

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

http://classifiedhttp://classified/email/data_source/msmail/record/cd005/apr1997/3356cd50.html

page 1 of 37

M S M a i l DATE-TIME 17 April 97 20:10
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT April 17 Press Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Babcock, Douglas W.
Boulton, Darrien D.
Bujold, Noelle D.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Hamel, Michael A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Jordan, Donald L.
Kuipers, Keelin G.
Moore, Lori A.
Norris, John J.
Orfini, Michael H.
Wise, William M.
Woolston, Ann E.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY
[[APR17GUI.DOC : 5210 in APR17GUI.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 17 April 97 20:9
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME APR17GUI.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

April 17, 1997

CWC

Zaire

Haiti

Middle East

Cyprus/Aegean

Albania

Dalai Lama

Russia/NIS

Saudi Arabia/Khobar

Bosnia

China

North Korea

Trips and Visitors

Japan

Northern Ireland

Gulf War Illnesses

Nazi Assets

Fast Track

A-10 Search

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

CWC Update

Yesterday's breakthrough agreement on 23 conditions to the CWC instrument of ratification means that virtually all of the concerns raised by the Republican Caucus re. the treaty have been addressed. The negotiations that got us this package were put in place by POTUS and Lott, and Majority Leader, working with Biden and Helms, kept them on track.

Today, working on few remaining outstanding issues, including RCA and search warrants (need update from Bell on where we are).

Also today, underscoring fact that every single chairman of the JCS for the past two decades supports this treaty, Shali released letter from former military leaders and also statement of support from Brown, Richardson, Perry. At same time, in testimony on the Hill, Colin Powell strongly reiterated his support for CWC (need to make sure he in fact did this). And just

yesterday, two other key VSOs -- the Air Force Association and the Military Order of the Purple Heart -- endorsed the CWC, joining just about every major VSO, including VFW and the Reserve Officers Association.

Also worth noting that yesterday, President Ford, following meeting with Albright, endorsed the treaty, once again underscoring bipartisan, "made in America" nature of CWC: initiated by Reagan, completed and signed by Bush, sent to Senate by Clinton.

CWC enjoys broad, bipartisan support: President Bush, Colin Powell, Brent Scowcroft, Jim Baker, Ed Rowny, 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 Sen 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.

Sen 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: Sen 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.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 17, 1997

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Senate Decision to Bring Chemical Weapons Convention to a Vote

I welcome today's unanimous agreement by the Senate to bring the Chemical Weapons Convention to a vote next week. This treaty -- initiated by the Reagan Administration, completed and signed by the

Bush Administration, submitted to the Senate by my administration

--

has been bipartisan from the beginning. Now, thanks to the good faith efforts of Majority Leader Lott and Minority Leader Daschle

--

working closely with my national security team and key members of the

Senate from both sides of the aisle -- the Senate will be able to vote on the treaty before it goes into effect on April 29.

Over the past two and a half months, we have all gone the extra mile to work through outstanding concerns about the treaty. As a result of negotiations Senator Lott and I established, and discussions led by Senators Biden and Helms, we now have agreement on

28 conditions that will be included in the treaty's resolution of ratification when it goes to a vote -- resolving virtually all of the

issues that have been raised about the CWC.

Just today, our negotiators reached agreement concerning the use of

Riot Control Agents like tear gas and to require warrants for any involuntary searches of an American business or facility under the

treaty's inspection provisions. We still have five issues on which

we fundamentally disagree -- but we are now assured, thanks to today's agreement, that they will be decided by votes of the full Senate.

These important developments reflect widespread, bipartisan and growing support for the Chemical Weapons Convention. Yesterday, former Presidents Bush and Ford joined Secretary of State Albright in making a special appeal for ratification. Today, at a Congressional hearing, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell strongly reiterated his endorsement of the treaty -- which also has the support of every other Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the past two decades. And three former Secretaries of Defense -- Harold Brown, Elliot Richardson and Bill Perry -- released a joint statement calling for the Senate to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention.

All of these distinguished American leaders agree that by requiring countries around the world to destroy their chemical weapons stockpiles -- as the United States already has decided to do -- and to renounce developing or trading in chemical weapons in the future, the Chemical Weapons Convention will help make our troops safer while making it harder for rogue states and terrorists to acquire chemical weapons.

This treaty literally was "made in America" and it also is right for America. I urge every member of the Senate to support the Chemical Weapons Convention when it comes to a vote next week.

#

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.

HAITI

Q: What is your reaction to reports of U.S.-funded Haitian Police raiding the house of a U.S. citizen and aunt of an employee of the International Republican Institute (IRI)? Was this employee targeted by the police for his work as an election monitor?

A: We are concerned about this report which involves the property of an American citizen who is the aunt of an IRI employee. Our Embassy in Port-au-Prince is looking into the facts and circumstances surrounding this police action.

The Director General of the Haitian National Police has stated categorically that the search of the house had nothing to do with IRI and was not

targeted at anyone connected with IRI, noting that another house in the vicinity was searched as part of the same criminal investigation. He also stated that a public prosecutor accompanied the police who searched the house, and he now awaits a full report about the search from the public prosecutor. We understand that neither the house owner nor the IRI employee was in the house at the time of the search, and that the IRI employee only very occasionally stayed in the house.

We will continue to actively seek additional details surrounding this incident.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

Netanyahu

Q: What is your reaction to the news Israeli PM Bibi Netanyahu may be indicted?

A: I've seen these reports. Obviously it would be inappropriate for me to comment on an internal Israeli matter.

(NOTE: Avoid saying this is a "political" issue.)

Q: Does this sink your efforts to revive the MEPP?

A: No, we are continuing our efforts to get the process back on track.

Q: What is Dennis Ross doing now?

A: Ambassador Ross met with Chairman Arafat last night. He met with the Israeli leadership again today.

Not going to get into the substance of those talks. As we've said, the focus of his current trip is to help stop the recent deterioration and lay the basis for the peace process to advance.

Osama el-Baz Consultations in Washington

Q: Do you have anything on the Osama el-Baz consultations yesterday with Sandy Berger?

A: They met for about 45 minutes Wednesday afternoon. Had a good discussion of how United States and Egypt can cooperate to help the parties move forward in the peace process, and discussed other regional issues.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 17, 1997

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Death of Former Israeli President Chaim Herzog

I was informed this morning that former Israeli President, Chaim Herzog, had died after a long illness. I offer my heartfelt condolences to his family and to the people of Israel. Chaim Herzog not only served the Israeli people with distinction as their President for ten years, he was a courageous soldier in the liberation of Europe and a distinguished leader in the Israeli armed forces.

He will long be remembered for his years as a statesman and scholar -- he personified a vibrant, emerging Israel, taking its place in the community of nations.

#

CYPRUS/AEGEAN

Meeting of the Three Ambassadors

(Re General Osterthaler's On-the-Record April 16 Remarks at American Hellenic Institute)

Q: Did the U.S. Ambassadors to Greece, Turkey and Cyprus meet in Zurich recently to discuss U.S. initiatives on Cyprus and the Aegean?

A: Our Ambassadors in the region get together on occasion to discuss developments and compare notes. This was one such meeting.

Q: Is a paper containing recommendations on its way to the President?

A: The President is kept regularly informed on developments in the region and on our current plans and activities in addressing the problems there. As a matter of policy, we do not comment on such communications.

Q: Are you tying our Cyprus initiative to progress on Aegean issues?

A: We do not link the two issues. Obviously, progress on one would facilitate progress on the other. The U.S. has made clear its commitment to pursuing solutions to these problems.

Q: General Osterthaler said you had not yet decided whether to pursue an initiative on Cyprus. Is there going to be an American initiative?

A: We are fully committed to promoting a durable, workable Cyprus settlement. Real progress toward a settlement, however depends on the will of the parties to achieve a settlement.

Q: Are you prepared to send American troops to participate in a new peacekeeping force on Cyprus?

A: It is far too early in the Cyprus peace process to discuss detailed questions like that.

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.

RUSSIA/NIS

WT Story on Russian Arms Sales to Iran

We don't comment on the specifics of articles purporting to draw

on intelligence information.

U.S. officials at the highest levels frequently discuss with the Russian Government our opposition to the sale of advanced air defense systems to Iran; and we have received firm assurances that such sales would not occur.

The USG monitors all international arms sales activity closely and follows up on any credible information that illegal activities could occur.

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.

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.

Have contingency plan to deal with delays in Russia's contributions to the Space Station; now implementing first stage of those plans.

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

However, If Russia continues to have funding difficulties, we would implement further contingency steps, in measured fashion, to allow us to continue program. Will work closely with Congress and Russian partners in dealing with these issues.

NATO-Russia

Consultations with Russia continue; NATO Secretary General Solana met in Moscow again this week, discussed contents of proposed agreement with Primakov.

On idea of holding late-May NATO-Russia 'summit' to sign

Charter, we're prepared to consider it -- 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.

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 G-7 to Become 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

Train and Equip Program (CNN)

The international Train and Equip program is successfully helping to establish a stable military balance in Bosnia, which is one of the keys to establishing a lasting peace in the region.

The T&E program continues to facilitate concrete progress in the formation of joint Federation defense structures that will be critical to strengthening the Bosniak-Croat Federation.

Agreement on Central Bank and Currency

We are encouraged by the parties agreement to a central currency bank and a single currency valid for all transactions in Bosnia. The new Bosnia currency will be the "convertible marka" linked 1:1 to the German Deutsch Mark and fully backed by foreign currency.

This marks another important step toward implementation of Dayton and the building of common institutions necessary for a functioning single Bosnian state.

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

[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.

CHINA

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(New York, New York)

For Immediate Release
April 15,
1997

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

United Nations Human Rights Commission Vote on China

The United States deeply regrets that today in Geneva, the United Nations Human Rights Commission approved a motion by China that prevented a resolution on that nation's human rights record from coming to a vote. This action is inconsistent with

the fundamental principle the Commission is charged to defend: that how a nation treats its citizens is the legitimate concern of all mankind.

The United States has chosen to engage China across a broad range of issues because it is in our national interest to develop a positive and constructive relationship with a country that is home to a fifth of the world's population and is playing an increasingly important role in world affairs. At the same time, it should be clearly understood that we will continue to speak out on important issues where we disagree, and one of the most important of these issues is human rights.

By taking a stand against human rights abuses in China and around the world, we keep faith with those who champion these principles. We also maintain our leadership on human rights issues and express the deepest values of the American people.

#

NORTH KOREA

North Korea Food Donation

Q: Can you confirm that the US has agreed to provide 50,000 metric tons of corn valued at \$15 million to North Korea?

A: On April 3 the United Nations World Food Program (WFP) expanded its emergency food appeal by an additional 100,000 metric tons bringing its total to 200,000 metric tons. The expanded portion of the appeal is specifically targeted towards children under the age of 6, who WFP considers to be most at risk.

After close consultation with the Republic of Korea (ROK) and Japan, we decided to provide 50,000 metric tons of corn valued approximately \$15 million. Our response will fulfill just under 40 percent of the total WFP appeal in tonnage, and just over a fourth in dollar value.

Q: Is the assistance linked to obtaining North Korea's attendance at a joint briefing on the Four Party Peace initiative being held today in New York.

A: No. Our contribution is strictly a humanitarian one and provided to the World Food Program in response to its emergency appeal.

Q: Can you guarantee that the assistance won't be diverted to the North Korean army?

A: We believe channeling assistance through the World Food Program provides the best means to ensure that the aid is delivered to those most in need, particularly to vulnerable infants and you children.

WFP has an office and a staff of monitors in North Korea and is well-positioned to see that the assistance reaches its intended population.

Four Party Talks

We and South Korea met DPRK reps in NYC Wednesday to receive the North's reaction to the March 5 joint briefing we gave them regarding the scope and content of the four party talks.

The talks were constructive, but no agreements were reached. We will resume talks tomorrow and hope that meeting can reach agreement on when the four party talks should begin.

The North continues to be absorbed by the food crisis facing it, and has discussed with us and the South Korean the question of food assistance. We confirmed our announcement yesterday regarding U.S. participation in the UN WFP food appeal -- \$15 million food aid targeted at children under six.

We and South Korea believe that long-term structural economic reform is needed to meet the North's continuing food shortage, and that the four party process holds the best prospect for initiating economic development projects.

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.

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.

Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto will be here April 25 for an official working visit.

Chinese Foreign Minister Qian is here for meetings with Secretary Albright on 4/28-29. We expect him to see Berger and (we hope) the President.

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.

APEC Summit in Vancouver, Canada November 24-25.

JAPAN

Q: Will the President raise the auto agreement in his meeting with Prime Minister Hashimoto next week?

A: I am sure the economic relationship will be part of the agenda.

This Administration strongly supports this agreement and continued progress through its full implementation.

JAPAN

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Embargoed for Transmission
or Release Until 8:30 p.m. EDT
Wednesday, April 16, 1997

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

Official Working Visit by Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto

In response to an invitation from the President, Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto will make his first official working visit to Washington April 25.

The President and the Prime Minister intend to discuss a full range of bilateral and international issues.

The President paid a State Visit to Tokyo in April 1996. Prime Minister Hashimoto and the President have met on several other occasions, most recently at the November 1996 APEC Leaders Meeting in Manila.

#

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. Ideally, we would prefer

to announce it at same time his successor is named, which will take a few weeks.]

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.

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.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 17 April 97 20:40
FROM Murray, Lori E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Pts on Helms COnditions [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Blinken, Antony J.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY [[PRESPTS.DOC : 5172 in PRESPTS.DOC]]
rebuttal points
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 17 April 97 20:39
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** PRESPTS.DOC

Rebuttal Points for Helms Amendments:

#1 US cannot join Convention until Russia ratifies.

- ☐ This condition would hold hostage our ability to join the CWC to the hardliners in the Russian Duma.
- ☐ We would not be able to deposit in time for April 29 when the Convention comes into force: Americans not hired for key positions, including inspectors, lose influence over setting rules for the inspection regime, sanctions kick in for US industry, lose of US leadership.
- ☐ We would allow Russian hardliners to deny us the non-proliferation benefits of this treaty.
- ☐ Bad Policy: our ratification is clearly putting pressure on Russia to ratify. We would lose that leverage. Russia does not want to be on the outside either, especially if the US is on the inside setting the rules.

#2 Stemming Proliferation--Requires amending Article X, XI.

Says to rewrite Article XI to strike any provision that states or implies disapproval of trade restrictions. Says

to strike Article X.

☐ We have gone the extra mile to fully address these concerns in two of the conditions in the agreed package.

☐ The condition obligates the President to obtain assurances from our Australia Group partners that Article XI is fully consistent with maintaining strict export controls on dangerous chemicals. We have already heard from most of our Australia Group partners who have reaffirmed that this is their understanding also.

☐ There is no concern that has not been addressed by the condition regarding Article XI.

☐ Regarding Article X, we have agreed that we will only give medical antidotes to countries of concern, such as Cuba, if assistance to protect against a chemical weapons attack is requested. We will not be sharing advanced defense technology.

#3 Essential Verification

Says we must have high confidence that we can detect a one ton of chemical weapons capability.

This is clearly a killer amendment. Our Intelligence Community has testified that it would be very difficult to detect small levels of CW. But we do have high confidence that we can detect a large scale systematic effort of a potential adversary to equip its armed forces with a chemical weapons capability.

#4 Rogue States

Says we can not become a party until rogue states do.

Again, Senator Helms would make our policy hostage to Qaddafi (etc.) Can't get in until they do, would allow them to continue business as usual with no constraints, while our industry suffers, our leadership is undermined, and our ability to influence and benefit from the CWC regime is compromised.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 17 April 97 22:08

FROM Wechsler, William F.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Q&A [UNCLASSIFIED]

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

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

How do these Q&As look? I need to get them to OVP first thing tommorrow. r,
Will

[[Q&AREORG.DOC : 5642 in Q&AREORG.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 17 April 97 22:6

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** Q&AREORG.DOC

Q&A on State-AID-ACDA-USIA Integration

Q: What is your plan?

Briefly, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will be fully integrated with the State Department within one year, the United States Information Agency will be integrated within two years, The Agency for International Development will remain a separate and distinct agency, but will be placed under the Secretary of State and, within two years, will share certain administrative functions with State. The State Department will undertake a new round of reinvention, prompted by the need to incorporate new organizations and to manage new responsibilities. This reinvention will make the new, integrated State Department more effective and efficient and better

able to defend American interests and promote American values abroad.

Q: Why was this necessary? Why now?

A: This is part of the Vice President's reinventing government initiative and has been under study for a long time. It will make the process by which we make and implement foreign policy more efficient and more effective. It puts matters of international arms control, sustainable development, and public diplomacy where they belong, at the heart of our foreign policy within a reinvented Department of State. There was no better time to make these changes than at the present, with a new administration, a new Congress, and a new Secretary of State.

Q: Didn't you simply cave to Senator Helms?

No. Certainly the views and expertise of many members of Congress informed our process, as they should. But the lengthy and thorough studies and deliberations that led up to this decision were driven by the Vice President, and the final decision was mine alone.

Q: Is this a quid pro quo for CWC? For Albright's easy confirmation? For UN arrears?

No. There is no linkage. I am confident that the Senate will see the wisdom of CWC in its own right.

Q: But you didn't always agree with Helms. Just a few years ago Secretary Christopher proposed very similar reforms and the Vice President rejected them. Besides a new, stronger Secretary of State, what changed?

A: The Vice President and I have always supported reinvention. What we have opposed is destroying agencies through sloppy, reckless acts in the name of reinvention. The Vice President led the battle for this reinvention because he was convinced that this is the best way to do it and that now is the best time to reinvent our

foreign
police agencies.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 18 April 97 10:16
FROM Wechsler, William F.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT reorg [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY Baldwin, Kenneth
Beers, Rand R.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Boynton, Peter J.
Burrell, Christina L.
Clarke, Richard A.
Danvers, William C.
Davis, William K.
Lindsay, James M.
Orr, Robert C.
Rice, Susan E.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sheehan, Michael A.
Simon, Steven N.
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wechsler, William F.

TEXT_BODY David, here are the Q&As on reorganization that Sandy needs. They have been cleared with Legislative affairs, OVP, and State. r, Will

[[Q&AREORG.DOC : 2639 in Q&AREORG.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 18 April 97 10:14

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** Q&AREORG.DOC

POTUS Q&A on State-AID-ACDA-USIA Integration

Q: What is your plan?

Briefly, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will be fully integrated with the State Department within one year, the United States Information Agency will be integrated within two years, The

Agency for International Development will remain a distinct agency,

but will be placed under the Secretary of State and, within two years, will share certain administrative functions with State.

The

State Department will undertake a new round of reinvention, prompted

by the need to incorporate new organizations and to manage new responsibilities. This reinvention will make the new, integrated State Department more effective and efficient and better able to defend American interests and promote American values abroad.

Q: Why was this necessary? Why now?

A: This is part of the Vice President's reinventing government initiative and has been under study for a long time. It will make

the process by which we make and implement foreign policy more efficient and more effective. It puts matters of international arms

control, sustainable development, and public diplomacy where they belong, at the heart of our foreign policy within a reinvented Department of State. There was no better time to make these changes

than at the present, with a new administration, a new Congress, and a new Secretary of State.

Q: Doesn't this just gut the smaller agencies?

No. It puts their issues, expertise, and people at the heart of our

foreign policy, because in the post-Cold War world the issues of arms control, non-proliferation, sustainable development, and public

diplomacy are more important than ever.

Q: Didn't you simply cave to Senator Helms?

No. Certainly the views and expertise of many members of Congress

informed our process, as they should. But the lengthy and thorough

studies and deliberations that led up to this decision were driven by

the Vice President, and the final decision was mine alone.

Q: Is this a quid pro quo for CWC? For Albright's easy confirmation? For UN arrears?

No. There is no linkage. I am confident that the Senate will see the wisdom of CWC in its own right.

Q: But you didn't always agree with Helms. Just a few years ago Secretary Christopher proposed very similar reforms and the Vice President rejected them. Besides a new, stronger Secretary of State, what changed?

A: The Vice President and I have always supported reinvention. What we have opposed is destroying agencies through sloppy, reckless actions in the name of reinvention. The Vice President led the battle for this reinvention plan because he was convinced that this is the best way to do it and that now is the best time to reinvent our foreign policy agencies.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 18 April 97 11:26
FROM Harris, Elisa D.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT billy graham [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bell, Robert G.
 Benjamin, Daniel
 Blinken, Antony J.
 Gibney, James S.
 Gray, Wendy
 LaFleur, Vinca A.
 Murray, Lori E.
 Naplan, Steven J.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[TP4-18.DOC : 2828 in TP4-18.DOC]]

final version of billy graham points --- needed by COS by 11:30.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 18 April 97 11:25

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** TP4-18.DOC

TALKING POINTS FOR ERSKINE BOWLES
 FOR USE WITH
 REV. BILLY GRAHAM

☐ The President noted your statement several months ago in Parade Magazine that you considered chemical weapons the "most vicious weapons of all" and that there should be a "great outcry against them."

☐ As you know, the President strongly agrees, and feels deeply that the Chemical Weapons Convention is the tool that will put us on the path to eliminating these weapons.

☐ Your views are shared by many in the religious community, who have written to the President and the Senate expressing their support for this treaty. Religious leaders from many denominations and many faiths have urged the Senate to act promptly on the Chemical Weapons Convention.

☐ The President assigned his national security adviser, Sandy Berger, to work closely with Majority Leader Lott on this matter.

Under the Majority Leader's guidance, we have now reached agreement on 28 issues of concern. Many of the concerns of our good friend and North Carolina neighbor, Senator Helms, have been addressed in this process.

☐ The Senate is scheduled to vote on the Convention next Thursday.

We hope that you can find the time in these critical final days to join with your colleagues in the religious community in showing your support for this important treaty.

Note: Desired outcome is a letter to President or public statement prior to April 23.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 18 April 97 14:39
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT April 18 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 [[MIKE0418.doc : 3672 in MIKE0418.doc]]
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 18 April 97 14:39
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** MIKE0418.doc

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 18, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING BY
MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

12:55 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: And happy Friday. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to

the White House Briefing Room, and we'll get going. We'll talk real fast today because we have to get done by 1:45 p.m. so you all can go and do the Teacher of the Year event. Okay, that's all I have to say. Anything else? No? Good, good bye. (Laughter.) In our hyperkinetic state today.

Let me just start by reading to you a part of a written statement from the Vice President of the United States, Al Gore. The Vice President's statement reads: "The President and I believe we have an historic opportunity to systematically reinvent the agencies which implement the nation's foreign policies in order to ensure that they effectively confront the new and pressing challenges of the post Cold War world. To that end, the President has approved the two year reorganization plan for these agencies.

I'm proud of this achievement. I'm confident that through this historic reinvention process we will create leaner and more effective structures in order to ensure American leadership around the world for the new century."

The person who has worked most closely with the Vice President on this reorganization plan and can tell you a lot about the effort that's really going on over the last three years to arrive at this moment is Dr. Elaine Kamarck, the Vice President's Senior Policy Advisor and reinvention of government guru.

Why are you looking at me, Leo?

Q Well, I was going to ask you, why was it a bum idea the last two years and this year it's a great idea?

MR. MCCURRY: Never been a bum idea, but the time is right now and the time was not exactly right then. And Dr. Kamarck can tell you why.

Q Wait a minute. Are you denying that the administration strenuously opposed this reorganization during the Christopher days?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, absolutely, because I was there with Secretary Christopher -- we had always looked for ways of restructuring and making more efficient those agencies, but we always believed simultaneously it needed to be done in the right context of reinventing government. It was not just about collapsing organization boxes on an organization chart, it was about innovation and a new spirit of modernization within our foreign policy apparatus. And it took until now to do that.

Now, there are other complicating factors, too. There was a budget fight in 1995 '96 which subsumed a lot of the efforts to look at the function 150 Account broadly and then to look structurally at the foreign policy apparatus. But Elaine will tell you a lot more about that, too.

Yes. Why do you want me in this when you've got the expert here?

Q Why should this not be regarded as a quid pro quo for Senator Helms in order to get a Senate vote on the chemical weapons?

MR. MCCURRY: Because long before we got to the point of debating in the Senate the Chemical Weapons Convention, Secretary Albright said she was committed as a matter of principle to modernizing and reinvigorating those foreign policy mechanisms that we used to advance U.S. interests around the world, and moreover, as part of the Vice President's longstanding interest in reinventing government, we had a strong interest in bringing reinvention to the State Department. That has been true for three years and we've been working to that end for three years.

Q But didn't she say that as a quid pro quo to get confirmed?

MR. MCCURRY: She said that, recognizing, obviously, that Chairman Helms has pressed this goal, but there's been support within this administration for modernizing our foreign policy institutions over the last three years as well -- three years being actually from the beginning of the President's term, but the serious work began in

'95
or so.

DR. KAMARCK: Let me talk to this a little bit. We looked at this seriously beginning in January 1995. At that time we began a very large scale reinvention activity that encompassed the four agencies involved here. It was led by the National Performance Review. Among the difficulties that we encountered at that time was a feeling that there was a significant amount of reinvention that needed to go on in the State Department itself before the State Department was ready to then absorb other agencies.

We then, as Mike said, as we were beginning to sort out some of those things and a reinvention agenda for the State Department, we came into the summer of '95, as you know, we ran into the budget crisis and the eventual shutdown of the government. And this job was put aside for a time being with the exception of work that was being done at OMB and at the State Department about how the State Department itself ought to reorganize.

When we got reelected, came into office again, this was one of the pieces of unfinished business in the reinventing government agenda that the Vice President wanted to go back to. He began to talk about this with the new Secretary of State, who also came in with a significant desire to do serious reinvention at the State Department.

Reinvention at the State Department is an a priori qualification for doing any other consolidations of other agencies, and that's one of the things that made this happen this time. There will be a new Under Secretary for Management, there is some personnel changes, et cetera, and there are management plans being developed right now at

the State Department. So part of what's going on here is we've got a reinvigorated State Department and a State Department that will hopefully start dealing with some of its core problems as we proceed.

Q And it's only coincidence that it came a week before the chemical weapons vote?

DR. KAMARCK: Only coincidence.

Q Is it a happy coincidence?

DR. KAMARCK: Yes. Of course, it is. But once again, remember, doing these things takes a long time. I mean, we generated piles and piles of paper last time. And one of the reasons that we could, in fact, do this in a relatively short period of time right now -- as we started thinking about this in February again -- is that we had, in fact, gotten to roughly these conclusion two years ago and had done a lot of the groundwork and kind of understood where the pieces would fit best for a 21st century diplomacy.

Q As a result of this reorganization, Elaine, how much money will the taxpayers save over the next several years?

DR. KAMARCK: They will save some money, but the savings are not big. The entire 150 Account, all of this money is about one percent of the federal budget. These are very small agencies; they have a very small number of employees. If you are looking to balance the budget on these agencies, it would be impossible.

As we develop the legislation and actually go through the details of the reorganization plan, we will give you personnel and savings figures. But they're not -- they will not be huge given the size of these entities.

Q Elaine, for two things -- first, how many jobs are going to be

lost
and how is it going to affect the relative independence of the
Voice
of America and other related --

DR. KAMARCK: The Voice of America has editorial independence and integrity as it is and that will stay exactly the same under the reorganization.

As I said before, there will be some job loss I'm sure, but this will not be huge. There will be administration consolidations, consolidations of public affairs, legislative shops, etcetera.
But
basically, these are -- the ACTA and USIA consolidations are being done in order to strengthen the State Department's capacity to do public diplomacy and arms control.

Q Do you have a figure on those jobs?

DR. KAMARCK: No, we don't have a figure on the jobs yet. And we won't until we actually write the legislation and then have OMB cost it out.

Q How far down the ladder on the table of organization at the State Department is ACTA going to end up?

DR. KAMARCK: ACTA will be, actually, very high up in a new under secretary that will have not only a reporting relationship to the Secretary of State, but the ability to speak directly through the Secretary to the President of the United States on matters of arms control advocacy. And what was very important to the Vice President in putting this together is that there be that independent advocacy role of ACTA preserved in the State Department. And we have models elsewhere in the government for preserving that independent access to the President.

Q And that under secretary will be limited to arms control or will have wider jurisdiction?

DR. KAMARCK: Wider jurisdiction. What will happen is that ACTA and what is now the PM bureau of State will merge essentially into a

larger under secretary.

Q -- information activities at USIA, where will they go in this --

DR. KAMARCK: Some of those information activities will be moved into the State Department. There will be an attempt to make a unified public affairs structure for diplomacy. The I Bureau at USIA, which has received a lot of kudos for bringing information into the electronic age, will be preserved, brought into the State Department, and we hope will enhance the State Department's capacity to communicate to foreign publics.

MR. MCCURRY: Tell them about the new under secretary for public diplomacy. (Laughter.)

DR. KAMARCK: I don't think we'd better do that right now.

Q Elaine, is there any way to assure those at VOA that the level of independence won't be impacted by this? You've said it won't, but as the process goes along -- might change. Can you give us that kind of a guarantee?

DR. KAMARCK: I can give you that kind of guarantee. That guarantee was explicit in the decision memorandum that the President signed off on that there would be this editorial integrity. And that is something that the President and Vice President feel strongly about.

MR. MCCURRY: Let me add something on that. You will not be surprised to hear that we have heard already quite an earful from Evelyn Lieberman on that subject. She has stressed how important the integrity of VOA's independent editorial voice is and how necessary it is for that to be a useful and reliable tool of information around the world. And, of course, that's foreseen as part of the plan.

Thanks.

DR. KAMARCK: Thank you.

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, sir?

Q What are the preparations the White House and other agencies in the federal government are undertaking in light of the upcoming Oklahoma City anniversary and Waco --

MR. MCCURRY: Appropriate and necessary ones. There is a greater attention to security and reminders about the need to be vigilant and alert. But beyond that, I'm obviously not going to discuss specific security measures.

Q Will people be inconvenienced as a result of these --

MR. MCCURRY: If any federal workers or American citizens are inconvenienced, I'm sure they'll understand why.

Q Mike, are papers going to be issued this afternoon on the consolidation?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, in fact, we've got a statement from the Vice President and a fact sheet that goes with the remarks that Elaine has just made. That's available -- should be available by the time we finish here.

Q Mike, you told us this morning there were no plans for any formal observances or events here linked to the ceremony. Is that related to the fact that the McVeigh trial is getting underway in any way?

MR. MCCURRY: It is so, very directly.

Q How so?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I think you're all aware of the judges order in that case, so we have to be very circumspect in our discussions about matters related to the case.

Q Will there be any statement issued or --

MR. MCCURRY: I believe we will -- I'll have to check on that. I think there is a plan for it, but I'll have to check on that.

Q Mike, a question on the First Family's tax returns. There was a that huge contribution to charity, but the President and Mrs. Clinton have big legal debts also. Why did they not do a direct application to their legal debts? Or can you ask that question?

MR. MCCURRY: I can ask them that question. To my knowledge, the -- first of all, the largest volume of the charitable contributions came from the book proceeds. And Mrs. Clinton made it clear that she was going to donate those to charities that deal with health care especially for children, and for institutions that are involved in philanthropic work on behalf of children. I think they would have considered it inappropriate to devote any of the proceeds of the book to their own legal bills.

On the \$12,000 they get from the Henry G. Freeman Pin Fund, that has traditionally been amounts that the First Lady directs to the charities that she and the President support, and they wanted to continue that practice. And then, the additional amount of about \$7,300 that represented the balance of their charitable contributions they prefer to give to their church, to some of the institutions that they have supported over the years.

I think that that's their preference. The President, on the subject of his legal bills, has indicated that he expects to be employable when he leaves the White House and has some measure of confidence he'll be able to retire his bills and his obligations.

Q Mr. Lee of Hong Kong emerged saying he wants the Clinton administration to continue to extent MFN for China without any strings attached and the President thanked him for that statement. Has the President flatly decided to do that this year?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, he has not -- he can't decide to do that, Wolf. The review of most favored nation status has to be done in the context of the Jackson Vanik Amendment. It would require an act of Congress, I believe, to make a change in that part of the process. There are a number of people who believe there should be

unconditional and permanent extension of MFN status, but we are continuing the review that's required under the law, specifically the Jackson Vanik Amendment.

Now, let me go back through just a couple general points. Mr. Lee met for about 45 minutes with the Vice President, and the President joined that meeting for about 25 minutes, the last 25 minutes of the meeting. The President, in his own presentation to Mr. Lee, stressed the strong view that the 1984 Sino British Joint Declaration is the cornerstone of law that protects the future of Hong Kong as we go through the changes that will occur approaching the date of reversion July 1.

The President said China should not only uphold the economic freedoms that have been so important to the people of Hong Kong, but should also continue to extend civil and political freedoms to the people of Hong Kong because that's a necessary condition of creating the environment in which market economics can flourish, which has been, obviously, the key to Hong Kong's success. So the President strongly shared the view, expressed also, of course, by Mr. Lee, that support for rule of law, that press freedoms, the freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, the liberties that have been associated with the people of Hong Kong should and must continue, and that that should be seen as a commitment made by the government of China in the 1984 declaration that they entered into with the government of the United Kingdom.

Q On that list, you didn't mention the right to elect their own legislature. Lee said that he considers the 1984 agreement already to be broached since they're disbanding the elected legislature. Do you agree with that?

MR. MCCURRY: We have expressed very grave reservations about the

action to adjust the structural polity of the Provisional Council, which has been the elected governing body of Hong Kong. And we have expressed concerns about that and said that that is contrary to the commitments that have been made by the government of the People's Republic in the 1984 Declaration.

Q What are you going to do about that?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've raised this in our dialogue. Secretary Albright raised exactly these points in her recent visit, as did the Vice President. And the future of the status of Hong Kong is something that will be very much a factor in our engagement with the People's Republic, as are a number of issues. And this is an issue in which clearly there are some potential disagreements.

Q Lee also said that he asked the President to invite the new China appointed Chief Executive of Hong Kong to come to the White House as well. How did the President respond to that? And will you consider --

MR. MCCURRY: I didn't get a specific readout on that point. I'll take the question and find out. I think that we would consider his views, but I'm not aware that we've extended any invitation at this time.

Q Mike, what portions of the U.S. China relationship could be affected by problems with Hong Kong?

MR. MCCURRY: It's not a direct zero sum trade off in any aspect of the relationship. What we've said often in areas where we have disagreements with the Chinese is that the full benefit of our bilateral relationship which means much to the people of the United States and much to the people of the People's Republic will not ever be fully realized while there are impediments in the relationship.

Clearly, any diminution of the freedoms enjoyed by the people of Hong Kong would be a serious impediment in the relationship.

But at the same time, we have got a structure in our relationship through the exchange of visits that we have to raise those issues, to deal with them. So it's really a question of when do you get the full benefit of the engagement that we are pursuing, and that relationship matures, blossoms to the degree that we erase some of these disagreements that we have on a number of areas, whether they're security areas related to proliferation, whether they're human rights concerns, whether they're questions about the structural polity and governance of Hong Kong.

Q Does China get the full benefit of our relationship now? I mean, would you want to quantify how close --

MR. MCCURRY: I don't believe they necessarily do. They have -- there are some things that they seek in the world, particularly with respect to membership in economic institutions that are important to their status as an emerging economic power, that are made more difficult by the impediments that exist.

Q Mike, are you saying that we would not back them for membership in the WTO if they continue with this plan to disband the legislature in Hong Kong?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I'm saying -- I'm not saying there is any direct linkage there because that's an issue that we've considered on a variety of bases and the merits of that I think have been well discussed in the past. I'm saying that is one example of the way in which the relationship would take on new energy if some of the these disagreements were diminished.

Q Mike, I think what we're trying to get at is something we've been trying to get at before. There doesn't seem -- I know you have to deal in diplomatic terms, but it seems that in the recent past

that
there hasn't been a great deal of effect on China's actions in
other
areas by our concerns over things such as human rights and things
of
that sort, and I think we're just trying to find out if you all
think
that there is anyplace where you can have influence, where you
can
exercise any sort of leverage if there turn out to be problems
with
Hong Kong, or if, in essence, it's just jawboning.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, a large measure of it is jawboning, but that
is
important to the Chinese leadership. And they demonstrate that
by
the vigorous opposition they bring to efforts, for example, to
raise
criticisms in fora like the U.N. Human Rights Commission, which
we
just experienced earlier this week. They clearly are sensitive
to
those in the international community who raise concerns about
some of
their actions.

Now, the flip side of this coin is there -- the other strategy
sometimes suggested is isolation, or to somehow treat the
People's
Republic as an outlier nation, and the United States firmly
believes
that would lead to even more severe consequences for the people
of
China than a strategy designed to engage with them to exchange
views
and to continue to bring the benefits of market economics and
democratic capitalism to the people of the People's Republic. In
the
long run, that strategy, in the President's view, has a greater
likelihood of success in bringing about the kind of respect for
universal human rights that we seek than a strategy of isolation.

Q Mike, how would you interpret the impression that Lee took from
the
meeting that the administration would be defending Hong Kong's
freedoms?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that he understands the deep concern we
have

about the future of Hong Kong, as I've just expressed it. I think we explicitly made clear the importance that we attach to the Joint Declaration. And I'm sure that's the impression he carried away.

Q The Athens News Agency of the Greek government dispatched yesterday that the targets for solution to the Greek -- over the Aegean Sea and Cyprus is in the hands of President Clinton to be announced soon. Any comment?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sorry. Who that's in --

Q The Athens News Agency.

MR. MCCURRY: We don't -- Eric, we don't have anything to that effect? We are discussing -- I would just reiterate what we've said in the past about our determination to work with both governments to minimize any conflicts that arise in the Aegean and to assure that these two close allies and friends of the United States amicably resolve their disagreements.

Q Could you please confirm reports that the next Ambassador to Greece will be -- Negroponti -- due to the point that he was a close associate to Henry Kissinger, responsible for the Turkish invasion, occupation and partition of Cyprus?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I can't confirm that.

Q Can you confirm the report that the U.S. government has asked the Israeli government for a six month freeze on settlement activity?

MR. MCCURRY: I wouldn't begin to get into any of that type of detail, even if that had any truth to it. What I will tell you is that Ambassador Ross just faxed in his departure statement. He's leaving, as we had told you earlier, to come back here after good and successful meetings with Chairman Arafat and with the Prime Minister. He also reports that he had a good -- if I can find it -- had a good meeting with the Chairman and senior Israeli and Palestinian security officials just in the last 24 hours to explore ways to ensure security coordination and cooperation between the

parties.

That is significant because, as you know, we have been working to try to get the parties engaged in, one, restoring in a sense a greater security, especially in the territories in the West Bank; two, to find ways in which they can build confidence between each other that they can work together which will, we hope, reinvigorate and reenergize the process itself. Now, we've shared a number of ideas. I'm not going to get into substantively in the kinds of ideas that we've shared.

Q The security meeting was everybody in one room together or also shuttling?

MR. MCCURRY: They were not proximity discussions. They were together, and they were described as being productive sessions.

Q What city was that in?

MR. MCCURRY: The statement doesn't say. I can find out.

Q Is that the first time that they --

MR. MCCURRY: Burns had talked -- I think, Nick Burns over at the State Department had talked to Dennis by phone, so he may have a little more. He's going to do more on that.

Q Is this the first time Dennis Ross personally had ever done that kind of three way meeting?

MR. MCCURRY: Not necessarily.

Q Is the White House encouraged, Mike, that the budget talks appear to be continuing, that this is apparently not the make it break it week?

MR. MCCURRY: I think the President is satisfied that a lot of hard work is being done throughout the White House at different levels on reaching a bipartisan balanced budget agreement. It is hard work. It is important for the White House to work this from many different

angles.

We also, as you know, have been discussing very closely with our Democratic friends on the Hill, especially in the Senate, how we are proceeding in taking their views on board because they rightfully want to know the structure of any potential balanced budget agreement.

But we're working hard, and I think that the statements you see from both sides indicating that the work is serious, the discussions have been productive. But there clearly are different points of view. And those different points of view have not been resolved.

But if there's going to be an agreement at some point, they will have to be resolved, and the question for next week is whether they can make any progress in addressing some of those differences.

I think they've got, as a result of the work they've done, now a much clearer understanding of where the differences lie, where the need is going to be for some flexibility and give and take. And then they can now move into a phase in which they examine the question of whether an agreement is, in fact, possible.

Q Has White House been able to knock down some of the road blocks as far as Herman is concerned today?

MR. MCCURRY: I would say that we're working hard at it, and we're loosening some of the screws, but we're not there yet.

Q I have a question about the President's phone call over to the Newseum today. When Paviani's media conspiracy chart came out and you explained it, a day later you said the President doesn't buy into the conspiracy. Today, he's talking about "near news" forces bearing down on us. What is he talking about?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, look, he's clearly talking about the proliferation and change that have occurred in the way information is provided. I know you referred to the staggering increase in the

number of news sources that exist. And near news, as is frequently used in your business, your trade, refers to like magazine shows and different types of information media that mix entertainment and news.

Q Also, does he think that --

MR. MCCURRY: The White House briefings sometimes do that, too.

Q Does he think that he or those in the White House have been hurt by news hype? What was his reference there to?

MR. MCCURRY: Go back and see what the President said. He said that there are occasions in which the rush to report things can damage reputations. And I think everyone in this room is aware that that's occurred. I don't think he was referring specifically to him, to anyone in the administration, to anyone in the White House. He was talking collectively about how reputations can sometimes be damaged when news is reported before adequate legwork that confirms facts.

Q What ever happened to the auto makers meeting that was supposed to take place --

MR. MCCURRY: Nothing. I don't have anything new on that.

Q Do you have any schedule or timing for it?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't heard of any schedule for it. The Vice President, of course, met with one of the leaders when he was in Detroit, but I haven't heard of anything firming up on the President's calendar.

Q In a series of interviews apparently, with The Los Angeles Times -- refined something he told the Times reportedly, after consultations with the White House. Do you know anything about the consultations? Did you talk with him yourself?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I didn't. That was Lanny. Lanny Davis knows

more about that. I got a bit of it and it was a very complicated saga, and I'd have to refer you to him.

Q Anything more on the error at Commerce in terms of remedy or preventive maintenance?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, only that the Commerce Department I think has talked a lot about how it happened. They got a good understanding of what the problem is. They had asked for some additional data on oil imports. The Customs Bureau had sent in some data that extended beyond the period that they were actually looking at for that statistical series they were doing. It generated about a \$1.1 billion miscalculation, which was an important one because it actually ended up being that the trade deficit figures that were finally put together at the end of the day yesterday I think were a little better than the market had anticipated.

But the importance of continuous, successive statistical series that help us measure the performance of the economy is something that the President understands is important. That's why we have proposed additional increases in funding for some of those series and why we've, even at a time of downsizing, tried to preserve the integrity of that body of economic data that allows all Americans to understand better how we're doing collectively.

Q Mike, do you mind running through next week's schedule?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't mind at all. (Laughter.) I should probably run through the rest of today. I think the boss wants to talk to you a little about the Chemical Weapons Convention. He'd like to end the week in which we've had a lot of positive momentum on ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention -- end the week on a high note with the President talking about the work that he will do next week in advance of the vote Thursday to try to achieve ratification, and then talk about some of the problems that exist with those amendments that are still pending on the Senate floor. So

I'll bring him down here 3:30 p.m. or so, in that neighborhood.

Q How long?

MR. MCCURRY: Long enough to get the job done.

Q Is it going to be a general press conference or just --

MR. MCCURRY: No, he'll come down and make that statement and I imagine you might want to ask him about the budget -- or maybe he'll talk about the budget, one or two other things. (Laughter.) One of two other things. I'll tell him that since I've exhausted all the questions that exist he doesn't have to stay here long.

Q How long, approximately, will his opening statement be?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know yet. Probably about five minutes -- three minutes, four minutes.

Q I just want to try one more time on this Hong Kong stuff. Were you trying to leave the impression that there will not be necessarily any specific negative consequences to China if they continue with their erosion of civil liberties in Hong Kong?

MR. MCCURRY: No. I hope the exact -- to the contrary. I was trying to say that we are -- I've said even several days ago, indicated that there would be consequences for any erosion of freedoms and liberties that are currently enjoyed by the people of Hong Kong. And the expectations are that commitments currently existing, such as those that are made in the 1984 Joint Declaration, will be honored.

Q And just one other question. Do you view what happens to Hong Kong in the same way that you view other human rights issues inside China proper, or do they have a whole other level of importance?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, you really can't compare them because the status of Hong Kong is different, the economic conditions are different, the benefits of democracy and market economics have meant much different things to the people of Hong Kong. I don't think

you
can compare that directly to different conditions in China --
just as
you cannot compare the human rights concerns that we had within
China as being identical from province to province. They are
different if you're talking about South China and the coast where
there's been a significant degree of economic modernization; and
different if you look at other, lesser developed parts of the
country.

Q What I'm getting at is the fact that China hasn't released
dissidents or hasn't done the things that we want them to do has
not
stopped us from pursuing our policy of engagement with China and
other economic ties. And what I'm wondering is will the same be
true
with Hong Kong?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, it would -- as of July 1st it will be
incorporated in the concerns we have that we raise bilaterally,
obviously.

Q With regard to the plans for a U.S. China summit in the second
half
of this year, you obviously haven't set a date yet. Is there
even a
particular month that the White House has in mind for that event?

MR. MCCURRY: I think the only -- I haven't seen anything other
than suggestions that it might occur sometime late in the year.

Q And whatever the date might be, how long after July 1 can you
watch
Hong Kong before you have, in effect, to make a go/no go decision
with regard to a summit? Does a summit like that take a week to
nail
down, a month to prepare for?

MR. MCCURRY: There are many factors that go into scheduling a
summit. I don't want to suggest any direct linkage to that. The
condition and status of Hong Kong and the conditions facing its
people will be an ongoing concern of the United States government
and
not directly related to any particular date on a calendar.

Q What you're saying, Mike, is that, nevertheless, there will be a
window of several months post July 1 that you could look at Hong
Kong
before you have to make a final decision on the summit?

MR. MCCURRY: I didn't say that, you did.

Q Let me just clarify that, if possible. Is the United States going to give a firm date to China before July 1, or are you explicitly waiting until after July 1 to do that?

MR. MCCURRY: We have an ongoing dialogue with the government of The People's Republic making arrangements. I'm not going to try to elaborate that.

Q There were some fairly clear sentiments emerging from the meeting of Mr. Lee here today. What sort of sentiments or message, if any, would you hope would come out of next week's meeting with the Dahli Lama, whom you've indicated this morning is coming here?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that the -- first and foremost, we would hope that the people of the world would understand the deep respect that the United States has for this important religious figure and the importance we attach to the cultural heritage, the political dynamic, the religious realities that exist for Tibet as an issue that should be of concern to the People's Republic.

Q Mike, getting back to Alexis Herman, a lot of people are saying that if the vote doesn't happen this week, you may as well forget it. Are you getting any semblance of who --

MR. MCCURRY: I think that's too dire and bleak. We are working through concerns that have been raised by some senators and we haven't satisfied those concerns. But we will do everything we can to do it because we don't think that should be an impediment to the confirmation of an excellently qualified nominee.

Q Have you gotten a date then or a potential date?

MR. MCCURRY: We have -- I just told you, we're not there yet.

Q Mr. Lee said that the President agreed with his view that issues surrounding the handover of Hong Kong would be considered even after the handover as an international matter and not a domestic Chinese matter. Is that correct?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the commitments that have been made by the government in an international agreement, the 1994 Sino British Declaration, are commitments that are made in the eyes of the international community.

Q And will continue to be after the handover?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the commitment was made in 1984 under different arrangements, but they are commitments that are seen by the international community as binding in agreement between two sovereign governments.

Q But I guess the question is, does the international led by the United States feel any responsibility for making sure that those are enforced?

MR. MCCURRY: I spent half of this briefing talking about the concern and the commitment we have to following closely the situation in Hong Kong. It's obviously not set; it will be an ongoing concern.

Q Back to the rest of the week ahead.

MR. MCCURRY: The President will do his weekly radio address live from the Oval Office tomorrow at 10:06 a.m. The subject will be NetDay and the things that he is doing to challenge Americans to link every classroom in this country to the Internet by the year 2000.

Q Will there be anything special about the --

MR. MCCURRY: There will then be, at 10:30 a.m., a computer video conference with schools participating in NetDay, and you can watch the President and the Vice President interact in telecommunicability.

Q With each other or with somebody else? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Watching them react it a little bit like watching corn grow. You know, you have to stand there a long time. No, that's not true. (Laughter.) They're going to be in the cyberspace.

They're going to go ride on the "Infobahn" together. Something. I don't know. What are they doing, Mary Ellen?

MS. GLYNN: They're going to talk to some kids.

MR. MCCURRY: They're going to talk to kids around the country who are doing NetDay and send messages back and forth. And this is another way of saying that the President's going to finally have a computer in the Oval Office. I may bury the lead. Maybe that's the lead.

Q What kind of computer?

Q It's going to be said that day? That's going to be in there permanent?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, we're going to get all kinds of questions.

Q Mac or PC?

Q Forever?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. But whatever company that made the computer, I'll bet you they made a donation to our campaign along the way. (Laughter.) It's a dead certain bet. You had better go find out.

Q Mike, is that computer going to stay there in the Oval Office or did you just bring it in?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, he's going to use it. He's going to like try to get computer literate. Al Gore's going to -- have you ever seen Gore's office? He's like fishing around stuff all the time. He's got more gizmos on that than I've ever seen.

Q Is it true, does he not type? That's what I was just about to --

MR. MCCURRY: He types about like I do, like -- like that. Hunting and pecking.

Q He'd better learn because he's not showing a good example.

MR. MCCURRY: He's been hearing that from the Vice President,

from
Chelsea, and from others for quite some time. So he's got to get
with it.

Q Is there coverage of this --

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, 10:30 a.m. Stills only? We're just taking
pictures?

Q That's not coverage.

MR. MCCURRY: All right. Let me go through the rest of the week.

We've got 6:30 p.m. on Sunday, for those who've got pool duty,
the
President is going out to address the United Auto Workers;
general
economic discussion, putting out his priorities over at the
Sheraton
Washington. Monday, no public events; he's got the day off
Monday
because he's been working Saturday and Sunday. Tuesday, he's --

Q Is that a comp day?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, it's a comp day. (Laughter.) No, flex time.
But if he works overtime we would insist on getting equitable pay
for
-- (laughter). All right. Tuesday is Earth Day. How soon we
forget. They're going to go to Anacostia Park and there is a
river
celebration in honor of Earth Day out at Anacostia Park. The
President will be there.

Wednesday, no public events yet. Thursday, no public events yet.

Friday, Prime Minister Hashimoto is here, as you know. We've got
a
working visit with him and I expect around 2:30 p.m. for the
Prime
Minister and the President to see all of you. Saturday, weekly
radio
address is broadcast. Saturday night, the President of the
United
States addresses the White House Correspondents Association.

Q Taking questions? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Only from the Association's president.

Q Stills only. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Stills only.

What else? What else do you want to know about? What else do I need to tell you? Go home. One more, go.

Q The Pentagon is doing this recycling thing now. Is the White House doing it for Earth Day, anything?

MR. MCCURRY: We've been -- we've had a program of recycling here for a long time. I can't tell you a lot about it, but I know I have to throw away all my white paper in a special place. And we do cans and we do other stuff. The Vice President instituted -- started doing a lot on recycling four years ago.

All right, have a good weekend everybody. See you all.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

1:35 P.M. EDT

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 18 April 97 16:59
FROM Murray, Lori E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bendick, Gordon L.
Burrell, Christina L.
Danvers, William C.
Davis, William K.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY [[PRESPTS.DOC : 4180 in PRESPTS.DOC]]
POints on Helms Conditions
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 18 April 97 16:58
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** PRESPTS.DOC

Rebuttal Points for Helms Amendments

#1 US cannot join Convention until Russia ratifies, makes reasonable progress on implementing the Bilateral Destruction Agreement, Russia has resolved outstanding compliance questions under the Wyoming MOU and BDA, Russia is committed to forgoing a chemical weapons capability.

☐ This condition would hold hostage our ability to join the CWC to the hardliners in the Russian Duma.

☐ We would not be able to deposit in time for April 29 when the Convention comes into force: Americans not hired for key positions, including inspectors, lose influence over setting rules for the inspection regime, sanctions kick in for US industry, lose of US leadership.

☐ We would allow Russian hardliners to deny us the non-proliferation benefits of this treaty.

☐ Bad Policy: our ratification is clearly putting pressure on Russia to ratify. We would lose that leverage. Russia

does not want to be on the outside either, especially if the US is on the inside setting the rules.

☐ BDA--neither the U.S. or Russia have ratified the Bilateral Destruction Agreement, so standard would definitely delay for some time US participation.

☐ Regarding outstanding compliance questions under the Wyoming MOU, the CWC not only requires the Russians to declare again their CW capabilities, but also has the enforcement provisions so we can pursue our compliance concerns (i.e. challenge inspections.) The BDA is not in force.

#2 Stemming Proliferation--Requires amending Article X, XI.

Says to rewrite Article XI to strike any provision that states or implies disapproval of trade restrictions. Says to strike Article X.

☐ We have gone the extra mile to fully address these concerns in two of the conditions in the agreed package.

☐ The condition obligates the President to obtain assurances from our Australia Group partners that Article XI is fully consistent with maintaining strict export controls on dangerous chemicals. We have already heard from most of our Australia Group partners who have reaffirmed that this is there understanding also.

☐ There is no concern that has not been addressed by the condition regarding Article XI.

☐ Regarding Article X, we have agreed that we will only give medical antidotes to countries of concern, such as Cuba, if assistance to protect against a chemical weapons attack is requested. We will not be sharing advanced defense technology.

#3 Essential Verification

Says we must have high confidence that we can detect a one ton of chemical weapons capability.

This is clearly a killer amendment. Our Intelligence Community has testified that it would be very difficult to detect small levels of CW. But we do have high confidence that we can detect a large scale systematic effort of a potential adversary to equip its armed forces with a

chemical weapons capability.

#4 Rogue States/Universality

Says we can not become a party until rogue states do.

Again, Senator Helms would make our policy hostage to Qaddafi (etc.) Can't get in until they do, would allow them to continue business as usual with no constraints, while our industry suffers, our leadership is undermined, and our ability to influence and benefit from the CWC regime is compromised.

#5 Denial of Inspectors

Automatically denies inspectors from countries of concerns.

☐ Would set up a quid pro quo where contras would respond by not letting our inspectors in. These countries of concern are the ones we would like most to have our inspectors in.

