

## M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 07 April 97 13:09  
**FROM** Danvers, William C.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** CWC [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Bendick, Gordon L.  
Burrell, Christina L.  
Danvers, William C.  
Davis, William K.  
**CARBON\_COPY** NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE  
**TEXT\_BODY**

Chris:

Here is the package. I think if Bell clears it, we're OK. If we have time  
, we can run it by Lori and Elisa as well.

Thanks for your help.

[[ CWC POTUS.DOC : 3331 in CWC POTUS.DOC ]][[ CWC MTNG2.DOC :  
3332 in  
CWC MTNG2.DOC ]][[ CWC MTNG.DOC : 3328 in CWC MTNG.DOC ]]  
[[ CWC PTS3.DOC : 3329  
in CWC PTS3.DOC ]][[ MYTH FACT.DOC : 3330 in MYTH FACT.DOC ]]

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE**

7 April 97 12:48

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME**

CWC MTNG.DOC  
2324  
cc: Vice President  
Chief of Staff

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER  
JOHN HILLEY

SUBJECT: CWC Meeting

You are scheduled to meet with a group of Senators on Monday, April 7 at 6:00 PM in the Cabinet Room to discuss Senate ratification of the CWC. The purpose of this meeting is to convince Senators to support the treaty. We are working to get the resolution of ratification to the Senate floor by the week of 14 April.

Ideally, we would like to see a common resolution of ratification agreed upon by proponents and opponents of the bill, plus a votes on amendments on issues that have not been resolved. As you know, we need 67 votes to pass the resolution of ratification, but we would only need a simple majority to defeat amendments to the resolution of ratification with which we disagree. This approach has not yet been agreed to by Sen. Helms or Sen. Lott. We are presently working with them on crafting a unanimous consent request that would encompass the afore mentioned approach plus a date certain next week for a vote.

The resolution of ratification has to be passed by the end of the week of 14 April in order for the U.S. to deposit the resolution of ratification by April 29 when the treaty goes into effect.

We have attached a list of invitees from the Hill, as well as suggested Administration participants (Tab A), talking points (Tab B) and additional background information (Tab C) for your use.

Attachment  
Tab A List of participants  
Tab B Talking Points  
Tab C Q&A

ATTACHMENT

**FILE DATE**

7 April 97 12:52

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME**

CWCPTS3.DOC

## CWC Points for POTUS Hill Meeting

## Why Support The Treaty

☐ Need your support for the Chemical Weapons Convention which I hope will be before the Senate this month.

☐ Enjoys broad bipartisan support: President Bush, Colin Powell, Larry Eagleburger, Brent Scowcroft, Jim Baker, Sam Nunn, Dave Boren and other leading Republican and Democratic foreign policy experts support the treaty.

☐ Treaty is in our national interest. Will help reduce the chemical threat to our soldiers and our citizens.

☐ Well before the CWC was concluded in 1993, Congress directed the destruction of the vast majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. The CWC will require that others do the same, under strict international supervision.

☐ Moreover, the elimination of our chemical weapons will not deny us a militarily useful tool. As JCS Chairman Shalikashvili and other military leaders have said, Desert Storm proved that we don't need chemical weapons to deter the use of chemical weapons against our forces.

☐ CWC will also help us deal with the threat of chemical terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and sanctioning the flow of chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons, the treaty will make it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons.

☐ We recognize that the CWC will not "solve" either the proliferation or terrorism problem. But we genuinely believe that it is a key element of any effective response.

### Process Toward Senate Action

□ Since January, we have been negotiating in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and a group he has put together in an effort to address the concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about the treaty.

□ During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, with Senator Biden's help we have either reached agreement on a compromise or identified a reasonable alternative, leaving it to the Senate to decide between the two.

□ Our objective has been to work with the Majority Leader and the members of his CWC task force to facilitate a timely debate and vote on the resolution of ratification in the Senate by mid-April so the United States can deposit the instruments of ratification on the Convention prior to April 29, when the Convention comes into force.

□

□ In short, we have moved well beyond the resolution of ratification that was on the Senate calendar last September. It's now time for the Senate to debate and vote.

### Why April 29 Deadline is Important

□ April 29 is a real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act positively, we will deny ourselves access to the treaty's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. We will be on the outside of this landmark arms control regime the U.S. led in negotiating, subject to its penalties, rather than on the inside designing its procedures. The credibility of American leadership across the

full  
range of proliferation issues will be undermined.

☐ The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors. And, Americans now serving as head of key posts, including security, administration, and industrial inspections will be replaced by nationals from countries that have ratified the Convention.

☐ American chemical companies will also begin losing sales to their overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Without ratification, the chemical industry will feel the brunt of the treaty's sanctions, which they estimate could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

☐ The Chemical Weapons Convention has been before the Senate since November 1993. There have been over 13 hearings, hundreds of questions answered for the record and numerous briefings provided to both members and staff. These efforts have continued in this new Congress as well.

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE**

7 April 97 12:56

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME**

MYTHFACT.DOC

## CWC FACTS AND FICTION

The Chemical Weapons Convention has been before the Senate since November 1993, when it was submitted by President Clinton. Over the past three and a half years, the Senate has held 13 hearings on the treaty and the Administration has conducted dozens of briefings for Senators and their staff. The Administration has provided the Senate more than 1500 pages of information on

the CWC -- over 300 pages of testimony, over 500 pages of answers to letters and reports, over 400 pages of answers to questions for the record, and over 300 pages of other documentation.

In April 1996, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations voted the treaty out of Committee by a strong bipartisan majority, 13-5. Despite this thorough scrutiny and debate, opponents continue to raise concerns about the treaty. For the record here are the facts, not the fiction, about the CWC:

**The Deterrence Fiction:** By ratifying the CWC, the United States will surrender a vital deterrent to chemical attack.

**The Facts:**

\_ This treaty is really about other countries' weapons, not our own. Well before the Bush Administration signed the CWC, President Reagan signed the law requiring the United States to destroy the bulk of our chemical weapons arsenal. The CWC will help ensure that other countries follow our lead.

\_ As the Bush and Clinton administrations have understood, we don't need chemical weapons to deter chemical weapons. We have the world's most powerful military. Saddam Hussein refrained from using his chemical stockpile during the Persian Gulf War not because he feared retaliation in kind, but because he feared retaliation of comparable or greater magnitude. As JCS Chairman General Shalikashvili has said: "Desert Storm proved that retaliation in kind is not required to deter the use of chemical weapons.... From a military perspective, the Chemical Weapons Convention is clearly in our national interest."

\_ The CWC allows parties to maintain robust chemical weapons defense programs to help further deter the acquisition or use of chemical weapons.

**The Rogue States Fiction:** Because rogue states will refuse to join the treaty, it will tie our hands but not theirs.

**The Facts:**

\_ The CWC will shrink the chemical weapons problem down to a few

rogue states and help  
curb their ability to obtain the materials to make chemical  
weapons.

\_ Under a law signed by President Reagan, the United States is  
destroying the bulk of our  
chemical weapons. Our military has decided we are better off  
without them. So, whether or  
not we ratify the CWC, we are getting out of the chemical weapons  
business. By ratifying,  
we can set an example for others and pressure them to follow our  
lead.

\_ Non-Party states will be affected. Over time, they will be shut  
out of the market for many  
"dual use" chemicals that can be used to make both chemical  
agents and commercial  
products like ink. Such states will find it much more difficult  
to produce or acquire  
chemical weapons. By imposing permanent trade restrictions  
against non-members, the  
CWC will generate permanent pressure on them to sign up -- or be  
excluded from the world's  
chemical markets.

\_ Right now, without the CWC, about twenty countries are suspected  
of pursuing chemical  
weapons programs. With the treaty, they will fall into one of  
two camps: 1) those that suffer  
trade restrictions and a clear cut stigma as pariah states; 2)  
those that have agreed to allow  
short-notice inspections of any suspicious site. This is clearly  
better than the status quo.

\_ As General Schwarzkopf has said, "We don't need chemical weapons  
to fight our future  
warfares. And frankly, by not ratifying that treaty, we align  
ourselves with nations like Libya  
and North Korea, and I'd just as soon not be associated with  
those thugs in that particular  
matter."

The Verification Fiction: The treaty is unverifiable.

The Facts:

\_ Opponents of the CWC would make the perfect the enemy of the  
good. Verification is never  
perfect -- but perfection is the wrong standard. We have laws on

the books that prohibit tax evasion or burglary or murder not because they are guaranteed to prevent these acts, but because such laws make crimes less likely to occur. Similarly, the CWC strengthens our hand against chemical weapons cheaters -- without it we have no hand at all, for chemical weapons are perfectly legal to make and prepare for use. And significant violations will be more readily detected because of the treaty's verification regime.

\_ In fact, the CWC is the most extensive arms control treaty yet. Its inspectors will have the right to conduct short notice inspections wherever they suspect prohibited activities are being carried out, coupled with access to inspection technologies that will pose important new barriers to cheating. The treaty's verification provisions cover every aspect of a chemical weapons program from development through production, stockpiling, transfer and use. The treaty also ties the United States into a global verification network and strengthens our access to information about other countries. It gives us new tools to deal with problems we must face with or without the CWC -- the threats of chemical weapons proliferation and chemical weapon terrorism.

\_ The military use of chemical weapons typically requires significant testing, equipping and training of forces that will be more difficult to hide in the face of a vigorous on-site inspection regime. Such an effort would more likely be detected with the CWC's verification measures than without them.

\_ The allegation that the treaty is unverifiable is ironic, given fearmongering from the same quarters about the treaty's allegedly draconian inspection and reporting requirements. How can it be both too tough and not tough enough?

The Proliferation Fiction: The treaty explicitly obligates members to facilitate the transfer of militarily relevant chemical technology to untrustworthy countries that can become parties.

The Facts:

\_ It would be strange indeed if a treaty expressly devoted to eliminating chemical weapons required members to help build them. In fact, the CWC does just the opposite. To help any country build chemical weapons is absolutely prohibited. The CWC reads: "Each Party... undertakes never under any circumstances to develop, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile or retain chemical weapons, or transfer, directly or indirectly, chemical weapons to anyone. Each State Party shall adopt the necessary measures to ensure that toxic chemicals and their precursors are only developed, produced, otherwise acquired, retained, transferred or used within its territory... for purposes not prohibited under this Convention."

\_ This false alarm may be based on a misreading of language in the Treaty: "...States Parties shall facilitate... and have the right to participate in... exchange of chemicals, equipment, and... information relating to... chemistry." This provision is explicitly restricted to exchanges for "purposes not prohibited under the Convention." It merely affirms the right of the parties to engage in chemical commerce for peaceful purposes (e.g. industrial, agricultural, research, pharmaceutical, medical or other pursuits) as they do today. A state with chemical weapons aspirations has no treaty right to anything that furthers those aspirations. And nothing in the treaty requires the elimination of our export controls on chemical materials and equipment.

The Vigilance Fiction: It would make us less vigilant about the need to maintain defenses against chemical threats.

The Facts:

\_ Following this logic, we should give chemical weapons to our potential adversaries to be sure we are reminded to defend against them. There is nothing inevitable about arms control agreements lessening our resolve to defend against the threat in question. This is a matter of political will here at home -- it has nothing to do with the treaty, which encourages defenses

against chemical weapons.

\_ The Clinton Administration is committed to maintaining a robust program to equip and train our troops against chemical and biological attack. We have asked Congress to increase the Defense Department's budget for chem/bio defense by \$225 million over the next six years.

The Riot Control Agent Fiction: It will prohibit our forces from using tear gas in the future.

The Facts:

\_ The use of RCAs is unrestrained by the CWC for peacetime uses. Thus, RCAs may be used in normal peacekeeping operations, law enforcement operations, humanitarian and disaster relief operations, counter-terrorist and hostage rescue operations and noncombatant rescue operations outside of internal or international armed conflict.

\_ RCAs may also be used in other situations, including when U.S. forces are conducting: peacetime military operations within an area of ongoing armed conflict when the U.S. is not a party to the conflict (such as Somalia, Bosnia and Rwanda); consensual peacetime operations when the receiving state has authorized the use of force (including Chapter VI operations); and, peacekeeping operations under Chapter VII authority of the Security Council.

\_ In all such cases, so long as U.S. forces, or the coalition in which U.S. forces are participating, do not become engaged in a use of force of a scope, duration and intensity which would trigger the laws of war, the CWC would not restrict our RCA use options, including against combatants who are parties to the conflict

\_ The CWC does not apply to all uses of RCAs in an armed conflict. When the U.S. is a party to such a conflict, only the use of RCAs where combatants are present is restricted. The use of RCAs solely against noncombatants for law enforcement, riot control, or other non-combat purposes would not be prohibited.

\_ Finally, the President has made clear that he is committed to

accelerating efforts to field non-chemical, non-lethal alternatives to RCAs for use in those situations where the use of RCAs is proscribed.

The Burdens on Business Fiction: Business opposes the treaty because it will impose huge reporting and inspection burdens on 8,000 American companies that use chemicals regulated by the Convention.

The Facts:

\_ Wrong on all counts. The chemical industry, which worked closely with the Reagan and Bush Administrations during the CWC negotiations, strongly supports ratification. The Chemical Manufacturers Association (CMA), the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association (SOCMA), the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) and other major trade organizations support the CWC and say it will not pose an undue burden on business. Small business, through the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), called treaty opponent's claims that it opposed the treaty "100% incorrect" (Wall Street Journal, 2/14/97). An NFIB official predicted its members "are not going to be impacted."

\_ The facts: Under the CWC, about 140 companies will likely be subject to routine inspections and more detailed reporting requirements. Many are members of CMA, which strongly supports the CWC. The rest of the businesses covered -- approximately 1,800 companies -- are producers of large volumes of covered chemicals -- not, as misinformed critics allege, users of chemicals like soap, tire and paint makers.

\_ More than 90 percent of the industry facilities covered by the treaty will be required to do little more than fill out a two-page form once a year. Moreover, we expect that challenge inspections in the U.S. will be directed largely at military facilities.

\_ What the critics fail to point out is the cost to American

business if we fail to ratify. The CMA has estimated that up to \$600 million a year in sales by American chemical companies and many jobs will be at risk from mandatory trade restrictions designed to pressure rogue states to join.

The Trade Secrets Fiction: It could jeopardize confidential business information through frivolous "challenge inspections" with extraordinary access to files, data and equipment and inspectors themselves could be spies (e.g. Chinese inspectors.)

The Facts:

\_ In fact, the Chemical Manufacturers Association, which strongly supports the CWC, helped write the rules covering confidential business information -- protecting trade secrets was its top priority during the treaty negotiations. Then, CMA "test drove" the treaty during seven full fledged trial inspections at chemical facilities to make sure protections against industrial espionage were strong. They are.

\_ Further, the treaty gives our government the right to reject ahead of time for any reason any inspectors we believe may try to spy at U.S. facilities.

\_ Fearmongering about the treaty's draconian inspection tools is ironic, given allegations by opponents that the treaty is unverifiable -- which is it, too tough or not tough enough?

The Constitutionality Fiction: It might involve unreasonable searches and seizures that violate the 4th Amendment to the Constitution.

The Facts:

\_ At the insistence of the United States, the CWC explicitly allows members to take into account their constitutional obligations when providing access for a challenge inspection. Both the CWC and its draft implementing legislation fully protect U.S. citizens, including businesses, from unreasonable search and seizure. In addition, sensitive equipment, information or areas not related to chemical weapons can be protected during challenge inspections using managed access techniques.

\_ Because the U.S. chemical industry fully supports the CWC, the Administration anticipates inspection access to be granted voluntarily in almost all cases. In the rare cases where access is denied, the implementing legislation contains procedures for requesting and issuing search warrants.

\_ As Attorney General Reno wrote to Majority Leader Lott, the "constitutional concerns [of the treaty's opponents] are unfounded. The dictates of the 4th Amendment have been scrupulously honored in the drafting and will be rigidly followed in the implementation."

The Cost Fiction: American taxpayers will bear substantial annual costs of membership.

The Facts:

\_ For FY98, the Administration has requested \$25 million for meeting our CWC assessment and an additional \$21 million for multilateral verification at U.S. chemical weapons-related facilities, should that be necessary. That amounts to about 20 cents from every American. This is a far cry from the \$200 million pricetag critics cite without basis. Less than a quarter from each American is a small price to pay to improve the safety of our troops on the battlefield and our citizens at home -- and a bargain compared to the losses American business could incur if we fail to ratify.

The Deadline Fiction: The April 29 deadline is of no consequence and is of the Administration's own making.

The Facts:

\_ In fact, failure to ratify by April 29 will have significant adverse consequences for America's security and American business.

\_ Our ability to oversee the first critical days and months of implementation of the treaty will be lost -- Americans who now head up the divisions that monitor the treaty's budget, security measures and industry inspections will be replaced by individuals from countries that have

ratified the treaty. Moreover, Americans will not be able to be hired as inspectors.

\_ Hundreds of millions of dollars in sales by American chemical companies and many jobs will be at risk as a result of mandatory trade restrictions originally designed to pressure rogue states to join.

\_ And failure to ratify would relegate us to the back benches with international pariahs such as Libya and North Korea, squandering our international leadership in the fight against chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

The Pull Back Fiction: Last September, the Administration pulled the CWC back from the Senate for fear it would unnecessarily burden U.S. industry.

The Facts:

\_ In fact, the treaty was put on hold in the midst of the Presidential campaign because, as Republican Senator Richard Lugar explained, "The whole process was politicized in a way that would be harmful to our foreign policy. This is not a good time for the debate."

\_ As detailed above, the leading trade organizations and small business all support the CWC and say it will not pose an undue burden on business.

The Russia Loophole Fiction: Treaty loopholes will allow Russia to produce new classes of nerve agents.

The Facts:

\_ In fact, the CWC was explicitly written to account for technological change by making all chemical weapons illegal, whether or not they are currently listed on its Schedules of Chemicals (which, in any event, are illustrative, not exhaustive). The Treaty also explicitly provides for expanding the list as new agents are identified. And it provides new tools for monitoring emerging chemical weapons threats, such as challenge

inspections.

The Linkage Fiction: The U.S. should only deposit its instrument of ratification after Russia ratifies.

The Facts:

\_ This approach would give hard-liners in Russia the power to decide whether the U.S. ever becomes a Party to the treaty. By "just saying no," the Duma could ensure that neither the U.S. nor Russia ever joins, thus allowing Russia to keep its chemical weapons stockpile.

\_ President Yeltsin's recent decision to submit the CWC to the Duma and to press for prompt Russian ratification is evidence that Moscow is worried about U.S. ratification. Rejecting the linkage approach will make clear to Russia that the train is leaving the station on April 29 with the U.S. on board and Russia left behind.

The Pressure on Others to Ratify Fiction: To pressure the Senate, the Administration encouraged other countries to approve the treaty and trigger entry into force.

The Facts:

\_ President Bush's Secretary of State, Lawrence Eagleburger, signed the treaty in January 1993. The almost four years it took for the 65th ratification to trigger entry into force on its face undercuts any claim this inevitable moment of truth was rushed.

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE**

7 April 97 13:1

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME**

CWCPOTUS.DOC

CWC POTUS MEETING LIST

Hill

Biden  
Bingaman  
Levin  
Lugar

McCain  
DeWine  
Grassley  
Coats  
Hatch  
Jeffords  
Collins  
Warner  
Domenici  
Hagel  
Mack  
Smith (Oregon)  
Stevens  
Roberts  
Gorton  
Coats  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Gregg  
Hutchison (ARK)  
Bennett  
Allard  
Burns  
Campbell  
Abraham  
Brownback  
Enzi  
Sessions  
McConnell  
Santorum

Administration

POTUS  
VPOTUS  
Secretary Albright  
Secretary Daley

Ambassador Richardson  
Deputy Secretary White  
General Ralston  
Sandy Berger  
John Hilley  
Leon Fuerth  
Jim Steinberg  
John Holum  
General Byron  
Bob Bell  
Goody Marshall

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE**

7 April 97 12:38

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME**

CWCMTNG2.DOC  
2324

April 4, 1996

**INFORMATION**

**MEMORANDUM FOR SANDY BERGER**

**FROM:** BILL DANVERS

**SUBJECT:** Presidential Meeting with Senators on CWC

The President is scheduled to meet with a group of Senators on Monday, April 7 at 6:00 PM in the Cabinet Room to discuss Senate ratification of the CWC. The purpose of this meeting is to try and get the 67 votes necessary for ratification.

We have attached a memo to the President (Tab I), a list of invitees from the Hill, as well as suggested Administration participants (Tab A), talking points (Tab B) and additional background information (Tab C) for your use.

Concurrences by: Bob Bell, Lori Murray, Elisa Harris

Attachment

Tab I Memo to the President

Tab A List of Participants

Tab B Talking Points

Tab C Q&A

## M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 07 April 97 13:22  
**FROM** Harris, Elisa D.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** op-ed points [UNCLASSIFIED]

**TO** Bell, Robert G.  
Benjamin, Daniel  
Blinken, Antony J.  
Gibney, James S.  
Gray, Wendy  
LaFleur, Vinca A.  
Murray, Lori E.  
Naplan, Steven J.

**CARBON\_COPY** NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

**TEXT\_BODY** [[ OP-EDPTS.DOC : 3370 in OP-EDPTS.DOC ]]

tony: here are the points you requested.

lori, bob, would appreciate your input on these, which are for a potential op-ed requested by berger on the "stonewalling" argument.

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE** 7 April 97 13:19

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME** OP-EDPTS.DOC

OP-ED POINTS ON CWC

☐ The CWC was signed by the Bush Administration in January 1993 and submitted to the Senate by President Clinton in November 1993. In the three and a half years that the CWC has been before the Senate, there have been 13 hearings and the Administration has conducted dozens of briefings for Senators and staff.

☐ Overall, we have provided more than 1500 pages of information on the CWC to the Senate, including over 300 pages of testimony, over 500 pages of answers to letters and reports, over 400 pages of

answers to questions for the record, and over 300 pages of other documentation.

☐ In early January, the President and the Majority Leader agreed to work together to try to address the concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about the treaty.

☐ We have been negotiating in good faith. National Security Adviser Berger has led the Administration team which has met four times with the Majority Leader's task force. These principal-level meetings have been followed by four extensive senior staff sessions.

☐ Senator Helms, who is a member of the Lott group, has proposed about 30 conditions and in nearly every case we have either reached agreement on a compromise formulation that can be accepted by the Senate or identified a reasonable alternative, leaving it to the Senate to decide between the two.

☐ For example, concerns were expressed that the Constitution's protection against unreasonable searches and seizures would be trampled by international inspectors. To address that concern, we have agreed to a condition which would require that the government obtain a search warrant for any inspection not done on a voluntary basis.

☐ Concerns have also been expressed that joining the treaty might lead to a reduction in our efforts to protect our troops against the effects of chemical weapons. To respond to this concern, we have undertaken a commitment to ensure that our troops are effectively equipped and trained to operate in a chemical or biological weapons environment.

☐ Concerns have also been raised that the treaty will require parties to facilitate the transfer of militarily-relevant chemical technology to countries like Iran that become parties. This is not the case. Moreover, we have offered to certify to the Senate that national and multilateral export controls on chemical-related materials are fully consistent with the CWC and that we and other Australia Group members see a continuing role for such controls in the future.

☐ In short, we have gone well beyond the 7 conditions approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last spring by a strong, bipartisan 13-5 vote. It is now time for the Senate to vote.

## M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 07 April 97 14:06  
**FROM** Witkowsky, Anne A.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: CFE Response [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Alijanil, Leyla  
**CARBON\_COPY** Andreasen, Steven P.  
Bell, Robert G.  
Bendick, Gordon L.  
Bouchard, Joseph F.  
Carter, Michael E.  
Darnes, Victoria J.  
Ficklin, John W.  
Hasman, Thomas M.  
Kelly, Sandra L.  
Langley, Janice M.  
Marsh, Thomas S.  
Millison, Cathy L.  
Mulligan, George D.  
Murray, Lori E.  
Porter, Gidell  
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.  
Seaton, James B.  
Witkowsky, Anne A.

**TEXT\_BODY**

What original letter to Helms? The letter to Lott (to which this letter refers) was sent on the 25th. Please clarify .

From: Alijani, Leyla  
To: Witkowsky, Anne A.  
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; Bendick, Gordon L.; Millison, Cathy L.; @WWD - West  
Wing Desk; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy  
Subject: CFE Response [UNCLASSIFIED]  
Date: Monday, April 07, 1997 01:59 PM

FYI:

Package 2142 - CFE Response to Letter from Senator Helms has been signed by Berger. However, the original letter to Senator Helms has not been dispatched as of yet. Per Cathy Millison, we will hold this letter until further instruction.

## M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 07 April 97 14:21  
**FROM** Millison, Cathy L.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: CFE Response [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Alijanil, Leyla  
**CARBON\_COPY** Andreasen, Steven P.  
Bell, Robert G.  
Bendick, Gordon L.  
Bouchard, Joseph F.  
Carter, Michael E.  
Darnes, Victoria J.  
Ficklin, John W.  
Hasman, Thomas M.  
Kelly, Sandra L.  
Langley, Janice M.  
Marsh, Thomas S.  
Mulligan, George D.  
Murray, Lori E.  
Porter, Gidell  
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.  
Seaton, James B.  
Witkowski, Anne A.

**TEXT\_BODY**

Leyla:

As discussed, please go ahead and send the letter to Helms. I understand from Ann Witkowski that it needs to go as soon as possible.

---

From: Alijani, Leyla

To: Witkowski, Anne A.

CC: /N, NonRecord at A1; Bendick, Gordon L.; Millison, Cathy L.; @WWD - West

Wing Desk; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy

Subject: CFE Response [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Monday, April 07, 1997 01:59 PM

FYI:

Package 2142 - CFE Response to Letter from Senator Helms has been signed by Berger. However, the original letter to Senator Helms has not been dispatched as of yet. Per Cathy Millison, we will hold this letter until further instruction.

## M S M a i l

**DATE-TIME** 07 April 97 15:17  
**FROM** Danvers, William C.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** CWC Pts. [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Harris, Elisa D.  
**CARBON\_COPY** Bendick, Gordon L.  
Burrell, Christina L.  
Danvers, William C.  
Davis, William K.

**TEXT\_BODY**

Elisa:

[[ CWCPTS3.DOC : 3867 in CWCPTS3.DOC ]]

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE**

7 April 97 12:52

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME**

CWCPTS3.DOC

CWC Points for POTUS Hill Meeting

Why Support The Treaty

☐ Need your support for the Chemical Weapons Convention which I hope will be before the Senate this month.

☐ Enjoys broad bipartisan support: President Bush, Colin Powell, Larry Eagleburger, Brent Scowcroft, Jim Baker, Sam Nunn, Dave Boren and other leading Republican and Democratic foreign policy experts support the treaty.

☐ Treaty is in our national interest. Will help reduce the chemical threat to our soldiers and our citizens.

☐ Well before the CWC was concluded in 1993, Congress directed the destruction of the vast majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. The CWC will require that others do the same, under strict international supervision.

☐ Moreover, the elimination of our chemical weapons will not deny us a militarily useful tool. As JCS Chairman Shalikashvili and other military leaders have said, Desert Storm proved that we don't need chemical weapons to deter the use of chemical weapons against our forces.

☐ CWC will also help us deal with the threat of chemical terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and sanctioning the flow of chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons, the treaty will make it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons.

☐ We recognize that the CWC will not "solve" either the proliferation or terrorism problem. But we genuinely believe that it is a key element of any effective response.

#### Process Toward Senate Action

☐ Since January, we have been negotiating in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and a group he has put together in an effort to address the concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about the treaty.

☐ During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, with Senator Biden's help we have either reached agreement on a compromise or identified a reasonable alternative, leaving it to the Senate to decide between the two.

☐ Our objective has been to work with the Majority Leader and the members of his CWC task force to facilitate a timely debate and vote on the resolution of ratification in the Senate by mid-April so the United States can deposit the instruments of ratification on the Convention prior to April 29, when the Convention comes into force.

☐

□ In short, we have moved well beyond the resolution of ratification that was on the Senate calendar last September. It's now time for the Senate to debate and vote.

#### Why April 29 Deadline is Important

□ April 29 is a real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act positively, we will deny ourselves access to the treaty's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. We will be on the outside of this landmark arms control regime the U.S. led in negotiating, subject to its penalties, rather than on the inside designing its procedures. The credibility of American leadership across the full range of proliferation issues will be undermined.

□ The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors. And, Americans now serving as head of key posts, including security, administration, and industrial inspections will be replaced by nationals from countries that have ratified the Convention.

□ American chemical companies will also begin losing sales to their overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Without ratification, the chemical industry will feel the brunt of the treaty's sanctions, which they estimate could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

□ The Chemical Weapons Convention has been before the Senate since November 1993. There have been over 13 hearings, hundreds of questions answered for the record and numerous briefings provided to both members and staff. These efforts have continued in this new Congress as well.



## M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 07 April 97 17:19  
**FROM** Harris, Elisa D.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** points again!! [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Bendick, Gordon L.  
Burrell, Christina L.  
Danvers, William C.  
Davis, William K.  
**CARBON\_COPY** Bell, Robert G.  
Murray, Lori E.

**TEXT\_BODY**  
[[ 2230B.DOC : 4367 in 2230B.DOC ]]  
bill: a few final changes, per bob. thanks!

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE** 7 April 97 17:18

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME** 2230B.DOC

CWC Points for Hill Meeting

Why Support the Treaty

☐ Need your support for the Chemical Weapons Convention, which we expect to be voted on in next two weeks.

☐ Last Friday, had the honor of hosting broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters here at White House, including former Sec State James Baker, former JCS Chairman Colin Powell, former Reagan arms control advisors Paul Nitze and Ed Rowny and 100 other prominent former government officials, retired military officers, veterans, small and large business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.

☐ Prior to event, received two important letters expressing strong support for ratification. First was from former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft and former Senators Kassebaum and Boren.

☐ Second letter was from 17 retired flag officers, including three

former Chairmen of the JCS (Powell, Vessey, Jones), five former Service Chiefs (McPeak, Mundy, Sullivan, Zumwalt and Dugan), Norman Schwarzkopf and 8 other Generals and Admirals.

☐ These letters join previous letters/expressions of support from former President Bush, Larry Eagleburger, former Senator Sam Nunn and many other leading Republican and Democratic officials.

☐ Would like to spend a few minutes outlining some of reasons why all of these people, with such diverse backgrounds and political views, believe CWC is in our national security interest.

☐ First, because it will reduce the chemical threat to our soldiers in the future. Well before the CWC was concluded, Congress directed the destruction of the vast majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. The CWC will require that others do the same, under strict international supervision. That is why every Chairman of the JCS since the Carter Administration -- General David Jones, General John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell, and General Shali -- as well as former Secretaries of Defense Melvin Laird, Harold Brown and William Perry support this treaty.

☐ Second, because our participation is a tangible demonstration of our willingness to lead international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support this treaty.

☐ Third, because the treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help the Intelligence Community do a better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- a task they face with or without the CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet all support this treaty.

☐ Fourth, because it will give us new tools to deal with the emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting the flow of chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons, the CWC will make it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Janet Reno, the International Union of Police Associations, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers and the National Association of Police Organizations all support this treaty.

☐ Fifth, because it will ensure a level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in certain dual-use chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons. If we are not a party, our chemical companies will face CWC-mandated traded restrictions which could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales.

That is why the Chemical Manufacturers Association, the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America all support the treaty.

☐ Finally, because it will establish a global norm against the possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why the Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, the United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support this treaty.

☐ Recognize that the CWC will not "solve" the chemical weapons problem. But it is a key element of any effective response.

#### Treaty Status in Senate

☐ Since January, we have been negotiating in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and a group he has put together in an effort to address the concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about the treaty.

☐ During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached agreement on a compromise or identified a reasonable alternative, leaving it to the Senate to decide between the two.

☐ Our objective has been to work with the Majority Leader and his CWC task force to facilitate a Senate vote by mid-April so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when the treaty comes into force.

☐ CWC has been before the Senate since November 1993. There have been 13 Senate hearings, hundreds of questions answered for the record and numerous briefings of both members and staff.

☐

☐ We have moved well beyond the resolution of ratification that was on the Senate calendar last September. It's now time for the Senate to debate and vote.

#### Importance of April 29 Deadline

☐ April 29 is a real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act before then, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Will also be denied the ability to require other states to do what we are already doing

--  
getting out of the chemical weapons business.

☐ Without ratification, the credibility of American leadership across a full range of transnational issues will be undermined.

☐ The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors. And Americans now serving in key posts, including as head of security, administration, and industry inspections, will be replaced by nationals from countries that have ratified.

☐ American chemical companies will also begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 07 April 97 19:26

**FROM** Wozniak, Natalie S.

**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED

**SUBJECT** April 7 Press Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]

**TO** Babcock, Douglas W.  
Boulton, Darrien D.  
Bujold, Noelle D.  
Elkind, Jonathan H.  
Fuerth, Leon S.  
Hamel, Michael A.  
Harding, Bruce D.  
Hilty, JoAnne M.  
Jordan, Donald L.  
Kuipers, Keelin G.  
Moore, Lori A.  
Norris, John J.  
Orfini, Michael H.  
Wise, William M.  
Woolston, Ann E.

**CARBON\_COPY** NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

**TEXT\_BODY** [[ APR07GUI.DOC : 4906 in APR07GUI.DOC ]]

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE** 7 April 97 14:4

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME** APR07GUI.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

April 7, 1997

Canada/Chretien

Middle East

Dalai Lama

Hong Kong/INS

CWC

Zaire

Chile

Russia/NIS

Taiwan

Saudi Arabia/Khobar

Bosnia

China

Trips and Visitors

Albania

Northern Ireland

Gulf War Illnesses

Nazi Assets

Fast Track

## CANADA -- CHRETIEN VISIT

### Saudi Bomb Suspect

Do you have any comment on the arrest of Hani Abdel Rahim al-Sayegh in Canada last week?

☐ I'd just note that we've long worked closely with Canada in counter-terrorism and the excellent cooperation we've had on this case reflects that fact

☐ United States is grateful for Canada's vigilance in arresting Mr. Sayegh.

☐ Given that case is currently before courts in Canada, can't comment further.

### Canadian Unity

There was recently a good deal of controversy in Washington about

an article by an active Foreign Service Officer concluding that the U.S. could accommodate an independent Quebec without difficulty. Why was that conclusion controversial?

☐ Our policy on Canadian unity is well known. As I've said many times, and as accomplishments of Prime Minister Chr,tien's visit demonstrate, we enjoy excellent relations with a strong and united Canada.

☐ Canada is our closest ally, and model for the rest of the world of how peoples of different backgrounds can live together in peace and harmony; hope that will continue.

☐ Naturally, Canada's political future is for Canadians to decide.

☐ [If pressed] The author of that article was expressing his personal views, which were not those of the U.S. government.

☐ [If questioned on an independent Quebec's entry into NAFTA] Hypothetical situation, speculation not appropriate. Would note that this is complicated issue, there is nothing automatic about it. We have made no commitments on this to any party.

Absence of an Ambassador

It's now been a year since there has been an American Ambassador in Ottawa. Aren't you concerned that Canadians will interpret the absence of an ambassador as a slight?

☐ No, I'm not worried about that. We're very capably represented in Ottawa by Charg, Tom Weston, a senior career Foreign Service Officer, who's done a superb job.

☐ But I do expect to fill this key vacancy quite soon.

Air Pollution

What steps is the U.S. taking to help reduce air pollution in Canada?

☐ I'm committed to cleaner air. High priority for both of us to reduce pollution and its effects

on the air we breath.

☐ Working together and with states, provinces and U.S. and Canadian industry to improve the air quality over the U.S. and Canada.

### Smog

What is the U.S. response to Canadian Government comments that EPA revisions to smog standards do not go far enough?

☐ Welcome Canada's comments. Know EPA will give full consideration to all comments it receives before making any final decisions.

### Anti-Personnel Landmines

Why has the U.S. decided to pursue the "slow path" toward a ban on anti-personnel landmines in the Conference on Disarmament rather than support the Canadian proposal (the "Ottawa process")?

☐ Not pursuing "slow path" toward an anti-personnel landmine ban. Conference on Disarmament is most practical forum to negotiate meaningful ban because it includes most of world's landmine producers.

☐ CD has proven track record: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Chemical Weapons Convention successfully negotiated there.

☐ Not "against" the Ottawa process. Canada's proposal and CD negotiations should be mutually reinforcing. That is why the U.S. attended February meeting in Vienna.

☐ [If asked] We have not decided whether to attend the June Ottawa process meeting in Brussels.

### Haiti

What was the outcome of U.S.-Canadian discussions on Haiti? Will the U.S. and Canada remain actively engaged in Haiti after the July 31 expiration of the UN peacekeeping mission?

☐ Pleased that Canada has decided to keep presence in Haiti after current UN mandate expires in July. Important to build on success of political transition by helping to strengthening democratic institutions, especially police and judiciary.

☐ Currently discussing best way to continue international presence in Haiti beyond the July 31 expiration of the UNSMIH mandate. Look forward to the UN Secretary General's recommendations on this presence.

#### Pacific Salmon

What is the U.S. doing to resolve the salmon dispute with Canada?

☐ This is a very important issue for both countries and one where we have not found agreement easy in past.

☐ Have begun process of direct talks among Canadian and American stakeholders, those most directly involved in salmon fishery. Talks underway on West Coast; hopeful for positive results.

#### Devils Lake

Will the U.S. violate the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 if an outlet is constructed at Devils Lake, N.D.?

☐ No, we are committed to observing the Boundary Waters Treaty.

☐ Projects like this are assessed under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) to ensure that they do not harm environment.

#### Canada and Cuba

What do you think about Canada's approach to Cuba. Aren't you concerned about their cozying up to Castro?

☐ Canada and the United States have long shared the goal of seeing democratic Cuba return to community of nations.

☐ We have differences over how to achieve this and over Helms-Burton Act, but agreed to

continue to work together to advance our common goal of democratic Cuba that respects human rights.

☐ Applaud Canada's emphasis on encouraging the promotion and protection of human rights and democratic change in Cuba.

☐ We are skeptical, however, that Castro will be amenable to change through a policy of engagement.

#### Helms-Burton

Did you discuss the NAFTA implications of HB? Doesn't Helms-Burton violate NAFTA?

☐ In our view, Helms-Burton is consistent with our international trade obligations, including NAFTA. Disagreement over this legislation is political issue, not trade issue.

☐ Key is not to lose sight of shared objective on Cuba -- promoting peaceful, democratic transition. It is important that we continue to focus on this as friends and allies, and today's meeting was very helpful in this regard.

If asked whether the U.S. would invoke essential security if Canada requests a NAFTA dispute settlement panel:

☐ Not going to discuss hypothetical case; see this issue as better handled in political channels.

#### Wal-Mart and the U.S. Embargo

What right does the U.S. have to tell foreign companies what to do? Is Wal-Mart Canada a U.S. firm?

☐ Provisions of the U.S. embargo of Cuba apply to U.S. firms and their subsidiaries. This case is under review by the Treasury Department, and therefore I cannot make any comment.

#### Managing the Border

What are you announcing on border initiatives? Why is it important?

- ☐ Initiatives we are announcing today will directly benefit some of our smallest and largest border communities.
- ☐ Our governments will offer 24 hour/day border services by the year 2000 to 22 pairs of small towns which now have only limited service, via new technologies such as remote video systems.
- ☐ These paired communities are highly integrated. As Mrs. Doris Adams, an American married to a Canadian and living in Crane Valley, Saskatchewan, has written, she can now work late at her job just across the border in the U.S. and avoid a 100 mile detour over hazardous roads back home, thanks to a pilot project in Scobey, Montana. "It will be a real boon to have the same system operating across the entire Northern Tier," Mrs. Adams wrote. Today's announcement is an important step in that direction.
- ☐ We will move truck backups off the bridges and tunnels linking some of our busiest ports of entry, to off-road processing centers. First off-road facility will open by early 1999 in Fort Erie, Canada, opposite Buffalo.

Are you creating an open border?

- ☐ Initiatives we are announcing today will facilitate the movement of low-risk people and goods while strengthening enforcement against illegal activities.

Law Enforcement

What about missing children? Telemarketing fraud?

- ☐ Any border complicates investigation and prosecution of many kinds of crimes, so we are taking action together to safeguard our most vulnerable citizens, the elderly and the very young, and to deny criminals any safe haven.
- ☐ Stepping up our joint efforts to intercept missing children who are being taken across our common border, by speeding up notice to legal authorities on

both sides of missing children  
reports and abductions-in-progress.

☐ Our law enforcement officials will report back in six months on joint progress against transborder telemarketing fraud crimes. These crimes especially target elderly, often robbing them of their life savings. We are going to cooperate to be more successful in prosecuting telemarketing scam artists.

#### NAFTA Deficit

You've spoken in glowing terms about the success of NAFTA, but I notice that you've avoided mentioning our growing trade deficits with our NAFTA partners. Don't those deficits, which together are now almost equal to our deficit with China, show that NAFTA has been a failure?

☐ No, they don't. While it's true that those deficits have increased, that's a short-term phenomenon, stemming from cyclical factors-- Mexico's 1995 peso crisis and the fact that until recently Canada's growth lagged behind that of the U.S.

☐ Without NAFTA those deficits would have been much higher. To see that fact, you just have to look at our experience with Mexico in its preceding devaluation crisis in 1982-- when our exports fell 50%. In 1995, in contrast, our exports fell only 9 percent, and they've since recovered.

☐ Under NAFTA, our exports to Canada and Mexico are at record levels, and I'm confident that we'll continue to build on that base. As Mexico continues its recovery and Canada's growth accelerates, things will even out.

#### Canadian Culture

Canadian law gives so-called cultural industries -- publishing, broadcasting, film-making, etc. -- broad protection from foreign competition. Since U.S. law provides much less protection to U.S. industries, isn't U.S. trade with Canada in these areas inherently unfair, and doesn't NAFTA

just make that unfairness permanent?

- ☐ We have with Canada not only the world's busiest trading relationship, but also the world's richest cultural exchange.
- ☐ Of course we accept Canada's right to determine its own national culture.
- ☐ However, there are some cases where, in our view, particular Canadian policies serve to discourage economic competition, rather than preserving Canadian culture.
- ☐ In such cases, if we cannot negotiate a solution, we have not hesitated to avail ourselves of trade remedies available under World Trade Organization and NAFTA.

## MIDDLE EAST

### Themes

- This is obviously an important juncture in the peace process.
- If there is to be progress, both sides need to act to restore calm and confidence in a serious and sustained way.
- The President and Prime Minister had a good discussion of how to deal with the current situation.
- They agreed that the key elements are to restore security and confidence in the integrity of the negotiating process.
- They had a thorough discussion of how to do that, and more broadly how to move toward our common objective of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.
- The meeting with the Prime Minister was just one in a series of discussions with Middle East leaders that the President has had over the past two months.

-- We will have further exchanges in the days ahead, including with the Palestinians later this week here in Washington. (Note: refers to Abu Mazen/Saeb Erekat coming to Washington.)

-- This is not the time to get into a discussion of details or modalities.

-- Any announcements on next steps will need to await further contacts with the parties.  
We are not going to be rushed on this.

-- In the meantime, it is critical that neither side take steps which make the task of reviving negotiations more difficult. This is a moment when each should be looking for ways to build confidence.

-- In particular, we expect every effort to be made to prevent new acts of terror.

Q: Is the President going to launch a Camp David type negotiation on final status issues?

A: Let's not get too far ahead of things here. The Prime Minister and the President will be discussing how to restore momentum to the peace process, particularly the negotiations with the Palestinians. We'll also need to continue our discussions with the Palestinians.  
We've still got some work to do. Their meeting today is part of that, not an opportunity to make big announcements.

Q: Does the President agree with the Israeli Prime Minister that the parties should go straight to permanent status talks?

A: What we want to do is find the best way to proceed with negotiations in an atmosphere of calm and confidence between the parties. That's what they'll discuss. It wouldn't be appropriate for me to comment any further right now.

Q: Will the President ask the Prime Minister to freeze construction at Har Homa and other settlement activity?

A: You know the President's views on these issues. They haven't changed. But I'm not going to comment right now on what their conversation will cover.

Q: Last week the President said Arafat is doing some things to prevent terrorism? What is he doing and is it enough in the President's view?

A: We have made very clear our view that violence is not the answer. I think Chairman Arafat understands that he and the Palestinian Authority need to do everything they can, in word and deed, to make clear that there is zero tolerance for terror.

The President is encouraged by some of the moves the Palestinian Authority, but he believes more can and should be done. (UPDATE IN PRE-BRIEF)

Q: What about rescinding the anti-Israel elements of the Palestinian Covenant. Arafat still hasn't done that. Has the President told him it's necessary to do that now?

A: Obviously we expect the Palestinians to keep their commitments. In April, 1996, the Palestinian National Council adopted a resolution canceling the articles inconsistent with its commitments to Israel. During the Hebron negotiations, Chairman Arafat committed to complete the process of revising the Charter.

Q: There's a growing perception that the President is willing to publicly criticize the Government of Israel. Normally U.S. Presidents don't criticize Israel publicly, and why doesn't the President criticize Arafat for not living up to his commitments?

A: When you're trying to be a credible partner with both sides in a negotiation, you've got to take the risk of sometimes being caught in the middle. You need to be able to take the heat, and you need to be able to call on both parties to take tough decisions. The President is comfortable with the role the United States is playing to help the parties. I think we've done the best we can when faced with some tough situations.

Q: Is the President planning a meeting with Chairman Arafat or a three-way meeting with Arafat and Netanyahu?

A: The President is meeting with the Prime Minister today. Don't have any other plans at the moment.

Q: What's the President's reaction to criticism that the Administration is not doing enough to save the Middle East peace process?

A: No question about the amount of time and effort that we've put into helping achieve peace in the Middle East. Been through difficult periods before, and we've helped restore calm and gotten the parties to re-focus on negotiations.

Will take some hard work on all sides to move back to the serious give and take of negotiations. Will help the parties do that, but they need to create the conditions to move forward.

Q: What is the President's reaction to the Arab League action recommending cutting Arab ties to Israel?

A: He thinks it is a mistake. It only encourages those opposed to peace.

Q: Does the President agree with the Prime Minister that the Palestinian Authority must comply with all its commitments, including those on terrorism and violence, in order for negotiations to resume?

A: What is important now is that the Palestinian Authority has to do everything it can to prevent further terror. There must be no doubts on this commitment, and the Palestinian Authority must make certain that both friends and enemies of the peace process understand that violence and terror are unacceptable -- there must be zero tolerance for terrorism.

Q. What will it take to get the negotiations with Syria started again? Will the President be in

touch with President Asad?

A: Our goal is a comprehensive peace and you can't have that without an Israeli-Syrian and Israeli-Lebanese agreement. We continue to be in touch with both sides.

#### ABU MARZOOK EXTRADITION CASE

Q: Can you tell us if Hamas leader Abu Marzook will be sent to Jordan? Why don't you prosecute him here?

A: That matter is still under litigation. I'm not going to comment on it.

Q: Did the President discuss the Marzook case with the Prime Minister?

A: I'm not going to describe our contacts with the Israeli government on this matter.

Q: Was the President involved in the decision not to extradite Marzook to Israel?

A: This was a decision reached entirely by the Government of Israel.

Note: NSC has been in close contact with both the Justice Department and State Department regarding this sensitive case.

#### DALAI LAMA

☐ The Dalai Lama, religious leader of Tibetan Buddhists and Nobel laureate, is always a most welcome visitor to the United States.

☐ Americans have tremendous feelings of goodwill toward His Holiness and adherents of Tibetan Buddhism in the United States and elsewhere.

☐ The administration welcomes the Dalai Lama's visit and looks forward to discussions with him.

☐ He will be meeting members of the administration, but at what level and with whom has not been decided.

☐ As a religiously diverse nation, we also welcome the contributions to our nation's spiritual life of Americans who have embraced Tibetan Buddhism.

## HONG KONG/INS

Background: The U.S. Consul-General in Hong Kong pledged that he and his superiors in Washington would get to the bottom of any allegations of corruption surrounding any U.S. officials based in the British colony.

Richard Boucher made the remarks today (4/7) after it was announced over the weekend that the highest U.S. immigration official in Hong Kong had been suspended and his wife arrested as part of an international probe into the suspected smuggling of illegal immigrants from China to the United States.

### Points

- ☐ Reprehensible, will root out corruption.
- ☐ INS has high standards and we will maintain those standards.

## CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

☐ CWC enjoys broad, bipartisan support: President Bush, Colin Powell, Brent Scowcroft, Jim Baker, Ed Rowney, Paul Nitze and other leading Republican foreign policy experts support it.

☐ CWC will reduce the threat to our soldiers by requiring others to do what we are already doing -- getting out of the chemical weapons business.

- ☐ CWC will also make it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons by eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting the flow of chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons.
- ☐ Recognize that the CWC will not "solve" either the proliferation or terrorism problem. But it is a key element of any effective response.
- ☐ Treaty has been before the Senate since November 1993. There have been 13 Senate hearings, hundreds of questions answered for the record and numerous briefings of both members and staff. More than 1500 pages of information has been provided to the Senate. It's time for the Senate to debate and vote.
- ☐ If we do not ratify by April 29, Americans will be less secure. We will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons.
- ☐ The United States will also not have a seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors. And Americans now serving in key posts, including as head of security, administration, and industry inspections, will be replaced by nationals from countries that have ratified.
- ☐ Without ratification, the credibility of American leadership across a full range of transnational issues will be undermined.
- ☐ Finally, American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

#### HELMS AND CWC

Q: During Secretary Albright's visit to North Carolina last week, Senator Helms indicated that he would probably allow the Senate to move forward with a vote on the Chemical Weapons Convention. What is your reaction?

A: We are encouraged by the Senator's comments about the prospects

for Senate action on this vital treaty. Over the past two months, we have worked closely with Senator Helms and other members of the Steering Committee established by the Majority Leader to try to address the concerns that have been raised about the treaty. We look forward to a Senate vote by mid-April -- in time for the U.S. to be an original party to the treaty.

Q: What is your reaction to Senator Helms statement that the Administration has delayed responding to his request for negotiations with his staff over the CWC?

A: In early January, the Majority Leader and I agreed to work together to try to address the concerns of members of the Republican caucus regarding the Chemical Weapons Convention.

We have been negotiating in good faith. National Security Adviser Berger has led the Administration team which has met four times with the Majority Leader's task force. These principal meetings have been followed by four extensive senior staff sessions.

Senator Helms, who is a member of the Lott group, has proposed about 30 conditions and in nearly every case we have either reached agreement on a compromise formulation that can be accepted by the Senate or identified a reasonable alternative, leaving it to the Senate to decide between the two.

Our objective has been to work with the Majority Leader and the members of his CWC task force to facilitate a timely debate in the Senate on the Convention prior to April 29, when the Convention comes into force. I welcome Senator Lott's statement on Thursday that he is working a process to get the CWC done in April and that it is not his intention to stonewall on this.

Q: Senator Helms claims that unless the Administration satisfies his key concerns over the Treaty it will never reach the Senate floor and that the Administration needs to address his

broad concerns regarding State Department reorganization, UN reform, and the handling of other arms control treaties in the Senate.

A: We disagree with Senator Helms that this treaty will do nothing to reduce the dangers of poison gas. During our extensive negotiations with Senator Helms and his staff, we have identified a list of key issues where we cannot agree with Senator Helms' proposed conditions. We believe these outstanding issues and our proposed alternative conditions should be debated and voted upon.

While the Administration is prepared to continue to address the broader issues Senator Helms has raised, direct linkage with the CWC is a prescription for inaction, which we cannot afford as the clock ticks on entry into force of this agreement.

Q: Senator Helms claims the April 29 date is a "chicken little" deadline with no meaning and that the Administration is trying to blackmail the Senate.

A: April 29 is a real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act positively, we will deny ourselves access to the treaty's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. We will deny ourselves the ability to require other states to do what we are doing already on our own--getting rid of our chemical weapons.

Without ratification the credibility of American leadership across the full range of proliferation issues will be undermined. The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty.

American chemical companies will also begin losing sales to their overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in.

ZAIRE

## ZAIRE PEACE PROCESS

- ☐ South Africa will be leading efforts later this week to bring the GOZ and rebels together for negotiations.
- ☐ UN SRSG Sahnoun is in South Africa and we hope he will be part of these discussions. The United States thinks Sahnoun has a central role to play in his double-hatted capacity as both UN and OAU representative.
- ☐ We are hopeful that both parties will send senior-level delegations to discuss seriously a cease-fire and comprehensive negotiated solution. We continue to see a negotiated solution as the best means of solving the ongoing crisis in Zaire.
- ☐ We have worked very hard with neighboring governments and France to secure commitments from both sides to a negotiated solution.

If asked:

- ☐ We have offered to assist the South Africans, but they are leading this effort alone.
- ☐ Understand UN Special Representative Ambassador Mohammed Sahnoun is in South Africa, but we don't know if he will be part of any negotiations. South African Deputy President Thabo Mbeki discussed the concept of talks in South Africa during his meeting with President Mobutu last week in Kinshasa. Other representatives of the SAG met with Kabila shortly thereafter to secure their commitment to talks.

## MOBUTU PROPOSALS/USG PERSONNEL IN ZAIRE/ELECTIONS

Q: What is your reaction to the confusing proposals from Mobutu? Do we endorse them?

A: The announcement of two proposed bodies -- a Council to seek a national consensus on how to settle the current crisis in Zaire peacefully and a seven-person committee of negotiators -- appears on the surface to be a positive step. We are waiting to get more details on these proposed bodies before making further comment.

We would like to see the members of the negotiating committee designated immediately and announce their readiness to enter into negotiations with the rebel alliance, within the context of the UN five-point plan.

Q: (If asked) Has Mobutu lost control of his government?

A: President Mobutu is still recognized as head of state of Zaire. Obviously, during this time of national crisis it is important for all Zairian political figures to work together towards a peaceful settlement.

Q: Is the U.S. included in the Lome talks? Who will represent the U.S.?

A: The summit in Lome is an OAU central organ meeting. Special Envoy Howard Wolpe is attending as an informal observer.

Q: How many official Americans remain in Zaire?

A: There are thirty-six U.S. Government employees, seven adult dependents and eight temporary duty personnel at post as of March 26. The number of temporary duty (TDY) personnel continues to fluctuate.

Q: What can you tell us about the deployment of American forces to Central Africa?

A: The President authorized on Friday the deployment of several hundred American forces under Operation Guardian Retrieval as part of contingency planning for a possible evacuation from Zaire. No decision to conduct an evacuation has been made.

The situation in the Zairian capital of Kinshasa is calm. We remain concerned, however, that the climate could degenerate warranting the evacuation of American citizens and some third country nationals. The posture of American forces in the region is simply a prudent, precautionary step.

American forces will not intervene in the ongoing fighting in

Zaire.

The deployment of these forces enhances the military's ability to ensure the security of U.S. citizens living in Zaire, but does not represent a commitment by the U.S. to any particular course of action.

The deployment includes command and support elements for a forward Joint Task Force and other enabling elements. U.S. Army Major General Edwin P. Smith, Commander of the Southern European Task Force is the Joint Task Force Commander.

U.S. forces have deployed to Brazzaville, Congo and Libreville, Gabon. They come from elements of the U.S. European Command, primarily from the Southern European Task Force based in Vicenza, Italy. Some additional support elements are from U.S. based units.

Q: What does the U.S. think about possible negotiations between the government and rebel leaders?

A: The United States continues to strongly support a negotiated settlement to the crisis in Zaire. We have been working with the Government of Zaire, representatives of the rebel leadership, regional governments, UN Special Envoy Ambassador Mohammed Sahnoun, the group of African "Wise Men" and the government of South Africa to bring about a cessation of hostilities and negotiated solution to the war.

(IF ASKED)

Q: What type of equipment is being deployed?

A: The Joint Task Force will have a range of equipment. Units will deploy with communications gear, airport control, support equipment and several fixed wing aircraft and helicopters.

Q: How many American citizens are in Zaire?

A: Roughly 550. There are approximately 300 Americans in Kinshasa.

Q: The French and Belgian governments are reportedly taking similar measures. Are these efforts coordinated?

A: Yes, our military actions have been fully coordinated with our European allies, some of whom have decided to deploy forces to the region as well.

We are also very pleased with coordination and cooperation of the Congolese and Gabonese governments in this effort.

Q: Were Congressional leaders notified?

A: Yes, Congressional leaders were notified Friday evening and throughout the day on Saturday.

## CHILE

Q: Has the Administration decided to permit the sale of advanced fighters to Chile?

A: No. The USG has decided to authorize the issuance of marketing licenses to companies which wish to compete in Chile's selection of fighter aircraft, while making clear to both the Government of Chile and to the companies involved that there has been no decision on whether to permit the sale itself.

The licenses are for marketing information only and do not constitute approval for an actual sale. A decision whether to permit such sale has not been made.

This decision to issue marketing licenses was made so as not to disadvantage U.S. companies in the competition. These licenses allow these companies to provide the Government of Chile with technical data on advanced fighter aircraft.

Q: Has the U.S. changed its Latin American conventional arms

transfer policy?

A: No. As you know, the Administration is reviewing U.S. conventional arms transfer policy toward Latin America in the context of the significant political, economic, and military changes that have been occurring in the past ten years.

This policy review is on-going. While the review is underway current policy remains unchanged.

Q: What is the current policy on arms exports to Latin America?

A: Our policy worldwide is to consider pending arms transfers on a case-by-case basis.

Our long-standing policy in Latin America is, and remains, to address potential transfers in the context of restraint.

Q: Why is a review necessary?

A: The welcome expansion and strengthening of democracy and democratic institutions in recent years makes it prudent for us to undertake this policy review to determine whether any changes in our policy are appropriate.

Our policy goals for the countries of Latin America are to enhance democracy, including civilian control of the military, foster regional stability, transparency and confidence building, and ensure that the weapons modernization decisions of these countries address legitimate defense needs within their existing economic resources.

Any possible change made to our current arms export policy will be in accordance with these goals.

## RUSSIA/NIS

### Current Items

Russia Signs Integration Treaty with Belarus

☐ Russia and Belarus signed Treaty April 2; unclear how it differs from last year's agreement; provides for territorial integrity, sovereignty, independence of Russia and Belarus; reportedly will allow one month for public comment prior to submitting to parliaments for ratification.

☐ We have no objections in principle to integration as long as voluntary, mutually beneficial, done on basis of equality, does not harm relations with other countries or create new divisions among nations.

☐ But continue to be concerned about political developments in Belarus -- restrictions on personal and press freedoms; unwarranted actions against foreigners, including recent expulsion of U.S. diplomat; recalled our Ambassador for consultations on situation; have cut U.S. assistance.

#### IMF Resumes Russia Program

☐ Welcome IMF Managing Director Camdessus' comments that Russia taking necessary reforms, management steps to resume IMF program. Shows confidence in new economic team. Expect decision to be made formally later this month by IMF board.

#### General Items

##### Helsinki Summit and Aftermath, Way Forward in U.S.-Russia Relations

☐ Welcomed Yeltsin's positive comments on summit results; Helsinki confirmed U.S.-Russian intention to work together, work through tough issues. As Yeltsin said, "our choice is for cooperation."

##### Yeltsin Claims Promise of Full G-8?

☐ Denver meeting will be Denver Summit of Eight; will build on increased Russian involvement; Yeltsin to arrive and depart with others; will be one press conference by leaders of the Eight.

☐ Seven will still discuss economic, financial matters; expect this to be small part of agenda.

## NATO-Russia

☐ NATO enlargement proceeding on schedule. Part of broader effort to build comprehensive European security system, which includes strong NATO-Russia relationship. It is going forward in way that does not threaten any nation's security, enhances stability in Europe.

☐ In Helsinki, President and Yeltsin disagreed over enlargement but agreed to work together to build cooperative NATO-Russia relationship.

☐ See Russia as partner of NATO in shaping more secure, stable and undivided Europe. That is good for United States, Russia and Europe.

## Russia Prepared to Sign NATO-Russia Charter in May?

☐ Charter can formalize cooperative NATO-Russia relationship. U.S. prepared to sign Charter before Madrid NATO summit in July, but Alliance and Russia must first agree on contents of document, which is now being discussed in NATO-Russia channel.

## TAIWAN

Q: What is the U.S. commitment to the defense of Taiwan?

A: According to the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 (TRA), it is the policy of the United States:

-- "To consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means... a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States;"

According to the TRA:

-- The President is directed to inform the Congress promptly of any threat to the

security or the social or economic system of the people of Taiwan and any danger to the interests of the United States arising therefrom.

-- The President and Congress shall determine, in accordance with Constitutional processes, appropriate action by the United States in response to any such danger.

The TRA also requires that the United States:

-- Make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

In the U.S.-PRC 1982 Communiqué, the PRC articulated its fundamental policy of resolving the Taiwan question by peaceful means.

We regard the issue of Taiwan's future as one to be resolved by the parties; our interest is that such a resolution be peaceful.

Background: According to the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), it is the policy of the United States:

-- To declare that peace and stability in the area are in the political, security and economic interests of the United States, and are matters of international concern;

-- To make clear that the United States' decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China rests upon the expectation that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means;

-- To consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States;

-- To maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or

economic system, of the people of Taiwan.

The TRA also requires that the United States:

-- Make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

#### SAUDI ARABIA -- KHOBAR BOMBING

Q: Are we getting cooperation from Syria on the Khobar bombing investigation?

A: The investigation into the Khobar bombing is ongoing. We do not comment on investigations in progress.

Regarding Syria, I'm not going to discuss the details of our diplomatic exchanges with other governments, particularly when they involve a matter under investigation.

Q: Are the Saudis helping? What have we learned from the suspect detained by Canada?

A: As I've said before, we have gotten cooperation from the Saudis and we've been assured at the highest levels of the Saudi Government that more cooperation will be forthcoming.

As has been reported, Canada has detained an individual who may have information about Khobar. I'd refer you to the FBI for any comment on that.

Q: But the Canadians charged this guy with participating in the bombing and the papers they filed indicate he has links to Syria and Iran. Do you concur with the Canadian assessment of his culpability? Does this mean we're going to finally take action against Iran? Will it be military action?

A: Canada did make some specific allegations in the papers the Canadian government filed with its own courts. As you know, we, too, have an investigation ongoing.

At this time in our own investigation, it is neither necessary nor appropriate to make specific public charges or allegations. The FBI, the agency in our government that is in charge of this investigation and the agency that has been working with Canada, will follow all leads and will take them to their appropriate conclusion.

We are treating this as a criminal, law enforcement investigation. I'm not going to speculate about the outcome of the investigation or any actions that outcome might require.

Q: So you're ruling out any military action against Iran based on the clear and convincing evidence Canada's authorities have submitted to their courts?

A: I'm declining to speculate on the outcome of the case. Nothing more, nothing less.

## BOSNIA

### Radovan Karadzic (NYT Piece)

☐ Karadzic has been out of power for almost one year, having been removed from public office as required under Dayton. According to the agreement reached with Republika Srpska, he is banned from participating in any political activities or making public appearances.

☐ We continue to monitor the situation to ensure Republika Srpska lives up to this agreement. However, we will not be satisfied until he and all others indicted by the War Crimes Tribunal stand trial in The Hague.

### War Criminals

☐ We continue to remain deeply concerned with the slow progress on war crimes front in

Bosnia. We're examining variety of ways we can help the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals to justice. We have made no decisions on how to assist the Tribunal. We are reviewing many different options.

If pressed about sending teams of special police or commandos to arrest war criminals:

☐ We have been examining several options to assist and enhance the ability of the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals into custody. One option may be to establish some sort of capability to execute the court's arrest warrants. We are studying the feasibility of these options but have made no decisions yet.

#### SFOR Mission Duration

☐ We expect the mission can be completed in 18 months. 18 months should give sufficient extra time needed for civilian implementation efforts on economic reconstruction, refugee return, and related issues needed to ensure a self-sustaining peace.

If asked about an all-European Force after 18 months:

☐ We believe the mission can be completed in 18 months. We are focused on the important work we have to do between now and June 1998.

#### FRY/Republika Srpska Agreement

☐ The decision of the FRY Assembly to ratify a cooperation agreement with the Serb Republic is a violation of the Dayton Agreement and is inconsistent with the Constitutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska.

☐ The agreement includes provisions that are under the purview of the individual states and which could be in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The agreement cannot take effect until it is ratified by the Bosnia-Herzegovina Assembly.

#### Kasich Legislation/Premature Withdrawal from Bosnia

□ Passage of the proposed legislation and unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops could lead to a resumption of the war in Bosnia, a serious crisis in the NATO alliance, and an abdication of U.S. credibility and leadership in Europe and around the world. We strongly urge that this legislation not be pursued.

## CHINA

### COSCO

Q: Does COSCO represent a threat to US national security? Does COSCO engage in predatory pricing and operate outside the normal rules and motivations of commercial behavior? Did COSCO decide to purchase ships from US yards to curry favor?

A: COSCO is the world's largest shipping line. It operates out of virtually every major West Coast port. And it moves much of the traffic in our trans-Pacific market.

We welcome its participation in our trading relationship. But like other companies, it must abide by our laws. I am confident that our Coast Guard, Customs and Maritime authorities will ensure that our laws are effectively enforced -- whether they involve COSCO or any other company.

Senator McCain has made some serious allegations with respect to COSCO. We are looking at those allegations. I'm not going to prejudge that review or its outcome.

### UNHRC

Background: France, Germany, Italy, and Spain reportedly have decided not to co-sponsor a China resolution, which means that there will not be an EU-introduced resolution this year.

However, any individual country can introduce the resolution, and we expect at least 10 EU countries to co-sponsor the resolution once it is introduced. Our position is that we are working with other countries on a resolution and will oppose China's no-action motion (which, if passed, would bar consideration of the resolution by the Commission). A vote is scheduled for the third week in April.

#### Points

- ☐ U.S. is working with other members of the Commission on a resolution concerning the human rights situation in China.
- ☐ U.S. will oppose motions designed to keep the resolution off the Commission's agenda.
- ☐ Aware of vigorous Chinese efforts to defeat resolution. Believe members of the Commission should make decision based on human rights situation in China, not other factors.
- ☐ Our own judgment at this point is that the current situation warrants a resolution on China's human rights record.
- ☐ We have made clear to China that in the absence of human rights progress we would see no reason not to proceed with a resolution at the UNHRC.

If asked whether our efforts were "downgraded" from last year

- ☐ At this point, we have demarched members of the Commission to convey our views and are working with Europeans partners on a proposed resolution.
- ☐ During his recent visit, Ambassador Richardson expressed the U.S. position in a statement to Commission members and met with several important delegations to convey our views.
- ☐ Our efforts this year are commensurate to our efforts in the past, and, more importantly, our approach remains the same: We will vote, and ask others to vote, based on the human rights situation in China.

## TRIPS AND VISITORS

- ☐ Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada will make an official visit to Washington on April 8.
- ☐ Spanish President Aznar will be here April 30 for meeting and working lunch.
- ☐ President's visit to Mexico postponed to May 6-7. Regional summit meetings in Bridgetown, Barbados and San Jose, Costa Rica will go forward as scheduled during the week of May 6-10.
- ☐ President will travel to Netherlands May 28 for US-EU Summit and Marshall Plan commemoration event. No details yet.
- ☐ Denver Summit June 20-22.
- ☐ POTUS will travel to Denmark in July in conjunction with the July 8-9 NATO Summit in Madrid.
- ☐ President's visits to Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela rescheduled to October 12-17.

### If asked about Hashimoto Visit

Background: The Japanese Embassy received guidance in reaction to a leaked story in Tokyo about a possible Hashimoto visit to Washington in April. The Japanese are saying, "The Prime Minister intends to visit Washington in late April and the two governments have begun consultations."

- ☐ We are consulting with Japanese officials about a possible PM Hashimoto visit to Washington this spring.

## ALBANIA

- ☐ The security situation in Albania has improved slightly but

remains very difficult, with armed gangs still at large, the central government still weak and deep divisions between the insurgents in the south and President Berisha, who remains in office.

☐

☐ While some humanitarian supplies are getting through, the possibility of a humanitarian crisis remains.

☐ The OSCE has taken on overall responsibility for coordinating the international community's response to the Albanian crisis. The OSCE plans to send a large mission to Albania to support political reconciliation, promote a return to law and order and help foster the conditions for a return to democracy. The U.S. is playing a very active role with the OSCE on Albania

☐ As part of a separate effort to support security for humanitarian and other assistance to Albania, the OSCE and UN Security Council have welcomed the initiative being organized by Italy and other European nations to send a multinational force to Albania.

☐ Italy, joined by about ten other governments, are planning the details of this force. It may deploy in the middle of April. The United States does not plan to join this force.

☐ The United States continues to support the government of Prime Minister Fino and supports his efforts to reach out to all constructive political forces in the country, including responsible forces in the south.

☐ (If pressed). It is up to President Berisha to determine how he can act to support stability and democracy in Albania.

## NORTHERN IRELAND

Start of Marching Season

☐ Pleased that Easter Monday parade went off smoothly. Commend those who took courageous decision to avoid confrontation.

☐ Hope people of goodwill in Northern Ireland will work together to avoid clashes and bitterness in this year's marching season.

#### Bomb at Sinn Fein Office

☐ Condemn this attempted attack, as we condemn all acts of violence.

☐ Urge loyalists to return to observing cease-fire; not precipitate downward spiral of violence that can only harm all people of Northern Ireland.

#### Continued IRA Violence

☐ Strongly condemn continued IRA violence in Northern Ireland and in Britain, urge immediate, unequivocal cease-fire.

☐ Belfast peace talks (now in recess until June) have best chance of long-term success if they are inclusive (that is, if Sinn Fein participates) but that can only happen after IRA cease-fire.

#### On Whether Ira Needs to Disarm Before Joining Talks

☐ Vice President did not address this point, but U.S., like British and Irish governments, have accepted the report issued last year by Senator Mitchell and his colleagues, which suggested decommissioning of arms in parallel with talks.

#### Murder of Catholic Father of Nine in Belfast

If asked about the murder of a Catholic father of nine in Belfast, possibly by loyalist gunmen:

☐ WH horrified by this brutal slaying, condemns it in strongest terms.

☐ Do not know who was responsible; police are investigating.

☐ [If pressed]: Have no way of knowing yet whether loyalists were involved, but are watching closely. Condemn it utterly, whoever did it.

### Berger/Steinberg Phone Calls

- ☐ In last several days NSA Berger and DNSA Steinberg have been in touch with British and Irish officials and with party leaders to discuss situation in Northern Ireland, exchange views on how to move process forward.
- ☐ If asked whether one of them spoke with Adams: Remain engaged in process; not going to comment further on details of who/when.

### GULF WAR ILLNESSES

What is your reaction to the recent LA Times article alleging that GWI is contagious and that the Blood Supply may be unsafe?

- ☐ We've been assured that there is no scientifically supportive evidence that the undiagnosed illnesses that some Gulf War veterans have been suffering from is contagious.
- ☐ Beyond that, I would refer you to the Departments involved (DOD, HHS and VA) for any additional particulars relating to precautions taken, ongoing research, etc.
- ☐ With regards to the blood supply, both FDA and the Red Cross have stated they believe the blood supply remains safe. I would refer specific questions to the FDA.

What action has been taken in response to the initiatives you announced during the roll-out of the PAC (Presidential Advisory Committee) report in early January 1997?

- ☐ We've accomplished a great deal since the PAC submitted its report.
- ☐ Leading examples:
- ☐ Secretary Brown has prepared a recommendation -- which I have accepted [?] -- to initiate rulemaking to extend the compensation eligibility period for Gulf War veterans with undiagnosed illnesses to December 31, 2001. This measure has been strongly supported by Gulf War veterans and members of Congress.
- ☐ The Secretaries of DOD, HHS and VA have developed -- within the

60-day period I

requested -- an integrated Action Plan to implement the PAC recommendations from its final report.

☐ Finally, as the PAC recommended, we have initiated a Presidential Review Directive (PRD) to address "Health Preparedness for and Readjustment of Veterans and Their Families After Future Deployments." This is the key prospective piece which will ensure that we act on the "lessons learned" to better safeguard the health of soldiers in future deployments.

What do you see as the way forward on GWI issues?

☐ Given the scope of the investigative efforts underway, there seems little doubt we'll learn of additional information which should have been made public sooner.

☐ However, such developments should be understood in a broader context:

☐ Most, if not all, of the new information appears unlikely to change our fundamental assessment of what happened out there that might have adversely impacted the health of our veterans.

☐ This new information is coming out precisely because of the "openness" process I directed and remain fully committed to.

☐ All of the information being developed will be used to improve policies so as to be better prepared for future deployments.

☐ Finally, while all of this investigative activity is underway, we are concurrently working very hard to further improve the quality of our medical care and research programs.

Why do the Pentagon and CIA continue to "lose and then discover" material needed to get to the bottom of what happened during the Gulf War? Is there a cover-up? If not, how can your PAC

lend credibility to institutions that seem hopelessly inept?

☐ The PAC has been key to reinvigorated DOD efforts to determine the facts. Last year, DOD acknowledged that its prior investigations lacked the vigor needed, and significantly increased its effort. We are now beginning to see the fruits of that effort. And to my knowledge, there is currently no evidence of a cover-up.

☐ We all wish that this information relating to Khamisiyah and the missing chemical warfare logs had come out sooner. The documents released recently are disturbing -- the public should have known about them long ago. I directed that we do this in an open manner, and I believe that is exactly what DOD is doing.

☐ Consistent with my strong resolve to get out the truth, I previously extended the PAC to provide independent oversight of DOD's investigation, and more recently I asked the PAC to review the recently-released information in assessing the adequacy of the ongoing investigation. I am also mindful of the continuing Army IG, CIA IG, and DOD

Intelligence Oversight investigations into many of these same questions.

☐ Finally, it is important to remember through all of this that our Gulf War veterans must receive the medical care they need -- and that's happening. We shouldn't lose sight of what's been done -- 80,000+ free medical exams, 26,000+ compensation claims approved, 90+ federally-sponsored research projects now underway, including research into low level chemical exposure.

What about the recently-declassified NOV 91 CIA "warning" messages?

☐ First, the message content does not change the substance of our understanding of Khamisiyah. We've known for some time that U.S. forces there conducted demolitions without knowing they were destroying chemical munitions, and may have been exposed to chemical agents.

☐ DOD announced this information to Gulf War veterans and the public in June 1996.

☐ The message content also does not change our health care and research postures. Gulf War veterans are being cared for even in those instances where we're not sure why they're sick, and the research required to further investigate possible causes -- including low-level chemical exposure -- is in progress.

☐ As to any further significance of these newly-rediscovered documents, we'll have to await the outcomes of the pending CIA and DOD IG investigations.

Why didn't these messages come to light earlier?

- ☐ I don't know, and here again this is an area where we need to await the outcome of pending investigations.
- ☐ Clearly everyone regrets this information not having come to light earlier.
- ☐ Note, however, that these messages have resurfaced now as part of DOD's and CIA's commitment to getting out all the facts and conducting thorough investigations to do so.
- ☐ Another point to consider is the sheer volume of information involved. One recent estimate is that there are some 50 million pages of intelligence information that may have some relevance to the various matters under investigation.

What is the significance of DOD's recently-released Khamisiyah Case Narrative?

- ☐ This was the first in a series of interim progress reports.
- ☐ The Khamisiyah progress report provides the single most comprehensive account of everything that is known -- and not yet known -- about the demolitions conducted there.
- ☐ Note that the Khamisiyah case narrative -- and those on other topics to follow -- is not the end of the story, but rather a work in progress; DOD is publishing them as part of its commitment to openness and to solicit any additional information that Gulf War veterans or others may have on these topics.

Why haven't you warned more veterans about Khamisiyah?

- ☐ We believe that the notification letters already sent by the DOD last November and December cover the overwhelming majority of those veterans who might have been affected... And all Gulf War veterans concerned about the possible adverse health effects of service in the Gulf theater are eligible for and have been strongly urged to take full advantage of free medical exams and subsequent health care, if needed -- this eligibility has been widely communicated by public service announcements and many other means.
- ☐ We should not lose sight of the fact that there remain no documented cases of soldiers reporting acute symptoms at the time, nor is there any clear-cut evidence of a link between low-level exposures and the undiagnosed illnesses -- that research continues, however.
- ☐ Significant uncertainties remain in terms of both source data

and most appropriate modeling approach.

- ☐ No one who has been involved in researching the Khamisiyah incident believes that the "worst case" scenarios are very credible.
- ☐ Finally, even the "worst case" scenarios focus on the possibility of low-level chemical exposures, and it is important to remember that there was no evidence at the time of more significant acute symptoms.

What does White House think about PAC draft preliminary findings?

- ☐ President asked them to take a careful look...
- ☐ Obviously doing so...
- ☐ Haven't seen preliminary findings...
- ☐ Wouldn't comment on them anyway...
- ☐ Look forward to getting PAC interim letter report at the end of April...

Were there misrepresentation about what CIA knew about Khamisiyah?

- ☐ President committed to getting out all the facts...
- ☐ As new information comes out, see it as consistent with our effort to leave no stone unturned...

Question falls under purview of IG investigations and/or PAC oversight -- we will await the results of those activities...

What about the statement (in the FEB 97 Khamisiyah narrative) that the CIA briefed the NSC

staff in January 1996 on the possibility of U.S. troop exposure?

- ☐ My understanding is that an NSC staffer received a classified brief from CIA in January 1996

as part of its ongoing monitoring of the Gulf War illnesses issue.

- ☐ During the briefing -- which focused on the CIA's declassification initiative -- the staffer was told that information had come to light about the possible presence of chemical munitions at Khamisiyah and about possible demolition operations involving those munitions. This was briefed as preliminary information, with the understanding that this possibility would be further investigated in cooperation with DOD.

Were Chemical or Biological Warfare Agents used during the Gulf War?

- ☐ The CIA's thorough August 1996 report on this issue concluded no Iraqi use of CBW.
- ☐ Moreover, based on current scientific evidence, the PAC found it

unlikely that exposure to  
CBW explains undiagnosed Gulf War illnesses.

Is DOD the right choice to continue the investigation -- even  
with independent oversight?

☐ Yes, and that's the decision the President took in January 1997  
in extending the PAC to  
provide independent oversight.

☐ DOD has unique resources for this task and is committed to a  
thorough & open process.

☐ Recent swift action to declassify recently-rediscovered  
intelligence reports and the publication  
of the Khamisiyah case narrative strongly attest to DOD's  
commitment.

☐ DOD's recent expansion of effort has included: (1) designation  
of a new Special Assistant for  
Gulf War Illnesses; (2) a ten-fold increase in investigative  
resources (including more than 100  
additional staff); and (3) an outreach program to the more than  
20,000 Gulf War veterans  
who may have been in the vicinity of Khamisiyah when chemical  
demolitions occurred.

Why are Gulf War veterans sick?

☐ I'll leave addressing the merits of specific theories to the  
many experts -- at DOD, HHS and  
VA, as well as outside government -- currently focused on Gulf  
War illnesses.

☐ The PAC carefully evaluated 9 leading environmental risk factors  
and concluded that current  
scientific evidence does not support a causal link -- pesticides;  
chemical warfare agents;  
biological warfare agents; vaccines; pyridostigmine bromide (PB);  
infectious diseases;  
depleted uranium; oil-well fires and smoke; and petroleum  
products. The Committee also  
found that stress is a likely contributing factor in some Gulf  
War illnesses.

☐ Having evaluated potential causes, the Committee also reviewed  
the federal research portfolio  
and concluded that it was generally appropriate, recommending  
increased emphasis in certain  
areas like research into the effects of low-level chemical  
exposure and stress.

☐ Bottom-line: further research on the causes of Gulf War  
illnesses is required and is now in  
progress.

What has the Administration done for Gulf War veterans who are  
sick?

- ☐ Through the dedicated efforts of DOD and VA personnel, veterans are receiving the care they need for Gulf War illnesses, whether diagnosed or undiagnosed.
- ☐ To date -- (1) DOD & VA toll-free help lines; (2) 80,000+ free medical exams; (3) 26,000+ compensation claims approved; (4) special legislation paying disability for Gulf veterans with undiagnosed illnesses; (5) thousands of pages declassified; and (6) 90+ federally-sponsored research projects underway.

Is there a "lessons learned" process in place for future deployments?

- ☐ DOD has begun to incorporate "lessons learned" in planning future deployments.
- ☐ Example: a new policy directive for a Medical Surveillance System for Deployments is near completion, with key elements having been tested in Bosnia and Southwest Asia.
- ☐ We've also initiated a multi-agency Presidential Review Directive (PRD) process to address many aspects of health preparedness and readjustment for the veterans and their families who make experience future deployments.

## NAZI ASSETS

CONTINGENCY PRESS GUIDANCE: Following is contingency press guidance on the decision to delay by 1-2 weeks the target date for release of the historians' report on the postwar USG role in distributing Nazi gold and assets. The main Administration spokesman on this issue is U/S Stu Eizenstat.

- ☐ The team of historians and others who have been working to assess a huge amount of historical material discovered they needed a little more time than originally anticipated. This short delay will ensure that we can provide our best possible understanding at this point of the events in question.

If asked about the President's role:

- ☐ The President cares deeply about this issue. The historians' report is being prepared at his

behest, under the direction of U/S Eizenstat.

If pressed:

☐ The President will of course see the report when it is completed.

## FAST TRACK

Q: It has been reported that the President is planning to delay his request for fast track authority to accommodate the budget process. Is that true? Does this signal Administration retreat on fast track? Has Gephardt scared the President off?

A: Not at all. The President is still firmly committed to seeking fast track authority to open foreign markets. It is critical if we want to continue creating good jobs for American workers.

Every President since Ford has had fast track authority for key periods, and the reasons for it now are more compelling than ever. Over 11 million U.S. jobs now depend on exports, and these jobs pay 13-16 percent more than the average U.S. job. Today, 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside the U.S., and the vast majority of those consumers live in the emerging and fastest growing markets of Latin America and Asia. We simply must continue to open these markets for U.S. exports if we are to succeed in the global economy.

We cannot afford inaction. If we are not seizing opportunities to break down trade barriers and open foreign markets, we can be sure other countries will act -- to the benefit of their companies and their workers.

The United States has nothing to fear. We are the most competitive large economy in the world as judged by independent experts. But our ability to define the nature of our trade relationships will in significant measure determine our

leadership role in the next century. Fast track authority is the most important factor determining these relationships.

As you know, we have been consulting with Congress to develop bipartisan support for this legislation. We think that is the best way to build a strong foundation for this effort. We will continue to consult with Congress as to the substance, tactics and timing of the fast track initiative.

Q: It has been reported that the Administration is weighing the dropping of labor and environmental goals from fast track trade authority legislation, a move certain to infuriate labor unions. Is this true?

A: As we have stated before, our goal is to build the broadest possible support for the fast track legislation. To that end, Ambassador Barshefsky and others have been consulting actively with members of Congress representing all points of view on this subject, and with all interested parties, including organized labor. We will continue to do so with the goal of enacting legislation that receives broad support.

## M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 07 April 97 19:32  
**FROM** Wozniak, Natalie S.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** DAILY GUIDANCE UPDATE [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO**

Akers, Dale W.  
Branscum, Sean D.  
Bresnahan, Gary E.  
Brown, Nancy E.  
Dupuy, Shawn L.  
Hale, John E.  
Hawes, David J.  
Lowry, Jay E.  
Miyaoka, Lester H.  
Gwyn M. Parker  
Roach, Darren S.  
Simons, James R.  
Snyder, Julie A.  
Wadsworth, Valon J.  
Abdulmalik, April B.  
Albert, Ronda A.  
Alijanil, Leyla  
Amiri, Rukhsana N.  
Andreasen, Steven P.  
Antholis, William J.  
Appel, Edward J.  
Armstrong, Fulton T.  
Atlas, Edwin L.  
Baker, Jane E.  
Baker, James E.  
Baldwin, Kenneth  
Barks-Ruggles, Erica  
Bass, Peter E.  
Battenfield, Pat  
Beers, Rand R.  
Behring, Deanna M.  
Bellamy, Ralph C.  
Bell, Robert G.  
Bemisderfer, Dwight D.  
Bendick, Gordon L.  
Benjamin, Daniel  
Birkland, Andrea L.  
Black, Todd F.  
Blinken, Antony J.  
Bolinski, Charlene C.

Bouchard, Joseph F.  
Boynton, Peter J.  
Brennan, Steven A.  
Brooks, Jennifer  
Bryan, Lloyd D.  
Burrell, Christina L.  
Busick, Paul E.  
Caravelli, John M.  
Carter, Michael E.  
Cicio, Kristen K.  
Clark, Bronya  
Clarke, Richard A.  
Cooper, Kathleen H.  
Danvers, William C.  
Darnes, Victoria J.  
Davies, Glyn T.  
Davis, William K.  
DeSouza, Patrick J.  
Dimel, Marsha L.  
Dobbins, James F.  
Dohse, Fred J.  
Dowling, J. Nicholas  
Durham, Robert J.  
Edwards, Joan  
Eggert, Tamara E.  
Epstein, Gerald L.  
Feeley, John F.  
Ficklin, John W.  
Florio, Elaine  
Fort, Jane B.  
Fried, Daniel  
Friedrich, M. K.  
Fuhrman, Thomas A.  
George, Christopher  
Gerstner, Christina L.  
Gibney, James S.  
Glinski, David L.  
Gorsuch, Robert P.  
Gray, Wendy  
Grummon, Stephen R.  
Haines, Mary A.  
Hall, James A.  
Hall, Wilma G.  
Hamilton, Roy A.  
Harding, Bruce D.  
Harmon, Joyce  
Harris, Elisa D.  
Harris, Karen  
Harrison, Lyle M.  
Hasman, Thomas M.

Hawkins, Ardenia R.  
Helweg, M. Diana  
Higgins, David B.  
Hilliard, Brenda I.  
Hill, Roseanne M.  
Hofmann, Stephan D.  
Huggins, Peter  
Hunerwadel, Joan S.  
Johnson, David T.  
Johnson, Natalie A.  
Jones, Kerri-Ann D.  
Joshi, M. Kay  
Kale, Dora A.  
Kelly, Sandra L.  
Kerrick, Donald L.  
Kessinger, Jodi  
Kinser-Kidane, Brenda J.  
Knepper, Charlotte  
Koehler, Marc  
Kreczko, Alan J.  
Kristoff, Sandra J.  
Kyle, Robert D.  
LaFleur, Vinca A.  
Langley, Janice M.  
Lawrence, Cynthia  
Leary, William H.  
LeBaron, Richard B.  
Lee, Malcolm R.  
Letts, Kelly J.  
Lindsay, James M.  
Lorin, Matthew E.  
Luzzatto, Anne R.  
MacDonald, Bruce W.  
Malley, Robert  
Marshall, Betty A.  
Marsh, Thomas S.  
Matera, Michael A.  
Maxfield, Nancy H.  
McCarthy, Mary O.  
McCormick, Shawn H.  
McIntyre, Stuart H.  
Merchant, Brian  
Mercier, Henry J.  
Millison, Cathy L.  
Mitsler, Elaine M.  
Motherway, Daniel J.  
Mueller, William (Doug) D.  
Murray, Lori E.  
Naplan, Steven J.  
Natoli, Kim M.

Neil, M. Elise  
O'loughlin, Kathrine  
Orr, Robert C.  
O'Shaughnessy, Patrick  
Panerali, Kristen E.  
Papadimitriou, Marianna  
Parris, Mark R.  
Pascual, Carlos E.  
Peggins, John W.  
Peters, Mary A.  
Piccone, Theodore J.  
Pifer, Steven K.  
Porter, Gidell  
Prendergast, John P.  
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.  
Pyatt, Geoffrey R.  
Quinn, Mary E.  
Ragan, Richard F.  
Rajan, Nahla B.  
Rice, Susan E.  
Rice, Sean P.  
Rim, Julie J.  
Robinson, Wylma  
Rosa, Frederick M.  
Roundtree, Beverly J.  
Rubin, Eric S.  
Rumer, Eugene B.  
Salvetti, Lisa M.  
Samore, Gary S.  
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.  
David B. Sandalow  
Schmelz, Angela  
Schmidt, John R.  
Schwartz, Eric P.  
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.  
Seaton, James B.  
Sheehan, Michael A.  
Sigler, Ralph  
Simonalle, Eugene A.  
Simon, Steven N.  
Smith, Michael P.  
Sonenshine, Tara D.  
Sparks, John E.  
Suettinger, Robert L.  
Sulser, Jack A.  
Tucker, Maureen E.  
Uriu, Robert M.  
Van Tassel, David S.  
Veit, Katherine M.  
Vershbow, Alexander R.

Verville, Elizabeth G.  
Walsh, Helen C.  
Ward, JoAnn X.  
Wechsler, William F.  
Whitworth, Frank D.  
Willis, Robin M.  
Witkowsky, Anne A.  
Wozniak, Natalie S.  
Wright, Allison M.  
Wright, Jay  
Yokum, Jeffrey G.

**CARBON\_COPY** NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

**TEXT\_BODY**

Please review and forward your updates IN BOLD to @PRESS by 10:00 a.m.  
Tuesday, April 8. Thank you.

[[ APR07GUI.DOC : 4888 in APR07GUI.DOC ]]

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE**

7 April 97 19:26

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME**

APR07GUI.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

April 7, 1997

Canada/Chretien

Middle East

Dalai Lama

Hong Kong/INS

CWC

Zaire

Chile

Russia/NIS

Taiwan

Saudi Arabia/Khobar

Bosnia

China

Trips and Visitors

Albania

Northern Ireland

Gulf War Illnesses

Nazi Assets

Fast Track

#### CANADA -- CHRETIEN VISIT

Saudi Bomb Suspect

Do you have any comment on the arrest of Hani Abdel Rahim al-Sayegh in Canada last week?

☐ I'd just note that we've long worked closely with Canada in counter-terrorism and the excellent cooperation we've had on this case reflects that fact

☐ United States is grateful for Canada's vigilance in arresting Mr. Sayegh.

☐ Given that case is currently before courts in Canada, can't comment further.

Canadian Unity

There was recently a good deal of controversy in Washington about an article by an active Foreign Service Officer concluding that the U.S. could accommodate an independent Quebec without difficulty. Why was that conclusion controversial?

☐ Our policy on Canadian unity is well known. As I've said many times, and as accomplishments of Prime Minister Chr,tien's visit demonstrate, we enjoy excellent relations

with a strong and united Canada.

☐ Canada is our closest ally, and model for the rest of the world of how peoples of different backgrounds can live together in peace and harmony; hope that will continue.

☐ Naturally, Canada's political future is for Canadians to decide.

☐ [If pressed] The author of that article was expressing his personal views, which were not those of the U.S. government.

☐ [If questioned on an independent Quebec's entry into NAFTA] Hypothetical situation, speculation not appropriate. Would note that this is complicated issue, there is nothing automatic about it. We have made no commitments on this to any party.

#### Absence of an Ambassador

It's now been a year since there has been an American Ambassador in Ottawa. Aren't you concerned that Canadians will interpret the absence of an ambassador as a slight?

☐ No, I'm not worried about that. We're very capably represented in Ottawa by Charg, Tom Weston, a senior career Foreign Service Officer, who's done a superb job.

☐ But I do expect to fill this key vacancy quite soon.

#### Air Pollution

What steps is the U.S. taking to help reduce air pollution in Canada?

☐ I'm committed to cleaner air. High priority for both of us to reduce pollution and its effects on the air we breath.

☐ Working together and with states, provinces and U.S. and Canadian industry to improve the air quality over the U.S. and Canada.

#### Smog

What is the U.S. response to Canadian Government comments that

EPA revisions to smog standards do not go far enough?

☐ Welcome Canada's comments. Know EPA will give full consideration to all comments it receives before making any final decisions.

#### Anti-Personnel Landmines

Why has the U.S. decided to pursue the "slow path" toward a ban on anti-personnel landmines in the Conference on Disarmament rather than support the Canadian proposal (the "Ottawa process")?

☐ Not pursuing "slow path" toward an anti-personnel landmine ban. Conference on Disarmament is most practical forum to negotiate meaningful ban because it includes most of world's landmine producers.

☐ CD has proven track record: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Chemical Weapons Convention successfully negotiated there.

☐ Not "against" the Ottawa process. Canada's proposal and CD negotiations should be mutually reinforcing. That is why the U.S. attended February meeting in Vienna.

☐ [If asked] We have not decided whether to attend the June Ottawa process meeting in Brussels.

#### Haiti

What was the outcome of U.S.-Canadian discussions on Haiti? Will the U.S. and Canada remain actively engaged in Haiti after the July 31 expiration of the UN peacekeeping mission?

☐ Pleased that Canada has decided to keep presence in Haiti after current UN mandate expires in July. Important to build on success of political transition by helping to strengthening democratic institutions, especially police and judiciary.

☐ Currently discussing best way to continue international presence in Haiti beyond the July 31 expiration of the UNSMILH mandate. Look forward to the UN

Secretary General's  
recommendations on this presence.

#### Pacific Salmon

What is the U.S. doing to resolve the salmon dispute with Canada?

- ☐ This is a very important issue for both countries and one where we have not found agreement easy in past.
- ☐ Have begun process of direct talks among Canadian and American stakeholders, those most directly involved in salmon fishery. Talks underway on West Coast; hopeful for positive results.

#### Devils Lake

Will the U.S. violate the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 if an outlet is constructed at Devils Lake, N.D.?

- ☐ No, we are committed to observing the Boundary Waters Treaty.
- ☐ Projects like this are assessed under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) to ensure that they do not harm environment.

#### Canada and Cuba

What do you think about Canada's approach to Cuba. Aren't you concerned about their cozying up to Castro?

- ☐ Canada and the United States have long shared the goal of seeing democratic Cuba return to community of nations.
- ☐ We have differences over how to achieve this and over Helms-Burton Act, but agreed to continue to work together to advance our common goal of democratic Cuba that respects human rights.
- ☐ Applaud Canada's emphasis on encouraging the promotion and protection of human rights and democratic change in Cuba.
- ☐ We are skeptical, however, that Castro will be amenable to

change through a policy of engagement.

#### Helms-Burton

Did you discuss the NAFTA implications of HB? Doesn't Helms-Burton violate NAFTA?

☐ In our view, Helms-Burton is consistent with our international trade obligations, including NAFTA. Disagreement over this legislation is political issue, not trade issue.

☐ Key is not to lose sight of shared objective on Cuba -- promoting peaceful, democratic transition. It is important that we continue to focus on this as friends and allies, and today's meeting was very helpful in this regard.

If asked whether the U.S. would invoke essential security if Canada requests a NAFTA dispute settlement panel:

☐ Not going to discuss hypothetical case; see this issue as better handled in political channels.

#### Wal-Mart and the U.S. Embargo

What right does the U.S. have to tell foreign companies what to do? Is Wal-Mart Canada a U.S. firm?

☐ Provisions of the U.S. embargo of Cuba apply to U.S. firms and their subsidiaries. This case is under review by the Treasury Department, and therefore I cannot make any comment.

#### Managing the Border

What are you announcing on border initiatives? Why is it important?

☐ Initiatives we are announcing today will directly benefit some of our smallest and largest border communities.

☐ Our governments will offer 24 hour/day border services by the year 2000 to 22 pairs of small

towns which now have only limited service, via new technologies such as remote video systems.

☐ These paired communities are highly integrated. As Mrs. Doris Adams, an American married to a Canadian and living in Crane Valley, Saskatchewan, has written, she can now work late at her job just across the border in the U.S. and avoid a 100 mile detour over hazardous roads back home, thanks to a pilot project in Scobey, Montana. "It will be a real boon to have the same system operating across the entire Northern Tier," Mrs. Adams wrote. Today's announcement is an important step in that direction.

☐ We will move truck backups off the bridges and tunnels linking some of our busiest ports of entry, to off-road processing centers. First off-road facility will open by early 1999 in Fort Erie, Canada, opposite Buffalo.

Are you creating an open border?

☐ Initiatives we are announcing today will facilitate the movement of low-risk people and goods while strengthening enforcement against illegal activities.

#### Law Enforcement

What about missing children? Telemarketing fraud?

☐ Any border complicates investigation and prosecution of many kinds of crimes, so we are taking action together to safeguard our most vulnerable citizens, the elderly and the very young, and to deny criminals any safe haven.

☐ Stepping up our joint efforts to intercept missing children who are being taken across our common border, by speeding up notice to legal authorities on both sides of missing children reports and abductions-in-progress.

☐ Our law enforcement officials will report back in six months on joint progress against transborder telemarketing fraud crimes. These crimes especially target elderly, often robbing them of their life savings. We are going to cooperate to be more successful in

prosecuting telemarketing scam artists.

### NAFTA Deficit

You've spoken in glowing terms about the success of NAFTA, but I notice that you've avoided mentioning our growing trade deficits with our NAFTA partners. Don't those deficits, which together are now almost equal to our deficit with China, show that NAFTA has been a failure?

☐ No, they don't. While it's true that those deficits have increased, that's a short-term phenomenon, stemming from cyclical factors-- Mexico's 1995 peso crisis and the fact that until recently Canada's growth lagged behind that of the U.S.

☐ Without NAFTA those deficits would have been much higher. To see that fact, you just have to look at our experience with Mexico in its preceding devaluation crisis in 1982-- when our exports fell 50%. In 1995, in contrast, our exports fell only 9 percent, and they've since recovered.

☐ Under NAFTA, our exports to Canada and Mexico are at record levels, and I'm confident that we'll continue to build on that base. As Mexico continues its recovery and Canada's growth accelerates, things will even out.

### Canadian Culture

Canadian law gives so-called cultural industries -- publishing, broadcasting, film-making, etc. -- broad protection from foreign competition. Since U.S. law provides much less protection to U.S. industries, isn't U.S. trade with Canada in these areas inherently unfair, and doesn't NAFTA just make that unfairness permanent?

☐ We have with Canada not only the world's busiest trading relationship, but also the world's richest cultural exchange.

☐ Of course we accept Canada's right to determine its own national culture.

- However, there are some cases where, in our view, particular Canadian policies serve to discourage economic competition, rather than preserving Canadian culture.
- In such cases, if we cannot negotiate a solution, we have not hesitated to avail ourselves of trade remedies available under World Trade Organization and NAFTA.

## MIDDLE EAST

### Themes

- This is obviously an important juncture in the peace process.
- If there is to be progress, both sides need to act to restore calm and confidence in a serious and sustained way.
- The President and Prime Minister had a good discussion of how to deal with the current situation.
- They agreed that the key elements are to restore security and confidence in the integrity of the negotiating process.
- They had a thorough discussion of how to do that, and more broadly how to move toward our common objective of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.
- The meeting with the Prime Minister was just one in a series of discussions with Middle East leaders that the President has had over the past two months.
- We will have further exchanges in the days ahead, including with the Palestinians later this week here in Washington. (Note: refers to Abu Mazen/Saeb Erekat coming to Washington.)
- This is not the time to get into a discussion of details or modalities.

-- Any announcements on next steps will need to await further contacts with the parties.  
We are not going to be rushed on this.

-- In the meantime, it is critical that neither side take steps which make the task of reviving negotiations more difficult. This is a moment when each should be looking for ways to build confidence.

-- In particular, we expect every effort to be made to prevent new acts of terror.

Q: Is the President going to launch a Camp David type negotiation on final status issues?

A: Let's not get too far ahead of things here. The Prime Minister and the President will be discussing how to restore momentum to the peace process, particularly the negotiations with the Palestinians. We'll also need to continue our discussions with the Palestinians. We've still got some work to do. Their meeting today is part of that, not an opportunity to make big announcements.

Q: Does the President agree with the Israeli Prime Minister that the parties should go straight to permanent status talks?

A: What we want to do is find the best way to proceed with negotiations in an atmosphere of calm and confidence between the parties. That's what they'll discuss. It wouldn't be appropriate for me to comment any further right now.

Q: Will the President ask the Prime Minister to freeze construction at Har Homa and other settlement activity?

A: You know the President's views on these issues. They haven't changed. But I'm not going to comment right now on what their conversation will cover.

Q: Last week the President said Arafat is doing some things to prevent terrorism? What is he doing and is it enough in the President's view?

A: We have made very clear our view that violence is not the

answer. I think Chairman Arafat understands that he and the Palestinian Authority need to do everything they can, in word and deed, to make clear that there is zero tolerance for terror.

The President is encouraged by some of the moves the Palestinian Authority, but he believes more can and should be done. (UPDATE IN PRE-BRIEF)

Q: What about rescinding the anti-Israel elements of the Palestinian Covenant. Arafat still hasn't done that. Has the President told him it's necessary to do that now?

A: Obviously we expect the Palestinians to keep their commitments. In April, 1996, the Palestinian National Council adopted a resolution canceling the articles inconsistent with its commitments to Israel. During the Hebron negotiations, Chairman Arafat committed to complete the process of revising the Charter.

Q: There's a growing perception that the President is willing to publicly criticize the Government of Israel. Normally U.S. Presidents don't criticize Israel publicly, and why doesn't the President criticize Arafat for not living up to his commitments?

A: When you're trying to be a credible partner with both sides in a negotiation, you've got to take the risk of sometimes being caught in the middle. You need to be able to take the heat, and you need to be able to call on both parties to take tough decisions. The President is comfortable with the role the United States is playing to help the parties. I think we've done the best we can when faced with some tough situations.

Q: Is the President planning a meeting with Chairman Arafat or a three-way meeting with Arafat and Netanyahu?

A: The President is meeting with the Prime Minister today. Don't have any other plans at the moment.

Q: What's the President's reaction to criticism that the Administration is not doing enough to save the Middle East peace process?

A: No question about the amount of time and effort that we've put into helping achieve peace in the Middle East. Been through difficult periods before, and we've helped restore calm and gotten the parties to re-focus on negotiations.

Will take some hard work on all sides to move back to the serious give and take of negotiations. Will help the parties do that, but they need to create the conditions to move forward.

Q: What is the President's reaction to the Arab League action recommending cutting Arab ties to Israel?

A: He thinks it is a mistake. It only encourages those opposed to peace.

Q: Does the President agree with the Prime Minister that the Palestinian Authority must comply with all its commitments, including those on terrorism and violence, in order for negotiations to resume?

A: What is important now is that the Palestinian Authority has to do everything it can to prevent further terror. There must be no doubts on this commitment, and the Palestinian Authority must make certain that both friends and enemies of the peace process understand that violence and terror are unacceptable -- there must be zero tolerance for terrorism.

Q: What will it take to get the negotiations with Syria started again? Will the President be in touch with President Asad?

A: Our goal is a comprehensive peace and you can't have that without an Israeli-Syrian and Israeli-Lebanese agreement. We continue to be in touch with both sides.

Q: Can you tell us if Hamas leader Abu Marzook will be sent to Jordan? Why don't you prosecute him here?

A: That matter is still under litigation. I'm not going to comment on it.

Q: Did the President discuss the Marzook case with the Prime Minister?

A: I'm not going to describe our contacts with the Israeli government on this matter.

Q: Was the President involved in the decision not to extradite Marzook to Israel?

A: This was a decision reached entirely by the Government of Israel.

Note: NSC has been in close contact with both the Justice Department and State Department regarding this sensitive case.

## DALAI LAMA

☐ The Dalai Lama, religious leader of Tibetan Buddhists and Nobel laureate, is always a most welcome visitor to the United States.

☐ Americans have tremendous feelings of goodwill toward His Holiness and adherents of Tibetan Buddhism in the United States and elsewhere.

☐ The administration welcomes the Dalai Lama's visit and looks forward to discussions with him.

☐ He will be meeting members of the administration, but at what level and with whom has not been decided.

☐ As a religiously diverse nation, we also welcome the contributions to our nation's spiritual life of Americans who have embraced Tibetan Buddhism.

## HONG KONG/INS

Background: The U.S. Consul-General in Hong Kong pledged that he and his superiors in Washington would get to the bottom of any allegations of corruption surrounding any U.S. officials based in the British colony.

Richard Boucher made the remarks today (4/7) after it was announced over the weekend that the highest U.S. immigration official in Hong Kong had been suspended and his wife arrested as part of an international probe into the suspected smuggling of illegal immigrants from China to the United States.

### Points

- ☐ Reprehensible, will root out corruption.
- ☐ INS has high standards and we will maintain those standards.

## CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

- ☐ CWC enjoys broad, bipartisan support: President Bush, Colin Powell, Brent Scowcroft, Jim Baker, Ed Rowney, Paul Nitze and other leading Republican foreign policy experts support it.
- ☐ CWC will reduce the threat to our soldiers by requiring others to do what we are already doing -- getting out of the chemical weapons business.
- ☐ CWC will also make it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons by eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting the flow of chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons.
- ☐ Recognize that the CWC will not "solve" either the proliferation or terrorism problem. But it is a key element of any effective response.

□ Treaty has been before the Senate since November 1993. There have been 13 Senate hearings, hundreds of questions answered for the record and numerous briefings of both members and staff. More than 1500 pages of information has been provided to the Senate. It's time for the Senate to debate and vote.

□ If we do not ratify by April 29, Americans will be less secure. We will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons.

□ The United States will also not have a seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors. And Americans now serving in key posts, including as head of security, administration, and industry inspections, will be replaced by nationals from countries that have ratified.

□ Without ratification, the credibility of American leadership across a full range of transnational issues will be undermined.

□ Finally, American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

#### HELMS AND CWC

Q: During Secretary Albright's visit to North Carolina last week, Senator Helms indicated that he would probably allow the Senate to move forward with a vote on the Chemical Weapons Convention. What is your reaction?

A: We are encouraged by the Senator's comments about the prospects for Senate action on this vital treaty. Over the past two months, we have worked closely with Senator Helms and other members of the Steering Committee established by the Majority Leader to try to address the concerns that have been raised about the treaty. We look forward to a Senate vote by mid-April -- in time for the U.S. to be an original party to the treaty.

Q: What is your reaction to Senator Helms statement that the Administration has delayed responding to his request for negotiations with his staff over the CWC?

A: In early January, the Majority Leader and I agreed to work together to try to address the concerns of members of the Republican caucus regarding the Chemical Weapons Convention.

We have been negotiating in good faith. National Security Adviser Berger has led the Administration team which has met four times with the Majority Leader's task force. These principal meetings have been followed by four extensive senior staff sessions.

Senator Helms, who is a member of the Lott group, has proposed about 30 conditions and in nearly every case we have either reached agreement on a compromise formulation that can be accepted by the Senate or identified a reasonable alternative, leaving it to the Senate to decide between the two.

Our objective has been to work with the Majority Leader and the members of his CWC task force to facilitate a timely debate in the Senate on the Convention prior to April 29, when the Convention comes into force. I welcome Senator Lott's statement on Thursday that he is working a process to get the CWC done in April and that it is not his intention to stonewall on this.

Q: Senator Helms claims that unless the Administration satisfies his key concerns over the Treaty it will never reach the Senate floor and that the Administration needs to address his broader concerns regarding State Department reorganization, UN reform, and the handling of other arms control treaties in the Senate.

A: We disagree with Senator Helms that this treaty will do nothing to reduce the dangers of poison gas. During our extensive negotiations with Senator Helms and his staff, we have identified a list of key issues where we cannot agree with

Senator Helms' proposed conditions. We believe these outstanding issues and our proposed alternative conditions should be debated and voted upon.

While the Administration is prepared to continue to address the broader issues Senator Helms has raised, direct linkage with the CWC is a prescription for inaction, which we cannot afford as the clock ticks on entry into force of this agreement.

Q: Senator Helms claims the April 29 date is a "chicken little" deadline with no meaning and that the Administration is trying to blackmail the Senate.

A: April 29 is a real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act positively, we will deny ourselves access to the treaty's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. We will deny ourselves the ability to require other states to do what we are doing already on our own--getting rid of our chemical weapons.

Without ratification the credibility of American leadership across the full range of proliferation issues will be undermined. The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty.

American chemical companies will also begin losing sales to their overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in.

## ZAIRE

### ZAIRE PEACE PROCESS

☐ South Africa will be leading efforts later this week to bring the GOZ and rebels together for negotiations.

☐ UN SRSG Sahnoun is in South Africa and we hope he will be part of these discussions. The United States thinks Sahnoun has a central role to play in his

double-hatted capacity as both  
UN and OAU representative.

☐ We are hopeful that both parties will send senior-level delegations to discuss seriously a cease-fire and comprehensive negotiated solution. We continue to see a negotiated solution as the best means of solving the ongoing crisis in Zaire.

☐ We have worked very hard with neighboring governments and France to secure commitments from both sides to a negotiated solution.

If asked:

☐ We have offered to assist the South Africans, but they are leading this effort alone.

☐ Understand UN Special Representative Ambassador Mohammed Sahnoun is in South Africa, but we don't know if he will be part of any negotiations. South African Deputy President Thabo Mbeki discussed the concept of talks in South Africa during his meeting with President Mobutu last week in Kinshasa. Other representatives of the SAG met with Kabila shortly thereafter to secure their commitment to talks.

#### MOBUTU PROPOSALS/USG PERSONNEL IN ZAIRE/ELECTIONS

Q: What is your reaction to the confusing proposals from Mobutu? Do we endorse them?

A: The announcement of two proposed bodies -- a Council to seek a national consensus on how to settle the current crisis in Zaire peacefully and a seven-person committee of negotiators -- appears on the surface to be a positive step. We are waiting to get more details on these proposed bodies before making further comment.

We would like to see the members of the negotiating committee designated immediately and announce their readiness to enter into negotiations with the rebel alliance, within the context of the UN five-point plan.

Q: (If asked) Has Mobutu lost control of his government?

A: President Mobutu is still recognized as head of state of Zaire. Obviously, during this time of national crisis it is important for all Zairian political figures to work together towards a peaceful settlement.

Q: Is the U.S. included in the Lome talks? Who will represent the U.S.?

A: The summit in Lome is an OAU central organ meeting. Special Envoy Howard Wolpe is attending as an informal observer.

Q: How many official Americans remain in Zaire?

A: There are thirty-six U.S. Government employees, seven adult dependents and eight temporary duty personnel at post as of March 26. The number of temporary duty (TDY) personnel continues to fluctuate.

Q: What can you tell us about the deployment of American forces to Central Africa?

A: The President authorized on Friday the deployment of several hundred American forces under Operation Guardian Retrieval as part of contingency planning for a possible evacuation from Zaire. No decision to conduct an evacuation has been made.

The situation in the Zairian capital of Kinshasa is calm. We remain concerned, however, that the climate could degenerate warranting the evacuation of American citizens and some third country nationals. The posture of American forces in the region is simply a prudent, precautionary step.

American forces will not intervene in the ongoing fighting in Zaire.

The deployment of these forces enhances the military's ability to ensure the security of U.S. citizens living in Zaire, but does not represent a commitment by the U.S. to any particular course of action.

The deployment includes command and support elements for a

forward Joint Task Force and other enabling elements. U.S. Army Major General Edwin P. Smith, Commander of the Southern European Task Force is the Joint Task Force Commander.

U.S. forces have deployed to Brazzaville, Congo and Libreville, Gabon. They come from elements of the U.S. European Command, primarily from the Southern European Task Force based in Vicenza, Italy. Some additional support elements are from U.S. based units.

Q: What does the U.S. think about possible negotiations between the government and rebel leaders?

A: The United States continues to strongly support a negotiated settlement to the crisis in Zaire. We have been working with the Government of Zaire, representatives of the rebel leadership, regional governments, UN Special Envoy Ambassador Mohammed Sahnoun, the group of African "Wise Men" and the government of South Africa to bring about a cessation of hostilities and negotiated solution to the war.

(IF ASKED)

Q: What type of equipment is being deployed?

A: The Joint Task Force will have a range of equipment. Units will deploy with communications gear, airport control, support equipment and several fixed wing aircraft and helicopters.

Q: How many American citizens are in Zaire?

A: Roughly 550. There are approximately 300 Americans in Kinshasa.

Q: The French and Belgian governments are reportedly taking similar measures. Are these efforts coordinated?

A: Yes, our military actions have been fully coordinated with our European allies, some of

whom have decided to deploy forces to the region as well.

We are also very pleased with coordination and cooperation of the Congolese and Gabonese governments in this effort.

Q: Were Congressional leaders notified?

A: Yes, Congressional leaders were notified Friday evening and throughout the day on Saturday.

## CHILE

Q: Has the Administration decided to permit the sale of advanced fighters to Chile?

A: No. The USG has decided to authorize the issuance of marketing licenses to companies which wish to compete in Chile's selection of fighter aircraft, while making clear to both the Government of Chile and to the companies involved that there has been no decision on whether to permit the sale itself.

The licenses are for marketing information only and do not constitute approval for an actual sale. A decision whether to permit such sale has not been made.

This decision to issue marketing licenses was made so as not to disadvantage U.S. companies in the competition. These licenses allow these companies to provide the Government of Chile with technical data on advanced fighter aircraft.

Q: Has the U.S. changed its Latin American conventional arms transfer policy?

A: No. As you know, the Administration is reviewing U.S. conventional arms transfer policy toward Latin America in the context of the significant political, economic, and military changes that have been occurring in the past ten years.

This policy review is on-going. While the review is underway

current policy remains unchanged.

Q: What is the current policy on arms exports to Latin America?

A: Our policy worldwide is to consider pending arms transfers on a case-by-case basis.

Our long-standing policy in Latin America is, and remains, to address potential transfers in the context of restraint.

Q: Why is a review necessary?

A: The welcome expansion and strengthening of democracy and democratic institutions in recent years makes it prudent for us to undertake this policy review to determine whether any changes in our policy are appropriate.

Our policy goals for the countries of Latin America are to enhance democracy, including civilian control of the military, foster regional stability, transparency and confidence building, and ensure that the weapons modernization decisions of these countries address legitimate defense needs within their existing economic resources.

Any possible change made to our current arms export policy will be in accordance with these goals.

## RUSSIA/NIS

### Current Items

#### Russia Signs Integration Treaty with Belarus

□ Russia and Belarus signed Treaty April 2; unclear how it differs from last year's agreement; provides for territorial integrity, sovereignty, independence of Russia and Belarus; reportedly will allow one month for public comment prior to submitting to parliaments for ratification.

□ We have no objections in principle to integration as long as voluntary, mutually beneficial,

done on basis of equality, does not harm relations with other countries or create new divisions among nations.

☐ But continue to be concerned about political developments in Belarus -- restrictions on personal and press freedoms; unwarranted actions against foreigners, including recent expulsion of U.S. diplomat; recalled our Ambassador for consultations on situation; have cut U.S. assistance.

#### IMF Resumes Russia Program

☐ Welcome IMF Managing Director Camdessus' comments that Russia taking necessary reforms, management steps to resume IMF program. Shows confidence in new economic team. Expect decision to be made formally later this month by IMF board.

#### General Items

##### Helsinki Summit and Aftermath, Way Forward in U.S.-Russia Relations

☐ Welcomed Yeltsin's positive comments on summit results; Helsinki confirmed U.S.-Russian intention to work together, work through tough issues. As Yeltsin said, "our choice is for cooperation."

##### Yeltsin Claims Promise of Full G-8?

☐ Denver meeting will be Denver Summit of Eight; will build on increased Russian involvement; Yeltsin to arrive and depart with others; will be one press conference by leaders of the Eight.

☐ Seven will still discuss economic, financial matters; expect this to be small part of agenda.

#### NATO-Russia

☐ NATO enlargement proceeding on schedule. Part of broader effort to build comprehensive European security system, which includes strong NATO-Russia relationship. It is going forward in way that does not threaten any nation's security, enhances stability in Europe.

☐ In Helsinki, President and Yeltsin disagreed over enlargement but agreed to work together to build cooperative NATO-Russia relationship.

☐ See Russia as partner of NATO in shaping more secure, stable and undivided Europe. That is good for United States, Russia and Europe.

#### Russia Prepared to Sign NATO-Russia Charter in May?

☐ Charter can formalize cooperative NATO-Russia relationship. U.S. prepared to sign Charter before Madrid NATO summit in July, but Alliance and Russia must first agree on contents of document, which is now being discussed in NATO-Russia channel.

#### TAIWAN

Q: What is the U.S. commitment to the defense of Taiwan?

A: According to the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 (TRA), it is the policy of the United States:

-- "To consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means... a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States;"

According to the TRA:

-- The President is directed to inform the Congress promptly of any threat to the security or the social or economic system of the people of Taiwan and any danger to the interests of the United States arising therefrom.

-- The President and Congress shall determine, in accordance with Constitutional processes, appropriate action by the United States in response to any such danger.

The TRA also requires that the United States:

- Make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

In the U.S.-PRC 1982 Communiqué, the PRC articulated its fundamental policy of resolving the Taiwan question by peaceful means.

We regard the issue of Taiwan's future as one to be resolved by the parties; our interest is that such a resolution be peaceful.

Background: According to the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), it is the policy of the United States:

- To declare that peace and stability in the area are in the political, security and economic interests of the United States, and are matters of international concern;

- To make clear that the United States' decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China rests upon the expectation that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means;

- To consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States;

- To maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people of Taiwan.

The TRA also requires that the United States:

- Make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

## SAUDI ARABIA -- KHOBAR BOMBING

Q: Are we getting cooperation from Syria on the Khobar bombing investigation?

A: The investigation into the Khobar bombing is ongoing. We do not comment on investigations in progress.

Regarding Syria, I'm not going to discuss the details of our diplomatic exchanges with other governments, particularly when they involve a matter under investigation.

Q: Are the Saudis helping? What have we learned from the suspect detained by Canada?

A: As I've said before, we have gotten cooperation from the Saudis and we've been assured at the highest levels of the Saudi Government that more cooperation will be forthcoming.

As has been reported, Canada has detained an individual who may have information about Khobar. I'd refer you to the FBI for any comment on that.

Q: But the Canadians charged this guy with participating in the bombing and the papers they filed indicate he has links to Syria and Iran. Do you concur with the Canadian assessment of his culpability? Does this mean we're going to finally take action against Iran? Will it be military action?

A: Canada did make some specific allegations in the papers the Canadian government filed with its own courts. As you know, we, too, have an investigation ongoing.

At this time in our own investigation, it is neither necessary nor appropriate to make specific public charges or allegations. The FBI, the agency in our government that is in

charge of this investigation and the agency that has been working with Canada, will follow all leads and will take them to their appropriate conclusion.

We are treating this as a criminal, law enforcement investigation. I'm not going to speculate about the outcome of the investigation or any actions that outcome might require.

Q: So you're ruling out any military action against Iran based on the clear and convincing evidence Canada's authorities have submitted to their courts?

A: I'm declining to speculate on the outcome of the case. Nothing more, nothing less.

## BOSNIA

Radovan Karadzic (NYT Piece)

☐ Karadzic has been out of power for almost one year, having been removed from public office as required under Dayton. According to the agreement reached with Republika Srpska, he is banned from participating in any political activities or making public appearances.

☐ We continue to monitor the situation to ensure Republika Srpska lives up to this agreement. However, we will not be satisfied until he and all others indicted by the War Crimes Tribunal stand trial in The Hague.

## War Criminals

☐ We continue to remain deeply concerned with the slow progress on war crimes front in Bosnia. We're examining variety of ways we can help the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals to justice. We have made no decisions on how to assist the Tribunal. We are reviewing many different options.

If pressed about sending teams of special police or commandos to arrest war criminals:

☐ We have been examining several options to assist and enhance the ability of the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals into custody. One option may be to establish some sort of capability to execute the court's arrest warrants. We are studying the feasibility of these options but have made no decisions yet.

#### SFOR Mission Duration

☐ We expect the mission can be completed in 18 months. 18 months should give sufficient extra time needed for civilian implementation efforts on economic reconstruction, refugee return, and related issues needed to ensure a self-sustaining peace.

If asked about an all-European Force after 18 months:

☐ We believe the mission can be completed in 18 months. We are focused on the important work we have to do between now and June 1998.

#### FRY/Republika Srpska Agreement

☐ The decision of the FRY Assembly to ratify a cooperation agreement with the Serb Republic is a violation of the Dayton Agreement and is inconsistent with the Constitutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska.

☐ The agreement includes provisions that are under the purview of the individual states and which could be in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The agreement cannot take effect until it is ratified by the Bosnia-Herzegovina Assembly.

#### Kasich Legislation/Premature Withdrawal from Bosnia

☐ Passage of the proposed legislation and unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops could lead to a resumption of the war in Bosnia, a serious crisis in the NATO alliance, and an abdication of U.S. credibility and leadership in Europe and around the world. We strongly urge that this legislation not be pursued.

CHINA

COSCO

Q: Does COSCO represent a threat to US national security? Does COSCO engage in predatory pricing and operate outside the normal rules and motivations of commercial behavior? Did COSCO decide to purchase ships from US yards to curry favor?

A: COSCO is the world's largest shipping line. It operates out of virtually every major West Coast port. And it moves much of the traffic in our trans-Pacific market.

We welcome its participation in our trading relationship. But like other companies, it must abide by our laws. I am confident that our Coast Guard, Customs and Maritime authorities will ensure that our laws are effectively enforced -- whether they involve COSCO or any other company.

Senator McCain has made some serious allegations with respect to COSCO. We are looking at those allegations. I'm not going to prejudge that review or its outcome.

UNHRC

Background: France, Germany, Italy, and Spain reportedly have decided not to co-sponsor a China resolution, which means that there will not be an EU-introduced resolution this year. However, any individual country can introduce the resolution, and we expect at least 10 EU countries to co-sponsor the resolution once it is introduced. Our position is that we are working with other countries on a resolution and will oppose China's no-action motion (which, if passed, would bar consideration of the resolution by the Commission). A vote is scheduled for the third week in April.

### Points

- ☐ U.S. is working with other members of the Commission on a resolution concerning the human rights situation in China.
- ☐ U.S. will oppose motions designed to keep the resolution off the Commission's agenda.
- ☐ Aware of vigorous Chinese efforts to defeat resolution. Believe members of the Commission should make decision based on human rights situation in China, not other factors.
- ☐ Our own judgment at this point is that the current situation warrants a resolution on China's human rights record.
- ☐ We have made clear to China that in the absence of human rights progress we would see no reason not to proceed with a resolution at the UNHRC.

If asked whether our efforts were "downgraded" from last year

- ☐ At this point, we have demarched members of the Commission to convey our views and are working with Europeans partners on a proposed resolution.
- ☐ During his recent visit, Ambassador Richardson expressed the U.S. position in a statement to Commission members and met with several important delegations to convey our views.
- ☐ Our efforts this year are commensurate to our efforts in the past, and, more importantly, our approach remains the same: We will vote, and ask others to vote, based on the human rights situation in China.

### TRIPS AND VISITORS

- ☐ Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada will make an official visit to Washington on April 8.
- ☐ Spanish President Aznar will be here April 30 for meeting and

working lunch.

☐ President's visit to Mexico postponed to May 6-7. Regional summit meetings in Bridgetown, Barbados and San Jose, Costa Rica will go forward as scheduled during the week of May 6-10.

☐ President will travel to Netherlands May 28 for US-EU Summit and Marshall Plan commemoration event. No details yet.

☐ Denver Summit June 20-22.

☐ POTUS will travel to Denmark in July in conjunction with the July 8-9 NATO Summit in Madrid.

☐ President's visits to Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela rescheduled to October 12-17.

If asked about Hashimoto Visit

Background: The Japanese Embassy received guidance in reaction to a leaked story in Tokyo about a possible Hashimoto visit to Washington in April. The Japanese are saying, "The Prime Minister intends to visit Washington in late April and the two governments have begun consultations."

☐ We are consulting with Japanese officials about a possible PM Hashimoto visit to Washington this spring.

## ALBANIA

☐ The security situation in Albania has improved slightly but remains very difficult, with armed gangs still at large, the central government still weak and deep divisions between the insurgents in the south and President Berisha, who remains in office.

☐ While some humanitarian supplies are getting through, the possibility of a humanitarian crisis remains.

- ☐ The OSCE has taken on overall responsibility for coordinating the international community's response to the Albanian crisis. The OSCE plans to send a large mission to Albania to support political reconciliation, promote a return to law and order and help foster the conditions for a return to democracy. The U.S. is playing a very active role with the OSCE on Albania
- ☐ As part of a separate effort to support security for humanitarian and other assistance to Albania, the OSCE and UN Security Council have welcomed the initiative being organized by Italy and other European nations to send a multinational force to Albania.
- ☐ Italy, joined by about ten other governments, are planning the details of this force. It may deploy in the middle of April. The United States does not plan to join this force.
- ☐ The United States continues to support the government of Prime Minister Fino and supports his efforts to reach out to all constructive political forces in the country, including responsible forces in the south.
- ☐ (If pressed). It is up to President Berisha to determine how he can act to support stability and democracy in Albania.

## NORTHERN IRELAND

### Start of Marching Season

- ☐ Pleased that Easter Monday parade went off smoothly. Commend those who took courageous decision to avoid confrontation.
- ☐ Hope people of goodwill in Northern Ireland will work together to avoid clashes and bitterness in this year's marching season.

### Bomb at Sinn Fein Office

☐ Condemn this attempted attack, as we condemn all acts of violence.

☐ Urge loyalists to return to observing cease-fire; not precipitate downward spiral of violence that can only harm all people of Northern Ireland.

#### Continued IRA Violence

☐ Strongly condemn continued IRA violence in Northern Ireland and in Britain, urge immediate, unequivocal cease-fire.

☐ Belfast peace talks (now in recess until June) have best chance of long-term success if they are inclusive (that is, if Sinn Fein participates) but that can only happen after IRA cease-fire.

#### On Whether Ira Needs to Disarm Before Joining Talks

☐ Vice President did not address this point, but U.S., like British and Irish governments, have accepted the report issued last year by Senator Mitchell and his colleagues, which suggested decommissioning of arms in parallel with talks.

#### Murder of Catholic Father of Nine in Belfast

If asked about the murder of a Catholic father of nine in Belfast, possibly by loyalist gunmen:

☐ WH horrified by this brutal slaying, condemns it in strongest terms.

☐ Do not know who was responsible; police are investigating.

☐ [If pressed]: Have no way of knowing yet whether loyalists were involved, but are watching closely. Condemn it utterly, whoever did it.

#### Berger/Steinberg Phone Calls

☐ In last several days NSA Berger and DNSA Steinberg have been in touch with British and Irish officials and with party leaders to discuss situation in Northern Ireland, exchange views on how to move process forward.

☐ If asked whether one of them spoke with Adams: Remain engaged in process; not going to comment further on details of who/when.

## GULF WAR ILLNESSES

What is your reaction to the recent LA Times article alleging that GWI is contagious and that the Blood Supply may be unsafe?

☐ We've been assured that there is no scientifically supportive evidence that the undiagnosed illnesses that some Gulf War veterans have been suffering from is contagious.

☐ Beyond that, I would refer you to the Departments involved (DOD, HHS and VA) for any additional particulars relating to precautions taken, ongoing research, etc.

☐ With regards to the blood supply, both FDA and the Red Cross have stated they believe the blood supply remains safe. I would refer specific questions to the FDA.

What action has been taken in response to the initiatives you announced during the roll-out of the PAC (Presidential Advisory Committee) report in early January 1997?

☐ We've accomplished a great deal since the PAC submitted its report.

☐ Leading examples:

☐ Secretary Brown has prepared a recommendation -- which I have accepted [?] -- to initiate rulemaking to extend the compensation eligibility period for Gulf War veterans with undiagnosed illnesses to December 31, 2001. This measure has been strongly supported by Gulf War veterans and members of Congress.

☐ The Secretaries of DOD, HHS and VA have developed -- within the 60-day period I requested -- an integrated Action Plan to implement the PAC recommendations from its final report.

☐ Finally, as the PAC recommended, we have initiated a Presidential Review Directive (PRD) to address "Health Preparedness for and Readjustment of Veterans and Their Families After Future Deployments." This is the key prospective

piece which will ensure that we act on the "lessons learned" to better safeguard the health of soldiers in future deployments.

What do you see as the way forward on GWI issues?

- ☐ Given the scope of the investigative efforts underway, there seems little doubt we'll learn of additional information which should have been made public sooner.
- ☐ However, such developments should be understood in a broader context:
- ☐ Most, if not all, of the new information appears unlikely to change our fundamental assessment of what happened out there that might have adversely impacted the health of our veterans.
- ☐ This new information is coming out precisely because of the "openness" process I directed and remain fully committed to.
- ☐ All of the information being developed will be used to improve policies so as to be better prepared for future deployments.
- ☐ Finally, while all of this investigative activity is underway, we are concurrently working very hard to further improve the quality of our medical care and research programs.

Why do the Pentagon and CIA continue to "lose and then discover" material needed to get to the bottom of what happened during the Gulf War? Is there a cover-up? If not, how can your PAC

lend credibility to institutions that seem hopelessly inept?

- ☐ The PAC has been key to reinvigorated DOD efforts to determine the facts. Last year, DOD acknowledged that its prior investigations lacked the vigor needed, and significantly increased its effort. We are now beginning to see the fruits of that effort. And to my knowledge, there is currently no evidence of a cover-up.
- ☐ We all wish that this information relating to Khamisiyah and the missing chemical warfare logs had come out sooner. The documents released recently are disturbing -- the public should have known about them long ago. I directed that we do this in an open manner, and I believe that is exactly what DOD is doing.
- ☐ Consistent with my strong resolve to get out the truth, I previously extended the PAC to

provide independent oversight of DOD's investigation, and more recently I asked the PAC to review the recently-released information in assessing the adequacy of the ongoing investigation. I am also mindful of the continuing Army IG, CIA IG, and DOD Intelligence Oversight investigations into many of these same questions.

☐ Finally, it is important to remember through all of this that our Gulf War veterans must receive the medical care they need -- and that's happening. We shouldn't lose sight of what's been done -- 80,000+ free medical exams, 26,000+ compensation claims approved, 90+ federally-sponsored research projects now underway, including research into low level chemical exposure.

What about the recently-declassified NOV 91 CIA "warning" messages?

☐ First, the message content does not change the substance of our understanding of Khamisiyah. We've known for some time that U.S. forces there conducted demolitions without knowing they were destroying chemical munitions, and may have been exposed to chemical agents.

☐ DOD announced this information to Gulf War veterans and the public in June 1996.

☐ The message content also does not change our health care and research postures. Gulf War veterans are being cared for even in those instances where we're not sure why they're sick, and the research required to further investigate possible causes -- including low-level chemical exposure -- is in progress.

☐ As to any further significance of these newly-rediscovered documents, we'll have to await the outcomes of the pending CIA and DOD IG investigations.

Why didn't these messages come to light earlier?

☐ I don't know, and here again this is an area where we need to await the outcome of pending investigations.

☐ Clearly everyone regrets this information not having come to light earlier.

☐ Note, however, that these messages have resurfaced now as part of DOD's and CIA's commitment to getting out all the facts and conducting thorough investigations to do so.

☐ Another point to consider is the sheer volume of information involved. One recent estimate is that there are some 50 million pages of intelligence information that may have some relevance to the various matters under investigation.

What is the significance of DOD's recently-released Khamisiyah Case Narrative?

☐ This was the first in a series of interim progress reports.  
☐ The Khamisiyah progress report provides the single most comprehensive account of everything that is known -- and not yet known -- about the demolitions conducted there.  
☐ Note that the Khamisiyah case narrative -- and those on other topics to follow -- is not the end of the story, but rather a work in progress; DOD is publishing them as part of its commitment to openness and to solicit any additional information that Gulf War veterans or others may have on these topics.

Why haven't you warned more veterans about Khamisiyah?

☐ We believe that the notification letters already sent by the DOD last November and December cover the overwhelming majority of those veterans who might have been affected... And all Gulf War veterans concerned about the possible adverse health effects of service in the Gulf theater are eligible for and have been strongly urged to take full advantage of free medical exams and subsequent health care, if needed -- this eligibility has been widely communicated by public service announcements and many other means.  
☐ We should not lose sight of the fact that there remain no documented cases of soldiers reporting acute symptoms at the time, nor is there any clear-cut evidence of a link between low-level exposures and the undiagnosed illnesses -- that research continues, however.  
☐ Significant uncertainties remain in terms of both source data and most appropriate modeling approach.  
☐ No one who has been involved in researching the Khamisiyah incident believes that the "worst case" scenarios are very credible.  
☐ Finally, even the "worst case" scenarios focus on the possibility of low-level chemical exposures, and it is important to remember that there was no evidence at the time of more

significant acute symptoms.

What does White House think about PAC draft preliminary findings?

- ☐ President asked them to take a careful look...
- ☐ Obviously doing so...
- ☐ Haven't seen preliminary findings...
- ☐ Wouldn't comment on them anyway...
- ☐ Look forward to getting PAC interim letter report at the end of April...

Were there misrepresentation about what CIA knew about Khamisiyah?

- ☐ President committed to getting out all the facts...
- ☐ As new information comes out, see it as consistent with our effort to leave no stone unturned...

Question falls under purview of IG investigations and/or PAC oversight -- we will await the results of those activities...

What about the statement (in the FEB 97 Khamisiyah narrative) that the CIA briefed the NSC

staff in January 1996 on the possibility of U.S. troop exposure?

- ☐ My understanding is that an NSC staffer received a classified brief from CIA in January 1996 as part of its ongoing monitoring of the Gulf War illnesses issue.

☐ During the briefing -- which focused on the CIA's declassification initiative -- the staffer was told that information had come to light about the possible presence of chemical munitions at Khamisiyah and about possible demolition operations involving those munitions. This was briefed as preliminary information, with the understanding that this possibility would be further investigated in cooperation with DOD.

Were Chemical or Biological Warfare Agents used during the Gulf War?

- ☐ The CIA's thorough August 1996 report on this issue concluded no Iraqi use of CBW.
- ☐ Moreover, based on current scientific evidence, the PAC found it unlikely that exposure to CBW explains undiagnosed Gulf War illnesses.

Is DOD the right choice to continue the investigation -- even with independent oversight?

- ☐ Yes, and that's the decision the President took in January 1997 in extending the PAC to provide independent oversight.
- ☐ DOD has unique resources for this task and is committed to a

thorough & open process.

☐ Recent swift action to declassify recently-rediscovered intelligence reports and the publication of the Khamisiyah case narrative strongly attest to DOD's commitment.

☐ DOD's recent expansion of effort has included: (1) designation of a new Special Assistant for Gulf War Illnesses; (2) a ten-fold increase in investigative resources (including more than 100 additional staff); and (3) an outreach program to the more than 20,000 Gulf War veterans who may have been in the vicinity of Khamisiyah when chemical demolitions occurred.

Why are Gulf War veterans sick?

☐ I'll leave addressing the merits of specific theories to the many experts -- at DOD, HHS and VA, as well as outside government -- currently focused on Gulf War illnesses.

☐ The PAC carefully evaluated 9 leading environmental risk factors and concluded that current scientific evidence does not support a causal link -- pesticides; chemical warfare agents; biological warfare agents; vaccines; pyridostigmine bromide (PB); infectious diseases; depleted uranium; oil-well fires and smoke; and petroleum products. The Committee also found that stress is a likely contributing factor in some Gulf War illnesses.

☐ Having evaluated potential causes, the Committee also reviewed the federal research portfolio and concluded that it was generally appropriate, recommending increased emphasis in certain areas like research into the effects of low-level chemical exposure and stress.

☐ Bottom-line: further research on the causes of Gulf War illnesses is required and is now in progress.

What has the Administration done for Gulf War veterans who are sick?

☐ Through the dedicated efforts of DOD and VA personnel, veterans are receiving the care they need for Gulf War illnesses, whether diagnosed or undiagnosed.

☐ To date -- (1) DOD & VA toll-free help lines; (2) 80,000+ free medical exams; (3) 26,000+ compensation claims approved; (4) special legislation paying disability for Gulf veterans with undiagnosed illnesses; (5) thousands of pages declassified; and (6) 90+ federally-sponsored

research projects underway.

Is there a "lessons learned" process in place for future deployments?

☐ DOD has begun to incorporate "lessons learned" in planning future deployments.

☐ Example: a new policy directive for a Medical Surveillance System for Deployments is near completion, with key elements having been tested in Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

☐ We've also initiated a multi-agency Presidential Review Directive (PRD) process to address many aspects of health preparedness and readjustment for the veterans and their families who make experience future deployments.

## NAZI ASSETS

CONTINGENCY PRESS GUIDANCE: Following is contingency press guidance on the decision to delay by 1-2 weeks the target date for release of the historians' report on the postwar USG role in distributing Nazi gold and assets. The main Administration spokesman on this issue is U/S Stu Eizenstat.

☐ The team of historians and others who have been working to assess a huge amount of historical material discovered they needed a little more time than originally anticipated..

This short delay will ensure that we can provide our best possible understanding at this point of the events in question.

If asked about the President's role:

☐ The President cares deeply about this issue. The historians' report is being prepared at his behest, under the direction of U/S Eizenstat.

If pressed:

☐ The President will of course see the report when it is completed.

## FAST TRACK

Q: It has been reported that the President is planning to delay his request for fast track authority to accommodate the budget process. Is that true? Does this signal Administration retreat on fast track? Has Gephardt scared the President off?

A: Not at all. The President is still firmly committed to seeking fast track authority to open foreign markets. It is critical if we want to continue creating good jobs for American workers.

Every President since Ford has had fast track authority for key periods, and the reasons for it now are more compelling than ever. Over 11 million U.S. jobs now depend on exports, and these jobs pay 13-16 percent more than the average U.S. job. Today, 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside the U.S., and the vast majority of those consumers live in the emerging and fastest growing markets of Latin America and Asia. We simply must continue to open these markets for U.S. exports if we are to succeed in the global economy.

We cannot afford inaction. If we are not seizing opportunities to break down trade barriers and open foreign markets, we can be sure other countries will act -- to the benefit of their companies and their workers.

The United States has nothing to fear. We are the most competitive large economy in the world as judged by independent experts. But our ability to define the nature of our trade relationships will in significant measure determine our leadership role in the next century. Fast track authority is the most important factor determining these relationships.

As you know, we have been consulting with Congress to develop bipartisan support for this legislation. We think that is the best way to build a strong foundation for this effort.

We will continue to consult with Congress as to the substance, tactics and timing of the fast track initiative.

Q: It has been reported that the Administration is weighing the dropping of labor and environmental goals from fast track trade authority legislation, a move certain to infuriate labor unions. Is this true?

A: As we have stated before, our goal is to build the broadest possible support for the fast track legislation. To that end, Ambassador Barshefsky and others have been consulting actively with members of Congress representing all points of view on this subject, and with all interested parties, including organized labor. We will continue to do so with the goal of enacting legislation that receives broad support.