

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Nicholas Burns to Rose Gottemoeller and Jessica Stern. Subject: RE: [DOE Prepared to Provide Briefings] (1 page)	11/16/1994	P1/b(1)
002. email	Nicholas Burns to Calvin Mitchell, Thomas Ross, Tara Shoenshine et al. Subject: [Confidential] (1 page)	11/16/1994	P1/b(1)
003. email	John Lennon to Morton Halperin. Subject: Broadcasting Governors [partial] [non-selection] (1 page)	12/22/1994	b(6)
004. email	Michael Froman and Robert Malley. Subject: RE: [Confidential] (1 page)	01/18/1995	P1/b(1)
005. email	Mark Parris to Jane Baker, Kristen Cicio, Melanie Darby et al. Subject: New (Pseudo) Inquiry. (1 page)	04/03/1995	P1/b(1)
006. email	Stanley Roth to Jane Baker, Peter Bass, Kristen Cicio et al. Subject: Asia Miscellaneous. (3 pages)	07/17/1995	P1/b(1)
007. email	Ardenia Hawkins to Susan Rice. Subject: RE: [Malawian Tobacco] (2 pages)	07/19/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/16/1994-09/27/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5595

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Nicholas Burns to Rose Gottemoeller and Jessica Stern. Subject: RE: [DOE Prepared to Provide Briefings] (1 page)	11/16/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/16/1994-09/27/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5595

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Nicholas Burns to Calvin Mitchell, Thomas Ross, Tara Shoenshine et al. Subject: [Confidential] (1 page)	11/16/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/16/1994-09/27/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5595

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 22 November 94 19:27

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

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

SUBJECT Press Conference: President Clinton and President Kuchma

TO

Alexander, Anne D.
Anderson, Marjorie
Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Aoki, Steven N.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Arnold, Gary W.
Atkin, Timothy J.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Battenfield, Pat
Beers, Rand R.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
Blakeman, Earle C.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Bradley, Amelia J.
Branscum, Larry
Breeland, Jocelyn G
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Barton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Burns, Nicholas R.
Buzalko, Russ
Kevin J. Cadieux
Campbell, Kurt M.
Chyba, Christopher F.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Claussen, Eileen B.

Clements, William L.
Cleveland, Carolyn E.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darby, Melanie B.
Darragh, Sean J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Emery, Mary C.
Evans, Paul A.
Fauver, Robert E.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Forsythe, Rosemarie C.
Fried, Daniel
Froman, Michael B.
Funches, Christina L.
Gardner, Anthony
Gates, Brian K.
Genton, Regina A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gottemoeller, Rose E.
Gray, Wendy
Greer, Roy A.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Hahn, Keith D.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Hammond, Cathy J.
Hammonds, Lisa W.
Harris, Elisa D.
Haskell, Jennifer
Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Herrington, David E.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hodgson, Georgeann M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.

Indyk, Martin S.
Itoh, William H.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lebourgeois, Julien D.
Lindsey, Wanda
Longoria, Michael A.
Lowry, Jay E.
Mack, Kathryn S.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Martinez, Alejandro
Mathiowetz, Nancy
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McGeath, Timothy A.
McIlhany, Jesika A.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Mislock, Raymond A.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Murphy, Miles R.
Neil, M. Elise
Nelson, Patricia D.
Niemerski, Stephen
Niemerski, Matthew B.
Norman, Marcia G.
O'Loughlin, Katherine
Owen, Elisa J.
Pahlke, Helen
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Pitman, James

Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Punke, Michael W.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Jim Reed
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
Rossin, Larry
Ross, Thomas B.
Roth, Stanley O.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Schifter, Richard
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Seeley, Charlotte P.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sherman, David J.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Sonenshine, Tara D.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Steinberg, Donald K.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarantino, Frederick A.
Tenet, George J.
Teraji, Barbara
Cathryn, Thorup L.
Turner, Joe T.
Turner, Veronica B.
Unrue, Michael M.
VanDam, Stacy L.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Von Hippel, Frank N.

Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Wallack, Matthew D.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Whyman, William E.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, Jeffrey B.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Wolin, Neal S.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

ICON below contains transcript of the Press Conference today (November 22) with President Clinton and President Kuchma of Ukraine.

[[KUCHMA.DOC : 4936 in KUCHMA.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

22 November 94 19:26

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

KUCHMA.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release November 22, 1994

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT CLINTON
AND PRESIDENT KUCHMA OF UKRAINE
IN PRESS AVAILABILITY

Room 450, Old Executive Office
Building

4:56 P.M. EST

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Good afternoon. President Kuchma and I had an excellent set of meetings today, and I have very much enjoyed getting to know him. The work we have done follows on the successful meetings in Kiev between President Kuchma and Vice President Gore. It has strengthened the friendship between our two nations that was already on a very firm basis.

Since his election just five months ago, President Kuchma has bravely and squarely confronted the two greatest challenges facing Ukraine: economic reform and the nuclear question. He has taken hard, practical steps, required to secure a more peaceful and prosperous future for his people. I applaud his leadership and the leadership of the Ukrainian Parliament in acceding last week to the Nonproliferation Treaty.

Ukraine's move is a major step toward ensuring that nuclear missiles never again will be targeted at the children of our nations. I told President Kuchma that the United States will continue to work with Ukraine to dismantle completely its nuclear arsenal. Three hundred and fifty million dollars of our total \$900-million two-year aid package is targeted toward that goal, and there could be no better use of the funds.

In addition, Ukraine's decision will permit the United States, Russia and the United Kingdom to extend formal security assurances to Ukraine. It will allow the START I Treaty to be brought into force, enabling the process of nuclear weapons reductions to move forward. It will permit us to strengthen our military relations with Ukraine. It will open up Ukraine to a new range of business and technological opportunities. In addition, we pledge to help defray some of the costs for participation by Ukraine in the Partnership for Peace.

On economic issues, the President and I discussed the

far-reaching reforms he has initiated. These reforms put Ukraine on the right path, toward a future of increasing prosperity and economic integration with the Western market economies.

At this moment in our history, we have an extraordinary opportunity to improve the lives of all of our people by working more closely together and trading together more. Ukraine's reform program can speed this development, and I have pledged to support it to the fullest of our ability to do so. In 1994 and '95, our economic assistance of \$550 million, including balance of payment support, will be speedily delivered to help to stabilize the economy. Our new U.S.-Ukraine Enterprise Fund will soon start making loans to new small businesses. We'll continue our work

together in aerospace and high tech.

As Ukraine's economy continues to improve, the opportunities for both our countries will multiply. The IMF and the World Bank are also working hard to make sure these reforms bear fruit, and Russia and Turkmenistan have given badly-needed help. I'll continue to press our G-7 partners, especially the European Union and Japan, to do more to contribute to this effort.

President Kuchma and I discussed other issues, including the nuclear power complex at Chernobyl. The G-7 nations and Ukraine have a common interest in agreeing on a plan to improve the safety and the efficiency in the Ukraine energy sector and in closing down the Chernobyl plants.

We've worked hard today. And the agreements we've reached promise to help deliver concrete results: increased security, increased prosperity for Ukrainians and Americans. Our relations continue to grow stronger as they have since Ukrainian independence just three years ago. Our friendship will grow because our futures are intertwined.

I'd now like to turn the microphone over to President Kuchma for his remarks, and then we'll answer your questions, beginning with an American journalist, alternating with Ukrainian journalists.

Mr. President.

PRESIDENT KUCHMA: Thank you very much, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen. President Clinton and I have just signed very important documents -- the Charter of Ukrainian American Partnership, Friendship and Cooperation; and also, the Agreement on Cooperation on Space Research for Peaceful Purposes.

We also signed several bilateral, accords on the ministerial level.

Thus, by joint effort, both countries have made another concrete step toward solidifying the legal basis of relations between the United States and Ukraine and enriching the

relationship of democratic partnership with practical content.

The signing of these documents has become possible due to a constructive and purposeful effort of politicians, diplomats and experts in both countries. It is noteworthy that the charter signed today removed the last barriers which, to an extent, held back the development of Ukrainian-American relations in a very first and extremely important stage of their formation. We can now

say that we have not simply signed several bilateral documents, but opened the way to a full-fledged cooperation in the political, economic, humanitarian and other areas in the interests of both nations. That was the main purpose of my state visit to the United States.

The current Ukrainian-American summit, the talks we had today, which can be characterized with a spirit of a constructive, businesslike and mutual interest in reaching practical results. And I'm very thankful to the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, and Vice President Al Gore. Thus, we are the participants and witnesses of a process where our relations are being formed step by step and cooperation is being enriched. Such are respective, to our extent, in the development of relations and in the interest of both nations.

Ahead of us lies practical work to realize. The reached signed accords, without such implementation, we will not be able to move ahead to a stronger bilateral cooperation. I would like to assure you, Mr. President, that Ukraine will fulfill its pledges and is ready for a further active cooperation. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, I'd like to ask you about some recent comments by Senator Jesse Helms. Last week, he said that you weren't fit to be Commander In Chief, and then yesterday he said that you better have a bodyguard if you ever come to North Carolina. But I wonder -- what's your reaction to his remarks, and if you feel comfortable with him being chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that's going to oversee your foreign policy?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: I think the remarks were unwise and inappropriate. The President oversees the foreign policy of the United States, and the Republicans will decide in whom they will repose their trust and confidence. That's a decision for them to make, not for me.

Mr. President.

Q President Clinton, first for all, for you a question. Will American policy change in Budapest in December towards expansion of NATO to the Eastern Europe? And would you mention Ukraine as a NATO member without Russia -- and, President Kuchma, would you imagine Ukraine being a member of NATO, not now, but in a couple of years?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: First, let me say that I believe we

will have discussions in Budapest about how we might go about expanding NATO, but not about when and which particular countries

would be let in; I think that is premature. Secondly, as I have said all along, I am working hard for the prospect of an integrated Europe. I have encouraged it economically; I have encouraged it politically; I have encouraged it in terms of security. Therefore, I would not say or do anything that would exclude the possibility of Ukrainian membership. That would be up to Ukraine, and it will be up to all of us, working together, to try to determine what is the best way to promote the security of what I hope and believe can be a united Europe, something that has never before occurred, I might add, in the whole history of nation states on the European continent. We have an historic opportunity, and we ought to do everything we can to seize it.

PRESIDENT KUCHMA: I would like to make my comment. I would like to say that I do agree with President Clinton. The security on the European continent is a very important issue, and it shouldn't be solved by the revolutionary way, but rather by the evolutionary method.

It is not important who enters where, but it is very important that we do not have a new Berlin Wall in Europe. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, since the election returns, the Republicans have played hardball, and they have threatened legislative reprisals against your agenda, and also have tried to force tradeoffs on GATT. What are you going to do about it?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, first, let me answer the GATT question. I am encouraged by the progress that we have made in working with Senator Dole on the substantive issues surrounding GATT. And I appreciate the very constructive attitude that has prevailed there. I disagree that there should be some deal cut regarding capital gains; I don't think that's the right thing to do. This is an important agreement on its own merits. Everyone concedes it will lead to hundreds of thousands of jobs.

In the wake of the election, let me say that one of the things that has been discovered again is something that I began talking about several years ago, long before I ever thought of running for president, and that is the declining wages of many of our working people. It's not surprising that a lot of people aren't a lot happier even when we add millions of jobs if all of the people who were working in the first place think they're never going to get a raise and don't think their jobs are more secure.

Many Americans think that trade causes that; that was one of the fights over NAFTA, if you'll remember. My argument is that we have an open trading system here, so we already get whatever down side there is to trade. We know when we create jobs related

to trade, they pay on average 13 percent higher than average jobs. So my argument for the GATT is that it will raise incomes of

American workers. And I think that is our most urgent economic job -- not just to create jobs and to keep low inflation and high investment, but also to pursue whatever strategies are available to us to raise incomes. So I think we should pursue the GATT vigorously, I think it's in the interest of the American working people, I hope it will prevail.

As to these other issues, again I will say there are a lot of areas where we can work together with the Republicans. We can finish the battle that this administration began with the last Congress to change what I would call "yesterday's government." We have begun the downsizing of the government, we have begun the deregulation that we need to do. We know there is much more that can be done.

We still have an enormous amount to do in the area of political reform that surely we can agree on -- the line-item veto, campaign finance reform, lobby reform, applying the laws to Congress that they apply to the private sector -- the Kempthorne-Glenn bill on mandates, which I strongly endorsed and worked on, which was caught up in all the delays in the last session to reduce mandates on state governments, giving the state and localities more flexibility in many areas. A lot of the things we can work on.

I do not believe the American people want the next Congress to repeal the things which benefitted ordinary Americans. I don't think they want to repeal Family Leave, or the Brady Bill, or the assault weapons ban or any of those substantive achievements, and I will resist that.

Q Are you surprised at the vengeful attitude?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, let me say, you characterize it in that way. I can only tell you that my job is to stand up for the interests of ordinary Americans; that's what I will do. I will do my very best to work with them, where we can work together. There are opportunities in the area of governmental reform where their contract and their agenda overlaps with mine. I will do my best to resist exploding the government deficit, sinking the economic recovery or repealing the gains that working people made in the last session of Congress.

Q Mr. President, you said that you have made another step in the development of relations. What would be the realization of that step? How do you visualize it? And in this long-term perspective in the nuclear disarmament -- the United

States can help Ukraine?

PRESIDENT KUCHMA: I'm very glad that you are asking about the future, but I would like the current agreements between the Ukraine and the United States be realized, first of all. Then we will think about the future in long perspective. Currently, we have agreed on some things which provide very longstanding

perspective for -- (TRANSLATOR INTERRUPTION.)

PRESIDENT CLINTON: If I could just answer that question briefly, it is a measure of the importance that we attach to Ukraine and to its impact on the entire future of Europe well into the next century that in this two-year period, a very difficult budget situation in America, where we are trying to bring our deficit down, and where we are cutting overall spending, Ukraine is the fourth largest recipient of American foreign assistance in the entire world because we think it is so important to complete the work of denuclearization, but also because we think your long-term economic development, your commitment to democracy and to an open economy is so important that we want to be there over the long run.

So, I agree with the President. We have to do what we are already agreeing to do. But there will be much more in the years ahead. As your country continues to grow and flourish, there will be much more.

Q Mr. President, there seems to be still some confusion over your position on the constitutional amendment involving prayer in public schools. And today there's some confusion resulting from Secretary Reich's comments, a proposal that he floated that \$111 billion could be cut in subsidies for big corporations as part of your new budget over five years. Your Commerce Secretary says he doesn't know anything about that. What exactly is your position on that proposal and on prayer in public schools?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Let me answer the second question first, because I think we can dispose of it rather quickly. I have not reviewed the specifics of Secretary Reich's proposal. As I understand it, he was speaking to the Democratic Leadership Council group today and they have what they call a "cut and invest" theory which calls for a complex of further budget cuts phasing out various tax subsidies and then using that money to finance the middle class tax cut as well as further investments in education. Conceptually, it's an attractive idea. I have to have time to review the details in the context of our budget. I have made absolutely no decision about any of the specifics in Secretary Reich's proposal.

Now, with regard to the school prayer amendment, let me make a few general comments first of all. I want to make it absolutely clear that this is not a political issue with me; it never has been, and it never will be. Secondly, I have a very long record on this issue. I have been coming to grips with it for at least a decade.

The comments I made in Indonesia, I'm afraid -- and those of you who were there with me know we had been on a rather rigorous trip schedule for the last few weeks -- may have been overread. I made a generalized commitment after the election in the press

conference that I had and also to all of our people that we would read and review, or listen to, any proposals the Republicans might have before condemning them. We ought to at least listen and we ought to look for ways to work together.

My position on the prayer issue is, I have always supported a moment of silence when I was a Governor; I supported the moment of silence legislation. I do not believe we should have a constitutional amendment to carve out and legalize teacher- or student-led prayer in the classroom. I think that is inherently coercive in a nation with the amount of religious diversity we have in this country. I think that would be an error.

As I understand it, that is what is being proposed by the Republican Congressman from Oklahoma and I would be opposed to that. I don't believe that -- I think the very nature of the circumstances mean that, for large numbers of our children, it could not be truly voluntary, and I would oppose it.

Q Can we say that after the negotiations that Ukraine and the United States are establishing a partnership relationship? If not, is there a possibility of establishing such relations in the future? Some people in Ukraine believe that the memorandum in Budapest would not be signed; and, if it is signed, it would be a political declaration, rather than a binding document.

PRESIDENT KUCHMA: The business-like talks that we had today with President of the United States Bill Clinton, do they give me hope that -- the talks give me the hope and understanding that it would be exactly what we meant. I would like to add that in my opinion, from all points of view, for the United States, for Russia and for the entire international community -- a stable democratic Ukraine is a big plus. And that's where we must proceed in our outlook on the relationship. (Applause.)

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 5:17 P.M. EST

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 01 December 94 09:58
FROM Bell, Robert G.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreasen, Steven P.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Thanks.

From: Andreasen, Steven P.
To: Bell, Robert G.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED] START I Vote Count
Date: Thursday, December 01, 1994 09:55 AM

START I was approved by the Senate on October 1, 1992, by a vote of 93-6.
Voting against were:

Larry Craig (R-Idaho)
Jesse Helms (R-NC)
Ernest Hollings (D-SC)
Robert Smith (R-NH)
Steve Symms (R-Idaho)
Malcolm Wallop (R-W)

Not voting: Albert Gore (on the campaign trail).

ACDA is also sending over a complete START II package.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	John Lennon to Morton Halperin. Subject: Broadcasting Governors [partial] [non-selection] (1 page)	12/22/1994	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/16/1994-09/27/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5595

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 22 December 94 15:54
FROM Lennon, John E
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED] Broadcasting Governors
TO Halperin, Morton H.
CARBON_COPY Cooper, Kathleen H.
TEXT_BODY

WH Personnel informs that Biden threatened to hold up the nominations until (b)(6) was put on the slate, but the WH decided to go ahead with them anyway. Then Biden went to Helms and complained, and Helms called the WH to say that if Joe Biden is unhappy, so is Jesse Helms -- and the latter would hold up the nominations unless the switch was made. So... the switch was made, and (b)(6) has fallen out; Personnel is negotiating with her on other opportunities -- including a position as delegate to the International Women's Conference. Craig Smith says the Board nominees are likely to go up to the Hill in February.

[003]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. email	Michael Froman and Robert Malley. Subject: RE: [Confidential] (1 page)	01/18/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/16/1994-09/27/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5595

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 08 February 95 19:34
FROM Andricos, George M.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Beers, Rand R.
CARBON_COPY Andricos, George M.
Danvers, William C.
Funches, Christina L.

TEXT_BODY

Raandy

This is the real thing.

[[RANDY.DOC : 4928 in RANDY.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

8 February 95 19:32

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

RANDY.DOC

Legislative Considerations

Congress generally exercises oversight of counter narcotics programs through three major committees in each House. In the Senate, policy oversight is exercised principally by the Senate Foreign Relations and Judiciary Committees. Funding issues are principally shared by the CJS and Foreign Operations Appropriations subcommittees. In the House the Government Reform and Oversight Committee (rather than the House Judiciary Committee) shares policy jurisdiction with the International Relations Committee. CJS and Foreign Operations subcommittees are the principal players, as in the Senate, on funding issues.

The Armed Services Committees have played a less direct role in narcotics issues except where they look at readiness issues and legal questions raised by military participation in counter narcotics programs

In the Senate Jesse Helms has had an active, personal interest in the narcotics situation in Panama and Mexico. In the past, narcotics issues in the SFRC have been handled by John Kerry's

subcommittee on Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations but in the 104th Congress jurisdiction is expected to shift to the regional subcommittees in the case of the Andean countries, the subcommittee on Western Hemisphere and Peace Corps Affairs, chaired by Paul Coverdell, Chris Dodd is ranking. In the Senate Judiciary Committee, both Orrin Hatch and Joe Biden have been active, especially in exercising direct oversight over the ONDCP. Jon Kyl is expected to continue to have a strong interest in the effects of counter narcotics programs on his border state. With regard to funding issues, the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Subcommittee (Gramm chairs, Hollings is ranking) will oversee broad program funding as relates to State's Office of International Narcotics Matters and the Foreign Operations subcommittee (McConnell chair, Leahy ranking) will look at country specific program funding.

In the House, the National Security subcommittee (Bill Zellif, chair, Karen Thurman, ranking) of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee will exercise overall program jurisdiction with the House International Relations Committee looking to regional subcommittees to oversee all issues affecting their respective countries with the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere (Dan Burton chair, Bob Torricelli ranking) dealing with the Andean countries. As with Sen. Helms in the SFRC, HIRC Chairman Ben Gilman has had an active interest in counter narcotics issues with specific focus on Columbia. Funding issues, as in the Senate, will be managed by the CJS subcommittee (Rogers chair, Mollohan ranking) and Foreign Operations (Callahan chair, Wilson, ranking). Full Appropriations Committee ranking member, Dave Obey has long questioned the usefulness of funding counter narcotics programs, especially in the Andean countries, calling it "feel good" funding, because in his view all it's good for is making us feel as if we're doing something.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 10 February 95 17:10
FROM Indyk, Martin S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Arab-AMericans [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Kreczko, Alan J.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Alan,

Attached is my proposed answer to Helms' question.

Please let me have your comments asap.

Many thanks,

Martin

[[HELMSQA.DOC : 4434 in HELMSQA.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 10 February 95 17:8

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** HELMSQA.DOC

Senator Jesse Helms Question #2

2. Have you met with representatives of CAIR, the Council on American Islamic Relations? Were any other U.S. government officials present? Was there any attempt to vet the backgrounds of the individuals with whom you met, or were you aware whether any have been involved with any terrorist organizations? Is there a memorandum of conversation or any record of the meeting (if any) held?

As part of my responsibilities I have met, from time to time, with representatives of the Arab-American community. These meetings are usually set up by Khalil Jahshan of the National Association of Arab Americans(NAAA) or James Zogby of the Arab-American Institute (AAI) who bring in representatives of Arab American organizations. NAAA and AAI are reputable organizations and we do not normally vet the people that they bring in.

On November 4, 1994, at the request of the NAAA, Alan Kreczko (the NSC Legal Adviser) and I met in my office with a group of Arab-Americans brought in by the NAAA. The delegation consisted of Khalil Jahshan(NAAA), Abdurahman Alamoudi (American Muslim Council), and Nehad A. Hammad (Council of American-Islamic Relations). Mr Jahshan and Mr Alamoudi had attended previous meetings. I had never met Mr Hammad before, nor heard of his organization. I was certainly not aware that any one of them might have been involved with a terrorist organization.

The summary of the meeting is attached.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 February 95 10:53
FROM Maxfield, Nancy H.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Report to Congress on Cyprus [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andricos, George M.
Baker, James E.
Danvers, William C.
Funches, Christina L.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Koff, Alexander
Kreczko, Alan J.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Attached is the latest Report to Congress on Cyprus. Would you please send me your concurrence or changes by e-mail and I will incorporate into the final package. Many thanks.

[[1301PRE.DOC : 2569 in 1301PRE.DOC]][[1301RPT.DOC : 2570 in 1301RPT.DOC]][[1301NG.DOC : 2571 in 1301NG.DOC]][[1301JH.DOC : 2572 in 1301JH.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 18 February 95 12:42

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 1301PRE.DOC

1301

cc: Vice President

Chief of Staff

CLASSIFICATION
LOG NUMBER
CLASSIFICATION
cc: Vice President
Declassify on: OADR
Chief of Staff

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

**FROM: ANTHONY LAKE
PATRICK GRIFFIN**

SUBJECT: Report to Congress on Cyprus

Purpose

To forward the bi-monthly Presidential Report to the Congress on Cyprus.

Background

In accordance with the International Security Assistance Act of 1978, the Department of State submitted a draft Presidential Report on Cyprus for your approval and transmittal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The law requires that, every 60 days, you submit a report on progress made during the period toward "the conclusion of a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem," including any relevant reports prepared by the UN Secretary General for the Security Council. The previous report covered progress through November 30, 1994. The current report covers December 1, 1994 through January 31, 1995.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the message to the Congress at Tab A.

**Attachment
Tab A Report to Congress**

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

21 February 95 10:46

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

1301RPT.DOC

PRESIDENT'S BI-MONTHLY REPORT ON CYPRUS

Efforts to find common ground for the resumption of intercommunal talks on the confidence-building measures (CBMs) and an overall settlement continued throughout the period November 30, 1994, through January 31, 1995. In numerous in-depth discussions, Ambassador Boucher and senior U.S. visitors urged both sides to take a comprehensive approach to achieving a solution based on proposals put forth by the parties themselves.

UN Secretary General (SYG) Boutros-Ghali issued his report on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus on December 12, 1994. He stated that during the June-December period covered by his report, the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) continued to carry out its functions effectively. He further stated that with the cooperation of both sides, the situation remained generally quiet. The Secretary General stressed however, that the continuing quiet should not obscure the fact that there is only a cease-fire in Cyprus, not a peace. He expressed serious concern over the excessive level of armaments and forces throughout the island. The SYG also expressed regret that the Security Council's call for a reduction of defense spending in the Republic of Cyprus and a reduction in the number of foreign troops on the island has not been heeded. Mr. Boutros-Ghali concluded that in the prevailing circumstances, UNFICYP's presence on the island remains indispensable to achieving the objectives set by the Security Council. He therefore recommended that UNFICYP's mandate be extended through June 30, 1995.

Special Cyprus Coordinator James Williams traveled to London, Bonn, Paris, Brussels, and Rome December 16 to December 20. He met with officials of the Foreign Ministries in the capitals, as well as with officials of the European Union Secretariat in Brussels. Discussion centered on how to advance the intercommunal negotiation process in light of the Republic of Cyprus' application for European Union membership. While in Brussels, Mr. Williams met with Alecos Michaelides, Foreign Minister of the Republic of Cyprus, who was paying an official visit on the European Union. On December 20, Greek-Cypriot leader Clerides stated in a television interview that the CBMs could be very beneficial if we had an agreed upon basis and we were at a stage that certain basic questions were resolved.

The UN Security Council adopted Resolution 969 on December 21, 1994. It supported the Secretary General's recommendation and extended UNFICYP for a further six months. It also expressed concern that no progress towards a final political solution had been made during the preceding six months. The

Security Council called again for all concerned to commit themselves to a significant reduction in the number of foreign troops and a reduction in defense spending on the island. The Security Council further reaffirmed the importance it attached to early progress being made on the substance of the Cyprus question and on the implementation of the UN-proposed package of confidence- building measures (CBMs).

On January 3, Andreas Jacovides, Ambassador of the Republic of Cyprus to the United States met with White House National Security Advisor, Anthony Lake. In addition to a number of bilateral issues, the two discussed how progress might be achieved in the intercommunal negotiations.

On January 5, Richard Holbrooke, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, accompanied by Special Cyprus Coordinator James Williams, and the Director of the Office of Southern European Affairs, Marshall Adair, traveled to Nicosia where he strongly conveyed to the Cypriot parties the U.S. desire to help reach a Cyprus settlement. Mr. Holbrooke had lengthy meetings with President Clerides and other officials of the Republic of Cyprus. He also met with Turkish-Cypriot leader Denktash and authorities of the Turkish-Cypriot administration. Both sides expressed a commitment to see the Cyprus problem resolved but described fundamentally different ways of addressing the issues of negotiations. Mr. Clerides advocated a comprehensive approach, whereas Mr. Denktash supported a step-by-step discussion beginning with the CBMs. Prior to departing Cyprus, Mr. Holbrooke stated: "Both men said they wanted a solution but at this time, even though all of the elements for a resolution are on the table, the final steps to make things happen, to make forward movement, are not yet in place." Referring to the application by the Republic of Cyprus to join the European Union, Mr. Holbrooke expressed the hope that Cyprus would enter the Union as a federation in which all Cypriots could share the benefits of membership.

Also on January 5, President Clinton announced the appointment of Mr. Richard Beattie as the Special Presidential Emissary for Cyprus. Mr. Beattie is the first Presidential Emissary in 18 years. His appointment demonstrates the importance the U.S. places in accelerating efforts to finding a solution to the Cyprus problem. In his first official meeting, Mr. Beattie held discussions with UN Secretary General Boutros-Ghali on January 5. The two agreed that the UN process must go forward. Mr. Beattie stressed to the SYG the United States Government's support of his continuing efforts.

On January 18, U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus Richard Boucher met with Mr. Denktash. The Turkish-Cypriot leader used the opportunity to emphasize his support for certain elements of the 1992 UN Set of

Ideas. On January 20, Mr. Denktash issued a letter which was circulated as a UN Document, in which he reaffirmed the Turkish side's commitment to a bizonal, bicomunal federation and called for immediate implementation of the CBMs. He also announced a number of unilateral humanitarian steps intended to assist the Maronite and Greek-Cypriot communities living in northern Cyprus. The United States welcomes this announcement and awaits further details about what specific steps will be taken. On January 21, Mr. Clerides replied to Mr. Denktash's initiative in a press release, which has also been circulated as a UN document. He asserted that talks on the CBMs would be useless without progress on the basic aspects of the Cyprus problem.

Mr. Beattie and Mr. Williams visited Nicosia January 25 through January 29. The two met twice each with Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash. They used these meetings to explore the positions and flexibility of the two sides on key issues. Mr. Beattie urged both leaders to improve the atmosphere between the communities and suggested that each consider concrete steps which would reduce military tensions along the Green Line and Buffer Zone. They also suggested the possibility of unilateral humanitarian gestures. In addition to the two leaders, the U.S. delegation met with other Greek and Turkish Cypriot community representatives.

Mr. Beattie and SCC Williams next traveled to Athens where they met with Prime Minister Papandreou and Foreign Minister Papoulias. The Greek officials expressed their hope that progress could be made quickly on an overall solution to the Cyprus problem. The Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister also stated their view that setting a date for negotiations to begin on EU accession for Cyprus

would act as a catalyst for achieving a solution. Mr. Beattie and Mr. Williams postponed their visit to Ankara, Turkey due to scheduling difficulties. That visit is now planned for March.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

18 February 95 12:53

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

1301NG.DOC

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered progress through November 30, 1994. The current report covers December 1, 1994 through January 31, 1995.

On January 5, I appointed Mr. Richard I. Beattie as my Special Emissary for Cyprus. Mr. Beattie will work closely with all parties to promote an overall solution which will be fair, just and permanent. He and Special Cyprus Coordinator James Williams traveled to Cyprus on January 23 for extensive meetings with the leaders of both communities. The two leaders expressed their desire to reach a settlement. In addition, Mr. Denktash reiterated his commitment to a bizonal, bicomunal federation with a single sovereignty and single citizenship. Mr. Beattie and Mr. Williams will consult in Ankara during March, to continue their efforts to facilitate agreements on concrete steps towards a solution.

Throughout the period, my representatives continued to work for comprehensive progress, both on concrete steps such as the confidence-building measures and on overall settlement issues. the Greek-Cypriot side endorsed this approach provided a common basis for an overall settlement has been established; the Turkish-Cypriot side urged we proceed incrementally from measures to overall talks. We will continue to pursue further efforts to establish such a common basis for a settlement.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Newt Gingrich
Speaker of the
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

18 February 95 12:53

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

1301JH.DOC

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered progress through November 30, 1994. The current report covers December 1, 1994 through January 31, 1995.

On January 5, I appointed Mr. Richard I. Beattie as my Special Emissary for Cyprus. Mr. Beattie will work closely with all parties to promote an overall solution which will be fair, just and permanent. He and Special Cyprus Coordinator James Williams traveled to Cyprus on January 23 for extensive meetings with the leaders of both communities. The two leaders expressed their desire to reach a settlement. In addition, Mr. Denktash reiterated his commitment to a bizonal, bicomunal federation with a single sovereignty and single citizenship. Mr. Beattie and Mr. Williams will consult in Ankara during March, to continue their efforts to facilitate agreements on concrete steps towards a solution.

Throughout the period, my representatives continued to work for comprehensive progress, both on concrete steps such as the confidence-building measures and on overall settlement issues. the Greek-Cypriot side endorsed this approach provided a common basis for an overall settlement has been established; the Turkish-Cypriot side urged we proceed incrementally from measures to overall talks. We will continue to pursue further efforts to establish such a common basis for a settlement.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse Helms
Chairman
Committee on Foreign Relations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 24 February 95 13:09

FROM Danvers, William C.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: NOTE FROM BILL DANVERS [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Baker, Jane E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Darby, Melanie B.
Dohse, Fred J.
Emery, Mary C.
Gray, Wendy
Hall, Wilma G.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Itoh, William H.
Joshi, M. Kay
Millison, Cathy L.
Jim Reed
Sens, Andrew D.
Veit, Katherine M.
Wolin, Neal S.

CARBON_COPY Andricos, George M.
Danvers, William C.
Funches, Christina L.

TEXT_BODY

Neal and Kathy:

I should have put this in context. The attached document is a draft insert for a news letter from InterAction, Julia Taft's group, that they want to send to the printers by 2 PM this afternoon. Julia Taft was one of the participants in the NGO/PVO meeting with Tony on Tuesday. The urgency is that this group can be very helpful to us on the resources problem.

From: Funches, Christina L.
To: @UP - APNSA Special Assistants; @NSA - Nat'l Security Advisor
CC: /R, Record at A1; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
Subject: NOTE FROM BILL DANVERS [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Friday, February 24, 1995 12:33 PM

[[QUOTE.DOC : 3349 in QUOTE.DOC]]

NEAL: We would appreciate clearance on quotes before 2:00pm. Thanks.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

24 February 95 12:29

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

QUOTE.DOC

Over 200 representatives of humanitarian agencies, ethnic-based groups, international corporations, cooperatives, and research groups gathered on February 21 at the Old Executive Office Building in Washington to demonstrate their joint support for international affairs funding, and to call on the Clinton Administration to actively defend the President's Fiscal Year 1996 budget request and the President's prerogative over the foreign policy agenda.

The three senior Administration officials participating in the meeting were National Security Adviser Tony Lake, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, and AID Administrator Brian Atwood. Lake outlined the Administration's priorities for international affairs as centering around the following: conflict prevention; support for multilateral organizations; diplomacy; support for PVOs, coops and private sector-led development; and peacekeeping. He said, "We're committed to fight for the resources necessary" to defending our national interest.

An announcement the week of February 14 that Jesse Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was reviving the proposed merger of AID, USIA and ACDA into the State Department, raised concerns among the groups about the Administration's stance on the issue. Lake said, "The decision (against the merger) stands."

Atwood said the Administration was concerned that the Hill's mandate for change will become a mandate for retreat" and said that the meeting signaled the launching of a new Administration commitment to defend against this possibility.

InterAction President Julia Taft, speaking on behalf of the PVO community. Also speaking on behalf of various private sector coalitions were: former Congressman Dave Nagle (D-IA), coordinator of the Freedom Support Coalition; Chris Baker, chair of the Overseas Cooperative Development Council; and Tom Fox, chair of the Advisory Council on Voluntary Foreign Aid (ACVFA).

Taft highlighted the tremendous mobilization of the PVOs and other groups, and challenged the President to take the lead in this effort. (Taft quote; Nagle quote, Baker quote; Fox quote)

Deputy Secretary Talbott said, "We hear you, and we will deliver a

strong message to the person who is not in this room -- the president."

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 03 March 95 20:52

FROM Danvers, William C.

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT Subject: NPR [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]

TO Baker, Jane E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Darby, Melanie B.
Dohse, Fred J.
Emery, Mary C.
Gray, Wendy
Hall, Wilma G.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Itoh, William H.
Joshi, M. Kay
Millison, Cathy L.
Reed, James W.
Sens, Andrew D.
Veit, Katherine M.
Wolin, Neal S.

CARBON_COPY Andricos, George M.
Danvers, William C.
Funches, Christina L.

TEXT_BODY

Note for Tony, Sandy and Nancy:

I am greatly bothered by Brian Atwood's memo to Tony and Nancy on the Helms'

"RIGO" bill and the need for a legislative strategy.

For the past couple of weeks I have been working with AID, ACDA, USIA and State on how to approach the Hill on RIGO. For the past week I have had nightly phone calls of up to an hour duration on how we ought to approach the Hill on the Helms bill and what we should prepare in the way of briefing material for the Hill. AID has participated in all of those calls. I have also had individual meetings with AID's leg/PA people.

In addition, I helped OVP distribute the VPTOUS' NPR letter to the Hill last week and worked with the NPR last weekend on what more we need to be doing on an interim Hill strategy to shore up our Democrats before we are ready to brief them. OVP made a number of calls to key Dem offices on this issue, asking them to hold off on embracing the Helms' proposal until we have an opportunity to discuss our views with them.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526 5/16/2017
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VZ NARA, Date 12/18/2018
2006-1363-F 3

While I have not been able to devote all my time to the NPR process, I have made an effort to keep the process moving. I saw my initial mission as helping to get the agencies to stop shooting at each other in public and on the Hill. I have also tried to put in place a Hill strategy that we can implement, even before we have the larger NPR proposal.

AID has had an opportunity all along the way to comment, to criticize, to change direction of what are doing. Until today, I thought they were going along with the program. Brian's memo makes me believe otherwise.

I don't object to someone having another point of view. AID has legitimate concerns, but I do object to the "bush" approach to how they express their point of view. There were no complaints by AID leg. people, no comments, criticisms or otherwise, and they have had ample opportunity to express themselves-- daily-- in the process we have set up. Hell, if they didn't like the process, they could have asked to do it differently. I got no heads up about the memo or the heightened concern.

I feel the need to explain myself, because by implication, Brian is saying in his memo that the Administration is falling down on the job to contact the Hill. It isn't so. In fact, all the concerned agencies in the NPR process have been talking to the Hill about what is going on with our encouragement.

One other note, I think publicly criticizing Jesse Helms doesn't help our cause. You only force his Republican colleagues to defend him, no matter what they think of his ideas, out of party loyalty. I believe a good fight is a useful thing to have when the time is right. We did a good job on HR 7. But you have to pick your moments. AID has not done a good job with its public criticism of Sen. Helms in picking its moments.

We have our work cut out for us in the NPR process, and we need to work together. Brian's memo does little to help that process along.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
005. email	Mark Parris to Jane Baker, Kristen Cicio, Melanie Darby et al. Subject: New (Pseudo) Inquiry. (1 page)	04/03/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/16/1994-09/27/1995]

2006-1363-F
vz5595

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 26 May 95 17:29
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT May 26 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Aoki, Steven N.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Arnold, Gary W.
Atkin, Timothy J.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bassett, Leslie A.
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
Birkland, Andrea L.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blakeman, Earle C.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boorstin, Robert O.
Boright, John
Bradley, Amelia J.
Branscum, Larry
Breeland, Jocelyn G.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Barton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.

Buzalko, Russ
Kevin J. Cadieux
Canty, Mary T.
Carter, Michael E.
Chyba, Christopher F.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Claussen, Eileen B.
Cleveland, Carolyn E.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darby, Melanie B.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Debortoli, Michelle A.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Drew, Samuel N.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Dymersky, Debra L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Emery, Mary C.
Evans, Paul A.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Fried, Daniel
Froman, Michael B.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Funches, Christina L.
Gardner, Anthony
Gates, Brian K.
Genton, Regina A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Guekel, Kathi A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Hammond, Cathy J.
Hammonds, Lisa W.

Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Herrington, David E.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kammerer, Kelly C.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
Mack, Kathryn S.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Marshall, Dana M.
Martinez, Alejandro
Martin, Roger L.
Mathiowetz, Nancy
Stefan T. Mauzy
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.

Neil, M. Elise
Niemerski, Stephen
Norman, Marcia G.
O'Loughlin, Katherine
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Pifer, Steven K.
Pitman, James
Poneman, Daniel B.
Poppiti, Victoria L.
Porter, Gidell
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Reed, George
Rice, Susan E.
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
Roth, Stanley O.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Seeley, Charlotte P.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Sterns, Crayton L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sullivan, Kathryn
Sulser, Jack A.

Tarullo, Daniel K.
Tenet, George J.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Tyler, John T.
Unrue, Michael M.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Wallack, Matthew D.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, William M.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Yorkdale, Glenn H.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[5-26MCBF.DOC : 4359 in 5-26MCBF.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 26 May 95 17:28

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 5-26MCBF.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release May 26, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

Foi

The Briefing Room

1:35 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. This is the last briefing of this week -- (applause.)

Q Uh, oh. I hope you haven't jinxed us.

Q Don't be too sure of that. (Laughter.)

Q We'll hold you to it.

Q You never know.

MR. MCCURRY: The President of the United States of America, having spoken -- earlier today on many subjects I know you're interested in, means that I can be brief here at this briefing.

Q What about the Persian Gulf report? Are you going to do it?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, we've got -- the announcement of that is ready to go very shortly. The President's talking about it now. I think as some of you know, the veterans roundtable he's doing -- we were giving them first crack at it on the executive order. On the presidential advisory committee on Gulf War Veterans Illnesses will be forthcoming immediately following the briefing.

Mr. Blitzer.

Q The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Jesse Helms, has just said, referring to President Clinton and his handling of the situation in Bosnia, "Maybe he'll get some good advice from the Joint Chiefs, but I hope he won't shoot from the hip, because I don't think he's qualified. I wish someone else was in the Oval Office."

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I -- I'll have to find out more about

that statement. But the President has spoken to you earlier today about the response that NATO is very effectively making to request from the United Nations in Bosnia. And the Commander-in-Chief is very satisfied that the military is responding correctly and efficiently to those requests.

Q Can you walk us through the chain of command now

in terms of authorizing these air strikes. Is the two-point system still in place?

MR. MCCURRY: There's the dual-key system, and has been described over and over again at the State Department and at the Pentagon. You can refer --

Q What is the status of that now? Has Akashi --

MR. MCCURRY: Been no change --

Q -- signed off and now we're in the situation where he's approved the first one so the second one is up to the NATO commander?

MR. MCCURRY: The operation of the dual-key is -- has been briefed before. How it works in the case of each individual request for an air strike is something that I would refer you over to the Pentagon and perhaps the State Department because they've addressed it both since it involves the United Nations' clearance for an air strike as well. I believe, if I'm not mistaken that the same arrangements are in effect. And UNPROFOR requests can come from the ground -- it's relayed up through dual chains of command to both the U.N. authority and to -- through NATO to SACEUR.

I do believe that in the case of the U.N. some of that authority has been delegated by Secretary General Boutros-Ghali to Mr. Akashi, his representative in former Yugoslavia. But I would ask you to check with the U.N. to make absolutely sure that's true.

Q What do you hear about the safety of the hostages?

MR. MCCURRY: We are monitoring that very carefully, and the less I say about that I think the better.

Q Is the President going to talk to Yeltsin? He said what he would tell him, but does he have any plans to contact --

MR. MCCURRY: There's been a variety of diplomatic contacts with the Russian Federation, including, I believe, an effort by the Secretary of State to reach his counterpart, the Russian Foreign Minister, who's attending a CIS meeting in Minsk. And so they have not connected yet, but the Secretary has had a very active today, as has just been briefed at the State Department.

Q Mike, do you have anything on this latest kook?

Was he just trying to show off, or was he a threat?

MR. MCCURRY: Nothing beyond what the Secret Service has told most of you already.

Q Mike, the President's going to have a couple of opportunities on Monday to talk about the POW-MIA issue -- the ceremony here, the one over at Arlington. Is he going to go beyond the formulation that he's stated in the past that Vietnam will have to do everything possible on the issue before full recognition --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, Memorial Day is an opportunity to honor veterans in our nation, and especially those who gave their lives and service to our nation. And I expect his remarks to be aimed in that direction. He is not going to articulate, as far as I know, any new position of our government related to relations with the government of Vietnam.

Q What about on the POW-MIA issue itself?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he's going to continue to say a very high priority of his and this administration's is the fullest possible accounting for POWs and MIAs. As you know, there's been a delegation just recently returned from Vietnam that has made some progress in that direction, has been -- delivered some documents by the government in Hanoi, and those materials are now being evaluated. But I'm not aware that there's been any definitive judgment on the materials received that would allow him to say anything further on that Monday.

Q We did this earlier in the week, but what was the President's response to the meeting with Senators McCain and Kerry when they came over and urged that now would be the time to formalize relations with Vietnam?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he restated our view and our policy that further progress in broadening the relations with Vietnam would depend on the fullest possible accounting for POWs and MIAs. He reviewed the status of the mission just led by Assistant Secretary Lord and indicated to the two senators that they had received materials -- of course, the two senators were aware of that. In fact, they, themselves, said that they thought that the government in Hanoi had been very helpful in providing those materials. But those are still being evaluated by the Pentagon. They're looking through what they got and seeing if it matches up to some of the discrepancy cases and some of the missing cases that they're still evaluating through the joint task force.

So I would suggest that we just have to wait and see what type of analysis we get out of the Pentagon, until we declare that this latest delivery of documents represents any significant

progress forward.

Q Mike, the formulation has -- for a long time has

been the fullest possible accounting in terms of POW-MIA. What does that mean? Does that mean every single one must be accounted for or --

MR. MCCURRY: That is -- we use that phrase "fullest possible accounting" for the simple reason that it may be in the end impossible in some cases to establish with absolutely certainty what has happened to those who most likely gave their lives in Vietnam. But that, nonetheless, puts a very high threshold there for this administration. And fullest possible accounting means exactly that, that we have to go to extraordinary lengths to make sure that in each and every case where there's any possible avenue to get additional information, those avenues are pursued.

Q How do you know when you've reached the point where there isn't anymore accounting that's possible?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that's one -- one thing that we now work through very carefully with Vietnam. As we get additional information -- in some cases we have family members who come forward who discover documentation or find letters or find things that they themselves might be useful to us as we try to get this accounting, we continue to pursue those types of leads. And as I've described to some of you prior, out at Hickam Air Force Base in Honolulu, they do extraordinary forensic work, almost like detectives in tracking down some of the information that they are able to retrieve from Vietnam on site visits that the joint task force has been able to do out in very remote parts of the Vietnam, and in some cases Laos and Cambodia as well.

Q Mike, what is the difference between China and Vietnam on one hand and Cuba on the other? Why is Cuba sort of treated as the one last pariah of the Cold War?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, China, among other things, has a --adopted policy of moving toward market economics, markets reforms, and has a body of law that recognizes western financial institutions and protects the value of western investments through some of their adopted law. So as a totalitarian communist country it has adopted a different type of economic strategy and has instituted some economic reforms that allow us to engage in commerce.

In the case of Cuba, remains a very backward, some say ideological -- ideologically-stuck state that has not learned the lesson of history taught to us throughout the 1980s that

totalitarian command-and-control economies don't work and can't work.

So thus the regime of Fidel Castro has not been able to get on the right side of history. So there's a substantial difference in the history of the two countries, and thus in the difference --

Q That isn't why we don't recognize Cuba, because of their --

MR. MCCURRY: And the other difference, Jack, is that we are governed in the case of Cuba by the Cuban Democracy Act, which is the law of the land and which the administration strongly supports, which codifies in law a mandatory approach that is different from the one that we would pursue in the case of China.

Q Mike, when do you expect a veto on the rescission bill?

MR. MCCURRY: I can't predict because we have not received the bill. The enrolled bill has not been delivered to the White House. And it obviously will be vetoed promptly upon its receipt. But it's anybody's guess when the leadership might send that to us.

Q What's the strategy --

Q When can we expect an MFN decision?

MR. MCCURRY: Sometime before June 3rd.

Q Mike, on the rescission bill again, is it true that the President has -- I may have missed you telling someone -- the President has decided not to worry about the timber references in it and some other things, but will simply -- would go for just the education being restored?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm glad you asked that. I saw some reference today to speculation by -- allegedly by an administration official, maybe a janitor somewhere -- I'm not entirely sure -- but someone who suggested that there was a willingness on our part to fall off our strong objections to the timber provisions in that bill. That's just not so. That remains a very strong concern. That language is one that we are -- have discussed very directly with various members of Congress and that the President feels very strongly about as reflected in all the public statements that he has made and the administration and as made on his behalf.

Q So he couldn't possibly go for it if it didn't

have that in it.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we -- you know, I -- there is going to be -- there be negotiations at a future date. And the President has made very clear what the parameters of a compromise would be that he would find acceptable.

Q Mike, the specific report to which you may refer was one which said that he had told Speaker Gingrich that in fact if he could get the \$700 million back for certain education and training programs that are important to him, that he would be willing to yield on this timber matter. Is that not true?

MR. MCCURRY: You can well imagine, Brit, that with the prospect of an active negotiation with congressional leaders on that bill so that we can achieve the administration's objective and the President's objective of significant deficit reduction, the elements of that negotiation I'm not going to display for you publicly.

Q Well, I understand that, but if the President has already told the Speaker of the House of Representatives that this is --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I'm not --

Q -- the position he would take, then there isn't much to conceal from us now, is there?

MR. MCCURRY: You're making -- you're making a facile assumption that what the Speaker may have told --

Q Well, then, Mike, if that's -- all I'm asking is whether -- if that assumption is incorrect, all you've got to do is say no he didn't say that.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he may have told the Speaker many things in the course of the negotiation. How they all fit together and how they all hang together is what a negotiation is usually about.

Q So you're not really denying it. You're not denying it.

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not confirming or denying anything about discussions that the President of the United States may have had in an attempt to achieve deficit reduction and move this country towards better sanity and fiscal discipline.

Q When you said, I'm glad you asked that question, we thought you were going to either knock it down --

Q In fact, answer it.

MR. MCCURRY: I was knocking down -- I was knocking down a very specific point on the timber salvage provision.

Q Well, that's what I'm trying to figure out. I'm afraid you've left me a little confused --

MR. MCCURRY: We didn't say that -- we didn't say we'd --

Q -- at this point -- (inaudible) -- Speaker one thing, and a policy --

MR. MCCURRY: You're alleging that the President has said things to the Speaker that I'm not confirming that the President said.

Q You're not denying either, however.

Q But is it not at the moment at least a moot point,

because objections by the White House to other elements of the bill remains -- (inaudible) -- assure its veto --

MR. MCCURRY: As we reported to you here at the moment, no reason to believe that there would be any progress sufficient to have a compromise measure ready to go when the Congress returns.

Q But all of that is a -- the whole conversation with the Speaker that was reported was a post-veto scenario for a rewritten bill. Am I not correct about that, or am I wrong about that?

MR. MCCURRY: It was reported, but only some parts of conversations get reported sometimes when people talk about private conversations between the President and others. So just take that - as you analyze where the discussions might be.

Q -- overall policy -- is the President willing to give up his objections to the timber language in anything post-veto?

MR. MCCURRY: I said earlier, I'm not going to speculate what forum a final compromise measure might take. But the President could not have been more open and more direct with all of you in describing exactly the type of measure that he would find acceptable and that he would be able to sign.

Q What's the strategy now to get the Foster nomination over the top? What do you foresee?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, what we foresee is a lot of hard work ahead as we -- with individual senators, let them know more about Dr. Foster's record, remind them of the very eloquent presentation he made to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, which has now approved his nomination. And probably a shoe leather by Dr. Foster as he gets around and meets additional members of the Senate who will be considering the nomination. But we hope the result of all that work would be a confirmation vote in his favor so that he can get on with being America's doctor and take the position of Surgeon General.

Q Are you expecting a filibuster?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, Senator Phil Gramm has indicated that is his intent, and that would be unfortunate, because Dr. Foster, now having won the support of the committee, is clearly someone well-qualified, with the experience and the background to serve in that position. And going to the extraordinary length of a filibuster on a nomination of this nature would certainly be -- what, a surprise, I guess.

Q Do you think you have the votes to break a filibuster?

MR. MCCURRY: We are working it, and we are confident that we have a lot of support in the Senate now for Dr. Foster's nomination. Whether that adds up to 60 votes or not, we don't know at this point.

Q And do you have a -- does the administration have a strategy to force Senator Dole to bring the issue to a vote?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sorry, say again.

Q Do you have a -- does the administration have a strategy to make sure that Senator Dole doesn't prevent this from coming up?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we don't have a strategy, because Senator Dole as the Majority Leader, can effectively prevent consideration of the nomination if he chooses to do so. But given the public support for this nomination and now the support of one of the committees of the United States Senate, the Majority Leader would probably have to go a long ways towards -- to explain to the American public why he would go to that length.

Q Mike, is the President or the administration making any special efforts today to make sure all the allies stay on board on the air strike policy?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes -- check with the briefing over at the State Department and they'll tell you a lot about what the Secretary of State has been doing. The President's been following the scope of those diplomatic contacts closely.

Q Is the President making any phone calls to world leaders?

MR. MCCURRY: He has not been advised to do so at this point by his foreign policy team?

Q Is Senator Frist's vote a surprise --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sorry, say again.

Q Was the Frist vote a surprise this morning?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it was -- I won't say a surprise. It was gratifying. There was a lot of hard work done. And I think you all know the work that Senator Frist did during the nomination process itself in the questioning that he directed to Dr. Foster. But it was certainly gratifying, as Dr. Foster said, and certainly as the President said, to see his home state senator support Dr. Foster's nomination.

Q Was Kassebaum's vote a surprise, and did she tell the White House --

MR. MCCURRY: I can't -- I just don't know the answer of

whether or not Chairman Kassebaum informed any White House staff in advance of her vote. I did say earlier, and I'd say again now, that the administration is gratified that she offered Dr. Foster the opportunity for a very fair hearing and a balanced presentation of arguments on behalf of his nomination. And despite her vote, which, of course, the White House found disappointing, we are appreciative of the way that she conducted the confirmation hearing itself, and appreciate her willingness and her determination to see that the nomination, one way or another, reached the Senate floor.

Q Do you view Frist's support as strong enough that he will actively lobby other senators -- are counting on him to do that?

MR. MCCURRY: It wouldn't be proper for me to answer that.

You can ask Senator Frist.

Q What about Japan -- are we ready to move into consultations with Japan?

MR. MCCURRY: Ambassador Kantor has just said so earlier today and has indicated that he's requested consultations with the Japanese counterparts June 20, 21 here in Washington.

Q Is it the intention that that would give it enough time for the sanctions to actually start taking effect?

MR. MCCURRY: Sanctions are not scheduled to take effect until June 28th, if I'm not mistaken.

Q Mike, under what conditions would the United States -- (inaudible) -- the Marines in Bosnia?

MR. MCCURRY: Well -- only under the types of contingency plans that NATO military planners have drafted to meet certain scenarios that they have been looking at. But there's been no decision by the Commander-in-Chief to do so.

Q Is there a process -- there has to be a decision at some level that would then signal you all that it's time to send the Marines in, or would you try --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there would be -- there is a detailed process by -- this would be within the context of a NATO operation on behalf of UNPROFOR that has been looked at very carefully by NATO military planners. We have been an active participant in that planning. But that would depend entirely on what situation and what contingencies NATO faced at a particular moment. It would be speculative at this point to suggest any particular scenario.

Q But as a broad matter, hasn't it always been to try to get NATO forces out of there? Isn't that what that's --

MR. MCCURRY: No -- broadly stated, the concern had been

if it was a necessity under whatever contingency to do an evacuation of UNPROFOR personnel, would NATO be there to assist in that evacuation. NATO has said it would be; the United States has said we would, of course, honor our obligations and our responsibilities to our NATO allies. But it is speculative to say what type of contingencies those might be.

Q But there is no such plan now, at this --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that's not correct. There are

--there's planning -- contingency planning that's been done by NATO military planners.

Q But I mean no decision to evacuate.

MR. MCCURRY: No decision -- no. There's not been a decision.

Q But evacuation is the linchpin of the whole thing, is it not?

MR. MCCURRY: Evacuation is connected with an extraction of UNPROFOR from former Yugoslavia and Bosnia, in particular. And there's been, to the contrary, no reason for that. And in fact, one of the things that is currently going on now is a demonstration that UNPROFOR intends to remain and to attempt to fulfill its mission in Bosnia.

Q Am I -- isn't that the sole exception to the broad policy that we're not -- or the general policy that we're not going to have ground troops in there?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, the policy of the President is very clear. He will not commit ground troops to the conflict in Bosnia as part of the ongoing conflict or on behalf of any of the warring factions.

Q Would a hostage situation where you wanted to extract specific NATO personnel --

MR. MCCURRY: Doyle, you can -- I'm not going to be able to speculate on what might happen. It wouldn't be wise to do so.

Q No, my question was, is that clearly not on your list of contingencies or is it a gray area?

MR. MCCURRY: That's a question that NATO military planners have no doubt addressed in their planning. But I'm not going -- at liberty, nor should I describe any of the details of that planning.

Q Are the U.S. Armed Forces on any special state of readiness this weekend?

MR. MCCURRY: I would refer that to the Pentagon.

Q Mike, have you confirmed that these U.N. people

that we've seen pictures of today chained to fences or whatever, are, in fact, U.N. personnel? And if they are, how --

MR. MCCURRY: Have I? No, I have not. You should direct that question to UNPROFOR, who would know more about the status of its enrolled forces in Bosnia.

Q But has the United States government been told that U.N. personnel have been taken hostage?

MR. MCCURRY: I'd have to check on that. I don't know what our latest communiques have been from U.N. authorities.

Q Well, is the President going to stay watch, in view of the escalation, new tensions --

MR. MCCURRY: He will be watching very carefully the developments in Bosnia.

Q Mike, is there a danger that the taking of hostages in fact will hurt the policy in keeping -- (inaudible) -- forces there?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not sure I understand your question. In what sense?

Q In the sense that it shows, it makes the argument of those who say you can't do air strikes and keep the air forces there because they become hostage, and that if they keep taking hostages that it will make people want to pull out?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it certainly complicates some aspects of UNPROFOR's mission in Bosnia, but UNPROFOR's mission in Bosnia extends to humanitarian relief, to sanctions enforcement, to additional activities beyond the protection of safe areas. It certainly does complicate the direct work they're doing in the safe areas.

Q Mike, what is the President's agenda in the meeting with the AFL-CIO this afternoon? And does he intend by his timing to signal support for Mr. Kirkland in his reelection?

MR. MCCURRY: No. I'd make very clear on behalf of the President that he is not taking a position at all in any questions related to the leadership of the federation. He is taking this opportunity to remind the members of the executive council of the AFL-CIO of all the good work that we have done on behalf of working families in this country, to review some of the issues that are outstanding on the agenda. And it is an opportunity for him to hear suggestions and ideas from the leaders of organized labor. That's the purpose of the discussion. And I doubt very much whether, given the array of participants, whether there will be

much discussion of leadership politics at the federation.

Q Mike, are you saying, then -- just a couple of

minutes ago on Bosnia -- are you saying that now the fact that NATO has taken this action makes it less likely that they would pull out ultimately?

MR. MCCURRY: I was saying that, as the President said yesterday, that the determination to remain in attempt to fulfill UNPROFOR's mission is certainly evidenced by the request from UNPROFOR to get assistance from NATO so that they can make good on the aspects of their mission. Yes. And that is certainly our -- our strong desire is to see UNPROFOR remain, to help save lives in Bosnia, and to continue to do the humanitarian work, and to continue to do some of the protective work that they have done and done against great odds, but done rather successfully.

Q Mike, why is it the President would threaten to veto legislation that would dictate foreign policy, but he so embraces the Cuban Democracy Act, which does exactly that?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the Cuban Democracy predates this administration, but it does represent, in the President's view, a valid and necessary way to bring economic pressure on a regime that does not seem to understand the scope and force of history, does not seem to understand the lesson that so many former communist states have learned, that market economics works best and democracy is the way in which people can self-govern. And that legislation is a way by which the United States brings economic pressure to bear on Cuba to help the people of Cuba make that transformation.

Q But isn't the same principle at issue of Congress dictating foreign policy that he so objects to in this other legislation in the Gilman bill?

MR. MCCURRY: There's a different legislative history in the case of that act. That act was developed in consultation between the Executive and the Legislative Branch. It does not represent a preemptive challenge to the authority of a president, in this case, a prior president to carry out foreign policy.

Thank you all.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:00 P.M.
EDT

#67-05/26

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
006. email	Stanley Roth to Jane Baker, Peter Bass, Kristen Cicio et al. Subject: Asia Miscellaneous. (3 pages)	07/17/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/16/1994-09/27/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5595

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
007. email	Ardenia Hawkins to Susan Rice. Subject: RE: [Malawian Tobacco] (2 pages)	07/19/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/16/1994-09/27/1995]

2006-1363-F
vz5595

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 18 September 95 17:25
FROM Tyler, John T.
CLASSIFICATION ***** CLASSIFICATION NOT FOUND *****
SUBJECT NPR Meeting with VP Re For.Aff. Ageencies
TO Halperin, Morton H.
CARBON_COPY Cooper, Kathleen H.
TEXT_BODY

Mort-- We missed the meeting with the Vice President because the invitation was not delivered in time.

Attending were: Bill Danvers; LeeAnn Brackett; Bill Wise and Leon Fuerth.

They visited and revisited the "options" that we developed and which Pam Johnson outlined in her paper after our last meeting. According to LeeAnn:

- "Consensus" is to hang tough for the time being;
- Erskin Bowles to call Jesse Helms and suggest that the SFRC begin its normal work if we agree to talk/work with them;
- The VP to make several telephone calls to Senate Democrats (who cannot seem to decide which way to jump, but want to be players) and test the waters a bit; (LeeAnn and Bill to develop the 'phone sheets' and Lee Ann to get back with me)
- The apparent end-game is to work toward obtaining the sense of the Congress (which we favor) and come back at budget time with the Administration proposal....

I believe we can structure this in our memo to TL and POTUS letter to Helms

After this meeting there was a 150 Account Meeting with Gordon Adams, which we also missed.

I have additional calls in to both Bill Danvers and Phil DuSault. Any further guidance?

Tim Tyler

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 20 September 95 10:39
FROM Tyler, John T.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Reply to Helms[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Halperin, Morton H.
CARBON_COPY Cooper, Kathleen H.
TEXT_BODY
[[6787-3.DOC : 2652 in 6787-3.DOC]][[6787-2.DOC : 2653 in 6787-2.DOC]][[6787-1.DOC : 2654 in 6787-1.DOC]]
Mort, would you please take a look at these--if they are ok, I will try to get them through the staffing process. I have saved them to the G-drive. Tim

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 20 September 95 10:33
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME 6787-3.DOC

Dear Senator Helms:

When we met last August, I did mention that I would get back to you on your State Department Bill. Since then, I am pleased that the staffs have been able to get and begin work on critical procedural matters. In this context, is naturally important for the Committee to resume its work with us on Ambassadorial and treaty confirmations.

When the time is appropriate, I would propose that Erskine Bowles and a small group meet with you or your representatives and continue discussion on the foreign assistance authorization bill.

I continue to believe that it is critical for this

nation to pursue a strongly bipartisan foreign policy and that the Congress provide the resources necessary to keep America strong.

Sincerely,

[Name/Title in Initial Caps]
[Title/Senate/House in Initial Caps]
[Organization/Position - Initial Caps]
[Address - Initial Caps]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

20 September 95 10:28

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

6787-2.DOC

6787

cc: Vice President

Chief of Staff

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

**FROM: ANTHONY LAKE
PATRICK GRIFFIN**

**SUBJECT: Response to Sen. Helms Letter of
September 8, 1995**

Purpose

To respond to Senator Jesse Helm's offer to work with us on the issue of reorganizing the State Department (and the other foreign affairs agencies).

Background

Following your meeting with him, Senator Helms wrote you on September 8th, offering to work with us and the State Department on the State Department Bill (i.e. on the issue of consolidation of the foreign affairs agencies). There has also been one follow-up meeting with Helm's staff and interagency legislative affairs representatives on procedural matters.

We have an opportunity to make some real progress with Senator Helms. He appears ready to negotiate seriously; however, there is a lack of unanimity within the Administration, particularly, over consolidation issues. Because of this and to protect your interests, the White House/NPR needs to be responsible for dealing with Senator Helms rather than the Agencies.

We need to "hang tough" for now. This is necessary to avoid open revolt by the Agencies and to avoid a Republican victory dance over our having agreed to "consolidation." In fact, lower appropriations numbers for Agency operating expenses and our own quest to balance the budget will probably stimulate significant re-engineering of the Agencies. It is better that we take the credit for it.

When the time comes, we should be able to gain agreement with Senator Helms to mutate the consolidation issue to a report to the Congress on efficiencies in government due to the reinvention of the foreign affairs agencies. This would be in time for inclusion in the budget submission for Fiscal Year 1997, and would enable us to manage the inevitable, budget driven consolidation process. A small team led by Erskine Bowles (plus Leon Fuerth, Mort Halperin, and Gordon Adams) could manage any discussions with Senator Helms. We should only agree to talk if the Chairman agrees to proceed with his committee's normal business of confirming our Ambassadors and working with us on treaty ratifications.

RECOMMENDATION

That, when the time is right, Erskine Bowles lead a small team to talk with Senator Helms.

That you sign the attached letter to Senator Helms.

Approve _____

Disapprove _____ [Optional]

Attachment
Tab [I or A] Letter to Senator Jesse Helms

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

20 September 95 10:19

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

6787-1.DOC

6787

D R A F T

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: MORTON HALPERIN

FROM: TIM TYLER

SUBJECT: Helms Letter to POTUS on Consolidation

Following their meeting, Senator Helms sent a letter to the President on September 8th offering to work with us and with the State Department on the authorization bill. We need to respond to the letter -- after we decide what to do.

There has been one subsequent meeting between Helm's staff and the interagency (State, USAID, ACDA, USIA and NSC) legislative affairs experts. That meeting was limited to discussion about procedures, i.e. deal with restrictions on presidential prerogatives first, then the numbers and then with the consolidation issue. Nothing has happened since, due in part to activity on the appropriations bills and CJS.

We have an opportunity to make some real progress with Senator Helms; he appears ready to negotiate seriously. However, there is a lack of unanimity within the Administration; particularly, over consolidation issues. We are also constrained because any position other than to "hang tough" will cause a real revolt by the Agencies--and be perceived as a sign of bad faith on the part of the

Vice President. The sense is that any public forward motion on the issue of consolidation would be trumpeted as a Republican victory and a defeat for the President. Because of this and because there are still some unwarranted perceptions that the consolidation concept originated with (and is quietly supported by) the State Department--to protect the President's interests, when the time comes, the White House/NPR needs to be responsible for dealing with Senator Helms rather than the Agencies.

This observation is made in the context of the savaging of the State Department and the other agencies in the CJS authorization bill; the realities of the appropriations process, where the numbers are inextricably lower than even the Helm's Bill numbers; and, the fact that any Continuing Resolution is unlikely to exceed the numbers agreed by both houses. This will effect the development of the FY 1997 budget.

By taking control of the process at the center, we should ultimately be able to gain agreement with Helms to mutate the consolidation issue to a report to the Congress on efficiencies in government due to the reinvention of the foreign affairs agencies, in time for inclusion in the budget submission for Fiscal Year 1997. This would slow down the seemingly inevitable, budget driven

consolidation process and place control of the process back with the Executive Office of the President.

A small team led by Erskine Bowles (plus Leon Fuerth, Mort Halperin, and Gordon Adams) could manage the discussions with Senator Helms. The idea would be to hang tough for now; try to get some progress with ambassadorial appointments and other, normal committee business--and when the time comes, agree to a Presidential report.

Concurrence by: Leon Fuerth___Bill
Danvers___Gordon Adams___

RECOMMENDATION

That you forward the attached memorandum to President with a letter from the President to Senator Helms.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachment

Tab [I or A] [Enter brief description of attachment]

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 22 September 95 11:35
 FROM Tyler, John T.
 CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 SUBJECT The Briarpatch Sanction ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 TO Halperin, Morton H.
 CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

DECLASSIFIED
 E.O. 13526 5/16/2017
 White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
 By VZ NARA, Date 12/18/2014
 2006-1363-F3

TEXT_BODY

Mort the attached was done quickly, but it should give you something to react to...I have not spell checked it! Tim [[BRIARPCH.DOC : 2907 in BRIARPCH.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE

22 September 95 11:31

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME

BRIARPCH.DOC

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCY REINVENTION/CONSOLIDATION

The Situation has Changed:

ù Jesse Helms won a 57-43 vote on tabling his amendment to force consolidation yesterday -- he then withdrew his amendment.

ù Bob Dole is now involved: Sheila Burke is calling Pat Griffin about putting ambassadorial votes on the executive calendar...

ù John Kerry commented on the Senate floor that he was willing to see one of the agencies consolidated; and in the context of debate, he was not willing to offer a sense of the Congress amendment that we should get back to them with our plan.

ù Issue raised at Panetta staff meeting -- his view: we have no plan -- perhaps no adult supervision -- we have to solve the problem. (He provided guidance that cut across the bow of the Vice President--who is the key player for the Administration.)

ù We can no longer rely on "hanging tough." Helms will keep coming at us on CJS or Reconciliation and he has some Democratic support.

The Problem:

ù The heads of the Agencies are neuralgic about the consolidation of their agency...it's a set of rice bowl issues for them.

ù We have had a solid hang tough--all for one and one for all position for months, which is identified with the Vice President. When we shift from that position, the Republicans will do a victory dance.

ù We need to control the process from the center and deliver a concise message to the Agency heads to attenuate outright revolt.

ù The Vice President will need to call Christopher, Atwood, Duffy and Holumb and tell them what the White House decision is...

The Gameplan/Process:

ù Get with the Vice President and gain his agreement to move from the position of "Hang Tough" to "Throw me in that briarpatch" in order to avoid "Sophie's Choice."

ù Vice President call the heads of Agencies and tell them:

- The situation has changed and we now need to talk seriously with Helms, Dole and Kerry;
- We will work within the changed budget context and within NPR Channels;
- We will take a hard look and develop a plan that we can offer the Congress when we submit the FY 97 budget;
- Erskine Bowles or I will meet initially with Helms, Dole and Kerry to begin the process.

Preferrably after the Vice President has called the Agency heads, meet with Leon Panetta and lay out our proposal and the context:

- The situation has changed -- we do not want to be forced to veto the Foreign Ops Bill, CJS or reconciliation because of mandated consolidation that leaves us with no choices.
- Helms earlier offered a sense of the Congress amendment that was could form the basis of a compromise--but we need to talk with him soon-- and also with Dole and Kerry, who became central players during the Foreign Ops floor debate and discussion on September 21.

- Our end game is simple:
 - Avoid forced consolidation;
 - Use the budget context to force a hard look at the reinvention of the foreign affairs agencies and move toward acceptance of the "Unified Field Theory" position of NPR;
 - Demonstrate to Kerry and Dole (and Helms?) that we are serious about reinvention by offering them a conceptual briefing on the "Unified Field Theory."
 - Include the "Unified Field Theory" in the FY 1997 budget in the context of the consolidation debate with Congress and the pressures to balance the budget.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 26 September 95 10:48
FROM Tyler, John T.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Helms [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Halperin, Morton H.
CARBON_COPY Cooper, Kathleen H.
TEXT_BODY
[[6787-1A.DOC : 2641 in 6787-1A.DOC]] Here is a revised memo to Tony.
Other docs will also be revised.
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 26 September 95 10:46
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 6787-1A.DOC
6787

D R A F T

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: MORTON HALPERIN

FROM: TIM TYLER

SUBJECT: Helms Letter to POTUS on Consolidation

Following their meeting, Senator Helms sent a letter to the President on September 8th offering to work with us and with the State Department on the authorization bill. We need to respond to the letter -- after we decide what to do.

There has been one subsequent meeting between Helm's staff and the interagency (State, USAID, ACDA, USIA and NSC) legislative affairs experts. That meeting was limited to discussion about procedures, i.e. deal with restrictions on presidential prerogatives first, then the numbers and then with the consolidation issue. Since then the context has changed.

ù Jesse Helms won a 57-43 vote on tabling his amendment to force consolidation -- he then withdrew his amendment.

ù Bob Dole is now involved: Sheila Burke is calling Pat Griffin

ù John Kerry commented on the Senate floor that he was willing to see one of the agencies consolidated; and in the context of debate, he was not willing to offer a sense of the Congress amendment that we should get back to them with our plan.

ù Issue has been raised by Leon Panetta at his staff meeting: his feeling is that we have to solve the problem. (He provided guidance that cut across the bow of the Vice President--who is the key player for the Administration on consolidation.)

ù We can no longer rely on "hanging tough." Helms will keep coming at us on CJS or Reconciliation and he is gathering Democratic support.

ù The heads of the Agencies are neuralgic about the consolidation of their agency...it's a set of rice bowl issues for them.

ù We have had a solid hang tough--all for one and one for all--position for months, which is identified with the Vice President. When we shift from that position, the Republicans can trumpet victory.

We need to control the process from the center and deliver a concise message to the Agency heads to attenuate outright revolt. The Vice President will need to call Christopher, Atwood, Duffy and

Holumb and tell them what the White House decision is.

If we work carefully within the EXOP we should be able to execute a gameplan that protects Agencies' interests for as long as possible, and more importantly, protects the prerogatives of both the President and the Vice President. In order to do this we need to ensure that the Chief of Staff understands that the Vice President is in control of the action on consolidation/NPR.

We should get with the Vice President and gain his agreement to move from the position of "Hang Tough" to that of agreeing to examine the Agencies' duplications and overlaps in the projected

budget context and commit to getting back to the Congress before we send up the FY 1997 budget. This may help us avoid the "Sophie's Choice" option of publicly having to choose one Agency for elimination (Kerry's solution).

Vice President needs to call the heads of Agencies and tell them:

- The situation has changed and we now need to talk seriously with Helms, Dole and Kerry;
- We will work within the changed budget context and within NPR Channels;
- We will take a hard look and develop a plan that we can offer the Congress when we submit the FY 97 budget;

After the Vice President has called the Agency heads, he needs to meet with Leon Panetta and lay out our proposal and the context:

- The situation has changed -- we do not want to be forced to veto the Foreign Ops Bill, CJS or reconciliation because of mandated consolidation that leaves us with no choices.
- Helms earlier offered a sense of the Congress amendment that could form the basis of a compromise--but we need to talk with him soon-- and also with Dole and Kerry, who became central players during the Foreign Ops floor debate and discussion on September 21.

Our end game is simple:

- ù Avoid forced, mandated consolidation;
- ù Use the budget context to force a hard look at the reinvention of the foreign affairs agencies and move toward acceptance of the position developed through the NPR review of the four agencies;

By taking control of the process at the center, we should ultimately be able to gain agreement with Helms to mutate the consolidation issue to a report to the Congress in time for inclusion in the budget submission for Fiscal Year 1997.

A small team led by Erskine Bowles (plus Leon Fuerth, Mort Halperin, and Gordon Adams) could manage the discussions with Senator Helms. The idea would be to hang tough initially; obtain commitment to some progress with ambassadorial appointments and other, normal committee business, and agree to a Presidential report on re-engineering the four agencies.

Meanwhile we also can answer Senator Helms' letter to the President

Concurrence by: Leon Fuerth ___ Bill
Danvers ___ Gordon Adams ___

RECOMMENDATION

That you support the process suggested above and encourage the Vice President to call the Agency heads and meet with Leon Panetta.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

That you forward the attached memorandum to President with a letter from the President to Senator Helms.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachment

Tab [I or A] [Enter brief description of attachment]

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 27 September 95 17:06
FROM Halperin, Morton H.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: RESPONSE TO HELMS ON CONSOLIDATION [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Tyler, John T.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Dick called me and signed off on the package. As you see I sent it on to Leon.

From: Halperin, Morton H.
To: Fuerth, Leon S.
CC: /R, Record at A1; Wise, William M.
Subject: RESPONSE TO HELMS ON CONSOLIDATION [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, September 27, 1995 04:31 PM

[[6787A.DOC : 4387 in 6787A.DOC]][[6787B.DOC : 4388 in 6787B.DOC]][[6787C.DOC : 4389 in 6787C.DOC]]

Attached is the package to respond to the Helms letter to POTUS on consolidation. It tracks what we have discussed. Since much time has passed since we received it I thought I should start moving it along.

I would like to get your response on this substance as well as process. How should the package move forward to get the necessary concurrences including the VP and Tony?

Any word on the meeting? I have alerted Tony.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

27 September 95 16:22

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

6787A.DOC

6787

LIMITED ACCESS

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: MORTON H. HALPERIN

FROM: TIM TYLER

SUBJECT: Helms Letter to POTUS on Consolidation

Following their meeting, Senator Helms sent a letter to the President on September 8th offering to work with us and with the State Department on the authorization bill. We need to respond to the letter -- after we decide what to do.

There has been one subsequent meeting between Helms' staff and the interagency (State, USAID, ACDA, USIA and NSC) legislative affairs offices. That meeting was limited to discussion about procedures, i.e. deal with restrictions on presidential prerogatives first, then the numbers and then with the consolidation issue. Since then the context has changed.

ù Jesse Helms won a 57-43 vote on tabling his amendment to force consolidation -- he then withdrew his amendment.

ù Bob Dole is now involved.

ù John Kerry commented on the Senate floor that he was willing to see one of the agencies consolidated.

ù Issue has been raised by Leon Panetta at his staff meeting: his feeling is that we have to solve the problem.

ù "Hanging tough is an increasingly difficult strategy." Helms will keep coming at us and he has some Democratic support.

ù The heads of the Agencies remain opposed to consolidation.

ù We have had a solid hang tough--all for one and one for all--position for months, which is identified with the Vice President. A shift from that position could move Helms to claim victory.

We need to decide how to proceed once we have an agreed upon position. We suggest that there be a VP-led meeting of concerned

agency heads, bringing them on board. We should then get back to our Democrats in the Senate and House to let them know what we want to do. Finally, contact should be made with Helms and Gilman, presenting our proposal. The issue remains as to what our "proposal" will be. The most workable solution is to tell Helms and Gilman that we will get back to them with a specific reorganization plan by a date certain.

Our end game is simple:

ù Respond to Helms;

ù Avoid forced, mandated consolidation; and

ù Use the budget context to force a hard look at the reinvention of the foreign affairs agencies and move toward acceptance of the position developed through the NPR review of the four agencies.

We have attached a memo to the President (Tab I) and a letters from the President to Senator Helms (Tab A) reflecting this position.

Concurrence by: Richard Clarke; Bill
Danvers; Bob Bell

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for the President

Tab A Letter to Senator Helms

Tab B Letter from Senator Helms

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE

27 September 95 16:23

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME

6787B.DOC

6787

LIMITED ACCESS

cc: Vice President

Chief of Staff

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE
PAT GRIFFIN

SUBJECT: Response to Sen. Helms Letter of
September 8, 1995

Purpose

To respond to Senator Jesse Helms' offer to work with us on the issue of "reorganizing the State Department" and the other foreign affairs agencies.

Background

Following your meeting with him, Senator Helms wrote you on September 8th, offering to work with us and the State Department on the State Department Bill (i.e. on the issue of consolidation of the foreign affairs agencies). There has also been a follow-up meeting with Helms' staff and interagency legislative affairs representatives on procedural matters. Since then the situation has changed:

ù Jesse Helms won a 57-43 vote on tabling an amendment he sponsored with Senator Dole to force consolidation last week during Senate consideration of the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. He subsequently withdrew his amendment.

ù Senator Helms has stated publicly on several occasions that he is waiting for a response from you to your meeting with him and that he will hold up nominations and consideration of treaties, particularly START II and the Chemical Weapons Convention; nominations; and other Committee business until he has an up or down vote on his proposal.

ù There is some Democratic support for consolidation. Three Democrats voted against the motion to table the Helms amendment last week. Senator Kerry stated on the Senate floor that he is willing to see one of the agencies consolidated, a position he took during Senate Foreign Relations Committee deliberations on this issue.

On the other side of this issue, Agencies targeted by the Helms legislation continue to oppose any consolidation. There are also key Democrats who are willing to back us in our resistance to the Helms plan. We believe that in order to try to get the Foreign Relations Committee business moving again, we should respond to

Senator Helms by telling him that we will present to Congress by a date certain a reorganization plan. This will allow us and our

supporters to be able to say that we have responded to the Senator and that he should now allow the SFRC to meet to conduct its business.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the attached letter to Senator Helms.

Attachments

Tab A Letter to Senator Jesse Helms

Tab B Letter from Senator Helms

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

27 September 95 16:24

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

6787C.DOC

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I wanted to get back to you following our meeting to discuss your proposal to reorganize the foreign affairs agencies. Since then, I am pleased that representatives from the Administration have met with your staff as a follow on to that discussion.

I am asking the Vice President to submit to you and Representative Gilman a proposal that we will provide you by a date certain our detailed plan for reorganizing the foreign affairs agencies.

As you know, I strongly believe that the organization of the federal government is the prerogative of the Executive branch, although I think it is important to take into consideration Congressional concerns and ideas as we complete this process.

I ask that in the interim the Committee resume its work with us on treaties such as START II and the Chemical Weapons Convention, Ambassadorial confirmations and other committee business.

I continue to believe that it is critical for this nation to pursue a strongly bipartisan foreign policy and that the Congress provide the resources necessary to keep America's world leadership

strong.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse Helms
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510