

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Willaim Danvers to George Andricos and Christina Funches. Subject: FW:#1423 - Certification for Narcotics Producing... (7 pages)	02/24/1995	P1/b(1)
002. email	William Danvers to Richard Feinberg, Morton Halperin, and Victor Rocha. Subject: RE: Administration's Position on Helms / Cuba Legislation. (2 pages)	03/06/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/07/1995-04/13/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5599

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 07 February 95 16:02

FROM Spalter, Jonathan H.

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

SUBJECT POTUS Guidance Revisions

TO

Andreasen, Steven P.
Aoki, Steven N.
Appell, Edward J.
Atkin, Timothy J.
Baker, James E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beers, Rand R.
Bell, Robert G.
Beyrle, John R.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blakeman, Earle C.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Burns, Nicholas R.
Clarke, Richard A.
Clements, William L.
Cleveland, Carolyn E.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darragh, Sean J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Edwards, Joan
Fauver, Robert E.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Forsythe, Rosemarie C.
Froman, Michael B.
Gardner, Anthony
Genton, Regina A.
Hahn, Keith D.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hammond, Cathy J.
Hammonds, Lisa W.
Harris, Elisa D.
Herrington, David E.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Indyk, Martin S.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.

Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Koff, Alexander
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Longoria, Michael A.
Mack, Kathryn S.
Malley, Robert
Marshall, Betty A.
Mathiowetz, Nancy
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
Merchant, Brian
Mislock, Raymond A.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Norman, Marcia G.
Owen, Elisa J.
Pease, Bruce E.
Pifer, Steven K.
Poneman, Daniel B.
Punke, Michael W.
Quinn, Mary E.
Jim Reed
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
Ross, Thomas B.
Roth, Stanley O.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Satterfield, David M.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Seaton, James B.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sherman, David J.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Steinberg, Donald K.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Tenet, George J.
Vershbow, Alexander R.

Walsh, Helen C.
Whitehouse, John W.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Witkowski, Anne A.

CARBON_COPY

Cicio, Kristen K.
Darby, Melanie B.
Emery, Mary
Hall, Wilma G.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Itoh, William H.
Joshi, M. Kay
Millison, Cathy L.
Sens, Andrew D.
Veit, Katherine M.
Wolin, Neal S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

TEXT_BODY

Colleagues,

In anticipation of Presidential press conferences which will be held in the next few days, please provide updates and revisions to the attached guidance package, and return your PEN AND INK addition/edits in HARD COPY to our office, room 487, NLT COB TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8.
[[GUI207.DOC : 4179 in GUI207.DOC]]
Thanks in advance.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

7 February 95 15:52

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

GUI207.DOC

Foreign Affairs Talking Points

February 6, 1995

Accomplishments

Mexico/Peso

Ecuador/Peru

Bosnia

China

North Korea

Ireland

Haiti

Vietnam

Cambodia

Israel

Russia

Peacekeeping

0

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

-- For the first time since the beginning of the Cold War not a single nuclear warhead is now aimed at the United States.

-- Under START I we will eliminate 9,000 warheads and thousands more under START II.

-- Our agreement with North Korea has stopped their nuclear program in its tracks and will require its eventual destruction.

-- Our armed forces are the best trained and best prepared in the world. And I have asked Congress to provide a \$25 billion increase to keep it that way.

-- The quality of our forces was demonstrated in Kuwait, in Haiti and in the humanitarian mission in Rwanda.

-- We have also helped to create peace in the Middle East, a truce in Northern Ireland and an Eastern Europe free of Russian troops.

-- We have made promotion of democracy a priority -- in Russia, the NIS, Central and Eastern Europe and South Africa.

-- And we have achieved highly beneficial advances in trade with

NAFTA, GATT, the Summit of the Americas and the Asia Pacific Economic Conference.

MEXICO/PESO

KEY POINTS

- Because Congress could not act in time, the President took the initiative and acted decisively with other countries and international financial institutions to help resolve the financial crisis in Mexico.
- The new package consists of a \$20 billion share from the United States' Exchange Stabilization Fund, which the President can authorize by executive action without a new act of Congress; \$17.5 billion from the International Monetary Fund; and a short-term lending facility of \$10 billion from the Bank of International Settlements. An additional \$1 billion has come from Canada, and \$1 billion as well from Argentina and Brazil.
- The new package represents in the aggregate more than the \$40 billion the Administration had proposed in the loan guarantee package, with more of the load being taken by international institutions and our trading partners around the world.
- This is in the interest of America. Thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of American exports are at stake.
- It is meant to address the potential of an even more serious immigration problem, the spread of financial instability in other emerging markets, and the likelihood of increased narcotics trafficking.
- This decisive action is key to U.S. leadership in economic affairs abroad, and our interests at home.

ECUADOR/PERU

BACKGROUND

Talks in Rio de Janeiro aimed at resolving the Peru-Ecuador conflict were suspended Sunday at Ecuador's request to give Quito additional time to study latest proposal by the Four Guarantors.

The proposal calls for cease-fire, separation of forces, demobilization and consultations to resolve other impasses. Alex Watson, head of U.S. delegation to Rio talks, is returning home. United States has suspended arms sales to both countries and has urged others to do the same; this after intel suggests other countries may be selling arms to Ecuador and, perhaps, Peru.

KEY POINTS

-- United States and other Guarantors of the 1942 Rio Protocol -- Argentina, Brazil and Chile -- will continue to lend their assistance to the two parties to try to resolve substantive points of disagreement. Guarantors have issued statement pledging continued commitment to facilitating an agreement and calling for cessation of hostilities.

-- We have received reports that fighting continues in the disputed area but there are no indications it has spread beyond that limited area.

-- We are not providing arms to either country. Encourage other countries not to do so, either.

BOSNIA

KEY POINTS

-- Cease-fire and cessation of hostilities agreement represent real progress and affirm the correctness of our policy.

-- Have been working hard to build on ceasefire to launch new peace talks based on the Contact Group plan.

-- Disappointed by the Bosnian Serbs recent refusal to accept Contact Group territorial proposal.

-- Remain convinced the conflict in Bosnia must end in negotiated settlement. Will continue our efforts toward that end, despite difficulties encountered. (FYI: Contact Group met over the weekend in Munich to address measures to shore up the Federation)

(If asked about the French proposal for an International Conference on Bosnia)

-- Consultations are underway now with the French and other members of the Contact Group on appropriate next steps in our efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement.

-- Inappropriate to speculate on outcome before those consultations are completed, but believe any conference would have to be well prepared in advance.

(If asked about unilateral lift)

-- We remain strongly opposed to a unilateral lift as a step with grave consequences for the United States.

-- It would seriously damage or destroy the peace process, severely strain relations with NATO and the Russians, and bring other UN sanctions into question, particularly on Iraq and Libya.

-- It is not clear that all who favor unilateral lift are prepared to support the rearmament, training, and extensive airstrikes that would be required or the deployment of U.S. ground forces that could become necessary if airstrikes are not fully effective.

(If asked whether we have changed policy in talking to the Bosnian Serbs)

-- Our policy in Bosnia has not changed. We seek a negotiated settlement to the conflict based on the Contact Group Plan that preserves Bosnia as a single state.

-- Within that context, and in close consultation with the Bosnian Government, we contacted the Bosnian Serbs to win their acceptance of the Contact Group map as a starting point for renewed negotiations.

-- Regret Bosnian Serbs have once again rejected the Contact Group plan.

-- Efforts continue, with the full backing of all five member countries of the Contact Group, to obtain a peaceful settlement.

(If asked whether Serbian sanctions compliance has been broken by recent Serbian Helicopters reportedly supplying the Bosnian Serb near Srebrenica)

-- Extremely concerned about the helicopters that were observed by UN forces flying across the inter-Serbian border over the

weekend.

-- Any significant resupply of the Bosnian Serb military would go against Milosevic's pledge to seal the border and deny ymilitary support to Pale.

-- Once all the facts are in, we will take the appropriate steps with our Allies and the UN to ensure Milosevic lives up to his commitment.

CHINA

BACKGROUND

On Saturday, USTR Kantor announced the imposition of 100% tariffs on \$1.08 billion of imports of Chinese products into the U.S. because of China's failure to protect and enforce the intellectual property rights of U.S. companies. These sanctions will go into effect unless an agreement is reached by February 26. China has responded by imposing comparable tariffs on roughly an equal amount of U.S. products.

KEY POINTS

-- One of the pillars of this Administration's trade policy is its determination to protect American jobs that would otherwise be lost as a result of unfair trading practices by our overseas trading partners.

-- This is a particular egregious case of a failure to abide by international norms. IPR piracy in China is not only rampant but growing, despite the fact that we signed an IPR agreement in 1992.

-- While the United States attempted to resolve the numerous issues involved through eight rounds of negotiations, unfortunately no agreement was reached. Meanwhile, the problem worsened.

-- For example, according to industry sources, 29 Chinese "pirate" CD factories produce 75 million CDs, almost all of them for export to third countries that might otherwise buy American

products.

-- Piracy is also common for computer software, CD-ROMs, audiocassettes, videos and video games.

-- While China has improved its laws concerning IPR, it has not improved enforcement, and the result is that the cost to U.S. companies is now believed to exceed \$1 billion.

-- Confronted with this growing problem, we had little choice but to impose sanctions, in order to demonstrate to China that we were dead serious about obtaining significant progress on implementation of IPR legislation.

-- The fact that China has now accepted an invitation from Mickey Kantor to resume the IPR negotiations in Beijing on February 13 suggests that they now understand just how serious we are.

-- I hope that this round of negotiations will lead to an agreement, which is, of course, preferable in principle to sanctions.

-- No one wants to get into a trade war, and even the sanctions that we will impose if no agreement is reached are designed to stop far short of an all-out trade war.

-- But no one should have any doubt that the Administration will proceed, if necessary, with sanctions in order to better protect both American companies and American workers.

NORTH KOREA

KEY POINTS

-- The North Korea agreement is strongly in our national interest. It has stopped the dangerous North Korean nuclear program in its tracks, and requires its eventual destruction.

-- It is not based on trust. The IAEA has verified that the North Korean program is frozen. We and the IAEA are monitoring North Korea's performance every day. If North Korea reneges, the deal is off.

-- We will need Congressional support for the Agreed Framework to work.

-- Our regional allies -- South Korea and Japan -- support this agreement, and will participate in implementing it.

IRELAND

Peace Process

-- I am strongly encouraged by the progress made since the IRA cease-fire was declared on August 31.

-- a cease-fire by loyalist paramilitaries is also in effect and holding.

-- Forum talks opened in Dublin last fall.

-- exploratory talks between British and Sinn Fein began in December and are ongoing.

-- We welcome steps by British to normalize peace in Northern Ireland, including opening of many cross-border roads and ending of daytime military patrols in Belfast and many rural areas.

-- The people of Northern Ireland are enjoying a peace more sustained and more hopeful than they have known for at least a generation.

-- I have heard from many people in Northern Ireland that the past Christmas was the first peaceful one they and their children had ever known.

-- The people of Belfast and other parts of Northern Ireland are enjoying the simple but profound pleasures of going about their daily lives -- working, shopping, sending their children to school and play -- in an atmosphere newly free from the fear of sudden, random violence. A return to violence becomes more unimaginable by the day.

-- We support the efforts of the British and Irish governments to create a new framework for resolving Northern Ireland's problems.

-- The United States, and the millions of Americans who care deeply and have strong ties to Ireland and Britain, can play an important role in supporting peace and new economic opportunities in the region. But details of negotiations and any eventual settlement are for the parties themselves to work out.

-- We will continue to broaden and deepen our dialogue with responsible political leaders in Northern Ireland from both

communities in order to understand better their views, and to make clear our support for a peaceful process of democratic dialogue in Northern Ireland.

(If asked about progress on disarmament as a condition for Sinn Fein's participation in all party talks)

-- I think everyone agrees that progress toward disarmament would help move the peace process forward. While disarmament is not a specific condition, I hope all sides will approach this issue in a constructive, flexible way. The ongoing talks provide a forum for making progress on this issue, as will the all-party talks.

Gerry Adams/Sinn Fein

-- Adams visited the U.S. three times in 1994, most recently in December, when he met with Tony Lake and other U.S. officials. We recognize the important role he plays in the peace process.

-- Adams now holds a three-month, multiple-entry U.S. visa. Since we first issued Adams a visa a year ago, we have maintained a fundraising prohibition. We are working to resolve the remaining issues of concern. (Do not get into specifics.)

(If asked about a report in the British Independent on Sunday that the Administration was working a deal with Adams to allow him to fundraise in exchange for a weapons turn-in)

-- The report is inaccurate. We are working through some concerns related to this issue. I am not going to be more specific.

U.S. Economic Initiatives

-- George Mitchell is actively engaged as Special Advisor to me and Secretary Christopher on Economic Initiatives in Ireland. He is overseeing our package of economic initiatives and identifying ways in which private sector trade and investment can promote peace and economic prosperity in Northern Ireland and the border counties of the Republic. Mitchell will visit the region in February.

-- I look forward to participating in the White House Conference on Investment in Ireland scheduled for May 25-26 in Washington.

-- The response from the American business community has been very encouraging. Peace in Northern Ireland makes it a vastly more attractive place to do business. In turn, job growth and

increased economic opportunity will help solidify the peace.

(If asked who will be invited, whether John Major and John Bruton, Gerry Adams or loyalist paramilitaries will be included)

-- The focus of the conference is trade and investment.

-- We anticipate following the model of our recent successful conference on investment in Central Europe, at which governments were represented at the ministerial, not head of government level.

-- As for political parties and other groups, the conference will seek to be as inclusive as possible while still focusing on the overall business objectives. Senator Mitchell's staff and the conference organizers are currently working on invitation lists.

(If asked whether fair employment issues will be addressed at the conference)

-- Conference organizers are considering including a session on labor at which fair employment questions can be discussed in detail.

-- Commerce Secretary Ron Brown led a strong group of business leaders on a successful trip to Northern Ireland and the Republic in December.

-- I remain committed to seeking from Congress a \$10 million increase in funding for the International Fund for Ireland in FY96 and again in FY97, for a total of about \$30 each year.

-- There is strong bipartisan support in Congress for the Fund, and for solidifying this chance for peace.

HAITI

Background: The UN Security Council Resolution approved Monday evening sets the date for a transition from the U.S. to the UN Mission in Haiti for no later than March 31. It authorizes up to 6,000 military and 900 civilian police.

Points

- We expect about 2,500 U.S. military to be part of the UN force of 6,000.
- An American officer, Major General Joseph Kinzer, will be the UN commander.
- The transition date will be no later than March 31.
- The resolution extends the mandate until July 31, and we expect the UN force to remain in Haiti through the presidential elections to the inauguration in February of 1996.
- Based on extensive planning, we expect the transition to be seamless.
- We have met with the UN almost weekly. We had one all day conference in December and expect another in February.
- We have also provided U.S. planners for the UNMIH advance staff in Haiti and for UN headquarters in New York to help with the transition.

VIETNAM

Background: On Saturday in Hanoi, the U.S. and Vietnam signed an agreement to open "liaison offices" in each other's capitals. Senator Helms and Congressman Gilman wrote to you last week, asking you to delay the opening of the liaison offices, pending the receipt by Congress of a statutorily-required report from DOD on the status of unresolved POW-MIA cases. This report is due on February 17. As there is no linkage between the report and the decision on liaison offices announced last year, there was no real reason to delay signing the agreements and opening the offices. A former U.S. intelligence operator, Ted Schweitzer recently published a book charging Vietnam killed hundreds of U.S. POW/MIAs and then hid the fact. While some U.S. POWs were certainly killed, our evidence does not corroborate Schweitzer's high numbers.

Points

-- The opening of the liaison offices does not represent establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Vietnam. Full diplomatic relations are dependent on further tangible progress in accounting for American POWs and MIAs.

-- An expanded official U.S. presence in Vietnam will encourage greater Vietnamese progress on POW-MIA accounting.

-- In addition, the opening of the Hanoi office will enable us to provide consular services for Americans visiting or residing in Vietnam, including numerous Americans who visit and work in Vietnam on the POW-MIA issue.

(If asked why you didn't postpone opening the offices as requested by Helms and Gilman)

-- The Defense Department is preparing the POW-MIA report cited by Senator Helms and Congressman Gilman and will forward it as soon as possible.

-- The liaison office which will facilitate the process of full accounting. It is thus in our interest to move forward with the liaison office.

(If asked about a new book claiming "hundreds" of POWs were killed or tortured to death)

-- We continue to press the governments of Vietnam and Laos for the fullest possible disclosure of information about POWs and MIAs.

-- We now have even fuller access to Vietnamese military files than the author had, and we have engaged in numerous on-site excavations -- with full Vietnamese and Laotian cooperation -- to resolve specific cases.

-- While we know that some Americans died at the hands of their Vietnamese captors, we cannot corroborate the claim that "hundreds" died that way.

CAMBODIA

Background: The Press has given considerable attention to Strobe Talbott's statement in Phnom Penh that the U.S. will give lethal

assistance to the Cambodian Army to fight the Khmer Rouge. Too little attention has been given to the fact that this policy requires the Cambodian Army to undergo a significant reform of its rank structure and procedures to qualify; and that most of our assistance is non-lethal..

Points

- Strobe Talbott's statement does not represent a new policy. Lethal assistance would only be considered in the context of reform of the Cambodian armed forces.
- We have not yet provided lethal assistance since the reform process is ongoing.
- We currently provide non-lethal assistance including mine clearing, road building and English language training.

ISRAEL

- I strongly condemn this horrendous act of terrorist violence and conveyed the condolences and deepest sympathy of the American people to the families of the victims.
- I believe that the parties must continue the peace process. To do otherwise would hand these terrorists their greatest victory. I admire and welcome the Israeli Government's decision to continue the talks with the Palestinians.
- I have directed the Treasury Department to freeze assets in the U.S. of terrorist organizations and to prohibit financial transactions between the U.S. and these organizations overseas.

Separation of Israelis and Palestinians

- Separation sounds like a quick fix solution to an immensely complex problem. It doesn't take account of settlers living in the West Bank and Palestinians living in Jerusalem. The Israeli and Palestinian population are so intertwined it is difficult to see how separation would work.
- The solution lies in negotiating agreements and keeping to

them.

Even separation would have to be negotiated.

-- Chairman Arafat has to find effective ways to meet Israel's security requirements. Israel has to find effective ways to help Palestinians feel the economic benefits of peacemaking.

-- Both sides have a strong interest in preventing the terrorists from succeeding with their effort to destroy the peace process.

(If asked about U.S. policy on settlements and whether Israel's actions are making the negotiations more difficult)

-- Israel and the PLO both agreed in the Declaration of Principles signed at the White House and the Gaza/Jericho Agreement that settlements are an issue that they will address in the final status negotiations. I support that approach.

-- That said, settlement activity clearly complicates the negotiations. They're not the only problem -- terrorism poses a much greater danger to the process -- but they do have a very negative impact on the attitudes of the Palestinians.

-- At the same time, this issue should be put in perspective. While allowing some new building in existing settlements, Prime Minister Rabin has curtailed settlement activity. Recently, he declared there would be no new settlements, no government funding, and no confiscation of land other than for security roads in the context of redeployment of the Israeli army.

RUSSIA

Background: The head of the OSCE mission to Chechnya held a press conference in Moscow after visiting Grozny. He compared the destruction there to Dresden. He called Russian use of force disproportionate and indiscriminate, and criticized both the Russians and the Chechens for human rights violations.

Points

-- We've been very much in support of the OSCE's efforts to deal with the humanitarian aspects of the situation.

-- We've also been encouraged by the Russian government's support for the mission's travel to Chechnya.

-- The head of the mission will be reporting to our Ambassador and other OSCE officials in Vienna. I don't want to react to press statements until we've had a chance to hear the full report.

-- But it's clear the toll of suffering from this conflict has been far too high. I again call on the Russians and Chechens to resolve this matter without further violence.

Stake in Russia

-- The United States has a tremendous stake in a healthy and democratic Russia. That's why we'll continue our vigorous support of reform in Russia, as well as in the other states of the former Soviet Union. Now is no time to give up.

-- We have said we support Russia's territorial integrity, just as we support its neighbors'. But we have made very clear our concern about the way the military operation in Chechnya has been handled. The violence simply must end.

(If asked)

-- There's no evidence to indicate that President Yeltsin is not in control in Russia.

-- There have been other episodes when some tried to write him off, but he showed that he remained in command.

-- I expect to continue an active dialog with President Yeltsin. But we haven't fixed a date for our next meeting.

PEACEKEEPING

-- Peacekeeping could become a point of partisan contention. It does not have to be. I hope we can work constructively with the Republicans on this as well as other national security issues.

-- UN peacekeeping serves our common interest in getting others to take on greater responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. It is a tool that any President would find useful as a means of burden-sharing. We should not seek to cripple peacekeeping but preserve and reform it.

-- As Secretary Christopher said, certain restrictions on peacekeeping could leave the United States with the choice of "acting alone or doing nothing."

-- UN peacekeeping missions in the Middle East, Cyprus, Cambodia, Namibia, El Salvador, and elsewhere demonstrate the value to the U.S. of many UN efforts.

NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

Background: Tony Lake gave a speech Monday outlining the decisions you made on the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban.

Points

-- We have been vigorously urging all countries to support the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I said this in my State of the Union speech and in my address to the United Nations.

-- To underscore my determination to achieve as much progress as possible before the NPT Extension Conference convenes in April, I made three decisions over the weekend.

-- First, on the assumption that the treaty will be signed before September 30, 1996, and subject to the same understandings that govern our current moratorium, I decided to extend the moratorium on its nuclear tests until a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty enters into force.

-- Second, I directed our CTB negotiator to propose that the Conference on Disarmament remain in session through August if the negotiation is not concluded during the round now scheduled to end in April.

-- Third, I directed that at today's (Tuesday's) session of the Geneva negotiations, the U.S. will withdraw its proposal for a special "right to

withdraw" from the CTB Treaty ten years after it enters into force.

-- Let me also note that the CTB will contain a traditional "supreme national interest" clause.

-- In articulating our National Security Strategy last July, I declared that the United States will retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter any future hostile foreign leadership with access to nuclear forces from acting against our vital national interests and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile.

-- In this regard, I consider the maintenance of a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile to be a supreme national interest of the United States.

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 12:10
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT February 10 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO

Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Aoki, Steven N.
Appell, 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
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blakeman, Earle C.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boright, John
Bradley, Amelia J.
Branscum, Larry
Breeland, Jocelyn G
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Burns, Nicholas R.
Buzalko, Russ
Kevin J. Cadieux
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.
Darnes, Victoria J.
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.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Funches, Christina L.
Gardner, Anthony
Gates, Brian K.
Genton, Regina A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Grant, Kathleen M.
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.
Hilty, JoAnne 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.
Koff, Alexander
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
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.
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.
Moore, Lori A.
Neil, M. Elise
Nelson, Patricia D.
Niemerski, Stephen
Niemerski, Matthew B.
Norman, Marcia G.
O'Loughlin, Katherine

Owen, Elisa J.
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Pifer, Steven K.
Pitman, James
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Punke, Michael W.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Jim Reed
Reed, George
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
Ross, Thomas B.
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, Sandra E.
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.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Steinberg, Donald K.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sullivan, Kathryn
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarantino, Frederick A.

Tenet, George J.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
VanDam, Stacy L.
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.
Whitehouse, John W.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, Jeffrey B.
Wise, William M.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Wolin, Neal S.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[10MCCBRF.DOC : 3082 in 10MCCBRF.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 10 February 95 11:55

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 10MCCBRF.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release February 10, 1995

Fo

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

9:00 A.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Let me do the President's day for you, because he will be working here most of the day looking ahead to the coming week, which I think is going to be filled with several opportunities for the President to begin in a more careful way to draw some lines and distinctions with the Republican majority in Congress on several matters in which I think we are inclined to feel differently than the Republican majority on emerging legislation on the Hill. But let me stay focused for a minute on today because I think today welfare reform is likely to be a major focus.

Minority Leader Gephardt later on today is going to be outlining the Democratic position on welfare reform and the strategy to address some of the things emerging in the Republican approach to welfare reform. I think, in general, it is emerging as a consensus view of both the administration and Democrats on the Hill that some of the things the Republicans are doing in their proposed legislation would be a little too soft on work. Our view is that the focus of this effort to reform welfare ought to be about moving people off of welfare and into work situations. And the flexibility that is given to states ought to be designed to both protect children, but also make it possible for people to have the kinds of opportunities for employment that will make welfare reform truly meaningful.

In short, welfare reform ought to be about moving people to work, while protecting the children who ought not to be punished. And I think you're going to hear both the President and Democrats on the Hill stress that as we begin to look very closely at the welfare reform proposals that are now emerging from the Republican majority.

There are some problems within the Republican ranks on their approach. We do not detect within the Republican majority unanimity on questions like cutting off all aid to legal immigrants or denying aid to unwed mothers. And so I think they are going to

have to address some of the more controversial aspects of their legislation. Meanwhile, we're going to be working to fix a broken welfare system to end welfare as we now know it and to press ahead with the type of objectives and goals that the President has outlined.

Q Mike, when you said we'll be hearing from the President, do you mean will there be anything today that the President will say?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he won't be -- he has no public events on his calendar today. Let me just say what he will be doing today. He is going to have lunch today with a group of Democratic senators. We expect to see Senator Dodd, Senator Moynihan, Senator Leahy, Senator Hollings, Senator Inoye, and Senator Bumpers. This continues a series of luncheons and private meetings the President has been having with members of the Congress, occasionally Republicans, but mostly Democrats, as we go through a range of issues and prepare for what will likely be some tough legislative fights with the Republican majority coming up.

We've got the crime bill now on the Hill. I expect tomorrow in the President's radio address you're going to hear him lay down some pretty firm markers on questions like getting 100,000 more cops out into the country. Welfare reform, as I've just said, is an area in which there are some serious and substantial differences with the Republican majority. I also believe next week you're going to hear when the President speaks in San Francisco some real differences in our approach on education and investments in education. And lastly, next week you'll also probably begin to hear some differences that we have on national security issues, particularly the role that the Commander in Chief has to play both in protecting America's vital national interests abroad and also in his role as this nation's chief foreign policymaker.

So all of these are beginning to emerge. There's cooperation when cooperation is possible, but there's also, when there is markedly different approaches between what Republicans want to do and what this Democratic President wants to do -- some areas in which we have to outline those differences very clearly. So I think that is going to dominate the week next week.

We will be doing some further briefings here later today on welfare reform to comment specifically on some of the things that Minority Leader Gephardt will raise. And tomorrow there's a possibility we'll also do some briefing around the issue of the crime bill and specifically our cops proposal, putting 100,000 more law enforcement officers out into the country.

Q Mike, on welfare, does the President actually plan to resubmit his welfare bill this year?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I'll leave that to -- Congressman Gephardt is going to be talking a little bit about that, I believe

at 11:00 a.m. today, so leave it to him.

Q How did you wind up selecting G.W.? You told us yesterday morning that Howard was under consideration. Did you just call the local universities?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe so. I think they were just looking for a proper venue. They started calling places to see where it would be good and appropriate to have an audience that Dr. Foster could address.

Q Mike, on other issues that are up on the Hill, the balanced budget amendment -- the President's seems to be taking a very low profile approach, and I would ask why is that? And then also, that proposal the Democrats have on adding a caveat into the amendment that no Social Security funds be used to balance the budget -- what does he think about that?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I think he's very supportive of the effort the Democratic senators are making to protect Social Security. One of our chief concerns, and one of the reasons why the administration has expressed opposition to the constitutional amendment to balance the budget is that there is no plan from the Republicans on how they would protect those social insurance programs that are so vital to the welfare of many American citizens.

We've taken the federal budget, put it on the table and said, all right, here's our plan, now where's your plan? And they consistently refuse to come back and explain how they would meet a very ambitious goal of balancing the federal budget by the year 2002, and specifically how, under a constitutional mandate, they would protect those citizens who rely upon Social Security benefits.

So we are fully supportive; the President has been very outspoken on the need to protect Social Security, and I think in the coming days he will be working with members of the Senate -- my guess is he might actually have some conversations with members of the Senate encouraging them to look very long and hard at issues related to the balanced budget amendment as it goes before the Senate.

Q Mike, it's still not clear to me how this administration explains the inconsistency in its approach between welfare reform and the crime bill. In welfare reform you advocate flexibility, you want the localities and the states to try something new. But if a locality says it needs a police car rather than an additional cop you won't let them use the money for that. Why the inconsistency there?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, because masquerading as flexibility in the case of the crime bill is an assault on the funding and the provisions of the 1994 crime bill, hard-fought over, that would get

more cops on the street and combat the type of violence that Americans are sick and tired of. That is not -- in the case of welfare reform, there is flexibility designed to move people from welfare into work situations, but there's a real concern with some of the provisions of the emerging crime bill in the Republican-dominated Congress that they would take back some of the very hard-fought provisions that were contained in the 1994 bill.

Q As long as you're drawing distinctions between the President's position and that of the Congress, what is his view on the Republican refusal to endorse the 4th Amendment the other day?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President has concerns about that issue, but he also is very supportive of tougher law enforcement measures that allow law enforcement officers, when there's been reasonable efforts made to guarantee the constitutional rights of potential defendants, he believes that law enforcement officials need some types of measures that have been talked about in the past so that they can make correct searches and seizures and --

Q Does he endorse the Republican proposal that as long as the cop thinks it's okay, it's okay?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't believe that's an accurate characterization entirely of the Republican provision. But he has not taken a position specifically on all of the different amendments. There have been a host of amendments that were considered in the course of the crime bill. I don't think he's addressed each and every one of them specifically.

Q You're fighting a two-front war on Foster, and you make an eloquent case on the abortion issue that it is a legal procedure, et cetera. But on the credibility issue, what are you telling members of Congress? Are you saying to them just, we're sorry, we goofed, or that the range of numbers presented to them doesn't matter, that he doesn't have a credibility problem? A lot of senators are seizing on that issue as a reason to vote against him. Whether it's a cover or not, it's given them an opportunity.

MR. MCCURRY: On that issue, Dr. Foster addressed it effectively in his television interview the other night.

Q Apparently it wasn't effective because a lot more senators came out yesterday and said on the credibility issue they're now against him.

MR. MCCURRY: I believe you'll see today a host of groups coming out in support of Dr. Foster. I believe you'll see senators stepping up and being very publicly supportive of him, and that reflects, I think, confidence that they have in him and in the presentation that he has made.

Q But I'm asking, Mike, if I can follow, what the argument is you're making to counter the credibility question.

MR. MCCURRY: The argument is that -- exactly the one that

Dr. Foster made on television the other night. He was very candid in addressing that himself, and we are supporting the nominee fully and pointing towards his own public explanation as the best evidence available that he was honestly, truthfully trying to deal with a question thrown at him very, very quickly, as he indicated the other night.

Q Mike, beyond the speech today, what is Foster doing, what is the President doing to salvage this thing?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, Dr. Foster, I think you all know what he's doing today. He'll be speaking publicly. And there will be a variety of groups today announcing publicly their support for the nominee. There will be a very extensive effort by the administration to make sure that people on the Hill have information they need to be fully supportive of the nominee. And in the coming days, Dr. Foster will be meeting with members of Congress, making courtesy calls on senators as we go through today and the weekend and into next week -- also meeting with friends and acquaintances of his on Capitol Hill who want to be supportive.

Q Is the President going to be involved?

MR. MCCURRY: The President has had discussions about Dr. Foster with, I'd say, several members of the Congress, both on the House side and the Senate side. And, as I indicated earlier, he'll be having lunch with Democratic senators today. He's got a very broad agenda for that lunch, but I can't imagine that the Foster nomination won't be at least one element of the discussion today.

Q Are you going to keep him out there over the weekend, more public appearances?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, Dr. Foster's got a lot of preparation work to do for his coming confirmation, so he will be working himself this weekend. He's had a very week. I think he deserves a little bit of the weekend off. But, as I said, he'll be preparing for a round of discussions with members of the Senate and members of the House going into next week.

Q When do you submit the nomination?

MR. MCCURRY: The nomination cannot be submitted until the FBI has completed its background check, and that's really up to the Bureau to do that deliberately.

Q Mike, this morning in his Speaker's conference, Newt Gingrich, after lambasting the White House for what he called "shoddy staff work" on Foster, made it sound as if he had the best interest of the President or the White House at heart when he said he didn't understand why the White House would go through what he predicted would be two weeks of very contentious debate over the Foster nomination. Could you answer that question? Why has the President chosen to go to the mat on the Foster nomination, which

is clearly in big trouble?

THE PRESIDENT: The President yesterday could not have been clearer on that point. He said that Dr. Foster is an enormously impressive nominee for this very important post, and that, ultimately, this fight is not about all the extraneous issues that are being cited, it is fundamentally about a woman's right to choose. And nobody is -- should be under the illusion that those groups that are working with the Republican majority in the Congress are fighting this nomination for any reason but they would like to make criminal those things with which Dr. Foster has done legally in the past.

That's what this nomination fight is about, as the President indicated yesterday. And that is one reason among many -- it should not be the sole reason why people are supportive of Dr. Foster, but it is a very important and substantial reason. It is about a different view of what role women have in our society. And there is an extreme view emerging within the Republican majority in the Congress that suggests that right to life out to be a litmus test for appointees to this very important federal positions. And that is an unfortunate dynamic in this current debate. But it is the one that is the most important; it is the one that the President finds very, very compelling, as he stated yesterday.

Q Mike, what do you perceive as the political impact on the Foster nomination now that Quayle has pulled out, how do you see that, or what kind of impact would you perceive on Republican opposition?

MR. MCCURRY: As I just said, it is -- there is an extreme right to life view that seems to be taking hold in the Republican majority on Congress, and I suspect that view now will dominate presidential politics on the Republican side, too. I'm no expert

on Republican presidential politics, but you can easily see the emergence now of a dynamic in which these groups, having a taste for the blood of this fight, will now work to make this a dominant issue in the Republican political agenda as they prepare for their nomination fight in 1996. That will be, frankly, not something that the White House will participate in, but it's something I know that all of you will follow.

Q Two questions; one just technical. Did you say Foster is going to make courtesy calls today?

MR. MCCURRY: They were still working on that, Mike. There's I think a chance he will go up to the Hill today to see some friends of his. He's not -- courtesy calls normally are used in connection with the senators that he will visit as part of the advice and consent procedure up there, and that may begin next week, but it will begin shortly one way or another.

Q With people like Frist --

MR. MCCURRY: He will visit -- I think his first visit --

he wants to see Congressman Clement and visit with his own home congressmen.

Q He'll be here?

MR. MCCURRY: Will he be here? Dr. Foster? I believe he was here earlier today before going out to his speech. I think he has now left to go to his speech.

Q The other question I have is on the litmus test issue. Hasn't the President made it a litmus test issue on choosing Supreme Court justices?

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

Q Hasn't the President made abortion a litmus test issue in choosing Supreme Court justices?

MR. MCCURRY: The role that choice plays in those nominations I think has been fully discussed in the course of those nominations.

Q But why is it wrong for Republicans to do the -- to apply the same test?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know that I suggested -- it's wrong for the nomination fight in our view to be solely about that issue. It ought to focus on the work that Dr. Foster has done to prevent

abortion by preventing unwanted pregnancies. But it is a fact of life I think that this is now becoming a litmus test issue for the Republican majority.

Q We've seen two themes develop out of the White House since the election -- cooperation and confrontation. You seem to be going to some lengths today to -- (laughter) --

MR. MCCURRY: My loyal staff is trying to get me out of the room. Go ahead.

Q You seem to be going to some lengths today to emphasize that the President is now going to confront Congress on issues that he feels very strongly about. Has something happened to prompt this reemphasis on confrontation?

MR. MCCURRY: No --

Q -- or this kind of an evolution of a strategy that's been in place some time, or what's going on?

MR. MCCURRY: I did not mean to sound belligerent earlier, but I did mean to suggest that there are areas emerging now, as we watch the Republican majority function in its first 100 days, where we can see some clear differences between the administration and the Congress.

We also see areas of cooperation. Welfare reform is one

in which there are many areas of agreement. I pointed out this morning some areas of disagreement that are important; that there are large areas of agreement on welfare reform where we hope we can work together. There are other examples, most recently the President's very strong leadership on the Mexico economic crisis, supported by the Republican leadership, where clearly the President and the Republican majority will work together. By and large, our view is that we would prefer to work in an area of cooperation and address so many of the problems on the nation's agenda.

But there will be specific areas, and they are now emerging as Congress continues its work, where we think it's important to draw some distinctions. And I think it will be increasingly -- you'll see this increasingly next week. And it will probably continue as we go through the balance of this first term in the 104th Congress.

Q Well, Mike, did the way the GOP left him out on a limb on the Mexico deal sort of sour his views on cooperation?

MR. MCCURRY: No, the President -- we've anticipated even

the President even in the State of the Union speech addressed this -- cooperation when it's possible, but drawing some sharp distinctions when, inevitably, we have a different view of what the country should be about, compared to what the Republicans suggest.

Q What are these foreign policy differences that he's going to be highlighting?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there are some embedded in the Contract With America, and they are now reflected in legislation beginning to emerge that really challenge many of the President's constitutional authorities. But I will leave that for next week.

Q What will the forum for that be?

MR. MCCURRY: I've got Ginny and Mary Ellen who will tell you a little bit more. That's not clear yet where that will be, but there's been testimony -- we've already been up on the Hill. Secretary Perry, Secretary Christopher, Ambassador Albright, others have been on the Hill testifying on specifically those points. They relate not only to peacekeeping, but also to some structure, some of the decision-making that should be within the province of the presidency.

Q Housekeeping before your staff drags you off -- do you brief later today? And you were saying something about briefings here on welfare.

MR. MCCURRY: No, I've got to -- in fact, that's why I'm doing this now, because I've got to go out of town on a short trip. But I'll be back late today. We're going to have a welfare reform briefing we're trying to get organized now by some other folks who can talk a little more about some of the things I've outlined here.

Q Do you know yet when?

MR. MCCURRY: No, these guys will take care of that.

Q Is the President in favor of Senator Helms'

initiative on Cuba?

MR. MCCURRY: The President -- we are aware that legislation was introduced yesterday. We will review it. We have not taken a position on that legislation at this time. We remain fully supportive of the Cuban Democracy Act and the elements of the Cuban Democracy Act that currently guide administration policy towards Cuba.

Q On payments to immigrants, Representative Shaw

purports to cite a study showing that the SSI payments are drawing in immigrants, legal immigrants, from other countries simply to retire. Do you have any comment on that? Is there any backing for that? Do requirements for SSI need to be tightened in any way?

MR. MCCURRY: I know that Congressman suggests that some of the SSI provisions and the immigrant provisions could save, I think he estimates, \$23 billion over five years, but I'll have to leave that question to some of the experts later on today. I don't know the answer to that right off hand.

Last question in the back.

Q As late as yesterday, some Democrats in the Senate were saying that the Foster nomination was 50-50 at best. What were your percentages on it?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, if that's the judgment of the members of the Senate, our view is that as we begin a successful and tough fight for his confirmation, those odds will shift in favor of Dr. Foster as the nomination fight proceeds.

Q Were you surprised at The New York Times editorial today, basically suggesting that you withdraw the nomination?

MR. MCCURRY: Newspapers take editorial points of view all the time. We disagree with it. I don't know that we were surprised by it, but we certainly disagree with it.

Q One more on that. Yesterday you acknowledged the vetting process was less than perfect, and you made extensive comments --

MR. MCCURRY: Wednesday.

Q The other day, I'm sorry. But a moment ago, you made extensive comments on the process and the litmus test.

MR. MCCURRY: No, I didn't -- oh, the Hill process, the confirmation process.

Q Are you telling us that, in a way, you did underestimate the impact of the antiabortion forces?

MR. MCCURRY: It was difficult to imagine that the

Republican majority would become seized of the very confrontational tactics of the Right to Life group and then allow that to dominate their consideration of the nomination. We thought, given Dr. Foster's impressive record, the work that he has committed his life

to, to avert teenage pregnancies, the acknowledgement of that work by former President George Bush by naming Dr. Foster one of his 1,000 Points of Light. That all suggested to us that the issue of abortion in connection with Dr. Foster's nomination would be seen in the broad context of a very impressive career devoted to thwarting the need for abortion. So it is difficult to imagine that the Right to Live movement would have gotten a hook into the Republican majority that fully.

Q But, Mike, some Republicans think the White House handed them a hook into Foster by the shoddy staff work. And some of these critics on the Hill are not even bringing up the word, "abortion," they're talking credibility here.

MR. MCCURRY: I talked about that pretty candidly on Wednesday. I've got to go.

END 9:30 A.M.
EST

#14-02/10

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 10 February 95 12:25

FROM Rocha, Victor M.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Subject: RE: Cuba bill [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Malley, Robert

CARBON_COPY Feinberg, Richard E.
Halperin, Morton H.

TEXT_BODY

I don't think he had time to use the points; however, he seems to have been well trained from his previous job. His instincts were right on the mark.

From: Malley, Robert

To: Feinberg, Richard E.; Halperin, Morton H.; Rocha, Victor M.

CC: /R, Record at A1

Subject: Cuba bill [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Friday, February 10, 1995 12:21 PM

Attached is what McCurry had to say on the bill today. I can't tell if he used our points, but it is consistent.

Q Is the President in favor of Senator Helms' initiative on Cuba?

MR. MCCURRY: The President -- we are aware that legislation was introduced yesterday. We will review it. We have not taken a position on that legislation at this time. We remain fully supportive of the Cuban Democracy Act and the elements of the Cuban Democracy Act that currently guide administration policy towards Cuba.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 21 February 95 11:01
FROM Lennon, John E
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Points for Lake Meeting; [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Cooper, Kathleen H.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

[[NPRLAKE.DOC : 2868 in NPRLAKE.DOC]]

From: Halperin, Morton H.
To: Lennon, John E.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: FW: Points for Lake Meeting; [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Friday, February 17, 1995 06:55 PM

pls do on NPR. thanks.

From: Andricos, George M.
To: @NSC - NSC Staff
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: Points for Lake Meeting; [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Friday, February 17, 1995 05:14 PM

Tony is meeting with the Freshman Class of the House of Representatives next week. He will be accompanied by Christopher, Perry, Shali and Albright. We anticipate questions on several topics, as follows. Could you provide about half a page of background points, as appropriate, on each issue by NOON TUESDAY? Existing materials should be fine in most cases.

Thanks.

Defense Supplemental
NMD and related issues
Defense Readiness
Bosnia
Haiti
Mexico
Russia
Peacekeeping
Somalia
Other Resource Issues as appropriate

.....and any other issues you feel are appropriate

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

21 February 95 10:42

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

NPRLAKE.DOC

TALKING POINTS FOREIGN AFFAIRS REORGANIZATION

BACKGROUND

The State Department proposed earlier this year that AID, ACDA, and USIA be merged with State. After a high-level review by a White House National Performance Review team, the Vice President decided against the proposal and in favor of a functional realignment within the existing framework of agencies. Since then Sen. Helms has announced plans to introduce legislation similar to the State proposal, and the Senate Budget Committee has proposed elimination of AID, ACDA, USG support for a variety of international organizations, PL 480 sales and grants, and overseas broadcasting, as well as drastic reductions in UN peacekeeping support, OPIC and Eximbank assistance, and aid to several countries. The Vice President and other members of the White House team are in discussions with the Hill, but continuing debate within the administration leaves the impression, as the Washington Post editorialized Saturday, of disarray.

TALKING POINTS

- ù The Vice President's NPR team has concluded that AID, ACDA, and USIA should continue to pursue their vital missions of sustainable development, arms control, and public diplomacy under the direction of the Secretary of State.
- ù The Vice President has directed the foreign affairs agencies to reduce spending by \$5 billion over five years.
- ù The Vice President has directed the agencies to establish joint administrative services by the end of the current fiscal year, in order to increase effectiveness and reduce cost.
- ù The President's Management Council will report to the Vice President by mid-April on ways to streamline overseas operations by making better use of communications technology and administrative and support systems.
- ù State will close 15 additional posts abroad by October 1 for a total of 32, eliminate one domestic bureau, and eliminate overlapping public affairs, congressional relations, political-military affairs, and policy planning functions.
- ù AID will close six additional missions for a total of 21, streamline its management and planning systems, and cut internal regulations by half.

ù ACDA and State will eliminate duplication of arms control and non-proliferation activities, cut back on overseas costs, and streamline Washington operations.

ù USIA will develop a streamlined public affairs function, consolidate policy planning staffs, oversee reinvention of foreign affairs exchange and training programs, and consolidate Inspectors General with State.

ù The Administration is working with Committee Chairs and staff to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of foreign affairs agencies while maintaining the necessary framework to meet U.S. policy goals and retain America's position as a world leader.

ù

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Willaim Danvers to George Andricos and Christina Funches. Subject: FW:#1423 - Certification for Narcotics Producing... (7 pages)	02/24/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/07/1995-04/13/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5599

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 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

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

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.

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.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 04 March 95 16:06

FROM Danvers, William C.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Subject: Legislative Update [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.
Reed, James W.
Sens, Andrew D.
Veit, Katherine M.
Wolin, Neal S.

CARBON_COPY 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, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
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
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Buzalko, Russell J.
Kevin J. Cadieux
Carter, Michael E.
Chyba, Christopher F.
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.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Darragh, Sean J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Evans, Paul A.
Fauver, Robert E.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Forsythe, Rosemarie C.
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.
Grant, Kathleen M.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Hahn, Keith D.
Hale, John E.

Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Hammond, Cathy J.
Hammonds, Lisa W.
Harris, Elisa D.
Haskell, Jennifer
Hawes, David J.
Herrington, David E.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Indyk, Martin S.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Koff, Alexander
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E.
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
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.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Mislock, Raymond A.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.

Moore, Lori A.
Neil, M. Elise
Nelson, Patricia D.
Niemerski, Stephen
Niemerski, Matthew B.
Norman, Marcia G.
O'Loughlin, Katherine
Owen, Elisa J.
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Pifer, Steven K.
Pitman, James N.
Poneman, Daniel B.
Poppiti, Victoria L.
Porter, Gidell
Punke, Michael W.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Reed, George
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
Ross, Thomas B.
Roth, Stanley D.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Seeley, Charlotte P.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sherman, David J.
Silger, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Stauffer, Helen L.

Steinberg, Donald K.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sullivan, Kathryn
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarantino, Frederick A.
Tenet, George J.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
VanDam, Stacy L.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Wallack, Matthew D.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Whitehouse, John W.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, Jeffrey B.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.

TEXT_BODY

Note for Tony, Nancy and Sandy:

NPR effort continues. Leon led an NPR team to meet with Sen. Helms staff on their restructuring proposal. State was the only agency present. We had a subsequent meeting with the other concerned agencies-- ACDA, USIA and AID. We hope to be able to meet with the Hill this week. We had intended to do so Mon. or Tues. but may have to wait a few days in order to incorporate additional input from AID and State.

We had a meeting with State, AID, OMB, USIA, White House LA to work on a strategy on the 150 account-- both for the Hill and public outreach. There will be two groups-- a leg. strategy group and a public outreach group-- that will coordinate through Nancy's long range planning group our efforts with the 150 account.

We met, along with Clements and Froman, with Rep. Roth's staffer on the EAA. It was a positive and productive meeting. We will have a meeting here with Dan and Bob Kyle next week on next steps.

We are prepared to make calls to the Hill on the results of the Bosnia discussions if necessary. I understand that we may want to wait a week. We will move ahead when you give us the signal.

In conjunction with Pat Griffin's shop, the Dept. of Veterans Affairs, and DoD we are coordinating Hill calls for Monday on the President's VFW speech and initiatives on Gulf War Veteran's Illness.

Tony is scheduled to meet with Sen. Dole and other Senators on Monday to discuss ABM/TMD at 1 PM on Monday. Bob Bell and I will accompany you. A background memo will be sent separately.

In marking up the DoD Supp on Thursday, SAC denied \$52.3 million for repair and construction at Gitmo. The Ct. said this should be deferred until a more definitive policy is approved by the Administration and Congress. The Ct. further noted that these costs could be covered in FY 96 approps without jeopardizing camp operations. Mort may call Graham and Mack about this.

Overall, the Ct. reduced the Administration's request of \$2.5 billion to \$1.9 billion. This is thought to at least partly reflect a conference strategy to bring the House, which provided \$3.2 billion, close to the actual request, i.e. split the difference in conference. Among cuts were the reduction in funds for Gitmo plus taking credit for Kuwait payments to the U.S. for operation Vigilant Warrior (\$230 million). The Ct. offset the \$1.9 billion in defense and international program rescissions. They also took \$1.5 billion in domestic program rescissions and applied it to deficit reduction. The supp. is expected to go to the floor next week-- maybe by Tues.

There may still be a possibility of doing something on Jordan debt relief on the DoD supp in the Senate, which we put us in a position to do something in conference. We have reason to believe that Sen. Dole may be supportive of this. We will watch it very closely.

The Speaker's office advised us that they have decided not to invite Gerry Adams to the Speaker's St. Pat's Day lunch. They will invite John Hume, the Taosich (sp) and the Irish Ambassador.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	William Danvers to Richard Feinberg, Morton Halperin, and Victor Rocha. Subject: RE: Administration's Position on Helms / Cuba Legislation. (2 pages)	03/06/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/07/1995-04/13/1995]

2006-1363-F

vz5599

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 March 95 08:23
FROM Rocha, Victor M.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Danvers, William C.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Can you kindly let me have a copy of the talking points you work out with State on the Helms/Cuba legislation. Thanks

From: Danvers, William C.
To: @UP - APNSA Special Assistants; @NSA - Nat'l Security Advisor
CC: /R, Record at A1; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs; @NSC - NSC Staff;
@VP -
VP Natl Security Affairs
Subject: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, March 07, 1995 09:14 PM

Note for Tony, Sandy and Nancy:

The DoD supp became somewhat of a battleground for foreign policy amendments. On Korea, Murkowski and Dole have put forward an amendment that would cut off any reprogrammed funds for the agreed framework.

Sen. Nunn and others may have worked out language that would make the amendment benign-- essentially making it only applicable to funds appropriated by the supp. We will know more in the morning if this is the case.

John Deutch deserves a great deal of credit for working this hard. Bob Bell and Dan Poneman were also, once again, very helpful.

On Cuba, Sen. Helms put forward his Cuba bill as an amendment to the supp. There is some indication that he may withdraw the amendment. We are working with State on talking points and getting Senators to help us out on the floor.

We won two TRP amendments. A Bingaman Sense of the Congress in support of the program and the defeat of a McCain amendment that would have cut the program further.

I believe the Leahy amendment on restoring DFA funds was accepted as well. We will check on details in the morning.

No indication that there will be other difficult amendments, but you never know.

Dan Poneman had an EAA meeting, talking about tactics on how to advance this legislation.

State had a p-k meeting to discuss next steps and pass on some thoughts that Christopher had after conversations with Rep. Rogers, House CJS chair. This could include enhanced consultations and establishing a contingency fund.

We will coordinate with State on the Peru-Ecuador observer mission as soon as all issues are resolved.

Bob Bell will brief Nunn and Levin tomorrow on ABM/TMD.

The CCW SFRC hearing went well today. We are hopeful that the Committee will take p the report soon. If all goes well, we could deposit the instrument of ratification by the third week in March, which would make us a party by opening of the Review Conference in Sept. Anne Witkovksy has done a great job on this whole process.

The NPR process continues. We will brief SFRC and HIRC Dem staff this Friday on progress to date.

Albright and Bennett before SACFO tomorrow on UN/P-K budget.

State and Commerce before HIRC Africa SCt.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 09 March 95 20:25

FROM Danvers, William C.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Subject: Legislative Update [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.
Reed, James W.
Sens, Andrew D.
Veit, Katherine M.
Wolin, Neal S.

CARBON_COPY 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, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
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
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Buzalko, Russell J.
Kevin J. Cadieux
Carter, Michael E.
Chyba, Christopher F.
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.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Darragh, Sean J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Evans, Paul A.
Fauver, Robert E.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Forsythe, Rosemarie C.
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.
Grant, Kathleen M.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Hahn, Keith D.
Hale, John E.

Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Hammond, Cathy J.
Hammonds, Lisa W.
Harris, Elisa D.
Haskell, Jennifer
Hawes, David J.
Herrington, David E.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Indyk, Martin S.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Koff, Alexander
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E.
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
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.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Mislock, Raymond A.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyataka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.

Moore, Lori A.
Neil, M. Elise
Nelson, Patricia D.
Niemerski, Stephen
Niemerski, Matthew B.
Norman, Marcia G.
O'Loughlin, Katherine
Owen, Elisa J.
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Pifer, Steven K.
Pitman, James N.
Poneman, Daniel B.
Poppiti, Victoria L.
Porter, Gidell
Punke, Michael W.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Reed, George
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
Ross, Thomas B.
Roth, Stanley D.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Seeley, Charlotte P.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sherman, David J.
Silger, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Stauffer, Helen L.

Steinberg, Donald K.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sullivan, Kathryn
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarantino, Frederick A.
Tenet, George J.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
VanDam, Stacy L.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Wallack, Matthew D.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Whitehouse, John W.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, Jeffrey B.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.

TEXT_BODY

Note for Tony, Sandy and Nancy:

We had a long, hard battle on the Bumpers amendment regarding space station, Russia and Iran. Thanks to Chip, Steve Pifer, OVP we did pretty well. The language that was agreed upon was far broader than we expected. We understand that the amendment will come up tomorrow. Although the deal is cut, I will rest easier when the amendment is finally adopted.

The Senate will continue to consider the supp. Uncertain when they will be done. Jordan debt still has to be resolved. Hopefully, things will remain on track.

SFRC is having a hearing on S. 5 on 21 March. They have asked Amb. Albright to testify. There may be additional hearings. We will get additional information from the committee tomorrow.

RIGO continues. We met with HIRC Dems tomorrow and SFRC Dems on Monday.

Per OVP's instructions, I called a Helms' staffer to tell him that we do not/not agree with consolidation but we would be happy to talk about common points of interest-- as a group, i.e. with all the agencies involved. This reflected conversations we had with OVP and the VP himself. I understand that Brian called Pat and Tony about his concern that we are negotiating with Helms. We are not. We are simply getting back to him as we said we would. You should also know that SFRC Dems have strongly encouraged us to talk with the Helms staff. Helms is having hearing son 16 and 23 March on reorganization and will likely have a press conference with Ben Gilman on Tuesday on his proposal.

Calls on Gerry Adams were made. Susan Brophy made most of them. Only negative response was from Sen. Helms.

On Gitmo funds, Mort called Sen. Graham. We followed up with Graham's staff. Graham goes to Gitmo on Sat. We think he can be of some help.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 13 March 95 12:02
FROM Cooper, Kathleen H.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Helms Guidance[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Mitchell, Calvin A.
Ross, Thomas B.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

To Jonathan Spalter --

The attached was drafted by Mort regarding the Helms bill. He assumes you will be sending this around for clearance to your counterparts. He also asks if you could get this cleared with the VP's office also.

If you need anything else or have questions or problems, let us know.
Thanks. Kathy

[[HELMSTP.DOC : 3139 in HELMSTP.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

13 March 95 11:59

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

HELMSTP.DOC

Comment by White House Press Secretary
on Introduction by Senator Helms
of a Bill Reorganizing the
Foreign Affairs Agencies

The Administration is strongly committed to a continuing process
of reinvention and reform of the foreign affairs agencies.

Under the direction of the Vice President, the Department of
State, USAID, USIA and ACDA are developing new proposals which the
Administration will submit to the Congress shortly. We will be
seeking congressional support for these proposals.

However, as I said last month, we reject the notion that
"consolidation" is good reform. We believe that USIA, AID and ACDA

should continue to pursue their missions as independent agencies under the foreign policy direction of the Secretary of State.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 March 95 11:43
FROM Lennon, John E
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Draft McCurry Statement [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Danvers, William C.
CARBON_COPY Cooper, Kathleen H.
Halperin, Morton H.
TEXT_BODY
As requested, here's a compilation of elements from statements by Mort and State.
[[HELMSTP2.DOC : 2837 in HELMSTP2.DOC]]
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 14 March 95 11:38
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** HELMSTP2.DOC

PROPOSED STATEMENT FOR THE
WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY ON
REORGANIZATION OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES

The press conference held today by Senator Helms and Congressman Gilman made clear that they favor consolidation of the nation's foreign affairs agencies. The Administration is strongly committed to a continuing process of reinvention and reform of those agencies. However, as I said last month, we reject the notion that "consolidation" is good reform. We believe that USIA, AID and ACDA should continue to pursue their missions as independent agencies under the foreign policy direction of the Secretary of State.

Under the direction of the Vice President, the Department of State, USAID, USIA and ACDA are developing new proposals for reinventing their agencies. The Administration will shortly be submitting, and seeking congressional support for, these proposals.

Any proposal to reorganize agencies that conduct American foreign policy has to be carefully measured against specific, tough criteria.

ù Will the government have more effective tools to limit

nuclear proliferation, defend our citizens against terrorism, provide humanitarian aid, promote human rights and democracy, explain our policies at home and abroad, and manage our relations with allies and adversaries?

ù Will our national security be enhanced, providing greater ability to deter conflict -- or to rally our allies and prevail if war breaks out?

ù Will American jobs, domestic prosperity, and economic security be advanced by a better defense of our trading interests, physical investments, and intellectual property abroad?

ù Will any new plan protect the President's constitutional authority as Commander-in-Chief and architect of America's foreign policy -- or will it compromise the President's ability to act to defend America's interests?

These are tough criteria, but any reorganization plan that is submitted has to meet them if America's vital interests are to be protected. The Administration's plan will meet those criteria.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 March 95 18:58

FROM Lennon, John E

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT NPR Statement & TPs [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Danvers, William C.
Halperin, Morton H.
Spalter, Jonathan H.

CARBON_COPY Cooper, Kathleen H.
Lennon, John E

TEXT_BODY

The statement has been vetted by NPR, NSC Leg & Democracy, and State/AID/ACDA/USIA. The talking points by NPR, & NSC Leg, Democracy, & Public Affairs; agencies haven't seen.

[[HELMSTP3.BAK : 4627 in HELMSTP3.BAK]][[HELMSTP5.BAK : 4628 in HELMSTP5.BAK]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 14 March 95 18:54

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME HELMSTP3.BAK

TALKING POINTS
FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES REORGANIZATION
March 15, 1995

ù The Administration has been engaged in reinventing Federal agencies and functions for two years.

ù The Vice President decided in January to retain separate status for AID, ACDA and USIA as agencies receiving foreign policy direction from the Secretary of State.

ù The Vice President's National Performance Review team has worked with the Secretary of State and other agency heads since January to pursue significant reform of those agencies and the functions they carry out abroad.

ù The Secretary of State and other agency heads support the need

for substantial reform of foreign affairs functions, including those that cross agency lines -- such as personnel, international exchanges, arms control, and disaster assistance -- with a view to eliminating duplication.

ù As the Vice President said in January, we are committed to streamlining these agencies, including their programs and functions, to provide better, faster service, with a projected savings of five billion dollars over five years.

ù Foreign affairs reinvention efforts so far have resulted in the closing of nearly forty overseas posts and missions, elimination of hundreds of high-level positions, and millions of dollars in savings.

ù Foreign affairs agencies plan to continue streamlining efforts by sharing administrative and communication systems, eliminating overlapping functions, and closing posts we don't need anymore.

ù We believe that consolidation would only create a bigger bureaucracy and run the risk of increasing, rather than eliminating red tape.

ù Foreign policy must be bipartisan to be successful, and we will work with the House and Senate on legislation designed to achieve the reforms that the Administration will propose.

ù

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

14 March 95 18:53

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

HELMSTP5.BAK

**DRAFT STATEMENT FOR THE
WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY ON
REORGANIZATION OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES
March 15, 1995**

The press conference held today by Senator Helms and Congressman Gilman made clear that they favor consolidation of four of the nation's foreign affairs agencies and three of its trade agencies. The Administration is strongly committed to significant change in these and other organizations involved with foreign affairs. Since March, 1993, the Administration has demonstrated that commitment through hard work and real change. Indeed, some of the things that Senator Helms appears to be recommending are things that the Administration is already doing or has recommended. We will need to see actual legislation before we can make a judgement.

However, as I said last month, we reject the notion that "consolidation" equals reform. We believe that missions of arms control advocacy, public diplomacy, and sustainable development and humanitarian assistance are essential elements in the conduct of foreign policy. We also believe that these missions are best pursued by lean, effective organizations operating under the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State, not as part of a mega-bureaucracy.

The Administration is continuing to pursue an agenda of significant reform in these agencies as well as government-wide.

DRAFT

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 15 March 95 09:10

FROM Lennon, John E

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Danvers, William C.
Halperin, Morton H.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Wise, William M.

CARBON_COPY Cooper, Kathleen H.
Lennon, John E

TEXT_BODY
Here's a redo

[[HELMSTP3.DOC : 2370 in HELMSTP3.DOC]][[HELMSTP5.DOC : 2371
in
HELMSTP5.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 15 March 95 9:6

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** HELMSTP3.DOC

DRAFT

TALKING POINTS
FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES REORGANIZATION
March 15, 1995

ù The Administration has been engaged in reinventing Federal agencies and functions for two years.

ù The Vice President decided in January to retain separate status for AID, ACDA and USIA as agencies receiving foreign policy direction from the Secretary of State.

ù The Vice President's National Performance Review team has worked with the Secretary of State and other agency heads since January to pursue significant reform of those agencies and the functions they carry out abroad.

ù The Secretary of State and other agency heads support the need

for substantial reform of foreign affairs functions, including those that cross agency lines -- such as personnel, international exchanges, arms control, and disaster assistance -- with a view to eliminating duplication.

ù As the Vice President said in January, we are committed to streamlining these agencies, including their programs and functions, to provide better, faster service, with a projected savings of five billion dollars over five years.

ù Foreign affairs reinvention efforts so far have resulted in the closing of nearly forty overseas posts and missions, elimination of hundreds of high-level positions, and millions of dollars in savings.

ù Foreign affairs agencies plan to continue streamlining efforts by sharing administrative and communication systems, eliminating overlapping functions, and closing posts we don't need anymore.

ù We believe that consolidation would only create a bigger bureaucracy and run the risk of increasing, rather than eliminating red tape.

ù Foreign policy must be bipartisan to be successful, and we will work with the House and Senate on legislation designed to achieve the reforms that the Administration will propose.

ù

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

15 March 95 9:7

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

HELMSTP5.DOC

DRAFT

**STATEMENT FOR THE
WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY ON
REORGANIZATION OF THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES
March 15, 1995**

At a press conference held today, Senator Helms unveiled a proposal to consolidate four of the nation's foreign affairs agencies. Joining him to unveil his proposal were Senator Snow and Representatives Gilman and Smith.

The Administration is strongly committed to significant change in these and other organizations involved with foreign affairs. Since March, 1993, the Administration has demonstrated its commitment to

significant, continuing change. Indeed, some of the things that the proposal recommends are things that the Administration is already doing as part of Vice President Gore's National Performance Review and the agencies' own reinvention efforts.

However, the Administration rejects the notion that "consolidation" equals reform. We believe that the missions of arms control advocacy, public diplomacy, and sustainable development and humanitarian assistance are essential elements in the conduct of foreign policy. We also believe that these missions are best pursued by lean, effective organizations operating under the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State, not as part of a mega-bureaucracy.

The Administration is continuing to pursue an agenda of significant reform in these agencies as well as government-wide.

DRAFT

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 15 March 95 19:31

FROM Danvers, William C.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Subject: Legislative Update [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.
Reed, James W.
Sens, Andrew D.
Veit, Katherine M.
Wolin, Neal S.

CARBON_COPY 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, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
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
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Buzalko, Russell J.
Carter, Michael E.
Chyba, Christopher F.
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.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Darragh, Sean J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Evans, Paul A.
Fauver, Robert E.
Feinberg, Richard E.
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.
Grant, Kathleen M.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Hahn, Keith D.
Hale, John E.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.

Hammond, Cathy J.
Hammonds, Lisa W.
Harris, Elisa D.
Hawes, David J.
Herrington, David E.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Indyk, Martin S.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Koff, Alexander
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
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.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Mislock, Raymond A.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Neil, M. Elise
Niemerski, Stephen

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

Sulser, Jack A.
Tarantino, Frederick A.
Tenet, George J.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
VanDam, Stacy L.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
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, Jeffrey B.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.

TEXT_BODY

Note for Tony, Sandy and Nancy:

NPR continues. There was a Helms/Gilman press conference on Sen. Helms vision of reorganizing the foreign affairs agencies. (Sen. Snowe also testified.) Mike McCurry made a statement on this issue, Leon Fuerth and Elaine Kamarch did a press backgrounder and Dave Johnson discussed at the State briefing. There will be hearings on 23 and 30 March before SFRC on this issue. Witnesses include: Eagleburger, Ikle and (I believe) Scowcroft. It is unclear when the Administration will testify. We have been asked to come up with witnesses for the Dems. The interagency group is working on this.

Next Tues., there will be a hearing on S.5 before SFRC with Jeanne Kirkpatrick, Jim Baker testifying. Madeleine will represent the Administration. State will work with Ct. Dems on this.

Bob Bell and Deutch briefed the Senate Arms Control Group today. Bob indicated that there was a much better reception today than Tony's recent meeting.

Sen. Dole and others sent a letter to the President on Bosnia and withdrawing UN forces from Croatia and Bosnia. Ironically, although the letter has snitty tone, he is basically in sync with our policy.

We had an interagency meeting on a potential Pakistan amendment today. We are discussing with the Hill whether they are receptive to the idea of putting it on the DoD supp. We will continue to work with the Hill and concerned agencies on this.

Mort and Dick Schifter had an interagency meeting today on outreach and the 150 account. I talked to State several times about things we need to be doing regarding the budget committee, and I will have some specific requests for you to talk to members on this issue.

White House LA is working to respond to the request for the information requested as part of the recent passed resolution in the House on Mexico.

Alec Watson testifies on Cuba tomorrow.

Dr. Dorn testifies before HCONS on readiness.

Perry is scheduled to meet with Sen. Stevens and Inouye, as well as Reps, Young and Murtha on the Def Supp.

Lynn Davis testifies on international security issues before HACFO.

CIA/State will participate on a intel hearing for HPSCI.

Gallucci has a meeting with SFRC Rep. members hosted by Senators Helms and Thomas.

Shattuck testifies before HIRC Asia SubCt.

Bill Richardson is scheduled to meet with Tudjman tomorrow, putting off his trip to Serbia until tomorrow. It is our understanding that Milosevic will send a private plane for him in Athens. He is also scheduled to go to Kosovo and to meet with opposition leaders in Serbia.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 18 March 95 11:38
FROM Bradley, Amelia J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: FW: npr tps [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Spalter, Jonathan H.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Jonathan -- what I need are talking points used in response to Sen. Helms' proposals announced last Wednesday. Thanks.

From: Lennon, John E.
To: Spalter, Jonathan H.
CC: /R, Record at A1; Bradley, A. Jane
Subject: npr tps [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Friday, March 17, 1995 08:56 AM

Jonathan... would you please e-mail the current set of NPR talking points to Jane Bradley in Eileen Claussen's office? Her tel=69141. Thanks.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 20 March 95 13:29
FROM Danvers, William C.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Points for Eageburger, et al calls [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.

CARBON_COPY Andricos, George M.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Danvers, William C.
Funches, Christina L.
Halperin, Morton H.
Lennon, John E
Longoria, Michael A.
Malley, Robert
Wolin, Neal S.

TEXT_BODY

Note for Sandy:

We have prepared points for calls to Eagleburger, Scowcroft and Ikle, offering to send an NPR team to brief them before the deliver their testimony on 23 March.

Please let us know if you need anything else.

Thanks.

[[EAGLEPTS.DOC : 3385 in EAGLEPTS.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT

FILE DATE 20 March 95 12:20
ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME EAGLEPTS.DOC

Calls for Eagleburger, Scowcroft and Ikle

-- Understand that you are testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC) on 23 March on Sen. Helms proposal to reorganize the foreign affairs agencies.

-- As you know, the Vice President is heading up an effort to reorganize the federal government, including these agencies and has come to some different conclusions on how we can best work a reorganization.

-- We would like the opportunity to share our views with you before you testify. We can send a few members of the National Performance Review team to meet with you to discuss our perspective on this issue.

-- If you agree, we can put that in place right away.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 03 April 95 17:41
FROM Genton, Regina A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Gingrich Letter to POTUS [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Hammonds, Lisa W.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY
As discussed, here are the memos for the pkg.
[[UN#1.DOC : 4360 in UN#1.DOC]][[UN#3.DOC : 4361 in UN#3.DOC]]
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 3 April 95 17:38
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** UN#1.DOC

April 3, 1995

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: GEORGE J. TENET

FROM: REGINA A. GENTON

SUBJECT: Response to Speaker Gingrich, Senator
Helms and Others Regarding Intelligence Support to
the UN

Attached for your review and signature is a Memorandum to the
President and a letter responding to Speaker Gingrich, Senator Helms
and others concerning intelligence support to the UN in the wake of
the discovery of U.S. intelligence material shortly before the

pullout of UN forces in Somalia last March.

Concurrence by: Bill Danvers

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the Memorandum to the President at Tab I.

Attachment

Tab I Memorandum to the Presidente

Tab A Response to Speaker Gingrich

Tab B Incoming Correspondence

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE

3 April 95 17:35

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME

UN#3.DOC

cc: Vice President

Chief of Staff

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE
PATRICK GRIFFIN

SUBJECT: Response to Speaker Gingrich, Senator
Helms and Others Regarding Intelligence Support to
the United Nations

Purpose

To respond to Speaker Gingrich, Senator Helms and others concerning
intelligence support to the United Nations.

Background

Last March, days before the pullout of UN peacekeepers in Somalia,

several boxes containing classified U.S. intelligence documents were discovered by U.S. officials in a vacant UN office in Somalia. Speaker Gingrich, Senator Helms and others have written to you to register their "strong concern" about this incident. In particular, they have requested that you direct the Inspector Generals of Defense, CIA and State to investigate, and that you immediately suspend intelligence sharing with UN peacekeeping operations unless necessary to protect the life or safety of deployed forces.

Attached at tab X is a response noting that Congress was immediately informed when U.S. intelligence documents were discovered, and that the Department of Defense has already begun both an investigation into this matter as well as security reviews of other intelligence sharing arrangements with the UN. In addition, the response states that pending the results of these efforts only intelligence information necessary to protect the safety and operational security of UN forces will be provided to the UN.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letters at Tab A.

Attachment

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 12 April 95 13:53
FROM Danvers, William C.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Talking Points [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Ross, Thomas B.
CARBON_COPY Andricos, George M.
Atkin, Timothy J.
Beers, Rand R.
Blakeman, Earle C.
Brown, Dallas
Clarke, Richard A.
Cressey, Roger W.
Danvers, William C.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Funches, Christina L.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Lindsey, Wanda
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
Norman, Marcia G.
Rice, Susan E.
Rocha, Victor M.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Simon, Steven N.

TEXT_BODY

Tom-- Here are a couple of points (pretty thin gruel) in response to a possible question on the Helms letter on Haiti. Dick Clarke's and Richard Feinberg's office should probalby pass on this.

[[HELMSHAI.DOC : 3355 in HELMSHAI.DOC]]

From: Ross, Thomas B.
To: @NSC - NSC Staff
CC: /R, Record at A1; @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: Talking Points [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, April 12, 1995 01:29 PM

I am assuming that all who have not responded to my E-mail of 7:45 a.m. today have no changes in the talking points as sent to you. The updated points will be going to Tony Lake at 2 p.m.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

12 April 95 13:49

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

HELMSHA1.DOC

(If asked about the letter from Senator Helms calling for a suspension of all U.S. aid to Haiti until completion of investigations into the slaying of a prominent opponent of Aristide)

-- The President is committed to helping the Haitian people.

-- We understand and share the Senator's concerns about the need to bring to justice those responsible for the slaying of Mireille Durocher Bertin.

-- Suspending aid pending a resolution to this issue, however, would not be in keeping with the effort of the Administration to help the Haitian people. While progress in programs such as training the Haitian police may at times seem slow, we are hopeful that our efforts in this area will come to fruition.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 13 April 95 16:39
FROM Brown, Dallas
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT POTUS Response to Helms Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Danvers, William C.
Rocha, Victor M.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY
Attached is a draft POTUS letter in response to Senator Helms' letter of April 7th. Please review and provide me any line-in/line-outs. Thanks.
[[HELMS.DOC : 4123 in HELMS.DOC]]
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 13 April 95 16:34
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** HELMS.DOC

Dear Senator Helms,

Thank you for your letter of April 7th and your thoughts on the situation in Haiti. I am sure you appreciate our success since the intervention began last September, and the tremendous work that our young men and women in uniform have done there to date.

I agree with your assessment that the Haitians themselves must work to establish a rule of law and build a lasting democracy in Haiti. To this end, we are working with President Aristide and his government to build a professional civilian police force, to improve economic conditions, to rebuild the Haitian justice system, and to hold free and fair parliamentary elections this June. To suspend U.S. assistance to Haiti immediately, as you suggest in your letter, would undermine the accomplishments that have been made to date, and allow Haiti to slide back into the vicious circle of political violence to which you refer.

With respect to the Durocher-Bertin murder: As you know, an FBI team is on site in Port-au-Prince to assist the Government of Haiti

with the investigation. The investigation is not yet complete. Allegations and counter-allegations notwithstanding, it would be inappropriate to base U.S. foreign policy decisions on rumor in this matter.

Again, I appreciate your letter, your concern, and your thoughts on the situation in Haiti.

Sincerely,

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 13 April 95 16:57
FROM Rocha, Victor M.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: POTUS Response to Helms Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Brown, Dallas
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Nicely done. I clear.

From: Brown, Dallas
To: Danvers, William C.; Rocha, Victor M.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: POTUS Response to Helms Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, April 13, 1995 04:39 PM

<<Attached File: HELMS.DOC>>

Attached is a draft POTUS letter in response to Senator Helms' letter of April 7th. Please review and provide me any line-in/line-outs. Thanks.