

# Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

## Clinton Library

| DOCUMENT NO.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                                                | DATE       | RESTRICTION |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| 001. email               | James Lindsay to Donald Kerrick. Subject: Berger Cover Memo. (5 pages)       | 04/16/1997 | P1/b(1)     |
| 002. email               | James Lindsay to Donald Kerrick. Subject: Final Berger Cover Memo. (6 pages) | 04/16/1997 | P1/b(1)     |

### COLLECTION:

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

### FOLDER TITLE:

[04/16/1997-04/17/1997]

2006-1363-F

vz5622

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

[Email did not print properly. Email re-constructed by Archives staff]

[http://classifiedhttp://classified/email/data\\_source/msmail/record/cd005/apr1997/3354ec82.html](http://classifiedhttp://classified/email/data_source/msmail/record/cd005/apr1997/3354ec82.html)

page 1 of 28

M S M a i l DATE-TIME 16 April 97 10:01  
FROM Peters, Mary A.  
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED  
SUBJECT Contingency Press Guidance on Senator Mitchell [UNCLASSIFIED]  
TO Johnson, David T.  
Luzzatto, Anne R.  
Rubin, Eric S.  
Wozniak, Natalie S.  
CARBON\_COPY Bass, Peter E.  
Cicio, Kristen K.  
Hall, Wilma G.  
Helweg, M. Diana  
Kale, Dora A.  
Kerrick, Donald L.  
Millison, Cathy L.  
Veit, Katherine M.  
Vershbow, Alexander R.

TEXT\_BODY

New points on page 20. Please use only if story of Mitchell's resignation of economic job leaks -- ideally we would prefer to announce it at same time his successor is named, which will take a few weeks. [[ APR16GUI.DOC : 2608 in APR16GUI.DOC ]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 16 April 97 9:59  
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME APR16GUI.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

April 15, 1997

Zaire

Iran/Mykonos Verdict

Middle East

Albania

Dalai Lama

CWC

Russia/NIS

Saudi Arabia/Khobar

Bosnia

China

North Korea

Trips and Visitors

Northern Ireland

Gulf War Illnesses

Nazi Assets

Fast Track

A-10 Search

ZAIRE

Q: What is the status of a possible Kabila-Mobutu meeting?

A: Mobutu indicated over the weekend that he would be prepared to meet with Kabila under certain circumstances, but we are not aware that there has been any direct contact between the two.

Q: Are peace talks continuing in South Africa or elsewhere?

A: Efforts continue on the part of Sahnoun, the South Africans and others, including the U.S., to start up the talks in South Africa again. We urge both sides to resume negotiations as soon as possible on a cessation of hostilities and a political transition in Zaire.

Q: What is being done to resolve the situation?

A: As we have said, we and the international community remain heavily engaged in efforts to get the parties to a negotiated settlement.

Q: What is the status of the rebel advance on Kinshasa?

A: We have seen a variety of media reports on rebel statements concerning their advance

on Kinshasa, but we have nothing to confirm them.

We have also seen the reports that rebels have occupied Kanango, the capital of western Kasai province, about 400 miles east of Kinshasa, and Kolwezi in southeast Shaba province.

Q: Has the proposed general strike taken place?

A: Kinshasa remains generally quiet today as the population observes the stay-at-home strike. We have seen reports that troops shot to disperse opposition demonstrators outside opposition demonstrators outside opposition leader Tshisekedi's house. There were no reports of injuries.

Q: What is the U.S. reaction to the proposed demonstrations tomorrow (4/15)?

A: We have seen the reports that high school and university students are proposing to strike tomorrow. We would urge all sides to exercise restraint to enable individuals to express their views freely and safely.

Q: Has Mobutu begun his threatened crackdown?

A: We have not detected any significant change in the security situation in Kinshasa at this time.

Q: What is Tshisekedi's status?

A: He is at home. He is not under arrest.

Q: What about the internecine rebel dispute in Kasumbalesa?

A: I don't have anything on this.

Q: Is Kabila in control of captured towns?

A: The Alliance is in de facto control, but local administrators are running day-to-day operations.

Q: Any plans to withdraw or reduce Embassy personnel?

A: We remain on authorized departure status.

Americans who wish to depart Zaire at this time are able to do so via commercial means.

The Department of State issued a travel warning for Zaire March 20 which strongly encouraged Americans to depart Zaire in light of the uncertain political and security situation and the potential for unrest throughout the country. The travel warning remains in effect.

## IRAN -- MYKONOS VERDICT IN BERLIN

Q: Does the verdict in Berlin in the Mykonos case prove that Germany's policy of "critical dialogue" with Iran is wrong-headed?

A: Commend the courage of the prosecutor, judge, and witnesses in this case.

Have believed "critical dialogue" with Iran not productive so long as it continues to sponsor terrorism.

Call on Iran to cease its terrorist operations and its sponsorship of terrorism.

Important for international community to work more closely together against terrorism.

## MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

### Osama el-Baz Consultations in Washington

Q: Do you have anything on the Osama el-Baz consultations in Washington? The Egyptian press reports say that the President requested in a recent letter to Mubarak that Osama come for talks? Is that true?

A: Osama el-Baz is in Washington for consultations. He will hold meetings at the NSC and at the State Department. We will compare notes on the peace process and discuss how

to help the parties make some progress. We'll also discuss bilateral relations.

Not going to get into content of communications between the President and leaders in the Middle East. We have regular consultations with President Mubarak and his senior advisers.

Q: Who will he meet with at the White House?

A: He'll meet with Sandy Berger. That meeting is planned for Wednesday.

Ross Trip

Q: Do you have any details on the Ross trip?

A: Don't really have anything more than what Secretary Albright said yesterday. Ross leaves today and will return by the weekend. As the Secretary said, he'll be consulting with PM Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat "on and what steps they are prepared to take to stop the deterioration and lay the basis for making the peace process work again." Ross will report back to the President and the Secretary and then we'll see what the U.S. can realistically do the re-establish the credibility of the process.

(NOTE: Albright announced the trip during her 4/14 photo-op with the Czech Foreign Minister.)

Q: Any progress in getting the talks between the Palestinians and Israelis re-started? Will you exert more pressure on Netanyahu to stop construction at Har Homa?

A: I don't have a lot to add to what we've been saying over the last week.

We'll be reviewing with parties ideas for dealing with the current impasse.. This is not going to be a quick or easy process, but we'll just keep working on it.

If pressed on what's needed from parties

As we have made clear, we need to see two things to get this process back on track:

There needs to be zero tolerance for terror. Israel has a right to expect a 100% effort by the Palestinian Authority to prevent acts of terror and to take stern measures against those who seek to carry out such acts.

And a readiness by both parties to take steps which build confidence in the integrity of the negotiating process in order to move forward.

Q: Do you agree or disagree with PM Netanyahu that Arafat has not kept his commitments, such as amending the Palestinian Charter, collecting weapons, etc.?

A: Obviously we expect the Palestinians to keep their commitments. That's an integral part of maintaining confidence between the two sides so that they can move forward.

If pressed on whether Arafat is doing enough to prevent terrorism

We've made it clear repeatedly that Chairman Arafat and the Palestinian Authority need to demonstrate zero tolerance for terrorism.

## ALBANIA

Q: Any reaction to the arrival of the Multinational Protection Force (MPF) in Albania, which began deploying on April 15?

A: We welcome deployment of the MPF to facilitate humanitarian and political assistance efforts in Albania.

We commend the Government of Italy for accepting the important leadership role in pulling the force together.

(If asked) The U.S. is not participating in the MPF.

## 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.

## CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

CWC enjoys broad, bipartisan support: President Bush, Colin Powell, Brent Scowcroft, Jim Baker, Ed Rowley, Paul Nitze and other leading Republican and Democratic 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 16 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: 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 President and the Majority Leader agreed to work together to try to address the concerns of some 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 task force, 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 Senate vote on the Convention prior  
to April 29, when the  
Convention comes into force. I welcome Senator Lott's recent  
statements that he is  
working a process to get the CWC done in April.

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.

## RUSSIA/NIS

### Ukraine Decides Against Nuclear Cooperation with Iran

U.S. long opposed any nuclear cooperation with Iran; welcome Ukraine's assurances to forego supplying parts for Iran's Bushehr nuclear power plant.

Important issue for us, will monitor carefully; resolution would open prospect for American-Ukrainian cooperation on commercial nuclear technology.

### Ukrainian Diplomat Charged with DUI

Aware of incident in which Ukrainian diplomat charged in traffic accident; would refer you to State Department for details.

### Space Station

Committed to completing the International Space Station -- most complex technical project ever undertaken. Have partnership with 14 countries, including Russia, to build it.

Russia has experienced difficulties in financing its portion of the Space Station. As a result, NASA announced on April 9 that the first launch to begin assembly of the International Space Station would be delayed from November 1997 to no later than October 1998.

Have contingency plan to deal with potential shortfalls in Russia's contributions to the Space Station; now implementing first stage to protect against possibility of further delays; plan to reallocate \$200 million unspent from Space Shuttle to begin building and modifying U.S.

hardware to serve as a temporary substitute for delayed Russian hardware.

Still hope Russia will deliver on Space Station commitments; have benefited greatly from our expanded cooperation in space, particularly in Shuttle-Mir program.

If Russia continues to have trouble meeting commitments, prepared to implement further contingency steps in measured, stepwise fashion to allow us to continue program. Committed to working closely with Congress and Russian partners in meeting these challenges.

(IF ASKED -- Reallocation of funds to affect space shuttle safety?)

Reallocation will have no operational or safety impact on the Space Shuttle program. Funds represent unanticipated savings resulting from management changes in that program.

Primakov Comments in Paris on possible May 27 Signing of NATO-Russia Accord

Noted Primakov comments on prospects for agreement on NATO-Russia relationship in advance of Madrid summit -- encouraged Russia taking positive tack toward issue.

Primakov's idea interesting, we're prepared to consider late May meeting to sign Charter -- of course, first need to finish document, actually have agreement between NATO and Russia-- before we can set date, make concrete plans for any event.

If pressed on suggestion of Paris as venue and/or on May date

Obviously first order of business to get agreement on document spelling out relationship; if that's successful, sure we with NATO members and Russia can settle on time and place.

NATO-Russia

Consultations with Russia continue; NATO Secretary General Solana in Moscow again this week (today) to discuss contents of proposed agreement with

Primakov.

Plans for NATO enlargement also proceeding on schedule -- Madrid summit on track; will issue first invitations to prospective new members at July 8-9 meeting.

Enlargement 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.

#### 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.

#### 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

### Elections in Croatia/Eastern Slavonia

Local elections proceeded peacefully in Croatia this weekend. We have no reports of significant irregularities and expect OSCE certification of the elections. These elections should be a step forward in bringing democracy, reconciliation and stability to Croatia and the region.

In the internationally controlled area of Eastern Slavonia, local elections officials were responsible for some serious logistical problems. UNTAES Administrator Jacques Klein took action to correct the situation and ordered voting to be extended as necessary.

Turnout was high by both ethnic Croats and Serbs particularly in Eastern Slavonia, where ethnic Croats are likely to win a majority of municipalities, but ethnic Serbs appear also to have won electoral control of a number of municipalities. This outcome is a good step toward the eventual peaceful integration of a multi-ethnic Eastern Slavonia into Croatia.

Now it is important for newly elected ethnic Croats and ethnic Serbs leaders in Eastern Slavonia to work together to ensure that integration of Eastern Slavonia into Croatia proceeds peacefully and that population movements are kept to a minimum.

### Pope in Bosnia

Pope John Paul II delivered an inspiring message of reconciliation and peace to the people of Bosnia this weekend. We hope that all Bosnians take heart in the wisdom of his call for a unified Bosnia at peace.

We have seen reports that some explosives were found along one of the likely routes of the Papal motorcade. We are thankful that SFOR and Bosnian authorities were able to ensure the Pope's safety during his visit to Sarajevo.

#### SFOR Mission Duration

We believe that SFOR's mission should be completed in 18 months. 18 months should give sufficient extra time needed to establish conditions to maintain security and stability without an outside military presence.

#### Kasich Legislation/Premature Withdrawal from Bosnia

We strongly urge that this legislation not be pursued. 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

## CHINA

### Conditional MFN

Q: Do you have any comment on Speaker Gingrich's comment that he favors only a six-month extension of MFN for China?

A: We have not discussed this issue in detail with the Speaker as yet, so don't know his full thinking.

[IF PRESSED] We have reviewed conditional MFN ideas in the past and do not consider them to be desirable or practicable. These ideas would require a change in the law. Moreover, we do not believe that we can advance our interests by isolating ourselves from China.

### Hong Kong

Concerned about any changes in Hong Kong's legal structure that restrict the civil liberties of the citizens of Hong Kong.

Fundamental rights that Hong Kong citizens have enjoyed, including freedom of the press and freedom of association, are essential elements of Hong Kong's "way of life," and of its economic success.

Nature of relationship with China would certainly be affected by actions to curtail civil

liberties in Hong Kong.

Martin Lee

United States greatly admires Martin Lee's steadfast efforts on behalf of democracy, individual rights, and the rule of law.

Mr. Lee has an appointment with the Vice President on Friday; the President will join that meeting.

UNHRC

United States will co-sponsor China resolution in Geneva that acknowledges the dramatic improvements in the lives of millions of Chinese, but also emphasizes the continued restrictions on freedom of speech, press, assembly, association and religion in violation of internationally accepted norms.

Consistent with our view that to engage China does not mean to condone all its actions and that U.S. will continue to speak out forcefully on issues of importance to us, including human rights.

U.S. also will oppose motion designed to keep the resolution off the Commission's agenda.  
Way a nation treats its citizens is of concern to the entire international community.

[If asked about decision by certain EU countries not to co-sponsor resolution]

Decisions on resolutions are made by sovereign nations.

U.S. believes decisions [on votes?] should reflect assessment of the human rights situation in particular countries.

Our own judgment, which we have shared with our allies, is that the current human rights situation in China warrants a resolution.

[If asked whether efforts were 'downgraded' from last year]

U.S. has made and is continuing to make vigorous efforts to convey our views to other members of the Commission.

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.

## NORTH KOREA

### No-Dong MRBM Deployment

Q: What is the status of North Korea's deployment of missiles that can reach Japan? What are we doing about it? Why are we providing food aid to a country that is developing missiles to threaten our troops and our Allies?

A: Long been concerned about North Korea's missile program. That's one of the threats our theater missile defense program is designed to counter.

Also addressing this through other ways, including an ongoing program of missile proliferation discussions with North Korea. The next round of those talks is scheduled to take place in May in New York City.

While not specifically on the agenda, we also plan to raise this issue at the meeting we will have with the North Koreans in New York on April 15. The specific purpose of that meeting is to discuss North Korea's reaction to the briefing that the U.S. and South Korea provided in March on the Four-Party talks we have proposed to address long term security issues on the Korean Peninsula.

Since questions of this missile's range and whether it is currently operational obviously touch on intelligence issues, can't discuss that.

With respect to food aid, we have provided food aid in the past when it has been requested by, and its distribution supervised by, reputable international organizations, such as the UN World Food Program. Have never used food as a weapon; hungry children are

not an enemy of the United States.

Q: Is the U.S. considering providing more food to North Korea?

A: As you know, in the past, the U.S. has responded generously to appeals for food aid to North Korea. The World Food Program (WFP) recently increased its current emergency appeal from 100,000 tons to 200,000 tons. As a result, we are carefully reviewing the new elements of the appeal, but no decision for support has been made.

Q: Why did WFP double the appeal and what are the new elements?

A: The head of the World Food Program just returned from a mission to North Korea. As a result of that visit, WFP decided to increase its appeal. The increase is targeted towards North Korea's 2.5 million children under the age of 6, whom many consider to be the most at risk.

## TRIPS AND VISITORS

Vice President will see Hong Kong legislative council leader Martin Lee Friday 4/18.  
President will join that meeting.

No one at WH/NSC is seeing Okinawa (Japan) Governor Ota. He has meetings at State and DOD.

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 U.S.-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.

We expect President and Hashimoto to meet at the end of April here at the White House and final details on date, time and likely topics will be available early next week.

## NORTHERN IRELAND

Mitchell Resignation as SAPASS for Economic Initiatives in Ireland  
(Background: It has not been made public yet but Senator Mitchell has submitted a letter to POTUS resigning his position as Special Advisor to the President and Secretary of State for Economic Initiatives in Ireland -- a position he has held since late 1994.)

Yes, Senator Mitchell has decided to give up position as Special Advisor to President and Secretary of State for Economic Initiatives in Northern Ireland. Will of course continue as chair of Belfast peace talks; in fact, understand his decision to resign the economic job based on need to devote his time to the talks.

We are moving to select a successor to Senator Mitchell to oversee Administration support for economic initiatives. Creating jobs through investment and trade is key to underpinning

Northern Ireland peace process over long term.

Shooting of Woman Police Officer in Derry

Abhor this callous crime; extend sympathy to family and hope/pray for officer's recovery.

IRA violence must stiffen resolve of those committed to democracy and peace. Men of violence should not be allowed to determine future of Northern Ireland.

Any Chance of IRA Cease-fire?

Impossible to know. Continue to call for immediate, unequivocal cease-fire. Way forward can only be through negotiations, not senseless violence.

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

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 the significance of CIA's recently-released Khamisiyah white paper?

CIA's white paper places approximately 40 just-declassified documents related to Khamisiyah into context and complements DOD's "Khamisiyah case narrative" released in FEB 97.

My understanding is that the white paper and accompanying documents do not change the essence of what we know about what happened at Khamisiyah that might be related to undiagnosed Gulf War illnesses. Moreover, the white paper is distinct from the forthcoming CIA IG report which has not yet been released. The white paper does, however, highlight certain intelligence

community shortfalls and  
"lessons learned" from an analytical perspective, and I  
understand CIA is addressing these.

What about the statement in the CIA white paper that the CIA  
briefed the NSC staff in JAN 96  
on the Khamisiyah evidence?

The CIA white paper (and one of the accompanying documents  
containing briefing slides)  
reflects the classified CIA brief the NSC staff received in JAN  
96.

During the briefing -- which focused on the CIA's  
declassification initiative and ongoing  
study of potential exposures -- the staff was told that  
information had come to light about the  
possibility of chemical munitions storage and agent release at  
the Khamisiyah facility. This  
was briefed as preliminary information, and the NSC staff noted  
at the close of the brief that  
CIA needed to pursue this possibility aggressively together with  
DOD.

Subsequent CIA and DOD efforts to investigate this concern  
eventually led to the JUN 96  
DOD announcement of Khamisiyah.

The CIA Khamisiyah white paper mentions that an AUG 91  
"highly-classified" intelligence  
assessment discussing chemical munitions storage at Khamisiyah  
was circulated among the entire  
national security team. Does this mean that the Bush  
Administration knew about the possibility  
of exposure of U.S. forces soon after the Gulf War?  
We have no information indicating that the Bush Administration  
knew of this possibility.

To my knowledge, the assessment you are referring to focused on  
the issue of whether  
Khamisiyah was a known chemical munitions storage site, and did  
not even reflect the issue of  
the possible exposure of U.S. forces.

How does the CIA explain these 40 or so documents coming out now,  
months after we had  
various assurances that the Agency had done its best on behalf of  
Gulf War veterans?

First, it's important to note that earlier statements were based  
on what was known at the time  
they were made. And the continuing DOD and CIA investigative  
efforts have identified new  
information, changing what we know over time.  
Finally, while these documents do not change our substantive  
understanding of the possible



exposure of U.S. forces at Khamisiyah, they do indicate certain intelligence community shortfalls and "lessons learned" which CIA intends to act on.

The intelligence community admits making mistakes in its handling of the Gulf War illnesses investigation, and this latest batch of 40 or so documents clearly should have come out much sooner. With much of the related activity occurring during George Tenet's tenure at CIA, does the Director-designate retain the President's full confidence? Absolutely.

The CIA has contributed a tremendous amount to our knowledge about chemical weapons in the Gulf War theater and specifically about exposure incidents that might be related to undiagnosed Gulf War illnesses. George Tenet is fully supportive of the President's commitment to get out all the facts, and has increased the level of resources devoted to the Gulf War illnesses problem when new information has highlighted the need to do so.

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 the President directed and remains 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.

Should more veterans be warned now about Khamisiyah? We believe that the notification letters already sent by the DOD last NOV and DEC 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; CIA and DOD are working together to resolve these expeditiously. 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.

Do these "intelligence failures" -- specifically, getting an appropriate warning to troops in the field during the Gulf War and failing to uncover the possibility of chemical exposure at Khamisiyah for more than five years -- indicate that the intelligence community and/or its relationship to the military need to be reconsidered? At this juncture, I would say no. Mistakes were clearly made during this process, these mistakes have been acknowledged, and the agencies involved will seek to develop appropriate "lessons learned" for implementation. Beyond that, we need to await the outcome of the CIA IG and various other ongoing investigations to determine whether any other actions may be appropriate.

What action has been taken in response to the initiatives announced during the roll-out of the PAC (Presidential Advisory Committee) report in early JAN 97? We've accomplished a great deal since the PAC submitted its report. Leading examples:

Secretary Brown prepared a recommendation -- which the President has accepted -- to initiate rulemaking to extend the compensation eligibility period for Gulf War veterans with undiagnosed illnesses to DEC 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 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 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. Overall, 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, with an extension of the presumptive period for undiagnosed illness compensation forthcoming soon; (5) thousands of pages declassified; and (6) 90+ federally-sponsored research projects underway.

## 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.

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

| DOCUMENT NO.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                                          | DATE       | RESTRICTION |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| 001. email               | James Lindsay to Donald Kerrick. Subject: Berger Cover Memo. (5 pages) | 04/16/1997 | P1/b(1)     |

### COLLECTION:

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

### FOLDER TITLE:

[04/16/1997-04/17/1997]

2006-1363-F  
vz5622

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

## M S M a i l

**DATE-TIME** 16 April 97 14:02  
**FROM** Lindsay, James M.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** Reorg Cover Memo [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Kerrick, Donald L.  
**CARBON\_COPY** Friedrich, M. K.  
Hilliard, Brenda I.  
Joshi, M. Kay  
Millison, Cathy L.

**TEXT\_BODY**

[[ SRB-BC.DOC : 3630 in SRB-BC.DOC ]]  
Don,

This version incorporates the ACDA arguments and notes that AID wants several minor modifications. Will the paper indicate whether those modifications are acceptable to everyone else? Also, the recommendation line remains to be modified.

Jim

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE**

16 April 97 14:0

**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME**

SRB-BC.DOC  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ XXX  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ cc: Vice President  
Reason: 1.5 (b,d) Chief of Staff  
Declassify On: 04/16/02

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT  
THE VICE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER

SUBJECT: Reorganization Options for the International Affairs

DECLASSIFIED  
E.O. 13526 5/16/2017  
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006  
By VC NARA, Date 2/17/2019  
2006-1363-4(3)

## Agencies

## Purpose

To forward the memorandum summarizing the work of the Administration's working group on reorganization (Tab I). Formed in late February, the working group is composed of representatives from State, ACDA, AID, USIA, NSC, OMB and OVP.

## Summary

The paper identifies four main reorganization options:

- A. Reinvent without reorganizing
- B. Establish a process for developing a reorganization plan
- C. Reorganization of State, ACDA, USIA and AID
- D. Full integration of all four agencies

The working group was not charged with recommending an option. However, a consensus has formed around the Vice President's option, Option C. The Vice President, the State Department and USIA support Option C. AID supports Option C with several minor modifications. ACDA will support Option C if one unresolved issue is decided in its favor.

## The Process

The working group led by Elaine Kamarck, Don Kerrick and John Koskinen met several times in full session with Brian Atwood, Joe Duffey, John Holum and Jamie Rubin. The group discussed the range of possible options and narrowed the list to the four options presented in the paper. The agencies also had multiple opportunities to provide written comments and shape the drafting of the paper. ACDA, AID and USIA have provided written comments explaining their views on reorganization (Tabs A-C).



The working group found considerable common ground among the agencies on Option C. In the last week, I have worked closely with Secretary Albright and Leon Fuerth to resolve all but one area of disagreement.

#### One Issue Remains Unresolved

The one unresolved issue is which agency should chair the Arms Control Interagency Working Group (IWG). The single sentence in dispute is **bolded and in brackets** in the options paper.

ACDA will support Option C only if it stipulates that the new State arms control office is made the chair of the Arms Control IWG. Otherwise ACDA supports Option A. ACDA argues that State should chair the Arms Control IWG because arms control and nonproliferation policy at the IWG level and below involves extensive technical analysis. ACDA believes that no NSC staff present or future can match the technical expertise that the new State arms control office will have. ACDA also argues that directing State to chair the Arms Control IWG ensures that the policy process is managed and led by officials in a traditional foreign policy agency that has routine, regular and direct relationships with foreign governments and who are confirmed officials responsive to the Congress.

The Vice President, Defense and the NSC strongly oppose ACDA's position. As you directed in PDD-2, the NSC chairs the Arms Control IWG because the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Intelligence Community and the Department of Energy have substantial equities in arms control issues and understandably want to be assured there will be a "level playing field" vis-a-vis State interests in such issues. As an impartial, objective arbiter, the NSC's chairmanship of this IWG meets this test. Moreover, the NSC-led Arms Control IWG has, since 1993, established an impressive track record and is widely regarded as a "model" IWG. For example, it managed the interagency process that produced an extraordinary

series of arms control achievements, including completion of the CTB, the Helsinki Summit agreements on START III and ABM/TMD demarcation, entry into force of START I and Senate ratification of START II, signature of the CFE Flank Agreement, and the U.S. initiative on landmines.

The State Department supports Option C. Secretary Albright supports the bracketed text but does not want it to be a deal breaker. She is prepared to support Option C without the ACDA language.

Next Steps

If you decide to reorganize the foreign policy apparatus, we will need to move quickly to communicate that decision to the affected agencies, to the Hill and to the public. After you decide when to announce your decision, we will need to take several steps:

#### The Administration

The first task is to notify the Secretary of State and agency heads of your decision so that they may inform their staffs. The agency heads have requested that they be notified 24 hours in advance of any public announcement.

If you select Option C or D, the second task will be for you to direct State to appoint a reorganization "czar" to oversee all reinvention and reorganization efforts. State has agreed to take this step. The announcement of the reorganization czar should be followed by the appointment of an interagency task force composed of State, ACDA, AID, USIA, NSC, OMB and OVP to coordinate the reinvention effort or review. (OMB chairs the task force under Option B.) This task force will be responsible for drafting legislation requesting reorganization authority.

#### Capitol Hill

We need to notify the Congressional leadership and other relevant members of your decision. We recommend that you call Speaker Gingrich, Minority Leader Gephardt, Majority Leader Lott and Minority

Leader Daschle. We will ask Secretary Albright to call Senator Helms and other members. We will also need to arrange briefings for relevant Congressional committees. In the longer term, we will need to submit legislation requesting reorganization authority.

#### The Public

The immediate task is to prepare fact sheets and other briefing materials to support your announcement. We will follow your announcement with background briefings for the news media, organizations that have been vocal on the reorganization issue and other opinion shapers. We will also arrange for prominent former officials and arms control, development, public diplomacy and other foreign policy experts to endorse your decision.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you choose one the options presented in the paper at Tab I:

- ☐ Option A: Reinvent without reorganizing
- ☐ Option B: Establish a process for developing a reorganization plan.
- ☐ Option C: Reorganization of State, ACDA, USIA and AID.
- ☐ Option D: Full integration of all four agencies.

Approve -- Option A \_\_\_\_\_

Option B \_\_\_\_\_

Option C  
W/Bracketed Text \_\_\_\_\_

W/O Bracketed Text \_\_\_\_\_

Option D \_\_\_\_\_

Let's Discuss \_\_\_\_\_

Attachments  
Tab I Paper on Reorganization Options  
Tab A Comments by ACDA

Tab B Comments by AID  
Tab C Comments by USIA

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

| DOCUMENT NO.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                                                | DATE       | RESTRICTION |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| 002. email               | James Lindsay to Donald Kerrick. Subject: Final Berger Cover Memo. (6 pages) | 04/16/1997 | P1/b(1)     |

### COLLECTION:

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

### FOLDER TITLE:

[04/16/1997-04/17/1997]

2006-1363-F  
vz5622

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]  
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]  
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]  
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]  
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]  
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]  
  
C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.  
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).  
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

## M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 16 April 97 17:20  
**FROM** Wozniak, Natalie S.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** April 16 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Benjamin, Daniel  
Blinken, Antony J.  
Gibney, James S.  
Gray, Wendy  
Johnson, David T.  
LaFleur, Vinca A.  
Luzzatto, Anne R.  
Naplan, Steven J.  
Rubin, Eric S.  
Wozniak, Natalie S.  
**CARBON\_COPY** NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE  
**TEXT\_BODY** [[ MIKE0416.doc : 4389 in MIKE0416.doc ]]  
**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE** 16 April 97 17:12  
**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME** MIKE0416.doc

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release April 16, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING BY  
MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

2:04 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: Thank you both. We don't comment on the specific

articles that purport to draw from intelligence matters, because -- obviously because it's classified information we can't, but I will say that U.S. officials have regularly, at a very senior level, raised with senior officials of the Russian Federation concerns that we have about certain sales and certain transfer of technology and issues related to our proliferation concerns generally. That's a regular feature of our bilateral dialogue with the Russian Federation; it includes sometimes discussions that occur at the highest levels between President Clinton and President Yeltsin.

We have frequently discussed our opposition to the sale of advanced air defense systems to Iran, specifically, and we've received firm assurances that such sales would not occur. We, obviously, in this area monitor, activity very, very closely, and that becomes part of the basis by which we continue our dialogue with the Russian Federation.

Q Has the administration come up with some kind of plan to help communities or states deal with the threat of terrorism and biological or chemical threats?

MR. JOHNSON: Under the Nunn-Lugar legislation, there is some funding that has been provided for a program that FEMA is administering and the Department of Defense is helping with to train a number of cities' emergency response teams on potential threats such as chemical weapons -- in response somewhat to what happened in Japan a couple of years ago in the sarin attack in the subway. I think they're conducting an initial briefing on that at the Pentagon today. This is a program that's already been enacted and funded. I believe that 28 cities are a part of the pilot program and there will be emergency response training for those 28 cities. And the Pentagon is going to be talking about how that's going to be done.

Q I was going to say, does the military provide this training to communities? Is that's what is envisioned?

MR. JOHNSON: I think that the Pentagon will be able to tell you

more clearly than I would on that. They may be working directly; they may be working through contractors. I'm not sure at this point.

Q Is this purely domestic?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, this is for emergency response teams in cities.

Q Mike, how involved is the Clinton White House in the tobacco negotiations, and does the President really want an agreement under which the companies are no longer liable for medical problems of smokers?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, let me make it clear what the President wants first and foremost. He wants the public health interests that he expressed when he launched his tobacco initiative to be addressed by any parties seeking to settle outstanding claims or settle litigation that's pending. Our interest is kids and preventing kids from smoking. And any settlement that would be reached would have to address exactly those parameters that the Food and Drug Administration established when they proposed their rule. So that has been our consistent message to all sides in these discussions, whether it's the attorneys general from the states that are suing on behalf of plaintiffs, whether it's the plaintiffs representatives, whether it's the representatives of the companies themselves.

Now, as to our involvement, our Counsel's Office through Bruce Lindsey has been in regular contact, I'd say in the last three weeks probably daily contact, with those who are having those discussions. It will be up to them to present to the White House anything that represents a proposal that would require action on our part or would require any legislative action. And our first and most important criteria will be, does it address exactly those public health concerns that the President raised when he proposed the restrictions on access and advertising for tobacco products as they are aimed at minors.

Q From what you know of the negotiations, since you're keeping such



close touch, does the agreement that's taking shape meet those parameters?

MR. MCCURRY: I think it's very difficult to say at this point because the parties themselves, as there has been some public discussion now, are not at a point to say that they have any agreement. So I would not suggest to you that there is an agreement taking shape that we understand fully enough to state whether it meets the criteria that we have.

Q Well, Mike, what sort of legislative action is envisioned? I mean, what are the possibilities that are being contemplated?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the specific interest we have in legislation -- and it goes back to when the President promulgated the proposed rule itself -- we have said all along that far preferable to regulation by the Food and Drug Administration would be an act of Congress which makes these restrictions the law of the land. That would be -- all along, we've said we'd prefer a legislative route because that's certain and it becomes federal law, as opposed to the FDA's assertion of jurisdiction in rulemaking which is now subject to litigation that could go on and on and on. We're interested in a certain outcome, the certain outcome being the protection of kids from the negative health effects of tobacco use.

Q Mike, just to follow up a little bit, can you be a little bit more specific than that? I mean, what would a law -- I understand you want a law; what would a law say?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, a law would say exactly those kinds of things that we say in our proposed rule, the kinds of curbs on access, on vendor sales, on face to face encounters, on advertising, on marketing, on targeting to kids that are at the heart of the rule that's been proposed and ready to be promulgated.

Q But, Mike, is the White House open to any agreement between the major tobacco makers -- cigarette makers and the attorneys general that would limit the liability -- the future liability of tobacco

companies?

MR. MCCURRY: We believe that any agreement that the parties reach are going to have to be -- will have to be an agreement that takes into account all of those who are affected. And certainly those who want to litigate or who want to sue have to be protected in any settlement, and the nature of that protection would have to be sufficient in the eyes of the parties themselves in order for there to be agreement. That states almost the self evident, but clearly if those who have brought these cases -- if the plaintiffs themselves are not satisfied with any of the terms of the agreement, then the agreement won't go forward.

Q Mike, in response to Terry's question -- Bruce Lindsey has apparently then communicated the White House view what you'd like to see in a deal like that. Have any of the parties express objection to those conditions?

MR. MCCURRY: Any objections to our standards? Not that I'm aware of. They are fully aware of the standard that we have set, which is that it has to meet the requirements that the FDA put forward and has to result in the public health outcome that we want here, which is the decline in use of tobacco products by young people.

Q That's not a hangup issue, as far as you know. Nobody has --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that has been a very big hangup issue, which is why the industry is in court suing the United States for promulgating the rule in the first place. So that -- the assertion of jurisdiction by the FDA and the resulting regulations have been very much at issue and, to my knowledge, that issue has not been resolved.

Q I guess my question is, has Philip Morris and all these other

companies said to Bruce that they'd be willing to do this if they could get the rest of this agreement?

MR. MCCURRY: They clearly know what our requirements are, and I don't think they would be proceeding with the conversations they're having unless they understood at the end of the day they would have to meet our requirements. But whether they will, whether the negotiations on other matters, specifically the pending litigation state by state, whether they resolve those issues, I think remains to be seen.

Q Mike, is it still your assertion that the White House is not a party to the negotiations, even if Bruce Lindsey is conveying what the White House would like to see in such an agreement?

MR. MCCURRY: That's correct. We are not in a position to negotiate with the plaintiffs, those who represent them, the companies, those who represent the companies. And, to my knowledge, Mr. Lindsey has not directly participated in any of the face to face discussions between the parties. Now, he's been available to meet with the public health community on this matter, with those who represent the states, those who represent the plaintiffs, those who represent the companies. And he has had regular contact with them. But he has not been in a position to actually negotiate formally between them.

Q So, Mike, if the parties come up with a compensation fund of, say, \$300 billion to pay for those who get cancer of whatever, that would be considered adequate by the White House?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to speculate on the terms of the settlement. We'd have to look very carefully at anything that comes forward, and we are following very carefully what they're suggesting. There would have to be adequate protection for those who have an interest. Clearly, those who have sued, those who are represented by the states do have an interest that would have to be

addressed.

Q Mike, can I follow up on that?

Q Mike, the Democratic Senators that are sending a letter to the President saying they want a good deal, led by Senator Lautenberg, Wellstone and Durbin and a few others, saying they want a good deal, they don't want a settlement. Would you agree with the Democratic -- this group of Democratic Senators?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't understand -- they want a good deal?

Q What I mean is, a settlement short of legislation. They want a good deal. They don't want to --

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, well that's what we want too. We want something that protects kids along the lines of what the President has proposed and I suspect that our thinking is similar with respect to what we want as the outcome to the Senators who have written.

Q Mike, my question is really, shouldn't you jump into the negotiations as representative of the national interest, which is now not part of the mix of negotiations? Because at the end of the day, the tobacco companies will want something from the national government, namely an end to their liability. In order for them to get that, they'll have to have Congress and the President on board. Why should Congress and the President be there at the end of the day, why not be there at the beginning of the day?

MR. MCCURRY: I think in suggesting that we are making our views very well known to the parties and what our interests are in protecting the public health, we're fulfilling that responsibility and there would not be these conversations I am reporting to you with Mr. Lindsey if they didn't at the end of the day know that the White House was going to have to be -- find whatever settlement they propose as it relates to the action that the federal government needs to take, acceptable to the President.

Q But is there something that's preventing or militating against the United States being a party to these negotiations at this point?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. I mean, specifically because the actions currently pending are litigation brought by states through their attorneys general on behalf of plaintiffs, so that is -- those are matters that we are not party to, I don't believe, because we have not entered into that litigation.

Q But apparently the negotiations are straying from merely individual, state by state interests to the national interests issues, namely a nationally granted -- liability.

MR. MCCURRY: There are differences between tort liability claims brought on the part of individuals and then the action that we've taken to protect the national public health. And we've made very clear what our assertion of interests are. We've made very clear also our belief that tort liability claims of individuals have to be considered and we'll see where they go as the parties discuss it.

There are intersecting issues here that reflect different levels of responsibility, whether it's the state governments who have brought suit because they are trying to recover funds that they have expended under Medicare, or whether it's the national interest that is reflected in what we promulgated as national policy with respect to tobacco advertising and access of tobacco products to minors. And I think that obviously some of these concerns intersect.

Q Mike, to follow, is the size of the compensation pot a presidential interest or not? Is it something that you will pass on this whether this is adequate or not?

MR. MCCURRY: The President's interest here is assuring that those plaintiffs who have legitimate claims see that their concerns and needs are addressed. I'm not going to put a dollar figure on it or attempt to do that. That's something that needs to be worked out

by  
the parties as they discuss these matters.

Q Does he think that's a legitimate claim? In other words, is he merely protecting their rights to sue, or does he agree with the proposition: Yes, there is some liability; the question is how much?

MR. MCCURRY: He agrees with the proposition that all of the parties that are represented in this dispute have to be satisfied with the agreement that is reached, that you can't short change any one group, and the settlement needs to take into account the needs of all the parties.

Q Does he think that the parties would ever have gotten to the table in this way if the FDA and the administration hadn't acted --

MR. MCCURRY: I think the President believes it's highly unlikely that we would be having these conversations, which represent, as you can clearly understand, a major departure from the position the industry has taken in the past, if it weren't for the fact that the FDA is proceeding and the President is proceeding to protect America's health interests, and specifically the health needs of kids. I think Dr. Kessler, in fact, has even said that today, too.

Q New subject?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes.

Q On the 70 occasions when Webb Hubbell apparently visited the White House, did he or did he not meet with the President and First Lady?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, I would assume he did. I don't know the specific answer to that. I would assume he did. He played golf with the President up at Camp David on at least one occasion, and I would assume that he saw the President and the First Lady. I don't know that for a fact, but I don't know any reason why he wouldn't have.

Q Mike, also, at the time that he played golf, is there any concern about the arrangement of his playing golf with the President and Truman Arnold, who provided money for him?

MR. MCCURRY: No. At the time, they were friends and they would have been golfing partners and would have had that kind of opportunity to socialize.

Q You mean, they did golf together before.

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, yes, the President, I think --

Q The President golfed with Truman Arnold and --

MR. MCCURRY: The President knew Truman Arnold well, and I think had probably golfed with him on occasion. They all knew each other and I think probably had played golf -- I mean, I don't know for a fact that they had played golf together in the past, but I wouldn't doubt it.

Q Some key Senators are saying that if the Alexis Herman vote doesn't happen tomorrow that it's lost, and a lot of people are saying that it doesn't look like it's going to happen tomorrow. What's the White House's plan B for this Alexis Herman nomination?

MR. MCCURRY: We are working very closely with any Senator who has got concerns related to the nomination or related to unrelated issues, to address those concerns so we can proceed with the vote. At the end of the day, we believe she will be confirmed, and we are working as hard as we can to satisfy the concerns that Senators have raised principally on a matter that is, while within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor, not something that has been specifically raised about Alexis Herman.

Q To address those concerns, is the President prepared to drop the draft executive order on federal contracting, or will he consult with senators to change the draft as it's circulating around?

MR. MCCURRY: We are actively consulting with senators already. The executive order itself was only in formation and was -- had not neared final draft form in any event.

Q Would you say it's on hold now?

MR. MCCURRY: I'd say that it's still in progress, but not nearing completion.

Q Just to get back to tonight's meeting --

Q Can we just finish this?

Q Okay.

Q Are you saying it's not nearing completion, and are you saying that it won't near completion anytime soon?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I'm just saying it's not -- it's going through the regular rulemaking review and the OMB ordered review, and that, in any event, had a ways to go.

Q But it's still his intention to issue it?

MR. MCCURRY: It's still his intention, as the Vice President announced in February, to proceed with that executive order. It's not dissimilar from the kinds of approaches that some Republican governors have taken. Governor Pataki, Governor Christine Todd Whitman on project labor contracts have done similar things. We are looking at promulgating some type of federal executive order on that, but that will have to continue to be reviewed through an interagency process that will likely take some more time.

Q In the wake of all of this new controversy with Alexis Herman, though, is the White House prepared to say now that the nomination is in trouble?

MR. MCCURRY: No. The White House is prepared to say that she deserves to be confirmed and confirmed quickly. That department needs to have a secretary in place. It's been a long time.



There is  
a vote that's been scheduled, and the vote needs to occur.

Q -- at the time to be confirmed.

MR. MCCURRY: We're working hard to unsnag the snag.

Q What's on the agenda this afternoon with the Hispanic Caucus?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sorry?

Q The President's meeting with the Hispanic Caucus.

MR. MCCURRY: He's looking forward to an opportunity to talk to them on a range of issues, principally and interestingly, first and foremost, education. Accessibility of education, particularly as it relates to bilingual education programs for adult and young Hispanic populations, is a very, very important part of economic empowerment for the Hispanic American community. Really, the need to make sure that quality education is available and that particularly the kind of funding that we have proposed in our FY98 budget for bilingual and English as a second language programs is really part of making sure that Hispanic Americans can participate fully in the economic life of the nation because that becomes to their economic performance in the future.

There will be other issues that they will want to review, too, I'm sure, related to immigration, some of the changes we're seeking in welfare reform as they relate to benefits for legal immigrants. There will be some discussion of the President's upcoming trip to Mexico and to Latin America. I think the Hispanic caucus has already said publicly they want to talk about representation of Hispanic Americans in appointments made by the President and the general question of representation in the federal employment work force. And all of those issues, the President is prepared to address and looks

forward to a good conversation.

Q Any coverage for this event?

MR. MCCURRY: Not -- no, these are -- are we doing it in the Residence? It's one of these ongoing sort of part social, part business efforts we've been making to reach out in a bipartisan way to members of the Congress.

Q Mike, are you going to do any readout after tonight's dinner?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't plan to. I think we've given you a good sense of what the lay of the land is. I can tell you more tomorrow about the President's general reaction to it. Some of the members who participate might stop by -- if there is a stake out, might stop by and give some of their own feelings to it, but I'd prefer to kind of do the general reaction to it tomorrow if that's okay.

Q Mike, it seems like the meeting might have more value if Gingrich and Helms were both there. I wonder, if these are real scheduling conflicts, whether you guys considered moving the meeting, or if they're not real scheduling conflicts, that this is more evidence that Gingrich isn't really part of the process -- that he suggested he wasn't on the budget last week.

MR. MCCURRY: He's a part of the process because the Speaker of the House always is. I don't know the nature of the scheduling conflict they had, though we would have been delighted to have them there.

But we also, in the case of Chairman Helms, I think it's well known that we work sometimes at -- in a somewhat different direction with him on some foreign policy issues, but we also have ways of reaching out to him, as I think Secretary Albright ably demonstrated just recently. So we remain in close contact with the chairman. His agenda is certainly a somewhat different agenda from the President's and the administration's, but we will seek additional opportunities

to work together with him.

I would also suggest in his case, he's very familiar with the President's strategic vision in foreign policy and works on that almost daily in his capacity as chairman of the committee, so this session will be a way to enlighten a broader sampling of both the House and the Senate on a range of issues.

Q Mike, back on the Herman nomination, aren't you risking setting a poor precedent by the kind of soft language you're using in responding to these extortionate demands? It's one thing to --

MR. MCCURRY: Leo, we're trying to get her confirmed. I'm trying to be careful so I don't mess that up. (Laughter.)

Q Well, that's my question -- if you have a nomination --

MR. MCCURRY: If it really was getting in as much trouble as some of the questions concern, I think you'd be hearing a little different --

Q My question, Mike, is this: If you have a nomination where somebody up there objects about something in the background or experience of the nominee, that's one thing and you folks are addressing that. But if they're going to hold nominations hostage and you respond in very mild, accommodating fashion, doesn't this set a precedent for them to simply raise the ante on something else and pretty soon you're held up on all kinds of things being ultra nice to people and tactics that you really should not counter?

MR. MCCURRY: No. (Laughter.)

Q Setting your hair on fire --

Q Why --

MR. MCCURRY: Because -- look, we're trying to -- we've got an issue, we're trying to work it out. In the end of day, we hope she is confirmed and we hope she's confirmed in the next 24 48 hours, so we will see what happens.

Q What's holding you back from denouncing their tactics?

MR. MCCURRY: Our desire to see her confirmed.

Q What does the President want out of this conference tomorrow? Anything concrete that he's looking for, or is this primarily just discussion?

MR. MCCURRY: Let me talk a little bit about the White House Conference on Early Childhood Development and Learning, what the newest research on the brain tells us about our youngest children.

The formal title of tomorrow's conference, I'd like to see --

Q Does this take the record for the longest title of a White House conference yet?

MR. MCCURRY: I hope so. It had better. Maybe we had better get that on the placard right behind. But the conference is going to highlight some very important new research on brain development in

very young children, principally children ages zero through three, discuss what it means for parents, for care givers and for policy makers.

We know now that a child's early development is heavily affected by the things that parents and others who care for children do with them and around them very, very early in life. And what we want to do tomorrow through the interest that the President and the First Lady have generated in the subject is to share some of this important research, to provide some of the experts who have really developed the information, and then share that with the broader communities so that in the end, as the specific outcome, parents understand how important it is for them to begin nurturing children very early in life.

The conference itself will be a call to action to all members of society, including the business, the faith, the health communities.

It'll be a chance for the media, for health care specialists, for health care providers to understand what they can specifically do to create more opportunities for young people to get the kind of

nurturing they need early in life, and the President will, in fact, have some pretty specific announcements that he makes tomorrow about things that the federal government can do to encourage this type of very important care for the early development of the health care needs of children.

Q Is he going to attend the whole thing, all day long?

MR. MCCURRY: He will be -- I think there are two sessions. There is a session that begins at 10:30 a.m. The first session goes from 10:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. There's a lunch in the State Dining Room for some of the participants, and we think the President probably will attend on that. He has an option on that. The First Lady will host throughout the day, obviously, and then there's a second session tomorrow in the afternoon from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Q Can you say what the coverage is?

MR. MCCURRY: Coverage is in house pool coverage, plus a media affairs pool on a rotating basis. And we've got audio -- will be fed all day long in here, so you can follow very closely the expert testimony that's being provided.

Q Will you brief tomorrow?

Q So, Mike, it's primarily an educational conference to spread the news about the research, rather than a policy --

MR. MCCURRY: It's partly that. It's partly to highlight and put some real focus on the needs that little kids have when they're very young in life. I think that many parents don't understand what impact they can have on children who are in the almost pre toddler age, and making sure that parents understand that and figuring out ways that information can get to parents is part of the task tomorrow, and there will be, as I say -- you know, the President does have some specific outcomes in mind of things that we can do to move

beyond just the conference itself to make sure we develop both government policies, then also working with health providers and others ways that we can follow up on some of the research that will be talked about tomorrow.

Q Are these things that have not been out in the public yet?  
Aren't these --

MR. MCCURRY: There are a couple of things the President will announce tomorrow that have not been public yet.

Q -- no, no, no, I don't mean the President, I mean, this information -- this research and things you're talking about. Is it already well publicized --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, a lot of it is new, but right now it's more often shared within the medical community and in medical journals and places where the experts talk about pediatric care and early infant care. What we're trying to do is move it more into the popular culture now to make sure that parents have a better understanding of what they can do that will really help their children develop, both mentally and physically, early in life in a way that will lead to better health and better opportunity later in life.

Q And what time do you expect his announcements?

MR. MCCURRY: Probably in the early session, in the first session in the morning.

Q What do you say to critics who contend the President went exactly in the wrong direction, given all this knowledge, by signing the welfare bill and shortchanging the needs of young kids by putting greater stress on their parents and putting them out of the home?

MR. MCCURRY: We'd say they're wrong.

Q But I mean --

MR. MCCURRY: Because for all of the reasons that when we had the welfare reform -- because, ultimately, another thing that will nurture and provide better health care and better quality of life for

children who grow up in households in which the parent or parents are contributing wage earning, taxpaying members of our community and not dependent on public assistance. The culture of dependency is debilitating to the health care needs of young children and to the emotional and physical needs of young people, and that's why the President's --

Q But if you have single parent households, and when you put in a work requirement and that one parent has to leave that child and can't nurture that child during the waking moments of that child, aren't you aggravating the situation?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that's one of the reasons why we put such a stress on the day care opportunities that have to be available. Quality day care is part of the nurturing of young people, but also young people understanding --

Q How do you get that?

MR. MCCURRY: By, among other things, approving some of the proposed increases in funding that the President has encouraged, providing some of the type of targeted tax relief that we've suggested, the earned income tax credit has worked in some respects to be helpful along those lines, so the variety of public policies that we have pursued that make it clear that work as an environment in which to raise families is preferable to dependency. It creates a better set of structures within the family that allow young people to go on and learn their responsibilities and their contributions.

Q Why not have coverage of all of the kids who are eligible for Head Start? You've always short cut the funding on that, and there are thousands of kids who are disadvantaged who should be going to Head Start.

MR. MCCURRY: We should be balancing the budget and figuring out how to devote resources to those kinds of needs.

Q Related to that, the budget walk through talks are supposed to end today. Could you summarize from the White House perspective

where  
the sides are closer together as a result of two weeks of talks  
and  
whether the President is going to meet with leadership next week,  
or  
what's the next step?

MR. MCCURRY: No, they are continuing to talk and we'll see what happens next week.

Q You don't want to summarize, or there are no --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to provide substantive readouts on the meetings that have been underway. I think they've been successful in part because I haven't.

Q No, no, I'm not asking that. I'm saying, do you think on children's health or tax cuts --

MR. MCCURRY: I think they are narrowing some of the differences, but in other areas there continue to be differences that need to be bridged.

Q And no plan for a meeting here?

MR. MCCURRY: We'll see how things go.

Q Has the President been in touch with Saudi Arabia on the hundreds of children?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, the President was very concerned about the death of those who have made pilgrimage to Mecca, and expressed his condolences to King Fahd last night. He also publicly expressed his sympathy for the victims. He understands the enormous emotional importance of the Hajj within the Islamic faith, and that doubles the sense of tragedy that the President feels as a result of the fire that occurred in the tents on the Mina plateau.

Q Mike, will the President be seeing the Chinese Foreign Minister when he's in Washington next week?

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I have heard. Qian Qichen is going to be in



Washington.

Q Madeleine Albright said that last night.

MR. MCCURRY: That's a surprise to me. We'll check into that.

Q Mike, two questions. One -- going back to Alexis Herman. You said before that it's still his intention to proceed with that executive order. Is there any doubt at all that he will proceed with that?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think there is any doubt we will proceed with it. I think it just is impossible to say at this point what the final shape of the order will be.

Q And also, might we be getting some ambassadorial appointments this week?

MR. MCCURRY: I doubt that very much. I think the President's deliberations on that are pretty well advanced, but ambassadorial appointments go through a somewhat different type of screening in terms of some of the background and some of the other checks that happen. Then there is an additional step that involves contacting the government that we propose to send a representative to. And that process, I think will take some time, so I don't anticipate announcements this week.

Q The Fed while you're at it? Could you check on the Fed?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't have anything -- I don't have any announcements to make on appointments yet.

Q You may have already indicated and I missed it -- do we have a meeting time, date set for Mark Lee?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe it's going to be Friday, and do we have time yet? The Vice President will have a meeting with the prominent Hong Kong Parliamentarian Martin Lee on Friday. I believe it's going to be afternoon, but I don't think that's certain yet. And the President is expected to join that meeting in progress.

Q I apologize if you went over this morning, but who is coming to this meeting tonight?

MR. MCCURRY: Tonight?

Q Yes.

MR. MCCURRY: I think between 35 and 50 members of the House and the Senate, drawn mostly from the key foreign policy and appropriating committees that deal with foreign policy and national security issues, bipartisan, representing both sides. And after we see who actually is able to come, because there were some that were still tentative about whether they'd be able to attend, we'll try to give you a better sense of who is actually there.

Q Do you think that could happen -- once the meeting starts?

MR. MCCURRY: Probably, yes, if we can. We can do that.

Q Mike, is the primary interest going to be CWC or is it the other topics as well?

MR. MCCURRY: As I said this morning, it's really -- I mean, it is, broadly defined, first, an opportunity for the President to talk about his six major priorities in foreign policy for his second term, then a long session about the future of Europe to begin with, a working dinner at which we'll do some selected topics ranging from resources to support our diplomacy to U.N. arrears to the CWC, to Mexico and some of the President's interests in the Latin America trip; then another working session after the dinner that will deal with our engagement with Asia and the Pacific community.

Q Can you get Sandy Berger out here to answer some of there questions? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: All of you who were at the gaggle can chastise Mr. Neikirk for asking that question. (Laughter.)

Q Did the President personally make any phone calls on Alexis Herman's behalf today?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know the answer to that. He's been calling senators with respect to the Chemical Weapons Convention, and I don't

rule out the possibility the other matter may have come up depending on who he was talking to.

Q Is he going to approach Senator Helms directly, or has he on chemical weapons?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've had -- I think -- he has -- the President's talked principally to the Majority Leader on this issue, and as you heard from the earlier briefing, the Majority Leader has structured a very effective way of dealing with the concerns of senators, including Chairman Helms. Obviously, Secretary Albright has had extensive contact with them. And there has been a negotiation, obviously, with respect to these conditions that we've attached to the convention that has involved Chairman Helms. So, I think he's -- they've had good contact. I'm not aware that the two of them have talked directly, but I think we have an effective way of addressing some of the concerns Chairman Helms has raised.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

MR. MCCURRY: Thank you. (Applause.)

END  
2:40 P.M. EDT

## M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 16 April 97 17:29  
**FROM** Wozniak, Natalie S.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** April 16 Berger/Bell Press Briefing on CWC [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Benjamin, Daniel  
Blinken, Antony J.  
Gibney, James S.  
Gray, Wendy  
Johnson, David T.  
LaFleur, Vinca A.  
Luzzatto, Anne R.  
Naplan, Steven J.  
Rubin, Eric S.  
Wozniak, Natalie S.  
**CARBON\_COPY** NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE  
**TEXT\_BODY** [[ SRB0416.doc : 4373 in SRB0416.doc ]]  
**ATTACHMENT  
FILE DATE** 16 April 97 17:28  
**ATTACHMENT  
FILE NAME** SRB0416.doc

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release April 16, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING

BY

NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR SAMUEL BERGER

AND

NSC SENIOR DIRECTOR FOR DEFENSE AND ARMS CONTROL POLICY

ROBERT BELL

The Briefing Room

1:35 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: First, for your enjoyment and entertainment today, given the President's focus on foreign policy matters of great significance, I've asked the President's National Security Advisor, Samuel R. Berger, to be here to tell you more about the work the President's doing today on two fronts: first, his meeting with a bipartisan group of senators and members of the House, tonight for a real intense session on foreign policy objectives the administration is pursuing that we hope we will pursue in a bipartisan way; then secondly, the work the President will do today to secure the very necessary ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Sandy will also then introduce my favorite briefer at the White House, Mr. Robert Bell, the NSC Senior Director for Defense and Arms Control Policy -- close enough? And he can walk you through a real important development in the CWC debate on the Senate, occurring today, which we put out some paper on earlier.

Mr. Berger, welcome to the Briefing Room.

Q Does that ensure the passage, these conditions that you've agreed to?

MR. BERGER: Okay, let me just say a few things first. Does that mean I'm the second favorite briefer? I'm certainly not the favorite, I guess. (Laughter.)

Q Don't worry about it. We make up our own minds. (Laughter.)

MR. BERGER: Tonight, as Mike indicated, the President will be hosting a meeting at Blair House of a very broad cross section of congressional leadership, particularly those who are involved in foreign affairs appropriations and defense policy issues on the Hill.

This is a session that will go from roughly 6:00 p.m. until 9:00 p.m. It is something the President has wanted to do since very early in the year, just to call together and convene a mini retreat with the Congress to talk about a fairly broad range of our foreign policy

objectives over the next four years and engage in a give and take with the members of Congress.

The President will be talking about NATO enlargement. He'll be talking about Asia and our relationships there. He'll be talking about how we -- our fight against terrorism and drugs, expanding the international trading system, Bosnia, a wide range of issues in an exchange with the leadership. And I think it's a very important opportunity for both the President and the congressional leadership to build a kind of bipartisan consensus around America's leadership in the world.

Now, as part of that, the President will speak directly tonight to this group about a priority that is coming to a head next week, and that is the Chemical Weapons Convention. And I want to say a few words about that, and then I want to ask Bob to brief you on some quite important developments over the past few days.

There is an enormous amount at stake in the vote which we now expect will take place next week on the Chemical Weapons Convention.

First is the question of America's leadership in the fight against weapons of mass destruction. We have been the prime movers of this treaty for almost 20 years. The negotiations began under President Reagan; they came to conclusion under President Bush, who signed this treaty. And if we now, having, in a sense, been the originators and the prime drivers of this treaty, fail to ratify it, we become associated with the outlier nations, as opposed to those who are inside the treaty trying to build a new regime against chemical weapons. We become associated with the Iraqs and the Libyas, as opposed to the broad swath of the international community that's fighting chemical weapons.

General Schwarzkopf in his characteristically straightforward way, I don't particularly want to be associated with those thugs. And I think issue number one is America's ability to continue to lead in

the world in fighting weapons of mass destruction.

Second, I think most of you are aware, we are destroying our chemical weapons stockpiles. This is a decision that was made in the '80s because of judgment by our military and civilian leaders that we did not need them, that they were not a necessary or appropriate weapon. So this treaty is about other people destroying their stockpiles, not about us destroying our stockpiles, and reducing the threat to a future American military unit that might be on the battlefield.

Third, this treaty makes it harder for rogue states to develop chemical weapons by, first of all, even if they're outside of the treaty, by imposing restrictions on the transfer of chemicals that can be used for chemical weapons; by a very aggressive inspection system whereby if there's a suspected location in which prohibited weapons are being manufactured, international inspectors can be sent to that site; and, third, by putting them outside the system, outside the international community.

So it is another tool to isolate and fight the development of chemical weapons by rogue states. Finally, it is another tool in the ability to fight terrorists who might use chemical weapons. Obviously, nothing can stop the terrorists from cooking up chemical weapons in their basement, but by reducing the stockpiles, these enormous stockpiles in the hands of most of the countries in the world, many of the countries in the world, by restricting the transfer of these chemicals by imposing an inspection regime, all of these things together will make it more difficult for terrorists to obtain these weapons.

And that is why this is a treaty that is supported by a very, very broad, cross section of Democrats and Republicans across a very broad, ideological spectrum. Obviously, President Bush, every chairman of the joint chiefs of staff for the past 20 years, and a very distinguished array of former military CINCS and chiefs, Paul

Nitze, Ed Rowny, negotiators of arms control agreements under President Reagan and others, Secretary Baker, veterans groups, chemical manufacturers -- there is broad support for this treaty.

We, as I said, expect and hope to see a vote next week, because the treaty will come into force on April 29th. And if we are not in the treaty in the beginning, we will not be part of shaping how the institutions of this treaty take hold. We will not be part of the inspection teams. We will not be part of the executive committee that operates this treaty. We'll be on the outside rather than on the inside.

Now, what I want to ask Bob to brief you on is the result of a process that has been going now for over two months, and resulted from some early -- an early conversation that President Clinton had with Senator Lott, from which Senator Lott formed a group of senators to work with the administration, seeing whether we could address many of the concerns that have been raised by those who have some difficulties with the treaty. And in parallel, there has been a process between Senator Biden and Senator Helms. And as a result of those two processes, there are over 25 amendments to the articles of ratification that have been agreed to and that were released today by Senator Biden. And I want Bob to go through that with you and explain it because it really does address the broad range of concerns that have been raised about this treaty.

There still are some concerns that we can't address without gutting the treaty. We can't address some of these which are actually, in a sense, killer amendments. But we have gone the extra mile here to try to, in a serious and good faith fashion, address the concerns that many had about various aspects of this treaty. And I think as a result of that, the treaty that the Senate will vote on next week will be much stronger and tighter with the amendment's stronger and tighter regime than the one that was before them last year.



Q Does the agreement on the conditions ensure passage?

MR. BERGER: No, I wouldn't say that, Helen. I think that this is very much up in the air at this point. There is some strenuous opposition from some groups. And I would not say that this is -- the outcome of this is at all certain. And I hope that all of you will focus attention on this issue because I think it is really a jump ball at this point.

Q Sandy, while we have you for a second, there is a report from Israel television that the police in Israel are recommending that Prime Minister Netanyahu be indicted for his role in selecting that attorney general, and I wonder if you would care to react to this report.

MR. BERGER: I've seen the report, Wolf, but this is a matter for -- internal matter involving the Israeli government, the Israeli judicial system, and I don't think it's appropriate for me to comment on.

Q Sandy, do you see any prospect for compromise on these four so called "killer amendments" that are out there now?

MR. BERGER: I think on each of those, we have -- and Bob will describe it -- we have put forward an alternative which I think addresses much of the concern that is embodied in those areas. But I think at the end of the day, there will be a group of senators who will oppose the treaty and who do oppose the treaty.

Q What is the President going to do to make sure that at least the vote comes? Is he meeting personally with Senator Helms? Is there anything else he can do to those --

MR. BERGER: The President has been very, very active and will continue to be active. From the beginning, he's talked to many senators about this, spoken with Senator Lott particularly about it several times. We had the event here in the White House -- the President will be making more phone calls. We had last week a session with about 15 senators here at the White House. He will raise it tonight at the retreat, and I suspect that he'll be speaking

to  
it more in the next week.

Q Will Senator Lott be at the retreat tonight? Will Arme y and  
Gingrich -- any of the --

MR. BERGER: I believe Senator Lott will be there. I don't  
believe  
the Speaker will be there tonight.

Q Was he invited?

MR. BERGER: I don't have the list, honestly.

Q Could you provide the list for us?

MR. BERGER: Maybe after the event. I'd rather give you the list  
of people who actually come than the list of people who --

Q If it's leadership in foreign policy and defense, wouldn't  
Senator  
Helms and the Speaker at least have been invited?

MR. BERGER: Oh, they certainly were invited.

MR. MCCURRY: They were both invited and unable to attend.

MR. BERGER: I think there, obviously, in a situation like this  
always going to be conflicts. But there will be 35, 40 members.

Q Do you think the Senate's going to ratify the Chemical Weapons  
Convention?

MR. BERGER: Ann, I honestly don't know the answer to that  
question. I'm not trying to be cute here. I think that this is  
-- I  
think there are a lot of undecided senators. I think the stakes  
are  
enormously high, and I think it would be a tremendous setback for  
the  
fight against terrorism and the fight against chemical weapons if  
we  
did not ratify this treaty. But I can't tell you that I know  
what  
the outcome will be.

Q Sandy, let me go back just for a minute to the Netanyahu topic  
just  
for a minute. I know that it's an internal matter vis a vis  
Israel,

but clearly that has ramifications for the United States. I mean, what are the U.S. concerns as they relate to this?

MR. BERGER: No, I'm not going to answer it any differently than I answered to Wolf. Dennis Ross is in Israel, he will go forward in his meetings. He'll be meeting with the Prime Minister I believe today.

Q What is the status of State Department reorganization? Senator Helms -- obviously, that's a priority for him to at least in some way mollify him --

MR. BERGER: We have been very, very actively engaged over the past several weeks in an internal exercise to develop a set of options for the President that he can decide among for reform of the foreign policy agencies. How you reform them is a subject of some disagreement. That there needs to be reform, I think, is not subject to disagreement. I would expect that we'll be in a position to present those options to the President in the very near future.

Q Is he going to be briefing the group tonight on the options?

MR. BERGER: I suspect that they may raise this issue, but as of now, we have not gone to the President with the options. But I think that we are a very -- we're getting close to being able to do that.

Q Can you just talk a little more about what the President hopes to get out of tonight?

MR. BERGER: I think -- let me take this last question and then we'll ask Bob to step up. I think there is no concrete or specific objective -- that is, agreement, on the level of the State Department appropriations bill. I think this is part of a larger process and a way of doing business that I think we've tried very hard since January to engage in, and that is, bring the Congress into the formulation of foreign policy to the extent we can, trying to seek

bipartisan consensus where we can. The Secretary of State has been very active in that. The Secretary of Defense -- by definition, anytime he speaks to anybody in the administration, it's a bipartisan conversation.

I've been very active in it, and Ambassador Richardson, in spending time on the Hill, trying to explain what we're doing, trying to listen to the Hill in terms of their views. And so I think it's a give and take where the President has an opportunity to define what his core objectives are as he did to the newspaper editors and in the State of the Union, and then focus particularly on two or three for this discussion, probably NATO, perhaps Bosnia, Asia, CWC, given the fact that there is a limited amount of time. And I'm sure the senators and congressmen will have their own individual matters they'll want to raise.

Thank you.

MR. BELL: As Sandy said, we believe that yesterday was a milestone in the Senate's ratification proceedings on the Chemical Weapons Convention. Final agreement was reached on 23 conditions to the resolution of ratification that will accompany this treaty. Agreement was reached with Senator Helms, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Now, as everyone here knows, and I'm sure across the country in schools and homes as well, the United States Constitution provides that treaties can only be ratified and entered into force by the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. This is the advice part, these conditions. And we hope to get to the consent part next week.

As Sandy said, reaching this milestone is really a tribute to many, many different leaders and officials who have been involved the last two and a half months in this process. The White House deeply appreciates the cooperations and good offices of the Majority Leader

who, as Sandy said, established this nine member steering group and engaged in meetings over about 30 hours that produced about two thirds of the conditions in this package.

I just want to say from my involvement in the process, that Senator Lott is a very tough negotiator, indeed, and would just remind you that last September, when the treaty was set aside, the point of departure was that if we could agree on perhaps three conditions -- three conditions -- we might be able to get the treaty back up. We're here today with agreement on 23 -- I think this could get as high as 25 or perhaps 30 by the time the treaty is called up Wednesday. So it's come a long ways.

We would also want to thank all of the senators that were involved in Senator Lott's steering group -- task force, that is -- Senator Nickles, Senator Helms, Senator Kyl, Senator Stevens, Senator McCain, Senator Warner, Senator Coverdell, Senator Shelby, and Senator Smith, which was indeed a representative sampling of the views within the Republican caucus on this treaty; and, of course, the senior staff, including Senator Lott's lead negotiator, Randy Scheunemann had carried the ball for about 30 more hours of negotiations. And last but certainly not least, to Senator Biden and Senator Helms who, themselves, as Senator Biden said in his cover letter, spent about 28 hours negotiating this package and carrying it from the 17 mark to the 23 mark, with maybe a few more to come.

Now, outside this package, there are two critical issues that have been under intense negotiation between Sandy Berger and Senator Lott himself that have been at the heart of a lot of the debate on the treaty. That is the issue of search warrants and the issue of those appropriate uses of riot control agents, or RCAs in wartime scenarios. I think we're very close on that, and we hope to get final

agreement very soon on those two issues, taking the package to 25.

Now, these agreed conditions represent extraordinary progress over two and a half months in addressing virtually all of the issues that have been raised during the debate on the treaty.

I might add that you've heard criticism of the treaty, to be sure, over the last few weeks, particularly the last few days, including in hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee. And I would just say that many of the critics, most of the critics, both in the op ed pieces, the editorials and witnesses before the committee, have not -- I repeat -- not been privy to these conditions. So we would hope that as soon as we can make these conditions available to those that have raised so many concerns about the treaty, that their concerns would be moderated or perhaps even allayed, and we could broaden the base of bipartisan support for the treaty.

As it stands today, and assuming that we do close with the Majority Leader on the search warrant and riot control agent issue, we would then go to the floor next week for a debate on the treaty that will probably focus on three fundamental propositions where we've not been able to reach agreement with Senator Helms, even though as Sandy said, we have made offers that go way beyond the benchmark of last September in each case.

Those three propositions are, first, the question of whether U.S. participation and leadership in this treaty regime should be held hostage to some other state or some other group of states joining the treaty first, whether that state is Russia or Libya. Second, the issue of whether the assurances and certifications that the President has made in this agreed package, which are binding, legally binding conditions on the President, whether those assurances, as they

relate  
to two specific parts of the treaty, Article X and Article XI,  
which  
have to do with various kinds of assistance that might be  
provided  
to other states, whether those assurances are sufficient to meet  
the  
concerns or whether, as we believe Senator Helms will insist, the  
Senate vote on a proposition to reopen the treaty, reopen the  
negotiation, go back and actually try to renegotiate Article X  
and  
Article XI of the treaty, a proposition that we don't think is  
realistic or feasible.

And then, finally, a vote on a proposition that the treaty only  
enter into force, in terms of U.S. participation, if the  
President  
certifies a standard of verification that we know the Director of  
Central Intelligence cannot support, and thus the President could  
not  
make.

We have offered in this negotiation to certify a very high  
standard  
of verification effectiveness indeed, the capability to detect a  
systematic effort by an adversary to equip across the ranks his  
army  
with an offensive CW capability. But the Senate will vote on  
whether  
that is a sufficient level of verification under the treaty or  
whether it will insist on a standard that we couldn't meet.

Now, we're confident, when these issues come to a vote next week,  
if we can get it to a vote, that when the full Senate works its  
will  
on these issues, which, after all, is the procedure envisioned  
and  
called for under the Constitution, that the Senate will make the  
right choice and will not adopt amendments that would have the  
effect  
of killing the treaty by preventing us from joining it.

Q Did they make any promises? What was their quid pro quo? What  
do  
they get -- the so called negotiation?

MR. BELL: Well, Helen, I think the negotiation of the treaty in  
Geneva is a lot like a negotiation in Congress between the House  
and  
Senate.

Q I meant the conditions that --

MR. BELL: I was going to come to that. You go into negotiation, and a lot of countries come to the negotiation and they want a lot of things. This is a treaty, as Secretary Albright has said, that was negotiated with a "Made in USA" stamp on it. This is a treaty that we took the leadership in negotiating. Most of the key provisions are provisions that were agreed to at American initiative. But like in any negotiation you'll find some language in a treaty that was necessary to be put in there to sort of get out of the negotiation and let countries have a way of receding to the U.S. position in the talks.

What's happened in the ratification phase is that critics have focused on some fairly general language and presented some worst case concerns about how it might be interpreted. What we've done through these assurances in most cases is to make clear that we don't interpret it that way, and that we would make a maximum effort, do everything within our power, to make sure no one else interprets it that way.

Just one example, some critics have said that under Article XI of the treaty there is a requirement for us to take down the Australia group multilateral export controls on certain types of chemicals that an outlaw state might find valuable in making weapons of mass destruction. We have now agreed with Senator Helms on a condition in which the President not only certifies that we don't read it that way, but he certifies that we have sent instructions to our ambassadors in all 30 countries that belong to the Australia group -- they have gone in to see the host country, and at the highest diplomatic levels have received assurances back that none of the states of the Australia group read the treaty that way, that none of them are going to claim that the Chemical Weapons Convention



supersedes the Australia group restraints.

And there is a mechanism beyond that, on a year by year basis, where we'll report to the Senate on our success in keeping the Australia group restraints in place. That's indicative, I think, of the kinds of conditions that we've been able to work out.

Q Do you acknowledge that the critics of the treaty identified deficiencies in the absence of these 25 agreements? Or was it simply a matter of clarifying what the administration's intent was?

MR. BELL: It's a very complex treaty. I doubt that anyone in the room has read it. When you do read it, it's almost overwhelming in terms of level of detail. There are formulations in here, as I said, that were arrived at to be able to conclude the negotiation. If read in isolation or out of context, there is a sentence here, a sentence there that can raise concerns.

The senators are totally within their rights -- it's the prerogative of the Senate to ask these kinds of questions. It's the intention of the Constitution by giving the treaty partnership role to the Senate and requiring a two thirds vote to ensure that there's an extraordinary level of scrutiny and questioning about treaties because, after all, the Founding Fathers knew that treaties were forever. So this has been a perfectly legitimate and appropriate process that we've gone through. It's taken us to now, I think, through this package, to get all the clarifications and all of the conditions communicated in a way that we think should be compelling. We had hoped that we had done that in the hearings over the last three years.

But, as you know, senators are busy, they can't go to all the hearings. There was a lot of testimony, a lot of assurances that were given in the hearings that were perhaps missed. I think this focuses everyone's attention now on the exact terms under which we had entered the treaty.

Q Has it been the administration's position that much of the

criticism of this was politically motivated? That was the line last fall when the passage fell apart.

MR. BELL: I believe what we said last fall was that the letter that Senator Dole wrote to his colleagues the night before the vote that the treaty was due to come up just created an impossible political situation because the environment by then was so super charged with the presidential campaign that an objective review by the Senate of the treaty was not necessarily guaranteed, and that it would be better to just let things calm down and put this over until after the election, which is what we did.

Q Bob, are you now assured of a vote next week, or is that still in some doubt?

MR. BELL: The Majority Leader will have to address that himself.

He has certainly, on a number of occasions over the last week, in an informal way, assured Senator Daschle that this is coming to a vote.

We take the assurances of the Majority Leader explicitly; he's a man of honor and we respect that. At the end of the day, of course, the floor debate is governed by a unanimous consent agreement in most cases, and as Richard Perle once said, the devil's in the detail. So working out that last bit of detail and unanimous consent agreement

--

Q -- employee of this administration.

MR. BELL: Sorry, I think that was back when Richard was a Democrat. But -- (laughter) -- and was working for Senator Jackson.

At any rate, I think they're still right on the cusp of getting the unanimous consent agreement nailed down, and once that's promulgated and you have that delicious moment of silence where no one objects, then we know that we've got the treaty coming up and the terms of

reference agreed.

Q Just to follow up on John's question, do you now accept the reservations and concerns and objections that have still been raised of this treaty as substantive and not political?

MR. BELL: It's just not my role to characterize the motive of any senator. I worked up there too many years to get into that. But we do acknowledge that very valid concerns and questions have been raised about this treaty and we, in good faith, as Sandy said, have worked very hard, through 60 hours of hard negotiation --not just general discussion, but 60 hours of negotiation on the text of these conditions -- to make sure that we've addressed those concerns.

Q On another subject since you're here, is the U.S. government aware that Russia has broken its promise not to send advance conventional weapons to Iran?

MR. BELL: I'm going to pass on that if I could. I came in this morning and went right to work on the Chemical Weapons Convention and vaguely aware that there's a story on that. I've not had a chance to look into it myself. There might be others that can address it.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

2:03 P.M. EDT

# M S M a i l

---

**DATE-TIME** 17 April 97 08:55  
**FROM** Bell, Robert G.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Points for Principals on Conditions [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Murray, Lori E.  
**CARBON\_COPY** Bendick, Gordon L.  
Burrell, Christina L.  
Danvers, William C.  
Davis, William K.

**TEXT\_BODY**

ok - 3 edits:

1. Don't say at beginning "over 20" - let's stick with "23" (I know blast fax said "over 20" but let's use the actual number).
  2. Where it says "agreement has been reached" add "with Senator Helms and Lott" (this is the way POTUS put it)
  3. delete reference to "circulated by Senator Biden" at end (we are trying to downplay Biden's role with Republicans).
- Tjthanks.

---

From: Murray, Lori E.  
To: Bell, Robert G.; Bendick, Gordon L.; Blinken, Antony J.; Danvers, William C.; Harris, Elisa D.  
CC: /R, Record at A1  
Subject: Points for Principals on Conditions [UNCLASSIFIED]  
Date: Thursday, April 17, 1997 01:24 AM

<<Attached File: PRINCON.DOC>>

Attached are the points for principals on the 23 conditions for their calls to Senators. Please clear ASAP.