatum?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not going to get into what options we might choose to exercise, what diplomatic efforts we might choose to exercise. But I think it is clear that Saddam Hussein knows what he needs to do.

Q When would you expect the President to hear back from his National Security Advisor?

MR. LOCKHART: Sometime in the next couple of days.

Q Joe, President Clinton meets with the Russian Prime Minister in Malaysia. Will he ask for KGB documents on American prisoners of war to be released?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't know about that. I'll look into that -- not expected to, I'm told.

Q Joe, the Pinochet case remains in limbo. We haven't heard the President say anything about it. What is the position of the U.S. government?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, as I've said several times from here, the position of the United States government is this is an issue that's being litigated between the government of Spain and I think today in the U.K. House of Lords. There was a lower court ruling in London that quashed the extradition order, but that's being appealed in the House of Lords today.

Q Joe, you spoke this morning of relations with Bob Livingston in the past have been kind of a mixed bag. What did you mean by that and can you work with him?

MR. LOCKHART: I think that what would be appropriate for me is to allow the Republicans to work through their leadership issues. There are three or four positions that are being filled. Some are contested, some, as of right now, are not contested. But I think rather than try to handicap or talk about who we can work with and who we can't, we'll allow them to work through their process -- except to say, which should be the quite obvious, whoever the Republicans elect as Speaker we'll work with.

Q What are you going to do without Newt?

MR. LOCKHART: Soldier on.

Q Are you going to miss Gingrich? I mean, in terms of the political calculation, on background, a lot of people around the White House for many months now have said, thank God for Newt Gingrich, the President is lucky in his enemies.

MR. LOCKHART: It's hard to divine what it will be like in the House without Newt Gingrich, or post-Newt Gingrich. And as I think I said this morning, to the extent that the environment is more positive and less partisan, that could be very good for the American public as far as pursuing the President's agenda and what's best for the country. To the extent that some take the message that Mr. Gingrich had to go because he was too moderate or too conciliatory to the Democrats and the President, that could lead to a much worse environment.

Q Joe, we asked you repeatedly over the summer whether the President had sent any signal to the Secret Service about whether they should or shouldn't assert a privilege against testifying. We were assured he sent no such signal. Now we find out in January he filed a document saying he emphatically endorsed such a privilege, he thought it should be absolute and inviolate. How can you reconcile these two statements?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, first off, because this was something that was filed by the President's private attorney and you know full well that I don't follow the Paula Jones case that closely, so what you're telling me is news to me. And, secondly, this is an issue that came up post -- so if you're somehow trying to argue that he sent a message in the Paula Jones case to somehow link up at a future date to litigation with the Secret Service, I think that would be pretty good lawyering.

Q Joe, can you confirm if First Lady has written a letter to the Indian opposition leader, Sonia Gandhi, and, if so, why she has written a letter to --

MR. LOCKHART: I don't have any information on that. I suggest you call her office.

Q I asked you last week if you have any response to the letter that was delivered to the President.

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, the letter -- we have received the letter and it is under review within the NSC, and at the appropriate time that they come to some --

Q What letter?

MR. LOCKHART: There's a letter that came from some foreign policy leaders and from some members of Congress seeking --

Q No, it's the letter from the Cuban American National --

MR. LOCKHART: Oh, I'm sorry. It's the second letter. That is an issue that's being handled at the Justice Department and you should go there for comment.

Q What is the other letter you were speaking of?

MR. LOCKHART: There was a letter from some members of Congress and some members of the foreign policy community seeking to establish a commission on looking at our relationship with Cuba. And that's the answer I gave.

Q Do you have a view on that?

MR. LOCKHART: As I just said, we're looking at that,

the NSC is looking at the letter and I have nothing for you now.

When I do, I'll let you know.

Q Does the White House have a view on the New Yorker article, which charges that Ken Starr might have been intimidating women witnesses?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not familiar with the article, so I can't articulate a view one way or the other.

Q Does the President reserve the right not to answer some of the 81 questions? You say he is going to respond.

MR. LOCKHART: I'm giving you the best answer I can based on what I've been told. I don't know precisely the form of the response, but I have been told the President -- or the Counsel's Office and the President will respond to the letters, will answer questions and you'll see the answers when you see them.

Q Are some of the questions considered trick?

MR. LOCKHART: Question number one is awfully difficult.

(Laughter.)

Q What is that, are you President --

MR. LOCKHART: Basically, yes. "Did you know when you took the Oath of Office you were taking an Oath of Office?"

Q Joe, what's the reaction to -- comments, suggestions that the First Lady should stay home more often and that the President should use a motel room?

MR. LOCKHART: I didn't see that comment, the last one. I think the governor-elect has wide latitude to talk on subjects, any subject he chooses without me having to comment on it.

Q Joe, under the Judiciary Committee rules, the White House can cross-examine witnesses. Are White House attorneys preparing to cross-examine Ken Starr; do they intend to do so?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not familiar with what our plans are. That hearing date is expected to be sometime next week. I can try to find out.

Q Did I just hear you give a commitment to release to us the President's answers to those 81 questions when they're --

MR. LOCKHART: No, don't think so.

Q You said we'll see the answers.

MR. LOCKHART: Oh, I think you'll eventually see them.

Q But not the --

MR. LOCKHART: Let's do this in order. Let's get the letter ready and then we can discuss what, if anything, will be released. Although, I do trust that given the track record of the committee and their belief that all information should be allowed to flower in the public, that we will all see whatever is made available.

Q Joe, now that the elections are over, the President is meeting tomorrow with the exporters -- will he bring up fast track again, will he revive it?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I don't expect that to be part of the remarks. I think it will be more focused on the global opening markets and what we expect in the context of some of the things we'll be talking about at APEC, where they will be talking about a broad global trade liberalization package.

Q But you still believe in fast track?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes.

Q Will he bring that up in the next Congress -- fast track?

MR. LOCKHART: I expect -- the President's views haven't

changed. He believes that fast track authority is an important tool for the President as far as opening markets and encouraging domestic economic expansion. And we'll bring it up at the appropriate time.

Q Over the weekend, Livingston indicated that one of the first pieces of legislation he'd like to introduce would change the way that Social Security is accounted for in the budget, and that would likely mean a temporary federal deficit. What's the White House view of that, particularly given that Social Security first is one of the President's priorities?

MR. LOCKHART: I have to tell you, I didn't see that comment. I didn't see it any of the clips I saw. So let me look into that and see.

Q Does the administration have a position on off-budget versus on-budget treatment of Social Security?

MR. LOCKHART: If they do, it's a mystery to me.

Q In the speech tomorrow, will the President be specific about what certain countries need to do? Will he say things like Japan needs to eliminate tariffs on forestry and fishery products?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think our positions are well-known, and I'm not familiar yet with how specific the speech

will get because I haven't seen the draft of it yet. So I should be in a better position to help tomorrow morning.

Q Kenneth Starr said after the Supreme Court ruling today that the administration's continued assertion of privilege for staff and Secret Service substantially delayed and impeded the grand jury's investigation. Did the President delay their investigation?

MR. LOCKHART: I believe the President and the White House made an important case about the value of having full and frank conversations between the President and White House attorneys. That was an important argument to make. And unfortunately, the Supreme Court chose not to review the lower court's ruling.

Q But Joe, no court -- no court -- agreed with the White House position on this. You lost in the lower court, the appeals, the emergency appeal to the Supreme Court, and then before the entire Supreme Court. There are arguments out there that this was frivolous and was designed to do nothing more than delay the Starr investigation.

MR. LOCKHART: And those arguments are wrong.

Q Joe, what does the White House make of Henry Hyde's suggestion that if the President doesn't answer the questionnaire, he might file another charge -- impeachment charge against him?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't think he has much to worry about.

Q Joe, will the President meet with the Dalai Lama this week?

MR. LOCKHART: My understanding is the Dalai Lama is in town for a few days. I believe he may meet with the Vice President tomorrow in the afternoon. I expect if that meeting is confirmed, the President may drop by, as he has done on previous occasions.

Q Why not have a regular meeting with the Dalai Lama as opposed to this drop-by which you always do? What's the diplomatic protocol -- the excuse for that?

MR. LOCKHART: Because drop-bys work. We're getting way too late in the briefing to make me do that, Wolf.

Q Joe, I don't want to test everyone's patience with this question, but I'm trying to go back for a bit of specificity here --

MR. LOCKHART: Do I get to ask everybody if their patience is being tested like mine? (Laughter.)

Q Maybe after the question.

Q We'll respond in good faith. (Laughter.)

Q In the Jones case, protective function privilege was first raised, and the President and his lawyers argued that the Secret Service agents should not have to testify. Now, those documents were under seal and that argument was not known publicly. Are you saying today that neither the President, nor any of his attorneys encouraged the Secret Service to pursue protective function privilege in the grand jury investigation later?

MR. LOCKHART: As we've said before, I'm not aware of any involvement in any way, shape, or form in what the Treasury Department and the Justice Department argued on behalf of the Secret Service. We've been very clear that the President has said that this is an issue for the Secret Service, as they are the experts on this issue and they have made this case.

And in fact, as you are also aware, there have been some who claimed in decisions on this that the argument would have been stronger if the President had asserted the privilege. But he did not because he didn't think that was appropriate.

Q But if he had done it in January, why didn't he repeat it --

Q Joe, why was it appropriate in the case of the Jones case and not appropriate in the case of the grand jury

investigation. Why didn't he assert it?

MR. LOCKHART: Again, you're telling me something that was under seal that I am not aware of. I'm just telling you what I know about the grand jury case and our position of non-involvement.

Q Joe, President Clinton spoke over the weekend with the President of Honduras, President Flores. Did he get through to any of the other Central American Presidents, that you know of?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, he did speak -- and if there are other calls to report on, we'll let you know -- he did speak of conveying our concern about the devastating losses and daunting task of reconstruction that both countries face and pledging U.S. commitment to work with the countries in both of those efforts.

Q Is there any discussion at the White House about establishing a protective function privilege by statute by Congress?

MR. LOCKHART: To tell you the truth, the only discussion I've heard of that has been from members. I've heard a series of members on both sides of the aisle who have come forward and said that that's something they want to look at, but I haven't heard any discussion here or any involvement here. I don't want to rule out that they haven't sought the views of the Counsel's Office; I'm just not aware if they have.

Q Joe, there seems to be a hole in the stomach, or at least dwindling stomach, even on the Judiciary Committee, for an impeachment vote within the committee. Are there any discussions going on about avoiding that and perhaps coming to terms with some deal, some agreement?

MR. LOCKHART: If there are any discussions, I'm not aware of them. I think most of the discussions right now are going on within the committee. I think if you watched the various members who were out on television this weekend, there were various ideas talked about, but I'm not aware that that's something that's going on except amongst themselves.

Q Does the President think he's out of the woods in impeachment?

MR. LOCKHART: The President has said he thinks this is out of his hands, and what he needs to do is concentrate on the job that the public elected him to do.

Q Joe, a question of standards for impeachment, touching on that. John Conyers said this morning that an issue of perjury can't arise out of questions the government has no legal authority to ask. Does the White House share that view?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm sorry, say again. I'm not sure I

understood that.

Q A charge of perjury, or the issue of perjury, can't arise out of questions that the government, meaning Ken Starr, has no legal authority to ask. In essence, the issue of perjury is inextricably tied to the question of Ken Starr's mandate.

MR. LOCKHART: I know that Congressman Conyers has been very adamant about getting some information going to the mandate. It's the first time I have heard that argument made, so I just don't know whether it's something -- whether it's a concern we share or not.

Q Joe, another member of that committee, Congressman Nadler, appeared today and said that the proper mechanism for handling alleged violations of law by a President is through the criminal process, to simply charge him and indict him like any other citizen could be indicted. Is that also the White House's view?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think the Congressman was expressing his view. I haven't heard any speculation one way or the other on that. And that's obviously something that raises constitutional issues, and I think Mr. Starr has got several constitutional experts on his payroll, so I imagine they have thought about it.

Q Has the President spoken to Newt Gingrich yet?

MR. LOCKHART: Not that I'm aware of.

Q Back to Iraq, can you tell us if you're discussing anything on tightening the sanctions regime, which is notoriously leaky?

MR. LOCKHART: I think there is a series of diplomatic channels and communications both private and public, but I don't think it's useful at this point to detail either anything that may happen diplomatically or militarily.

Thanks.

END

2:03 P.M. EST

#016-11/09

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-MAR-1999 02:34:46.00

SUBJECT: 1999-3-30 remarks to Electronic Industries Alliance

TO: "/R=3\$=/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mrx.eop.gov (
"/R=3\$=/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mrx.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEEOB/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov (
"/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEEOB/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera ("Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher S. Lehane ("Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie ("Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger ("Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jodi R. Sakol ("Jodi R. Sakol"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nathan B. Naylor ("Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia M. Ewing ("Patricia M. Ewing"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt ("Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov [@LNGATE])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: BARTHOLOW_T (BARTHOLOW_T@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BUDIG_N (BUDIG_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cmbeach (cmbeach@msn.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alexian T. Wines (CN=Alexian T. Wines/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock (CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne E. McGuire (CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Antony J. Blinken (CN=Antony J. Blinken/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aviva Steinberg (CN=Aviva Steinberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bradley M. Campbell (CN=Bradley M. Campbell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Barreto (CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian D. Smith (CN=Brian D. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brooks E. Scoville (CN=Brooks E. Scoville/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (CN=Carmen B. Fowler/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen (CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Chandler G. Spaulding (CN=Chandler G. Spaulding/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (CN=Cheryl D. Mills/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine N. Macy (CN=Christine N. Macy/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher K. Scully (CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dana C. Strand (CN=Dana C. Strand/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dario J. Gomez (CN=Dario J. Gomez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (CN=David E. Kalbaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David R. Goodfriend (CN=David R. Goodfriend/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David T. Johnson (CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn L. Smalls (CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Bird (CN=Debra D. Bird/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood (CN=Debra S. Wood/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dominique L. Cano (CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorian V. Weaver (CN=Dorian V. Weaver/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas R. Matties (CN=Douglas R. Matties/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap (CN=Elisa Millsap/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Essence P. Washington (CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evan Ryan (CN=Evan Ryan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G. Timothy Saunders (CN=G. Timothy Saunders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George G. Caudill (CN=George G. Caudill/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jackson T. Dunn (CN=Jackson T. Dunn/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Teague (CN=James M. Teague/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen (CN=Jeannetta P. Allen/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Gribben (CN=John A. Gribben/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon P. Jennings (CN=Jon P. Jennings/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan E. Smith (CN=Jonathan E. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur (CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph C. Fanaroff (CN=Joseph C. Fanaroff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield (CN=Judithanne V. Scourfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (CN=Julianne B. Corbett/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie B. Goldberg (CN=Julie B. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin Coleman (CN=Justin Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (CN=Karen L. Barbuschak/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lanny A. Breuer (CN=Lanny A. Breuer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa J. Levin (CN=Lisa J. Levin/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Loretta M. Ucelli (CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori E. Abrams (CN=Lori E. Abrams/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret M. Suntum (CN=Margaret M. Suntum/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto (CN=Maria E. Soto/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis (CN=Mark D. Neschis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew (CN=Mark H. Bartholomew/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark J. Bernstein (CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry (CN=Marsha E. Berry/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martha Foley (CN=Martha Foley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marty J. Hoffmann (CN=Marty J. Hoffmann/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Cahill (CN=Mary E. Cahill/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (CN=Maureen A. Hudson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Sullivan (CN=Michael J. Sullivan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell (CN=Michael V. Terrell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Jolin (CN=Michele Jolin/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mindy E. Myers (CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neal Sharma (CN=Neal Sharma/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden (CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noa A. Meyer (CN=Noa A. Meyer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (CN=Patrick E. Briggs/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glasstris (CN=Paul D. Glasstris/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet (CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip J. Crowley (CN=Philip J. Crowley/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phillip Caplan (CN=Phillip Caplan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ralph Alswang (CN=Ralph Alswang/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Renee C. Riley (CN=Renee C. Riley/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr (CN=Reuben L. Musgrave Jr/OU=OSTP/O=EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert B. Johnson (CN=Robert B. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Weiner (CN=Robert S. Weiner/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin J. Bachman (CN=Robin J. Bachman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally Katzen (CN=Sally Katzen/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Knight (CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney (CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Serena C. Torrey (CN=Serena C. Torrey/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Shannon Mason (CN=Shannon Mason/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sharon Farmer (CN=Sharon Farmer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani (CN=Sheyda Jahanbani/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susanna B. McGuire (CN=Susanna B. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd A. Bledsoe (CN=Todd A. Bledsoe/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (CN=Tracy F. Sisser/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy Pakulniewicz (CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia N. Rustique (CN=Virginia N. Rustique/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (CN=Wayne C. Johnson/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William C. Haymes (CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. White Jr. (CN=William H. White Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (CN=Woyneab M. Wondwossen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CUTLER_L (CUTLER_L@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DICKY_L (DICKY_L@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmilbank (dmilbank@tnr.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: FORDE_R (FORDE_R@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRAY_W (GRAY_W@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: INFOMGT (INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john.longbrake (john.longbrake@ms01.do.treas.sprint.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john_see (John_See@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: julie_green (julie_green@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: klasky_helaine (klasky_helaine@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KTORPEY (KTORPEY@AOL.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: meglynn (meglynn@ibb.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: meglynn (meglynn@usia.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael_J_Sullivan (Michael_J_Sullivan%who.eop.gov@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MOFFETT_J (MOFFETT_J@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NAPLAN_S (NAPLAN_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: OLCOTT_E (OLCOTT_E@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pub_Arch (Pub_Arch [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Releases (Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: releases (Releases@www3.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RUBIN_E (RUBIN_E@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: skgmd (skgmd@umich.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_BD (SMITH_BD@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TCSmith (TCSmith@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tingen-terri (tingen-terri@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: usnwire (usnwire@access.digex.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wh-outbox-distr (wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK_N (WOZNIAK_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 30, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ALLIANCE DINNER

J.W. Marriott
Washington, D.C.

8:25 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. First of all, I want to thank you all for giving me a chance to come tonight. I thank my longtime friend, Dave McCurdy, for his introduction and for his leadership of EIA. You made a good decision when you named him your President. And I know what you're laughing about out there. (Laughter.) Two or three years from now you'll think it's an even better decision. (Laughter.)

I want to also pay my respects to your Vice President, John Kelly, who went to Georgetown with me, although he's a much younger man. (Laughter.) John -- when I was a senior, John was actually President of the freshmen class. And I've been trying to think out of respect for the will of the people -- the only people we knew back then -- whether I should still address him as "Mr. President." (Laughter.) But then that would confuse the EIA, so I didn't do it.

Mr. Major, thank you for your invitation. Mr. McGinn, thank you for your remarks. That was very impressive. I couldn't even keep up with all the new things you announced tonight.

I'm glad that our FCC Chairman, Bill Kinard, is here, and I think Secretary of the Army Louis Caldera is also here. And, General Jones, I thought you gave a terrific invocation. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. (Applause.)

You know, I was trying to think tonight whether there was any way I could say what I originally wanted to come here and say, which is to talk about some of the technology policies that we're trying to pursue that I hope will help you, but in the process will strengthen our democracy, and the sweep of opportunity and freedom around the world -- and at the same time, say a few words, as I feel I must, about our important mission in Kosovo.

And before I came over here tonight I had a long meeting and I went and had what has now become almost my daily phone call with Prime Minister Blair. And I sat down and I thought about it. I thought about how grateful I am to the members of this organization for the phenomenal successes you have enjoyed in these last few years and the major contributions you have made to the economy of the United States; the opportunities you have given our people. And I thought about this terrible brutality that is going on in Kosovo, replaying what happened not so long ago in Bosnia, and in a way replaying what we see around the world, the modern world that seems to be troubled with ancient hatreds rooted in racial, ethnic and religious differences.

If you think about the major forces alive in the world today, the move toward globalization and the explosion in technology, especially in information and communications, they

really not only, as all of you know better than I, are dramatically changing the way we work and live and relate to each other and to the rest of the world. They represent both a pull toward integration and a dramatic force toward decentralization. And I would argue to you that both forces have within them the potential for enormous good and enormous trouble for the world of the 21st century.

If you think about the forces toward integration of the global economy, for example, that's a wonderful thing. But it can be very destabilizing if we leave whole countries and vast populations within countries behind.

If you think about the explosion in technology and how wonderful it is in empowering individuals and small firms and communities, and enabling communities -- little schools I've seen in poor African and Latin American villages to hook up to the Internet and have access to learning that would have taken them a whole generation, at least, to achieve through traditional economic development processes in their countries. It is breathtaking.

But looked at another way, it also provides access to technology for every terrorist in the world to have their own weapons site, and for independent operators to figure out how to make bombs and set up chemical and biological labs.

And when married together with the most primitive hatreds, like those we see manifest in Kosovo today, the advent of technology and decentralized decision-making and access to information can be a very potent, but destructive force.

When I ran for President in 1992, what I was seeking to do was to articulate a vision to the American people of the way I wanted America to look in the 21st century in a world I hope we would be living in then, and what I thought the President and the government of the United States should do; to take advantage of the benefits of globalization and the explosion of technology; and to provide those policies and bulwarks necessary to guard against the deepest problems of the modern world. There are so many things bringing us together and so many things breaking apart. We have to decide a lot of new questions.

And if I could just say a word about what we tried to do -- and Dave McCurdy and I have been working on this through the Democratic Leadership Council for more than 15 years -- I believe that if we could create a country in which there was genuine opportunity for every responsible citizen, and in which we had a real sense of community, of belonging, of mutual responsibility, one to another, so we all felt we would be better off if everybody had a chance as well; and that if we could maintain America's sense of responsibility for leading the rest of the world toward peace and prosperity and harmony both with the environment and with others across all the lines that divide

us, that the best days for our country and the best days for humanity were still ahead.

I still believe that. Every story you can tell about every company represented in this room reflects that. But we cannot forget that there will never be a time when life is free of difficulty and where the organized forces of destruction did not seek to move into the breaches of human conduct for their own advance.

And that is what we see in Kosovo. It is a sad commentary, indeed, that on the edge of a new millennium there are still people who feel they must define their own self-worth and merit in terms of who they are not; and who believe that their lives only really count not when they are lifting themselves up, but when they are holding someone else down; and sometimes who believe that it is literally legitimate not only to uproot totally innocent civilians from their homes and their villages, but to kill them in large numbers.

This is, of course, not confined to the Balkans; it is still at the root of the troubles in the Middle East; it is still at the root of the problems we are, oh, so close to getting finally resolved in Northern Ireland; it is at the root of an ancient tribal difference that led to the deaths of somewhere between 500,000 and 800,000 people in 100 days in Rwanda just a few years ago.

We see it everywhere -- the fear of the other. It led a couple of demented people in a little Texas town to dismember and drag an African American to death; and a couple of other people in Wyoming to kill a young man at the dawn of his life, apparently because he was gay.

We have to find a way to use all of this technology in a way that celebrates our differences instead of uses them for destructive ends. And the only way to do that, I am convinced, is to somehow reaffirm that amidst all our differences, what it is we have in common as human beings is more important.

And ultimately, that is the liberating logic of the telecommunications revolution, so much that you have powered. The idea that if we just gave everybody a chance, ordinary people would do extraordinary things, and so they have.

And so I asked all of you tonight to support what the United States and our 18 other NATO allies are trying to do in the Balkans -- first, because of all the little people who may never even see most of the things you invent and sell and market, but who could if they could live in peace. Second, because the problems could spread, and you see them beginning to spread with the outflow of refugees. And, third, because the United States and our allies will always have to provide for some order in a world where you want to maximize freedom and individual

initiative. There have to be some limits beyond which we collectively do not wish to see our country go and our world go.

I know you had Congressman Davis and Governor Gilmore here today. The White House, as all of you know, is quite close to the Potomac River. Right across the river in Virginia -- I used to run down there every day and just be amazed -- in the Fairfax County School District there are children from 180 different racial, ethnic and national groups. They speak about 100 different languages as their first language. It is the most diverse of all American school districts; but what they represent is happening everywhere.

I went home a couple of weeks ago to the little town in Arkansas where I was born. There are about 9,700 people there now. It's a lot bigger than it was when I was born there. And there is a little grade school in this little town in southwest Arkansas named for me -- which I appreciate; usually you have to die before they do that. (Laughter.) And, anyway, in this little grade school in my little hometown there are 27 immigrant children, first generation immigrant children whose parents, by and large, were migrant farm workers who settled there.

This is an incredible asset for America. But we have to say to people, whatever your national background, whatever your racial background, whatever your religious convictions, you can have a home here in this country and you ought to be safe in

the world if you are willing to abide by the norms of civilized conduct everywhere. We must not allow, if we have the ability to stop it, ethnic cleansing or genocide anywhere we can stop it -- particularly at the edge of Europe.

So I ask you to support our men and women in uniform, but to support the proposition that the 21st century world will be a case of, yes, there will be a lot more decentralization, there will be a lot more individual empowerment, but it will not be a time of chaos and madness. We will not let it descend into the vision of the darkest of the science fiction writers, because we believe our common humanity is better than that. Thank you. (Applause.)

Now, I want to say what I came to say. (Laughter.) But it relates to what I just said. I believe in the Information Age the role of government is to empower people with the tools to make the most of their own lives, to tear down the barriers to that objective, and to create the conditions within which we can go forward together.

Now, the answers to all the questions will not always be easy. But at least I want you to know that's how I think about this. I see myself trying to help create the conditions of dynamic balance so we can get the maximum benefit from market economics without giving up the idea of community and without leaving anyone behind who's willing to try to do the right thing.

And I see our environmental policy in the same way. I think we have to take on the challenge of climate change because I'm convinced the science is real; but I believe we can do it in a way that grows the economy, not undermines it. And all the big questions we're facing this year as a country require that sort of decision-making. You don't have to agree with the decision I make, but you ought to ask yourself what is the basis of your decision.

We're dealing with the challenge, for example, of the aging of America. And the older I get, the better I like that challenge. (Laughter.) I've never understood all this hand-wringing about Social Security and Medicare, this is a high-class problem. (Laughter.) Some of you have helped to bring it about. (Laughter.) We're living longer and that's good, isn't it? And there's more medicine, and that's good, isn't it? But as a consequence, you know, the average age in America is 76.7 years.

Anybody in this room over 60 who still doesn't have any life-threatening conditions has probably got a life expectancy well in excess of 80 years already. Any child born in America that's under the age of 15 that's healthy and stays healthy has probably got a life expectancy of about 84. And with the baby boomers retiring, this is an issue we have to deal with.

Now, I'll tell you how I think about this. I believe we should make maximum use of technology, maximum use of modern business organizations and competition. I think that we have to be willing to reform the Medicare system. But I don't believe we should turn the Medicare system into, in effect, a defined contribution, as opposed to a defined benefit plan, because health care is not like retirement -- and it's a life-saver for people.

And I'm willing to work with Congress to save it. And we'll have some philosophical differences, but I'm trying to achieve a dynamic balance of maximizing the change while maximizing the sense of community and the fact that it's a life-saver for so many people.

Social Security we're going to have an interesting debate. By 2030 we'll only have two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. Now, by 2034, 35 years from now, the Social Security system is projected to run out of money, the trust fund, which means you only have three choices: you can raise revenues, reduce benefits or increase the rate of return on what we're investing.

And there are a lot of people who believe that we should, in effect, take this surplus and give it back to the American people as mandatory individual retirement accounts; let them invest it in the stock market because the stock market

always out-performs the government bonds over any long period of time. And if you happen to be one of those unfortunate people who retire in a period like we had between -- in the 1960s and early '70s, where the value of the stock market is going down, then the government would make up the difference between what you would have gotten under the old Social Security program and what you, in fact, get.

The other way to do it is to do what Canada does, which is set up an independent board, like the Federal Reserve, and let the whole trust fund earn money. And then you'll know you'll always be able to have uniform, but higher, returns for people.

None of us want -- no Republican or Democrat I've talked to believes we should raise payroll taxes, because the tax is regressive, more than half the working people in the country already pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes; and small businesses just getting started would have to pay that, whether they make money or not -- unlike the income tax. So we don't believe that's an acceptable thing.

So when you hear this debate, think of the dynamic balance, think of how you can maximize the market forces that are good and still preserve a sense of community -- and maybe even improve it. For example, I want to lift the earnings limitations because people are living longer, and I think once you earn Social Security you ought to be able to work. I want to do something about single women, because the poverty rate among

elderly single women, if they're living alone, is about twice the poverty rate for other seniors in our country. That's the framework in which I hope this debate will play itself out and get resolved this year.

The last issue I'll tell you is that I firmly believe we ought to deal with Social Security and Medicare in a way that maximizes the amount of the surplus we use over the next 15 years to buy down the public debt.

Now, that is much less popular than the alternative proposal by the congressional majority, which is to give most of the surplus away right now in a tax cut. It's your money anyway, they say, and of course, it is. It is your money anyway. But keep in mind, our country quadrupled the national debt between 1981 and 1993. And in an uncertain economic climate in the rest of the world, with all the financial troubles you've seen in Asia, it seems to me to be given a chance to pay down our debt to the lowest level we had since before World War I is better for most of you than a short-term impact of a tax cut.

Why? Because it will give us lower interest rates, lower inflation; it will lower interest rates for countries that have to borrow money that you want to sell your products to; it will maximize growth; it will, therefore, maximize income and job-generating potential in America. And to me, the benefits of having an America that could be out of debt in 17 years is quite

staggering. Because we might have to borrow money ourselves someday, again, and we don't ever want to do -- ever get back to the way we were when we were having to borrow money just to pay the bills.

Most of your companies have borrowed a lot of money, but presumably, you didn't do it very often just to make payroll. And that is what we -- that's the decision we've been given the opportunity to deal with. So it seems to me that's the right decision to do.

And I think that -- when I look at our technology policy, I think about that. I think about how can we have the dynamic balance, how can we maximize this -- this is almost 100 percent positive good. And if there is something that has to be done to limit it in any way, shape, or form, how can we minimize the damage to the economy and to the rapid spread of opportunity.

Now, that's what we've tried to do for six years, and it's worked pretty well. So we cut the deficit and balanced the budget, but almost doubled investment in education and training.

I believe very strongly that we have to continue to expand trade. That's another issue. Most of you support that position. Most of you believe the President should be given fast track authority. (Applause.) And most of you believe if we can get an agreement with China that is good for the American economy, we should extend the opportunity to them to join the

World Trade Organization. (Applause.)

But I ask you to think about how are we going to get this passed in a Congress where there are some people who are afraid of trade and some people who are basically -- they're afraid trade hurts more of the people they represent than it helps -- and others just are afraid trade gives power to countries that they feel will be adversaries of the United States over the long run. Some people feel that about China now, that they're inevitably our adversaries.

I say there has to be a dynamic balance here. We should be trading more. We should be opening our markets more. We should be getting more open markets, but we should make sure we're investing what is necessary here to help people who are dislocated by trade through no fault of their own, and we should support the same thing in other countries.

When we elevate trade, if we increase national income it should lift the incomes of all working people. It should be a race to the top, not a race to the bottom. And when we deal with China, we should recognize that were advantaged when we open China more economically, informationally, culturally; but if we have honest differences with them over political and human rights, we ought to say it. And we ought to encourage them to have their differences with us -- but not in a way that isolates us one from another.

Keep in mind what I said to you about these ethnic wars. There are people who cannot bear to live without somebody to be afraid of or look down on. And there are -- sometimes I have the feeling that we're looking for a new enemy in America. I'm not looking for a new enemy. I didn't pick Mr. Milosevic, for example. His conduct made him the adversary of the United States and people who believe in the inherent dignity of every religious and ethnic group in the world. I did not look for a new enemy. (Applause.)

So I say to you, if you want us to go forward with China, then remind everybody the same debates we're having about China today are being held about the United States in China. I promise you there are people inside the high councils of government who say, those Americans don't want us to amount to a hill of beans. Those Americans want us to be their enemy so they will have a way to increase their defense budget. Those Americans will do everything they can to promote discord in our country; that's why they're all for political and human rights, they want us to purely disintegrate, just like we did once before.

And by the time -- you know, you just keep on talking like that, and there is enough mutual misunderstanding until finally you get the political equivalent of a divorce.

So I say we should be careful. We should evaluate our partners, our friends, our potential adversaries based on the facts at hand. But we should always be working for the best future, even as we prepare for something we might not like. And that's where I think you are.

So I ask you to work with us to help to fashion a fast track bill, for example, that will reflect a new consensus on trade; that will be able to say, we want more trade, but we want to lift people up, and we don't want to tear the environment up. And there is a way to do that. And, yes, we would like to have a good relationship with China that includes a frank, sometimes even uncomfortable airing of our differences, but we recognize that the Chinese people will be better off, and we'll be less likely to have conflict in the 21st century if there is more constructive relationships -- not just commerce, but also culture, education, all kinds of information. And so let's try to build that sort of relationship.

And that again I say, it seems to me you folks are in a unique position to make these arguments because if you take -- while Rich was giving his speech tonight and I was thinking about what his company does in Newark, New Jersey. Now, most of the people there helping in Newark, New Jersey, will never work for Lucent. But it will be a more successful company if everybody is at least literate enough to make a decent living, have a good job, and buy those products. And life will be a lot better if

every inner-city in this country has a set of thriving businesses beyond the drug trade, and where the children feel safe walking on the street, and where the schools are functioning at a high level and people aren't dropping out of school. And so they invest in that -- not because it immediately shows up on the bottom line, but because they have a sense that life is of a whole texture and you have to understand what these relationships are. That's what we have to do as Americans. And that's how we have to look at this.

So let me just mention two or three specific things that I think we should do in your area -- and I ask you for your help. First, we have to work to keep America's lead in science and technology, which means you have to do your part, but we have to do ours. Basic government investment in research and development is important and fulfills a role fundamentally different from that done by most companies.

Tonight I ask you to help us to increase our investments for the seventh straight year in research and development. Our budget provides those kinds of investments that will spur the next generation of information technology, meet the challenge of climate change, find new cures for medical difficulties, explore space, protect our infrastructure against terrorist attacks.

The budget resolution passed by the congressional majority would inevitably lead to big reductions in many of these investments. It is not necessary for us to do this. We can find a way to be fiscally responsible without cutting our R&D investments, and I ask your help in that regard.

Second, I ask you to work with me to maintain the right conditions for entrepreneurship in electronics. Just a few years ago, E-commerce did not exist. In four years, retail trade on the Internet could reach \$100 billion, business-to-business trade above \$1 trillion. Two years ago, the Vice President and I released a framework for seizing the potential of global electronic commerce. We said the Internet should be a free trade zone, with incentives for competition, protection for consumers and children, supervised not by government, but by the people who use the Internet every day. Most of you thought that was a pretty good idea.

Now, in the coming months we've got to fill in the blanks of that nice sounding general statement. I want to work with you to find ways to give consumers the same protection in the virtual mall they now have at the shopping mall -- to enhance the security and privacy of financial transactions on the Internet, an increasingly deep concern of citizens everywhere; and to bring advanced, high-speed connections into homes and small businesses.

I may not know as much about cable modems or T-1 lines as the Vice President -- (laughter) -- "may" is a misleading word there. (Laughter.) But I know what this can do for our children's future.

The third thing I'd like to ask you to do relates to something Dave McCurdy talked about. I want you to help us continue to work to bridge the digital divide. We have to have shared prosperity and leave no one behind. Today, affluent schools still are more likely than disadvantaged ones to have Internet access in the classrooms. And white households are more than twice as likely to own a computer as black or Hispanic ones. The digital divide has begun to narrow, but it won't disappear on its own. We'll have to work at it.

Dave talked about the first NetDay in 1996. Listen to that -- before that day only 8 percent of our classrooms were wired to the Internet. Today, well over half of them are, and we are well on our way to connecting every classroom to the Internet by the end of next year. (Applause.)

I'd like to ask you to do one other thing, as well. A lot of you have had a hard time finding sufficiently trained workers in the United States to do the work you need done. Last year I agreed to increase the number of H-1b visas as an emergency measure. But over the long run, the answer to this

problem of the lack of skilled workers cannot simply be to look beyond our borders -- surely a part of it has to be to better

train people within our borders to do this work. (Applause.)

For many years, your foundation has made this a top priority and many individual firms have, as well. Cisco Systems is now working to establish a networking academy, for example, in every empowerment zone high school that wants one. These academies will provide students with the skills they need to get certified for jobs and information technology. It's like giving a student first-class ticket to a high-skilled, high-wage future. We have to do more of that.

Because you have done so well, I would argue that you have larger responsibilities as citizens than those who have not. And many of you are fulfilling them remarkably.

The last thing I'd like to say is this: You were very kind when I spoke about Kosovo earlier; kind to stand -- maybe just hoping I was through with my speech -- (laughter). I believe there is a hunger for substantive information on the part of our citizens greater than I have ever seen before. And the more you give them ways to get information, the more hungry they feel. But keep in mind, you can sit in front of your television and channel-surf all night long. You can have 50 channels, or 70, or 80 or 90. You may pick up a lot of facts and you may go

to bed bleary-eyed at 3:00 a.m., and the next day your understanding of what it is you have seen or heard might not be any greater.

And so the last thing I would like to say is, with your employees, with those in the community with whom you work, help people to understand that the forces of globalization can be good, but they present challenges that must be met. Help people understand that the forces of decentralization, of the breaking-up of old blocs can be a magnificent story of individual empowerment and democratization, but they, too, present challenges that must be met.

I have done everything I could to fashion a government that could do its part to meet those challenges. It's the smallest government we've had since President Kennedy was here. It has given more power to states and localities. It works more with community groups and churches and social programs. It does a lot of things that need to be done badly, and I'm sure we can do better.

But in the end, there will be these gaps, and someone must be standing in the gap to reaffirm our basic devotion to freedom and democracy, to peace and prosperity, and to the principle that we must be a community -- that out of many we are one; and that we are still about the business of our Founding Fathers, forming a more perfect union.

Thank you and God bless you all. (Applause.)

END

9:00 P.M. EST

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tovah_Ravitz (Tovah_Ravitz@murray.senate.gov (Tovah Ravitz) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-NOV-1999 16:26:05.00

SUBJECT: pi story on Clinton's seattle visit

TO: Barry_Toiv ("Barry_Toiv"@who.eop.gov [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa B. Ratcliff (CN=Melissa B. Ratcliff/O=OVP@OVP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Clinton plans a major policy speech

here

Tuesday, November 9, 1999

By JOEL CONNELLY and MICHAEL PAULSON

SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER REPORTERS

President Clinton will come to Seattle for two days during the upcoming World Trade Organization meeting, delivering a major policy speech and meeting with citizens concerned about the human face of global trade, congressional and Clinton administration sources said yesterday.

Clinton is scheduled to arrive the evening of Nov. 30, the first day of the conference and the day anti-WTO organizers are vowing to put thousands of demonstrators into the streets.

The president will face a dual challenge during his visit.

The WTO will use the Seattle meeting to launch a new round of trade talks, and eleventh-hour negotiations are under way to bring China into the 134-member organization.

But the president also needs to bolster the position of his favored successor, Vice President Al Gore. Gore used a recent Seattle trade luncheon to argue that labor standards and environmental protection "are not second-class issues anymore" and should be on the table at the WTO meeting.

The president will be renewing a commitment to free trade articulated during the 1992 campaign, in which Clinton used a Seattle appearance to say he would fight to remove foreign barriers to U.S. products but would not yield to trade protectionists in the Democratic Party.

Seven years later, the issue of trade remains divisive within the Democratic Party. Two of the party's core constituencies, labor and environmentalists, have been angrily critical of the Clinton administration's handling

of

trade issues and are organizing protests during the WTO meeting.

Divisions within the Democratic Party have led to congressional refusal to grant Clinton fast-track authority for expedited negotiations of trade agreements with other countries, and Clinton has called international trade "the one remaining issue on which we have not forged a consensus within our party."

"We can't go to the American people and say, we have a whole vision for the future that will be a unifying vision until we get over this one last big hump," Clinton told the Democratic Leadership Council last month. "This is an exciting issue, and it is a difficult issue."

Gore will be back in Seattle next Monday, and his schedule will include meetings with labor and environmental leaders, but he will not attend the WTO conference.

"Words are cheap. We want real action to implement core labor standards into trade agreements," Washington State Labor Council President Rick Bender said after hearing Gore speak on his last visit.

The AFL-CIO has since endorsed Gore. But many of the vice president's union and environmentalist supporters are waiting to see if Clinton will deploy his clout on

behalf of their concerns.

"I think he should push hard for more openness in the World Trade Organization. . . . There is a lot of legitimate concern that labor, the environment and human rights don't get the attention they deserve," said former Gov. Mike Lowry, a free trade advocate who also is close to labor and environmental activists.

Linda Lanham, political director for the Boeing Machinists, added: "We're not anti-WTO. . . . What we want is to elevate core labor, environmental and human rights standards." Such core standards include freedom to organize unions, a prohibition of forced labor, and a minimum wage for work."

Despite criticism of U.S. trade policy from the streets of Seattle to the halls of Congress, strong pro-free trade views have been voiced by almost all of the Republican and Democratic presidential candidates who have visited the state.

In recent presidential elections, only two significant candidates have questioned the wisdom of U.S. trade policy -- Texas billionaire Ross Perot and conservative commentator Pat Buchanan. Perot had the most success with his first presidential bid in 1992, when he

successfully tapped into a vein of economic dissatisfaction by railing against the North American Free Trade Agreement and predicting a "giant sucking sound" of jobs heading south for Mexico.

Buchanan, who ran as a Republican in 1996, has switched to a bid for the Reform Party nomination. He appeared earlier this year at the Port of Seattle to dramatize the United States' \$58 billion trade deficit with China.

Buchanan argued that China was "not remotely qualified" to join the WTO, and decried U.S. trade negotiators as "too weak and wimpish" for not demanding complete access to Chinese markets as a trade-off for China's continuing to sell its products here.

But even the Reform Party's criticism of free trade has come under challenge. New York developer Donald Trump, who is considering running for the party's presidential nomination, is an unabashed free trader who has said he would appoint himself as U.S. trade representative.

The Democratic Leadership Council, which is the ideologically centrist wing of the party with which Clinton is closely associated, has made trade policy its major

concern, and is trying to forge a new relationship between business and labor in support of trade.

Even within the labor movement, trade has become deeply divisive. The Teamsters union, its members upset about the potential effect of the North American Free Trade Agreement on truckers, refused to join the AFL-CIO in endorsing Gore. The union squeezed a more conciliatory policy on cross-border trucking out of Bradley, and is now in a dispute with AFL-CIO President John Sweeney over support for the Clinton administration's position on trade.

Sweeney recently signed a letter expressing "broad support" for the administration's position on trade, which includes a push to have the World Trade Organization establish a working group on trade and labor. Both the Teamsters and the United Auto Workers have criticized Sweeney, arguing that the Clinton administration hasn't gone far enough.

"Core industrial jobs, good-paying middle class jobs, are leaving this country in droves due to a number of trade practices," said Teamsters spokesman Bret Caldwell.

The Clinton administration contends that union officials are blaming trade for jobs that are really lost because of

technology, and that the number of jobs created in this country by a booming economy over the last several years far outweighs the number of jobs lost for any reason.

Whatever the size of Seattle's anti-WTO protests, most experts believe trade will not play a big role in how voters ultimately cast their ballots. That is in part

because

economic issues are low on voter priority lists in times like these when the economy is strong, in part because trade issues are complicated, and in part because all the major candidates espouse similar positions on trade policy.

"The major candidates out there -- Gore, Bradley, Bush and McCain -- they're all essentially centrists, supporting a position on trade that big business supports and that generally even labor supports except when it impacts them quite narrowly," said Douglas Schuler, a management professor at Rice University who studies international trade policy and poli

tics.

Because the issue is complicated for Democrats, Gore in particular has gone out of his way to voice his concern

for labor and environmental issues.

Supporters expect Gore to be their advocate.

"He doesn't just have to be the loyal vice president," said Bill Arthur, director of the Sierra Club's Northwest office.

But James Thurber, director of the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies at American University in Washington, D.C., predicted that the WTO and trade will not be "hot issues in this campaign."

"Environmentalists and labor are trying to push the candidates, and this president, to be more moderate, and to take care with respect to the health and safety of workers and environmental protections, but it's not a national movement that catches people," Thurber said.

In 1992, when Perot had some success with the trade issue, the economy was thought to be in recession; this year's strong economic growth makes trade a less important issue.

Here is what presidential candidates have said about trade, and China's admission to the World Trade Organization, during Pacific Northwest visits:

Vice President Al Gore (Democrat): "With 96 percent of the world's consumers outside our borders, it should be obvious that fair trade offers the greatest opportunities.

"We have to make sure in trade that labor standards and environmental protection are not second-class issues anymore."

Former Sen. Bill Bradley (Democrat): "China should be allowed to join the WTO with no special favors. . . . The more China opens up, the more it ultimately liberalizes. You now see a higher level of political freedom in China than ever before."

Patrick Buchanan (Reform): "The transnational corporations, which are entirely correct calling themselves that, have a right to make their case and defend their interests. But when they shut down factories, lay off American employees, kill jobs -- and make their parts in China -- it is the duty of the

American

president to look after American workers, not Mr. Condit and his executives."

(The reference was to Boeing Chairman Phil Condit.)

Steve Forbes (Republican): "This administration wants to think there are only two options on trade, appeasement or a new Cold War. With China, we will trade but there should be rules of engagement. We are going to stay in Asia, and not be run out. We will hold them not to use force against Taiwan. We will be critical of them on human rights, because that is part of our heritage.

"If China wants to sell nuclear technology to rogue states such as North Korea, a price must be paid. I would suggest that we apply sanctions against exports by companies owned by the Peoples Liberation Army."

George W. Bush (Republican): "We will be prosperous if we are bold enough to embrace free trade. Only the fearful build walls.

"I think China should be admitted to the WTO . . . so that we can gain access to Chinese markets. I know it is to our advantage to establish an entrepreneurial class, an educated class, in China."

Sen. John McCain (Republican): "I prefer to live in a hopeful country, and an open trade policy is part of that. . . . I am disturbed by this xenophobia toward China.

We must stand by our friends on Taiwan. We must protect our security interests. But trade is the key element in opening up and changing that society."

P-I reporter Joel Connelly can be reached at 206-448-8160 or joelconnelly@seattle-pi.com

P-I reporter Michael Paulson can be reached at 202-943-9229 or michaelpaulson@seattle-pi.com

Safeco Field
construction
scrutinized

I-695 fallout

hits

credit

prospects for

cities

Clinton plans a
major policy

speech

here

of Agencies knew
faculty part-time

inequities

alert Hospitals on

for an attack

by

chemical

weapons

Global warming

could bring us

wetter winters

awaits Hat 'N Boots

brighter future

young Goodbye to a

man with a

boyish

smile

FBI report

blames a

city attorney

for

file

blunder

What will we

take

for a used bus

tunnel? asks

county

Bothell

principal

defends

drinking

punishment

Gates gift at

heart

of

library dispute

Tables turned

on

license plate

cheats

Lend a helping

hand

to those left

out of

prosperity

Northwest

Briefing