

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Jodi Kessinger to Pat Battenfield, Macarthur Deshazer, Shawn McCormick, and Susan Rice. Subject: Agenda. (19 pages)	02/11/1996	P1/b(1)
002. email	Jodi Kessinger to Jill Schuker. Subject: Big Think Issues/1996 Agenda. (19 pages)	02/13/1996	P1/b(1)
003. email	Elizabeth Verville to Jane Baker, Kenneth Baldwin, Peter Bass et al. Subject: Today's Certification Cabinet-level meeting. (4 pages)	02/27/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/11/1996-03/12/1996]

2006-1363-F

vz5614

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Jodi Kessinger to Pat Battenfield, Macarthur Deshazer, Shawn McCormick, and Susan Rice. Subject: Agenda. (19 pages)	02/11/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/11/1996-03/12/1996]

2006-1363-F

vz5614

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Jodi Kessinger to Jill Schuker. Subject:Big Think Issues/1996 Agenda. (19 pages)	02/13/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/11/1996-03/12/1996]

2006-1363-F

vz5614

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Elizabeth Verville to Jane Baker, Kenneth Baldwin, Peter Bass et al. Subject: Today's Certification Cabinet-level meeting. (4 pages)	02/27/1996	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/11/1996-03/12/1996]

2006-1363-F
vz5614

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 05 March 96 13:08
FROM Brown, Dallas
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Haiti Pol-Mil Plan, Chapter 11 [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Danvers, William C.
Schuker, Jill A.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Jill, Bill -- Attached is the "Congress, the Media and Public Outreach" Chapter of the Haiti Phase III Pol-Mil Plan that Rob Malley wrote back in October. He tells me that yes, he drafted it back then because Mort Halperin wanted Democracy to have a hand in Haiti policy, but simply forwarded it on to your two offices. He doesn't see that he should own it any more.

This Thursday evening, Sandy will chair a DC-EXCOMM review of the overall Pol-Mil plan. I've been working with State, DOD, AID, etc, to get the other eleven chapters of the Plan revised for this meeting. Do either (or both) of you want to claim ownership of this Chapter for revision and briefing purposes at the Thursday meeting? From what Sandy has said in the past, this stuff is a critical part of our overall policy. Please give me a call to discuss. Thanks.

[[11NSC.DOC : 3329 in 11NSC.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

1 March 96 19:14

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

11NSC.DOC
UNCLASSIFIED

11-

UNCLASSIFIED
UNCLASSIFIED
11-

UNCLASSIFIED

CONGRESS, THE MEDIA AND PUBLIC OUTREACH

11.0 Congress, the Media and Public Outreach

11.1 USG Objectives: The objective is to maintain the necessary conditions to continue U.S. policy toward Haiti, including enhancing public and congressional understanding and support for U.S. policy, and in particular resisting congressional attempts to undermine it. The message both to Congress and the public should stress Haiti's remarkable progress in terms of respect for human rights, democracy, and economy recovery, while forthrightly acknowledging problem areas and demonstrating U.S. leadership in addressing them. In view of the forthcoming presidential elections in Haiti, we must stress that the U.S. position is for free and fair conduct of elections, not favoring any particular party.

11.2 Congressional Strategy

11.2.1 Congressional Concerns: Despite, or perhaps because of the overall success of the policy, we can expect intense congressional scrutiny. Members probably will not seek to interfere with our planned withdrawal schedule because of concern with maintaining a "secure and stable environment" once the troops are withdrawn. Likewise, in a pre-withdrawal period, Members will be chary of restricting funding for activities we convincingly can portray as essential to preparing for withdrawal of U.S. troops (e.g., police training). Instead, Congress most likely will continue to focus on the political, human rights, economic and security situation.

We can expect a number of restrictions and conditions imposed on U.S. activity in Haiti. Senator Dole's amendment to the Senate Foreign Operations bill links assistance to Haiti to Administration certification concerning investigation of the Bertin killing and conduct of Haiti's security forces. Senator Helms has placed a hold on election assistance funds, citing in particular concerns regarding the conduct of the elections and the use of U.S. funds. In the House, Rep. Goss inserted an amendment to the Foreign Operations bill that would restrict the disbursement of funds to Haiti (effective March 1996) if the elections are not held in substantial compliance with the Haitian Constitution. We can anticipate other Congressional holds of varying lengths on upcoming USAID programs in Haiti, since under Section 520 of the FY 96 foreign Operations Appropriations bill, Congress will have to be notified of all USAID projects. Senate appropriators also have taken action to prohibit use of special authorities (which in the past were used to fund the MNF, police training, etc.) and to weigh down the heretofore unencumbered voluntary peacekeeping account with congressional notification requirements.

11.2.2 USG Strategy: Between now and the February withdrawal of UNMIH peacekeeping troops, we should use the opportunity of several

major events to highlight the Administration's success, address

problem areas and frame the debate in such a way that Congressional efforts to obstruct USG efforts will be blamed for any adverse consequences. Specifically, we should:

- ù Share responsibility for the success or failure of our policy with the Congress by stressing that cutting aid to Haiti, or otherwise restricting the Executive Branch's ability to carry out our policy, is a threat to US national security which could result in a return to uncontrolled Haitian migration, a recurrence of widespread violence in Haiti, and/or the potential for another coup.

- ù Seek to limit Congressional conditionality on Haiti policy. In instances where this is unavoidable, work with Congress to ensure that the conditions imposed are not detrimental to overall policy.

- ù Reduce the GOH's vulnerability by highlighting successes, pressing it to take corrective action in problem areas, and letting Congress know when things go right. Provide regular background information so that congressional supporters of the Administration's policy can promote US successes.

- ù We also should make clear that Congress would be held responsible for exacerbating Haiti's problems if Congress interferes with Administration initiatives. In particular, stress that congressional holds on programs like election assistance threaten Haiti's presidential transition.

- ù Make every effort to avoid using special authorities which can result in congressional holds.

- ù Organize as appropriate interagency briefings (State, DOD, AID, Commerce) for a core group of congressional supporters (e.g., members of the Black Caucus, Oberstar, Foglietta) to brief on a regular basis so that they can serve as advocates on the Hill.

- ù In contacts with Congress, emphasize economic development efforts, particularly Commerce's role, in light of congressional interest in business development in Haiti.

- ù Engage "responsible critics" (e.g., Coverdell, Goss) through individual briefings by appropriate senior Administration officials.

11.3 Media/Public Outreach Strategy: USG public message should stress demonstrable success of Haiti policy, emphasizing the following points in media briefings, op-eds, and meetings with foreign policy

leaders:

- ù The President acted in support of America's values and interests and those of the Hemisphere in restoring democracy to Haiti. We were aware of the risks, but we couldn't permit brutal violence and instability especially that close to our own shores to continue indefinitely.

- ù One needs only to think back to where Haiti was just a year ago: Military rule; rampant political violence and killings; absence of democracy, free speech, elections; instability and the real threat of a continuing dangerous and massive refugee flow; and a devastatingly high mortality from disease and the ravages of violence.

- ù US and Haitian efforts have been remarkably successful. Constitutional government has been restored; Aristide, the democratically-elected President is back in office; Haitians can

speak freely and elect representatives of their choice without intimidation; people no longer are fleeing the island out of fear; a new, legitimate judicial system is being established; reliable, newly trained police are now patrolling the streets. These are real, concrete, meaningful changes that improve the lives of Haiti's people and, by reducing the flow of refugees and lessening the risk of instability on the island, the lives of US citizens.

- ù By February 1996 a presidential election will have been held and a new] President inaugurated. This will be a milestone, for we will be witnessing the first peaceful transition from one democratically-elected President to another in Haiti's history.

- ù Haiti is still desperately poor and facing daunting challenges after decades of misrule and plundering of its resources. But now is not the time to retreat. Rather, we must build on what already has been accomplished in so short a time to help Haitians move forward and construct a stable, peaceful democracy. This is in the security interests of the U.S. and the hemisphere.

A decision by the opposition to boycott the presidential election will create problems both with the Congress and with public opinion. To minimize this risk and maintain our credibility and record, we should refrain from blaming the opposition parties for the existing situation and continue our dialogue with them.

11.4 Milestones

- ù December 17: Tentative date of first round of presidential elections.

ù January 21: Tentative date for second round of presidential elections (if needed)

ù February 7: Scheduled date for inauguration of new president.

ù February: Beginning of withdrawal of UNMIH peacekeeping troops. Offer briefings to relevant committees on withdrawal of troops and deployment of police.

ù February-March: Visit of Former President Aristide to Washington. Schedule meetings with key Members.

ù Spring 1996: Visit of new Haitian President to Washington. Schedule meetings with key Members.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 05 March 96 18:14

FROM Davis, William K.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT ACDA Funding Status [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Wise, William M.

CARBON_COPY Bendick, Gordon L.
Burrell, Christina L.
Danvers, William C.
Davis, William K.

TEXT_BODY

- For FY 1996, ACDA requested \$50 M but is currently operating at a rate under the Continuing Resolution that leaves them with only \$35.7M.

- OMB has proposed to Congress that \$10M be added to the \$35.7M in the year long Continuing Resolution that is currently being drafted on the Hill for signature by the President before March 15th.

- The House has not acted on the \$10M, and further, they are proposing to cut ACDA to \$32.7M for FY 1996 to punish ACDA for lobbying so strongly for increased funds. Appropriations Chairman Livingston is an ACDA opponent. Rep. Obey has been urging the Administration to push for more money for ACDA

- ACDA reports that Holum met with Sen. Hatfield's staff, who said that the WH Budget negotiating team had not indicated ACDA was a first order priority, therefore the Senate has not included the additional \$10M in their version of the Continuing Resolution either.

- Rep. Obey has called Panetta urging him to identify ACDA as a priority.

- We have fought hard for nearly a year against Sen. Helms to keep ACDA independent and alive - it would be inconsistent to kill it now through inadequate funding and lack of identification as an Administration priority

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 12 March 96 13:35

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT RBTP at Signing of the Helms-Burton Bill [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
Alijanil, Leyla
Andreasen, Steven P.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Armstrong, Fulton T.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bassett, Leslie A.
Bass, Peter E.
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Birkland, Andrea L.
Blacker, Coit D.
Black, Todd F.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boynton, Peter J.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Brown, Nancy E.
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Bujold, Noelle D.
Burrell, Christina L.
Canty, Mary T.
Carter, Michael E.
Cicio, Kristen K.

Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Cullin, Brian P.
Daadler, Ivo H.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davis, William K.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dobbins, James F.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Dymersky, Debra L.
Eddy, Randolph P.
Edwards, Joan
Eisenhower, James J.
Fairfax, Kenneth J.
Feeley, John F.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Fetig, James L.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Florio, Elaine
Frias, Angela M.
Fried, Daniel
Friedrich, M. K.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Fuhrman, Thomas A.
Gates, Brian K.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gladbach, Damon J.
Glinski, David L.
Goldgeier, James M.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grummon, Stephen R.
Guekel, Kathi A.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harrison, Lyle M.
Hawes, David J.

Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephan D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Huggins, Peter
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Johnson, David T.
Jones, Kerri-Ann D.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Leary, William H.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsey, Wanda
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
MacDonald, Bruce W.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Martinez, Alejandro
Mauzy, Stefan T.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Naplan, Steven J.
Neil, M. Elise
Norman, Marcia G.
Norris, John J.
Nuccio, Richard A.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Parco, Jim E.

Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Peggins, John W.
Peters, Mary A.
Pifer, Steven K.
Kenneth M. Pollack
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Reade, Evan G.
Reed, George
Reznik, Victoria (NMI)
Rice, Susan E.
Ritterhauff, Robin
Roach, Darren S.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schuker, Jill A.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Smith, Michael P.
Snyder, Julie A.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.

Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Willis, Robin M.
Wise, William M.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Yorkdale, Glenn H.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[H-BPOTUS.DOC : 3353 in H-BPOTUS.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 12 March 96 13:31

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** H-BPOTUS.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release March 12, 1996

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT SIGNING OF THE HELMS-BURTON
BILL

Washington, D. C.

10:37 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Welcome to the White House Senator Helms, Senator Gramm, Senator Mack, Senator Lautenberg, Senator Coverdell, Congressman Menendez, Congressman Torricelli, Congressman Diaz-Balart, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Congressman Deutsch, Congressman Burton, Congressman Kennedy -- I hope I haven't missed any members of Congress who are here -- to the family members of those who were tragically shot down, Ambassador Albright, Assistant Secretary Watson, and my fellow Americans.

We are here today around a common commitment to bring democracy to Cuba. Two and a half weeks ago, the world received a harsh reminder of why a democratic Cuba is so important, not only to us but to the people of Cuba. In broad daylight and without justification, Cuban military jets shot down two unarmed United States civilian aircraft causing the deaths of three American citizens and one U.S. resident. The planes were unarmed, the pilots unarmed. They posed no threat to Cuba's security.

This was clearly a brutal and cruel act. It demanded a firm, immediate response. On my instructions, Ambassador Albright convened the United Nations Security Council which unanimously deplored Cuba's actions. Dozens of countries around the world expressed their revulsion. Cuba's blatant disregard for international law is not just an issue between Havana and Washington but between Havana and the world.

I ordered, also, a number of unilateral actions. One of those steps was to have my representatives work closely with Congress to reach prompt agreement on the Cuban Liberty and Democracy Solidarity Act. Within two days, and with the extra efforts of our friend, Congressman Menendez, Democrats and Republicans came together and produced a better bill. It will strengthen the embargo in a way that advances the cause of freedom in Cuba.

Today I sign it with a certainty that it will send a powerful, unified message from the United States to Havana, that the

yearning of the Cuban people for freedom must not be denied. This bill continues our bipartisan effort to pursue an activist Cuba policy, an effort that began some four years ago with the Cuban Democracy Act.

Under the provisions of that legislation, our Administration has encouraged Cuba's peaceful transition to democracy. We have promoted the free flow of ideas to Cuba through greater support for Cuba's brave human rights activists, a dramatic increase in non-governmental humanitarian aide to the Cuban people, long-distance telephone service. And the more the Cuban people are free to express the freedoms and rights their neighbors enjoy the more they will insist on change.

We have also kept the pressure on Cuba by maintaining a tough embargo policy. The legislation I sign today further tightens that embargo. It sends a strong message to the Cuban government. We will not tolerate attacks on United States citizens and we will stand with those both inside and outside Cuba who are working for a peaceful transition to freedom and democracy.

Finally, let me say as I sign this bill into law, I do so in the name of the four men who were killed when their planes were shot down on February the 24th: Armando Alejandre, Carlos Cofta, Mario De La Pena and Pablo Morales. In their memory, I will continue to do everything I can to help the tide of democracy that has swept our entire hemisphere, finally, finally reach the shores of Cuba.

The Cuban people must receive the blessings of freedom they have been so long denied. And I hope and believe that this day is another important step toward that ultimate goal that so many of you in this audience have worked so hard for, for so very, very long.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

MS Mail

DATE-TIME 12 March 96 17:22
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT March 12 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Abdulmalik, April B.
 Alijanil, Leyla
 Andreassen, Steven P.
 Appel, Edward J.
 Argarin, Jocelyn D.
 Armstrong, Fulton T.
 Atlas, Edwin L.
 Baker, Jane E.
 Baker, James E.
 Bakke, Kyle D.
 Baldwin, Kenneth
 Bassett, Leslie A.
 Bass, Peter E.
 Battenfield, Pat
 Beardsley, Tyler S.
 Beers, Rand R.
 Behring, Deanna M.
 Bellamy, Ralph C.
 Bell, Robert G.
 Bendick, Gordon L.
 Benjamin, Daniel
 Birkland, Andrea L.
 Blacker, Coit D.
 Black, Todd F.
 Blieberger, Marion H.
 Blinken, Antony J.
 Bolinski, Charlene C.
 Boynton, Peter J.
 Bresnahan, Gary E.
 Broadway, Jamuna
 Brown, Dallas
 Brown, Nancy E.
 Bruton, Robert G.
 Bryan, Lloyd D.
 Bujold, Noelle D.
 Burrell, Christina L.
 Canty, Mary T.
 Carter, Michael E.
 Cicio, Kristen K.

Clark, Bronya
 Clarke, Richard A.
 Cooper, Kathleen H.
 Cullin, Brian P.
 Daadler, Ivo H.
 Daniel, Patty A.
 Danvers, William C.
 Darnes, Victoria J.
 Davis, William K.
 Deshazer, Macarthur X.
 Dimel, Marsha L.
 Dobbins, James F.
 Dohse, Fred J.
 Dragone, Karen D.
 Dupuy, Shawn L.
 Dymersky, Debra L.
 Eddy, Randolph P.
 Edwards, Joan
 Eisenhower, James J.
 Fairfax, Kenneth J.
 Feeley, John F.
 Feinberg, Richard E.
 Fetig, James L.
 Ficklin, John W.
 Flessas, Daniel
 Florio, Elaine
 Frias, Angela M.
 Fried, Daniel
 Friedrich, M. K.
 Fuerth, Leon S.
 Fuhrman, Thomas A.
 Gates, Brian K.
 George, Christopher
 Gerstner, Christina L.
 Gladbach, Damon J.
 Glinski, David L.
 Goldgeier, James M.
 Gorsuch, Robert P.
 Gray, Wendy
 Grummon, Stephen R.
 Guekel, Kathi A.
 Haines, Mary A.
 Hale, John E.
 Hall, Wilma G.
 Hamilton, Roy A.
 Harding, Bruce D.
 Harmon, Joyce A.
 Harris, Elisa D.
 Harrison, Lyle M.
 Hawes, David J.

Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephan D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Huggins, Peter
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Johnson, David T.
Jones, Kerri-Ann D.
Jordan, Donald L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kessinger, Jodi
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Leary, William H.
Letts, Kelly J.
Lindsey, Wanda
Lorin, Matthew E.
Lowry, Jay E.
MacDonald, Bruce W.
Malley, Robert
Marshall, Betty A.
Martinez, Alejandro
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McCormick, Shawn H.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Miscik, Judith A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Mueller, William (Doug) D.
Naplan, Steven J.
Neil, M. Elise
Norman, Marcia G.
Norris, John J.
Nuccio, Richard A.
O'loughlin, Kathrine
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.

Parris, Mark R.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Peggins, John W.
Peters, Mary A.
Pifer, Steven K.
Kenneth M. Pollack
Poneman, Daniel B.
Porter, Gidell
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Reade, Evan G.
Reed, George
Reznik, Victoria (NMI)
Rice, Susan E.
Ritterhauff, Robin
Roach, Darren S.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
David B. Sandalow
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schuker, Jill A.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Showalter, Victoria A.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Smith, Michael P.
Snyder, Julie A.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.
Unrue, Michael M.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Verville, Elizabeth G.

Wadsworth, Valon J.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Whitworth, Frank D.
Wiley, Mary C.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Willis, Robin M.
Wise, William M.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Yorkdale, Glenn H.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[MIKE0312.DOC : 4374 in MIKE0312.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 12 March 96 17:21

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** MIKE0312.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

or
Immediate Release March 12, 1996

F

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

12:17 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to today's daily White House news briefing. We've got a lot of our Middle East folks wrapping up loose details at the end, so I will, in a minute, give you my passable imitation of the briefing I promised you and the trip the President is about to take. But a couple of other items first.

First, at 1:20 when the President departs, I expect him to make a departure statement on the South Lawn that will address both the trip that he is taking to the Summit of the Peacemakers and his journey onward to Israel. And then he will also have some things to say about the necessity of Congress taking urgent action to balance the budget and provide a clearer picture for appropriations for the fiscal year 1996.

He'll call for passage of the Kennedy-Kassebaum Health Reform Measure, and also for passage of reform legislation that would end welfare as we know it.

The President will also make reference to the fact that he has now signed H.R. 3021, which is the temporary extension of the debt limit. It actually exempts certain payments and obligations of the Federal Government from the debt limit. That will provide a window or a short cushion in which the debt limit itself will not impact on federal obligations -- not, by any means the necessary long-term extension of the debt ceiling, and that the President continues to hope that Congress will take action on.

Q When does it go to? What's the date, deadline?

MR. MCCURRY: The Treasury will estimate the date. It is expected to run, roughly, to the end of the month. But the Administration in the White House would note that there are critical benefit payments that will be due for payment beginning in early April and the necessity of the passage of a longer debt extension is quite clear.

Q Has he already signed it, Mike? It's not clear from what you said.

MR. MCCURRY: It is not clear to me that he has signed it yet, but he intends to sign it. We'll put out the statement when he does so. He'll probably make some reference to it when he departs.

Q Mike, just out of curiosity, at what point does Treasury begin to undo all the extraordinary measures that they took to extend the debt limit while all of this was going on?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I guess the question is: When would they begin to reconstitute funds that they have taken from some of the trust funds? That happens, I think, on a time table that Treasury can be clearer about. But once they begin to reshuffle obligations with a longer term extension of the debt limit they can manage accounts in a way that begins to restore some of those funds.

Q On the longer term measure, the Republicans are saying they want to have the time to work out the welfare reform, which you mentioned that he was going to touch on. How close are the Administration and the Republicans on those issues?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President has long felt that there is broad bipartisan agreement on the fundamentals of welfare reform, measures that would move people off of welfare dependency into work situations without penalizing children. Those fundamental agreements have been in place for some time but there are some critical differences in the approach the President would take versus the Republican majority in Congress on some key questions like funding for child care, like making sure that there are federal standards that apply so that there is some consistency of benefits that are available across state lines.

The President is confident that those issues can be addressed if there is a spirit of bipartisanship that prevails in the welfare reform discussion. He has consistently called on Congress to try

to
put aside any partisan political differences so we can get this
very
necessary piece of legislation passed.

Q Will he be moving the budget discussions forward or
will he just be again putting out on the table how important it
is
to get a budget?

MR. McCURRY: Well, he will be again calling on Congress to
get the work done and not put the American people and the federal
workforce through another threatened shutdown, which is the
situation we will be in at the end of this week if Congress has
not
taken necessary legislation. He is just going to say, once
again,
that's a very bad idea and you would think that Congress would
have
learned its lesson by now.

Q What is the reading on it? Is that highly likely?

MR. McCURRY: Well, it is the President's strong desire to
see these measures passed in a way that preserves his fundamental
priorities. We've got to maintain our commitments to the elderly
and the Medicare program. We've got to make sure that we keep
necessary funds available for protecting this nation's
environment.
The President wants to see investments in education and
technology
that will, in the long term, spur economic growth. And he doesn't
want to see roll backs in so many of these categories that are
necessary to maintaining a consistent quality of life for
Americans.

The issue here is that the Republican Congress, in essence,
wants to cut \$32 billion off of the President's stated
priorities.
We are asking only that they add back some \$8 billion for FY
1996,
not an unreasonable request in the President's viewpoint. But
Congress does not seem to want to move forward to address the
priorities that the President has consistently articulated. And
based on our experience in two previous government shutdowns, the
American people seem to recognize the President has a point when
he
stands up firmly for those priorities that he articulates.

Q Is Leon going to be negotiating over the next two

days? What are you hoping, that on Friday he'll be able to come back?

MR. McCURRY: We have had a regular pattern of contact at the staff level, Mr. Panetta himself has met with Chairman Livingston, Chairman Hatfield and talked to them on many occasions. The President's concerns and views are very well known to them and there doesn't seem to be any reason why they wouldn't be able to go ahead and address the President's priorities in the fashion that we've suggested -- not any new spending required here; shift from other areas of the budget, change some of the budget priorities to acknowledge that the President's priorities count for something. Congress needs to do that work. They need to do it expeditiously.

And we will continue to press for some kind of discussion on this and the President will suggest that he remains available with the door open and is willing to do so immediately upon his return here to the United States.

Q Where are we on the '97 budget, the details?

MR. McCURRY: The '97 budget planning continues to move forward. There will be, by sometime later in the month, a fuller presentation on the details. I'm not sure what OMB is planning by way of making that publicly available but they'll let you know.

Q It was supposed to be produced or published on March 18th.

MR. McCURRY: Sometime next week, that's correct.

Q That hasn't been moved back?

MR. McCURRY: Not that I'm aware of. But the OMB staff can let you know more.

Q Back on the budget, the Republicans would argue that they think that the President would not want to veto a bill that would be put in the position of causing the government to shut down because he wants to spend more than what --

MR. McCURRY: Well, spending more is not the issue here. The President wants to change the priorities in the spending. We

want
to shift, basically, \$8 billion away from some categories that
the
Republicans are insisting upon and shift them into some of the
President's priority areas. Specifically, make sure we maintain
adequate levels of funding for Medicare for the nation's elderly
and
that we put some of the money back into programs that are
relevant
to education and technology that the President thinks are a good
long-term investment in the future of the American economy and
make
sure that we don't cut environmental protection.

We saw a very vivid example in New Jersey yesterday of what
happens when you don't have that type of necessary investment.
There are other areas related to job training and skills that
Secretary Reich can tell you about, where they've taken really
deep
cuts in our ability to take a workforce that's anxious about its
economic future and move them into skills and training, and they
will insure that they are higher wage earners as the economy goes
through the profound changes the President often tells you about.

It doesn't seem to be asking so much from this Congress. But
as usual, this Congress wants to play it right up to the deadline
in
order to try to hold the President hostage. And the President
has
made it abundantly clear that he will not be held hostage to that
type of tactic.

Q Has there been any discussion with Congress about
another short-term CR that would kick this down the road a couple
of
weeks so you can resolve the 4 billion --

MR. MCCURRY: There has been discussion, and it is our
understanding that some members of Congress have suggested that
if
they can't resolve these issues, they might adopt that approach.

That is really a haphazard way of running the Federal
Government, to kind of put us on one-week, two-week allowances.
And
it's not good for the American people when there's that type of
uncertainty. The uncertainty that exists now is having a
profound
ripple effect throughout the United States. If you can't tell
local

school districts, for example, what their level of funding is going to be for federal education assistance programs, they can't write budgets. They're trying to prepare for school years where they have no idea where they are going to be in terms of their own budgets.

So they're causing damaging effects at the local level as they play all these budetary games up on the Hill.

Let me go -- can I do a little bit on the Middle East trip? Because some of you had asked for that. As you all know, in a short while, the President will depart to co-host the meeting of the Summit of the Americas, with President Mubarak of Egypt in Sharm-El Sheikh, a very appropriate location given the residents of Sharm-El Sheikh and the history of Israel's place in that region.

It was from that location that that the Egyption navy blocaded the Straits of Tiran in the 1967 War. Now that location will stand as a symbol of support within the region for the Middle East Peace process and for Israel's effort to combat the terror it now feels and mourns within its own borders -- so an appropriate location.

The President, upon arrival, will meet with President Mubarak. They'll have an opportunity to review the agenda of the summit, discuss some bilateral issues, but, more imporantly, the conference itself, the summit itself. The Preident will then have, depending on the arragements and the timing, brief bilateral meetings with President Yeltsin and with Prime Minister Shimon Peres.

They will then go into the formal session of the summit of the peacemakers. They will hear from President Clinton, President Yeltsin, Prime Minister Peres, and Chairman Arafat, I belive in that order. And then other heads of state will be recognized for individual presentations.

They will then go into a private session where they will discuss in more detail a support for the peace processs, the necesssity of the region coming together and getting support from

the international community as they combat terror, and the steps that together these heads of state and high level representatives of governments can take as they both nurture the peace process and nurture an international effort to combat terrorism.

Over 30 nations are going to be represented, along with the European union and the United Nations. This is perhaps the most significant gathering ever of those who are dedicated to the Middle

East peace process. In the past, many of these leaders have come together to celebrate true milestones on the pathway to peace when there have been major agreements, major events to be acknowledged and celebrated.

This is a different type of moment. This is a moment in which the peace process itself is at its most fragile state. But it's at a time when together, shoulder-to-shoulder, these leaders can demonstrate their support for the peace process, their concerns about the region, and demonstrate their willingness to accept Israel into the future of that region as a partner.

Q What is the reaction to Syria's request for reconvening in Madrid?

MR. McCURRY: That is not an idea under active consideration at this time.

Let me tell you a little bit more. After the formal meeting, President Clinton and President Mubarak will have a brief session with the press where they will read a chairman's statement summarizing the results of the summit. The President will then meet with King Hassan of Morocco, Prime Minister Major, Chairman Arafat. He will then fly to Israel with Prime Minister Peres and upon arrival will have an arrival statement at Ben-Gurion Airport in Tel Aviv.

On Thursday, President Clinton will meet Prime Minister Peres's security cabinet, then have a bilateral meeting. He will also visit the grave of Prime Minister Rabin and Mount Herzl in Tel Aviv. He will then go back -- I'm sorry, in Jerusalem -- he will then go back to Tel Aviv. He will address about 1,200 students at the performing arts center in Tel Aviv and then depart for the

United States. Helen?

Q Is there going to be a communique or a joint statement actually listing some concrete results?

MR. McCURRY: We expect there will be some significant, tangible byproducts of the summit of the peacemakers. The discussion of how to best present those is currently under way. There is a lot of diplomatic activity that sets the stage for a meeting of this nature.

When leaders come together at a moment like this a lot of advance work can assure that their deliberations produce a productive outcome. We believe that the presence of these leaders, especially those from Arab nations, in the presence of the Israeli Prime Minister is, in itself, a very significant statement about the change in that region as a result of the peace process. It is, in fact, a direct rebuke to the terrorists who believe that they could somehow or other throttle the desires of the people of the territories and the Palestinians and the Jews of Israel as they search for a lasting peace in the region.

Q What is your reaction to Syria's decision not to attend?

MR. McCURRY: Well, we believe that was an unfortunate decision because Syria is very much a part of a peace process that will lead to a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in that region. The deliberations between Syria and Israel are critical to building that type of long-term support for peace. But they made their decision in response to the invitation of President Mubarak and President Clinton and we accept it.

Q Terrorist organizations have been rebuked before, criticized, vilified -- pick your verb -- and it has had no particular effect. Is anything likely to result from this conference that would accomplish something concrete, either shutting down Hamas offices that are in various countries or anything along those lines?

MR. McCURRY: Well, they are already underway, particularly because of Chairman Arafat's decisions of the last several days -- a significant effort to combat Hamas. And there is significant effort underway within the international community to combat organizations that sponsor terror. The importance of this issue is underscored by the dramatic presence of these high-level representatives of these nations.

I would suggest that for those who believe that they are somehow martyring themselves in the name of stopping the peace process, the vivid demonstration that this process goes forward with renewed strength is, in itself, a very important statement that this summit will make.

Q And what about Israel? He'll be meeting with Peres about an upcoming anti-terrorism intelligence agreement. Tell us about that.

MR. McCURRY: Well, let me tell you a little bit about the delegation we have and then a little bit about the follow-up we expect in Israel. In addition to the President, the delegation traveling with the President will include the Secretary of State, the National Security Advisor, the Director of Central Intelligence, John Deutch, Ambassador Dennis Ross, who is our special Middle East coordinator, Mark Parris, who is the key member of our Middle East Peace Team from the National Security Council staff and Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Robert Pelletreau.

That delegation sets the stage for not only the bilateral meetings the President will have but I imagine in the course of the day, Wednesday, a fair number of pull-asides that will involve some of the other high level representatives of other governments that are present. That delegation will then journey to Jerusalem and I expect that you will see, after the deliberations on Thursday, that Secretary Christopher and CIA director John Deutch will remain behind to address exactly the question that you pose: How can we

better cooperate with the government of Israel as we work together to combat terrorism and as the government of Israel develops new capacities working with the Palestinian authority to combat terrorism, both within Israel and within the region? But some of that I will save, obviously, for Thursday.

Q Will there be any shared U.S. intelligence then? Is that the plan?

MR. McCURRY: Well, we already do have cooperation between our government and their government, and they will examine the question of how we can make our cooperation that exists more effective.

Q What kind of precautions are you taking for the President's safety in this?

MR. McCURRY: Exactly the ones that you would imagine, and beyond that I won't comment.

Q Can I ask a Cuban question when that's wrapped up?

MR. McCURRY: Sure.

Q Cuba reacted to the President signing of Helms-Burton by -- I don't have the exact words in front of me -- but calling it another effort by the United States to meddle in the affairs in Cuba, something it's been doing for years and years, and said they would work to negate the effects of the bill. And we need reaction to that.

MR. McCURRY: Well, in some sense, Fidel Castro is right. We do want to see changes within Cuba. We want to see Cuba commit itself to human rights, to a better quality of standard of life for the citizens of Cuba. And we want to see them make the commitment that every other nation in this hemisphere has made towards democracy and towards market economics. Fidel Castro is an outlier in history now and is a relic of the past. And he needs to understand that the force of history in this century and into the next century lies with those democratic nations that, through peaceful means, advance commerce, advance market economics. In short, he needs to get with it. And that is the message of the Helms-Burton Act.

And so if he is reacting strongly against that, it not only confirms the pattern that he has pursued now for well over three decades of being stuck in the past, but it also indicates that he in no time soon will enjoy the benefits of more fruitful dialog with the international community.

Q You all worked hard to negotiate this waiver process in the Helms-Burton bill. But as soon as Congressmen started coming out into the driveway out here, they were all warning you against ever using it. Senator Helms said specifically that if the President did that, he would regret it. He didn't specify why. Do you all have any reaction to that?

MR. McCURRY: Well, under Title III of the legislation, the President has no ability to consider any waiver of the provisions of the Helms-Burton Act until much later this year, mid-summer at the earliest. So we will look at that question when the appropriate time comes. I don't want to speculate on what the President will assess as the environment for deliberation under Title III at this time.

Q Sort of following up on that, as you know, Canada and Mexico were both saying that they hope that they will be granted a waiver because it violates NAFTA. Would you have any reaction what you're telling Canada or Mexico right now?

MR. McCURRY: Well, that specific legal question on what are the implications of NAFTA, to my knowledge, have not been examined within our government yet. What we would suggest kindly to our trading partners, both in the Americas and also in Europe, is that the devastating tragic violation of international law by the Cuban government when it shot down these two unarmed planes is testimony to how preposterous is the suggestion that you can somehow or other moderate the behavior of Fidel Castro's regime through economic commerce. The facts very clearly now demonstrate exactly the reverse, and that is the reason why we are toughening our own

economic sanctions against Cuba and it is why we will continue to press vigorously for change in Cuba that leads Cuba towards democracy and market economics.

Q Just to follow then, exporters from other countries that are not NAFTA, are they directly penalized? Obviously, there are psychological penalties -- legal penalties against them?

MR. McCURRY: Well, under the extraterritoriality provision of the Helms-Burton Act, a right of action could arise against some of those entities if they are invested in property that has been expropriated as a result of Fidel Castro's regime. Now, there is a very specific legal right of action that is outlined in the bill.

It's not a blanket one. It has to be a result of a legal action taken in a U.S. court, but it is one that is significant and one that obviously is going to be of some concern to those nations that have invested in Fidel Castro's regime.

Q It's only expropriated costs concerned?

MR. McCURRY: I believe that's correct, but the exact wording of that provision of the bill I think you can get from the bill.

Q You talk about relics of the past, but we have a policy that is rooted in the past and that has been bereft for nearly 50 years, 40 years, to get us the sanctions against Cuba and so forth. You want market economics. Maybe they don't want it. I mean, the point is it's up to the people of Cuba.

MR. McCURRY: I don't know that that is a correct historic judgment. You are entitled to make that judgment if you wish. But the pattern of change in Cuba, the demonstrable desire of the Cuban people to move away from the very rigid formulations of totalitarian communism seems pretty clear. It may, in our own analysis, have something to do with the fact that Fidel Castro has taken these reprehensible actions. In short, within the framework of our own policy --

Q Maybe they do want change, but I'm saying our policy has not changed.

MR. McCURRY: Within the framework of the Cuban Democracy Act, which enjoys bipartisan support that you saw here at the White House today, there are provisions designed to encourage the people of Cuba to think about the benefits of a more prosperous form of economics and a more sensible form of politics. It is the nature of our policy and I think there is some concrete evidence that the people of Cuba understand that and that they would like to move on with history and be on the right side of history for a change.

Q Let me just ask one follow-up. They mentioned that the Cubans said they worked to try to negate the effect of this. I understand idealistically what you want in the long term, but in the near term what will be the effect of Helms-Burton? What do you seek to accomplish with this right now?

MR. McCURRY: What we seek to accomplish right now is what the purpose of our entire approach to Cuba has been for some time.

We want to increase the pressure on that regime to understand that its future lies with democracy and with more market economics and that those changes are within its grasp, if it only does what every other totalitarian country has done: shed the vestiges of a brutal form of dictatorship and enjoy the benefits and fruits that come from more democratic relations with other peaceful nations and more appropriate economic ties with countries that enjoy markets and the benefits of democratic capitalism.

Q Mike, to change the subject, China and live-fire exercises. Can you bring us up to date? There have been conflicting reports.

MR. McCURRY: I have not had anything that can bring anyone up to date. We are still monitoring the situation very carefully and we've got a very active presence of the Seventh Fleet in the vicinity of Taiwan, and they continue to monitor very carefully the

tests that have been announced by the People's Republic.

I am not aware that there is any information that suggests that there have been any live-fire aspects of that, those exercises, as of this moment, but they are anticipating, given the announcement of the People's Republic.

Q What is your understanding of the American commitment to Taiwan if China should mount aggression of some sort against Taiwan?

MR. McCURRY: My understanding is that the provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 apply, that the United States asserts a strong interest in peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue and that use of force, threat of force, or use of means that are non-peaceful to attempt to coerce behavior related to that issue are unwelcome and a source of grave concern.

Obviously any military action that produces results contrary to the stipulations of the Taiwan Relations Act would be a source of grave concern and grave consequences.

Q But you think the United States would be bound by the 1979 Act to defend Taiwan against Chinese aggression?

MR. McCURRY: The 1979 Taiwan Relations Act does not answer that question specifically and, indeed, there is merit we believe in keeping somewhat ambiguous about the answer.

Q Do you think our show of force will convince China to stop or interrupt the military exercises?

MR. McCURRY: That is not likely. That is not the purpose of our presence there. The purpose of our presence there is to make clear that we have interest in the Western Pacific. We assert them both through our diplomacy and through the presence of our military assets.

Q Are you suggesting to Taiwan that they act with restraint also?

MR. McCURRY: We have always urged both Taiwan and the People's Republic as they address the difficult issue of Taiwan to avoid provocative and belligerent steps. But the issue here in this instance are the military exercises that the People's Republic has conducted in an attempt, we believe, to affect the outcome of the March 23rd election on Taiwan.

Q On another peacemaking matter, the Prime Minister of Ireland on Friday -- what is supposed to come of that? Are they going to simply review where this process stands or what?

MR. McCURRY: Well, the President was encouraged by the announcement that Prime Minister Major and Prime Minister Bruton made recently -- for all party talks June 10th this will be an excellent opportunity with Prime Minister Bruton to review the preparation for those all-party talks to review the status of the peace process itself, to celebrate the fact that even admits the recent set back with the resumption of terror activity in the United Kingdom. The strongly expressed desire of the people of Northern Ireland is for peace, Protestant and Catholic alike.

And as the President suggested in his remarks last night, it's at difficult moments in the peace process that you have to remain most constantly faithful to the process itself because that's the way you overcome adversity and set backs.

Q One final question on China, any reaction to the Amnesty International report condemning China's human rights record.

MR. McCURRY: We have no specific reaction. We will certainly, as we always do with Amnesty International's contributions to the debate, study their analysis.

I would suggest, though, that last week the United States government rendered its own, very extensive commentary on that same body of material when it released its own human rights evaluations of the Peoples Republic during the calendar year. We stand by that -
- those judgments in that report and believe that much of the same criticism raised was addressed effectively in our own human rights

report.

Thank you. We'll see you all back here on Friday.

END

1:45 P.M. EST

#191-03/05

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 12 March 96 17:35
FROM Malley, Robert
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT cuba [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Nuccio, Richard A.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

FYI - From McCurry today:

Q Can I ask a Cuban question when that's wrapped up?

MR. McCURRY: Sure.

Q Cuba reacted to the President signing of Helms Burton by I don't have the exact words in front of me but calling it another effort by the United States to meddle in the affairs in Cuba, something it's been doing for years and years, and said they would work to negate the effects of the bill. And we need reaction to that.

MR. McCURRY: Well, in some sense, Fidel Castro is right. We do want to see changes within Cuba. We want to see Cuba commit itself to human rights, to a better quality of standard of life for the citizens of Cuba. And we want to see them make the commitment that every other nation in this hemisphere has made towards democracy and towards market economics. Fidel Castro is an outlier in history now and is a relic of the past. And he needs to understand that the force of history in this century and into the next century lies with those democratic nations that, through peaceful means, advance commerce, advance market economics. In short, he needs to get with it. And that is the message of the Helms Burton Act.

And so if he is reacting strongly against that, it not only confirms the pattern that he has pursued now for well over three decades of being stuck in the past, but it also indicates that he in no time soon will enjoy the benefits of more fruitful dialog with the international community.

Q You all worked hard to negotiate this waiver process in the Helms Burton bill. But as soon as Congressmen started coming out into the driveway out here, they were all warning you against ever using it. Senator Helms said specifically that if the President did that, he would regret it. He didn't specify why. Do you all have any reaction to that?

MR. McCURRY: Well, under Title III of the legislation, the President has no ability to consider any waiver of the provisions of the Helms Burton Act until much later this year, mid summer at the earliest. So we will look at that question when the appropriate time comes. I don't want to speculate on what the President will assess as the environment for deliberation under Title III at this time.

Q Sort of following up on that, as you know, Canada and Mexico were both saying that they hope that they will be granted a waiver because it violates NAFTA. Would you have any reaction what you're telling Canada or Mexico right now?

MR. McCURRY: Well, that specific legal question on what are the implications of NAFTA, to my knowledge, have not been examined within our government yet. What we would suggest kindly to our trading partners, both in the Americas and also in Europe, is that the devastating tragic violation of international law by the Cuban government when it shot down these two unarmed planes is testimony to how preposterous is the suggestion that you can somehow or other moderate the behavior of Fidel Castro's regime through economic commerce. The facts very clearly now demonstrate exactly the reverse, and that is the reason why we are toughening our own economic sanctions against Cuba and it is why we will continue to press vigorously for change in Cuba that leads Cuba towards democracy and market economics.

Q Just to follow then, exporters from other countries that are not NAFTA, are they directly penalized? Obviously, there are psychological penalties legal penalties against them?

MR. McCURRY: Well, under the extraterritoriality provision of the Helms Burton Act, a right of action could arise against some of those entities if they are invested in property that has been expropriated as a result of Fidel Castro's regime. Now, there is a very specific legal right of action that is outlined in the bill. It's not a blanket one. It has to be a result of a legal action taken in a U.S. court, but it is one that is significant and one that obviously is going to be of some concern to those nations that have invested in Fidel Castro's regime.

Q It's only expropriated costs concerned?

MR. McCURRY: I believe that's correct, but the exact wording of that provision of the bill I think you can get from the bill.

Q You talk about relics of the past, but we have a policy that is rooted in the past and that has been bereft for nearly 50 years, 40 years, to get us the sanctions against Cuba and so forth. You want market economics. Maybe they don't want it. I mean, the point is it's up to the people of Cuba.

MR. McCURRY: I don't know that that is a correct historic judgment. You are entitled to make that judgment if you wish. But the pattern of

change in Cuba, the demonstrable desire of the Cuban people to move away from the very rigid formulations of totalitarian communism seems pretty clear. It may, in our own analysis, have something to do with the fact that Fidel Castro has taken these reprehensible actions. In short, within the framework of our own policy

Q Maybe they do want change, but I'm saying our policy has not changed.

MR. McCURRY: Within the framework of the Cuban Democracy Act, which enjoys bipartisan support that you saw here at the White House today, there are provisions designed to encourage the people of Cuba to think about the benefits of a more prosperous form of economics and a more sensible form of politics. It is the nature of our policy and I think there is some concrete evidence that the people of Cuba understand that and that they would like to move on with history and be on the right side of history for a change.

Q Let me just ask one follow up. They mentioned that the Cubans said they worked to try to negate the effect of this. I understand idealistically what you want in the long term, but in the near term what will be the effect of Helms Burton? What do you seek to accomplish with this right now?

MR. McCURRY: What we seek to accomplish right now is what the purpose of our entire approach to Cuba has been for some time.

We want to increase the pressure on that regime to understand that its future lies with democracy and with more market economics and that those changes are within its grasp, if it only does what every other totalitarian country has done: shed the vestiges of a brutal form of dictatorship and enjoy the benefits and fruits that come from more democratic relations with other peaceful nations and more appropriate economic ties with countries that enjoy markets and the benefits of democratic capitalism.