

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Cathy Millison to Antony Blinken, Susan Braden, Sue Bremmer et al. Subject: 5032-Helms Burton. (13 pages)	07/09/1999	P1/b(1)
002. email	Caroline Krass to Gary Samore. Subject: FW: KEDO Reprogramming. (34 pages)	09/08/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange-Record (Sept 97-Jan 01) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/25/1999-09/08/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5637

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 5/25/99 2:41:37 PM
FROM Tavlarides, Mark J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Nuclear safety certification [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Kaufman, Stuart J.

CARBON_COPY Krass, Caroline D.
Barnett, Cheryl E.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Faranda, Regina D.
Kaufman, Stuart J.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Segal, Jack D.
Silva, Mary Ann T.
Tedstrom, John E.
Weiss, Andrew S.
Burrell, Christina L.
Lackey, Miles M.
Shapiro, Daniel B.
Tavlarides, Mark J.
Caravelli, John M.

TEXT_BODY

Leg. clears with change in salutation for helms letter.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Kaufman, Stuart J.

Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 1999

1:32 PM

To: Krass, Caroline D.; Tavlarides, Mark J.

Cc: @RUSSIA

- Russia/Ukraine; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; Caravelli, John M.

Subject: FW: Nuclear safety convention certification
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Caroline--here's
the nuclear safety package. Sorry it got hung up; didn't realize
the deadline was so close. I understand you've already cleared the
Helms letter; please check the POTUS memo as well. Mark--for your
clearance as well--letter must be delivered to Helms tomorrow.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT nuke safety cert letter.doc

The Honorable Jesse Helms
Chairman
Committee on Foreign Relations
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510-6225

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing in connection with the Senate's advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, provided by Resolution on March 25, 1999.

In accordance with Condition (2) of the Resolution, I hereby certify that the United States will comment in each review meeting held under Article 20 of the Convention (including each meeting of a subgroup) upon aspects of safety significance in any report submitted pursuant to Article 5 of the Convention by any State Party that is receiving United States financial or technical assistance relating to the improvement of safety of its nuclear installations.

In accordance with Condition (4) of the Resolution, I hereby certify that the Comptroller General of the United States shall be given full and complete access to (i) all information in the possession of the United States Government specifically relating to the operation of the Convention, including any report or document; and (ii) information specifically relating to any review or analysis by any department, agency, or other entity of the United States, or any official thereof, undertaken pursuant to Article 20 of the Convention, of any report or document submitted by any other State party.

I will, of course, implement these provisions consistent with the allocation of

authority and responsibility under the Constitution.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT nuke safety potus memo.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: Certifications Required by Senate Ratification of the
Convention on
Nuclear Safety

Purpose

To sign a letter to Senator Helms certifying that the United States will
comply
with two conditions imposed by the Senate in ratifying the
Convention on Nuclear
Safety (CNS).

Background

In April of this year you signed the Instrument of Ratification and
proclamation
for the CNS, along with two letters of certification. In ratifying the
CNS, the
Senate imposed two additional certification requirements, with a 45-
day deadline.

That deadline is May 26, 1999.

Attached for your signature is the required letter of Certification (Tab A).

The CNS was negotiated with strong U.S. support and leadership. It strengthens nuclear safety around the world by having each country's civilian nuclear power program held up for peer review every three years. Ratification of the agreement allowed us to begin participating in the civilian nuclear program peer review mechanism laid out in the CNS, maintaining our ability to provide international leadership in nuclear safety fora.

The conditions you will certify can be met without undue difficulty. The first states that the U.S. will comment on reports submitted by the Parties receiving U.S. nuclear safety assistance; the second states that the Comptroller General of the United States will have access to certain information the U.S. has relating to the operation of the convention, and to information about U.S. analyses undertaken pursuant to the Convention.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter of certification (Tab A).

Attachment
Tab A Certification letter

2

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

May 25, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL R. BERGER

THROUGH: CARLOS PASCUAL

FROM: JONATHAN ELKIND AND STUART KAUFMAN

SUBJECT: Certification Required by Ratification of the Convention
on Nuclear
Safety

The United States signed the Convention on Nuclear Safety (CNS) on September 20, 1994. The Senate ratified it on March 25, 1999. The memorandum at Tab I recommends that the President sign the attached letter of certification required by the U.S. Senate.

Concurrence by: Jack Caravelli, Caroline Krass, Mark Tavlarides

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum for the President at Tab I.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for the President

Tab A Certification Letter

2

2117

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 5/27/99 11:07:52 AM
FROM Sapiro, Miriam E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: CYPRUS REPT - FW: pkg 3766 [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Barnett, Cheryl E.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Faranda, Regina D.
Kaufman, Stuart J.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Segal, Jack D.
Silva, Mary Ann T.
Tedstrom, John E.
Weiss, Andrew S.

CARBON_COPY Blinken, Antony J.
Braden, Susan R.
Brown, Keim C.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Gordon, Philip H.
Holtzapple, Richard A.
Hurley, C. Michael
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
Moyn, Samuel A.
Quinn, Mary E.
Russ, Judith P.
Sapiro, Miriam E.
Schulte, Gregory L.
Uyehara, Margaret A.

TEXT_BODY

judy - this has been cleared and is ready to go. plse use THESE versions, not the ones already in my library, since there have been a few edits, not allof which are marked. thx, ms
plse put one
red dot on it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Allen, Charles

A.

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 1999 10:33 AM

To: Sapiro, Miriam E.
Cc: @EUROPE
- European Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT -
Legislative
Affairs
Subject: FW: CYPRUS REPRT - FW: pkg 3766 [UNCLASSIFIED]

Miriam,
Legal clears. Please see minor edits in report and hastert/Helms
letters.

-----Original Message-----

From: Sapiro, Miriam E.

Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 1999 6:26 PM
To: Allen, Charles A.; Tavlarides,
Mark J.
Cc: Blinken, Antony J.; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT
- Legislative Affairs; @EUROPE - European Affairs
Subject: CYPRUS
REPRT - FW: pkg 3766 [UNCLASSIFIED]

chuck/mark - cld i plse have
your concurrence on this package by 11 am Thurs. thx, ms

-----Original
Message-----

From: Russ, Judith P.
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 1999
5:35 PM
To: Sapiro, Miriam E.
Subject: pkg 3766 [UNCLASSIFIED]

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 3766 Rprt to Congress.doc

President's Bimonthly Report on Cyprus
February - March 1999

U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus Kenneth Brill met with Cypriot President
Clerides on
February 5 to discuss next steps on the Cyprus issue.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Thomas J. Miller traveled to Russia and
Sweden during
February 9-11 for consultations on Cyprus. In Moscow, Ambassador
Miller met with
officials from the Russian Foreign Ministry, including Russian

Special representative for Cyprus Vladimir Chizov. In Stockholm, he met jointly with Swedish State Secretary Jan Eliasson, Finnish State Secretary Jakob Bloomberg and Norwegian State Secretary Aslaug Haga. In both capitals, Ambassador Miller and his counterparts agreed to continue to support the United Nations (UN) Secretary-General's September 30 initiative to reduce tensions and promote a just and lasting Cyprus settlement.

On February 9, Ambassador Brill met with Cypriot Foreign Minister Kassoulides to renew the status of the Cyprus situation in preparation for the Foreign Minister's upcoming visit to the United States.

Ambassador Brill met on February 10 with Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash to exchange views on the current situation on the island and prospects for the settlement process. He urged Mr. Denktash to lift the Turkish Cypriot suspension of bicomunal contacts between the two sides.

Special Presidential Emissary for Cyprus Richard C. Holbrooke and Ambassador Miller met on February 16 with Mr. Kassoulides in New York. They discussed the status of the Secretary-General's September 30 initiative concerning Cyprus.

Also on February 16, Ambassador Brill met with Mr. Clerides to discuss the status of the UN Secretary-General's September 30 initiative and the Cyprus settlement process.

Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright met on February 17 with Mr. Kassoulides in Washington. The Secretary reiterated firm U.S. support for the UN Secretary-General's initiative to reduce tensions and promote a just and lasting settlement. She reiterated U.S. support for a solution based on a bizonal, bicomunal federation and stressed that the United States is committed to working with both sides and "will not hesitate to bring to the table whatever contributions we can make ourselves." Secretary Albright urged both

sides to
"negotiate creatively and flexibly."

Ambassador Miller subsequently met on February 24 with Mr. Kassoulides to follow up on aspects of the Secretary's meeting, including prospects for a settlement.

U.S. Representative Doug Bereuter led a delegation to Cyprus during February 17-18. Representatives Bateman, Bilirakis, Bliley, Gillmor, Goss, Hefley, McInnis, Packard, Roukema, and Tanner participated in the delegation. They met with Messers. Clerides and Denktash, UN Secretary-General's Deputy Special Representative for Cyprus Ann Hercus, and a cross-section of Cypriots from both sides of the island. In Athens on February 18, the representatives met with Greek Defense minister Tsouhazopoulos and Greek Parliament Speaker Kaklamanis to discuss Cyprus as well as other issues.

On February 23, Deputy Assistant National Security Adviser James B. Steinberg and Under Secretary for Political Affairs Thomas Pickering met separately with UK Special Cyprus Representative David Hannay in Washington to review the Cyprus settlement process. Ambassador Hannay also met with Ambassador Miller to discuss next steps.

On February 24, Ambassador Brill met with Mr. Denktash to discuss prospects to resume the negotiation process.

On March 8, Ambassador Brill met with Mr. Kassoulides to follow up on his visit to the United States and discuss the upcoming visit by Ambassador Miller.

Ambassador Miller traveled to Turkey, Cyprus, and Greece during March 8 - 13. On March 8, Ambassador Miller met in Istanbul with Turkish business leaders. In Ankara on March 9, he met with Foreign Minister Cem, Deputy Foreign Minister Gurel and other senior MFA officials. In Nicosia on March 10 and 11,

Ambassador

Miller held separate meetings with Messers. Clerides and Denktash to discuss

prospects for resuming settlement negotiations. On March 11 - 12,

Ambassador

Miller met in Athens with Foreign Minister Papandreou, alternate

Foreign Minister

Kranidiotis and other senior MFA officials.

On March 12, Cypriot MFA Director General Shambos called in Charge d'Affairs

Deborah Graze and the ambassadors from the other Permanent five

UN Security

Council members to lodge a protest about reported plans by Turkish

Cypriots to

change the status of Varosha.

During his visit to the United States on March 24, Greek Deputy foreign Minister

Niotis called upon Under Secretary Pickering, Assistant Secretary for European

Affairs Marc Grossman, NSC Senior Director Antony Blinken and

Ambassador Miller

to discuss a wide-range of issues, including Cyprus and the settlement process.

On March 25, Ambassador Miller met in London with Ambassador Hannay regarding the

Cyprus dispute.

Ambassador Miller traveled to Paris on March 26 for consultations with MFA Deputy

Political Director Baleine du Laurens and other senior MFA officials

to review

prospects for settlement negotiations.

On March 26, Ambassador Brill met with Mr. Kassoulides to continue discussion of

U.S. efforts to resume Cyprus settlement talks.

Ambassador Miller met in Brussels on March 30 with European Union (EU) Troika

representatives to discuss the Cyprus problem. Among the EU representatives were

German Council President and German Cyprus Coordinator Detlev Zuercher, EU

Commissioner for Cyprus, Malta, and Turkey Eric Van Der Linden, EU Commission

Administrator for Cyprus, Malta, and Turkey Benoit Hambueckers, Austrian MFA

Director of Southern European Affairs Walter Hagg, Finnish MFA
Deputy Director
General Anneli Puura-Markala, and EU Council Secretariat Principal
Administrator
for South East Europe Leena Aalto.

3

2

3766

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 3766ltrHastert.doc

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 1999 to March 31, 1999. The previous submission covered events during December 1998 and January 1999.

The United States remains actively engaged in efforts to promote a negotiated settlement to the Cyprus dispute, under UN auspices and on the basis of a bizonal, bicomunal federal solution. Secretary Albright underscored the U.S. commitment to finding a comprehensive solution to Cypriot Foreign Minister Kassoulides during their February 17 meeting in Washington.

Our efforts also continued in the region. Special Cyprus Coordinator Thomas J. Miller traveled to Turkey, Cyprus and Greece during March 8-13, and Ambassador Brill continued discussions with the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leadership on next steps. Ambassador Miller also discussed prospects for

progress with
counterparts in EU capitals and in Moscow.

Sincerely,

The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

1

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 3766ltrHelms.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 1999 to March 31, 1999. The previous submission covered events during December 1998 and January 1999.

The United States remains actively engaged in efforts to promote a negotiated settlement to the Cyprus dispute, under UN auspices and on the basis of a bizonal, bicomunal federal solution. Secretary Albright underscored the U.S. commitment to finding a comprehensive solution to Cypriot Foreign Minister Kassoulides during their February 17 meeting in Washington.

Our efforts also continued in the region. Special Cyprus Coordinator Thomas J. Miller traveled to Turkey, Cyprus and Greece during March 8-13, and Ambassador Brill continued discussions with the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leadership on next steps. Ambassador Miller also discussed prospects for progress with counterparts in EU capitals and in Moscow.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse Helms
Chairman
Committee on Foreign Relations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

1

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 3766pre.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Report to Congress on Cyprus

Purpose

Forward the bimonthly Presidential Report to the Congress on Cyprus.

Background

The International Security Assistance Act of 1978 requires that you submit a bimonthly report on progress made during the period toward "the conclusion of a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem," including any relevant reports prepared by the UN Secretary General for the Security Council. The Department of State has prepared for your approval a draft Presidential Report on Cyprus, which is at Tab B. At Tab A are transmittal letters to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The previous report covered progress during December 1998 to January 1999. The current report covers the period February 1999 to March 1999.

The United States remains actively engaged in efforts to promote a negotiated settlement to the Cyprus dispute, under UN auspices and on the basis of a bizonal, bicomunal federal solution. Secretary Albright underscored the U.S. commitment to finding a comprehensive solution to Cypriot Foreign Minister Kassoulides during their February 17 meeting in Washington.

Our efforts also continued in the region. Special Cyprus Coordinator Thomas J. Miller traveled to Turkey, Cyprus and Greece during March 8-13, and Ambassador Brill continued discussions with the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leadership on next steps. Ambassador Miller also discussed prospects for progress with counterparts in EU capitals and in Moscow.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letters to the Congress at Tab A.

Attachments

Tab A Transmittal Letters to Congress
Tab B Report to Congress

2

2

3766

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 3766SRB.doc

May 26, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL R. BERGER

THROUGH: ANTONY BLINKEN

FROM: MIRIAM SAPIRO

SUBJECT: President's Report to Congress on Cyprus

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President transmitting his bimonthly Report to Congress on Cyprus, submitted in accordance with the International Security Assistance Act of 1978. This report covers the February 1999 - March 1999 timeframe and should be submitted as soon as possible.

Concurrence by: Chuck Allen, Mark Tavlarides

RECOMMENDATION

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

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President
Tab A Transmittal Letters to Congress
Tab B Report to Congress
Tab II Incoming from State
1

3766

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 6/24/99 2:23:44 PM
FROM Kaufman, Stuart J. (RUE)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Ratification of Convention on Nuclear Safety [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Elkind, Jonathan H. (RUE)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Jon--I think this was it--guess it went under your name. Looks like 2117 was the package no.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kaufman,
Stuart J.
Sent: Friday, April 02, 1999 2:50 PM
To: Barnett, Cheryl
E.
Cc: Kaufman, Stuart J.
Subject: FW: Ratification of Convention
on Nuclear Safety [UNCLASSIFIED]

Cheryl--please use the attached
version of the two memos, NOT what's saved on the G drive. G drive
version is old. Ready to go final.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kaufman,
Stuart J.
Sent: Friday, April 02, 1999 1:11 PM
To: Krass, Caroline
D.
Cc: @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine; @NONPRO - Export Controls;
@LEGAL
- Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Subject: FW: Ratification
of Convention on Nuclear Safety [UNCLASSIFIED]

Caroline: Thanks
for the quick turnaround. Much appreciated. State is double-checking
on the "easily met", but wanted to know: is the "easily" important?
What if (hypothetically) meeting the requirement takes a moderate
amount of effort, but it's effort worth making anyway? In other
words, could "easily met" be changed to, "met without undue

difficulty"
or something like that?

-----Original Message-----

From: Krass,
Caroline D.
Sent: Friday, April 02, 1999 11:16 AM
To: Kaufman,
Stuart J.
Cc: @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @NONPRO - Export Controls;
@LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine
Subject: FW:
Ratification of Convention on Nuclear Safety [UNCLASSIFIED]

Legal

clears with the following comments (substantial edits to the POTUS memo and minor misspelling on SRB memo). As I believe Jo discussed with you, there are some formatting issues with the certification letters (perhaps your secretary can help).

Please let me know
if you have any questions.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kaufman,
Stuart J.
Sent: Thursday, April 01, 1999 8:09 PM
To: Krass, Caroline
D.; Samore, Gary S.; Tavlarides, Mark J.
Cc: @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;
@NONPRO - Export Controls; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
@RUSSIA
- Russia/Ukraine
Subject: Ratification of Convention on Nuclear
Safety [UNCLASSIFIED]

Please pass comments and clearances by 2:00 pm Friday, April 3. We need to get this formally in force fast in order to attend the meeting of parties to the treaty later this month.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 2117helmslet.doc

June 24, 1999

The Honorable Jesse Helms, Chairman
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
415 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-6225

Dear Senator Helms:

I am writing in reference to the Senate resolution of advice and consent on the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

In accordance with Condition (1) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, adopted by the Senate of the United States on March 25, 1999, I hereby certify that the United States Government will not engage in any multilateral activity in the field of international nuclear regulation or nuclear safety that unnecessarily duplicates a multilateral activity undertaken pursuant to the Convention.

I would like to thank you for your consideration and action on this important matter.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

June 24, 1999

The Honorable Benjamin Gilman, Chairman
House Committee on International Relations
2170 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Gilman:

I am writing in reference to the Senate resolution of advice and consent on the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

In accordance with Condition (1) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, adopted by the Senate of the United States on March 25, 1999, I hereby certify that the United States Government will not engage in any multilateral activity in the field of international nuclear regulation or nuclear safety that unnecessarily duplicates a multilateral activity undertaken pursuant to the Convention.

Thank you for your consideration on this important matter.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

June 24, 1999

The Honorable Joseph Biden, Jr.
415 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-6225

Dear Senator Biden:

I am writing in reference to the Senate resolution of advice and consent on the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

In accordance with Condition (1) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, adopted by the Senate of the United States on March 25, 1999, I hereby certify that the United States Government will not engage in any multilateral activity in the field of

international nuclear regulation or nuclear safety that unnecessarily duplicates
a multilateral activity undertaken pursuant to the Convention.

I would like to thank you for your consideration and action on this important matter.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

June 24, 1999

The Honorable Sam Gejdenson
B-360 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Gejdenson:

I am writing in reference to the Senate resolution of advice and consent on the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

In accordance with Condition (1) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, adopted by the Senate of the United States on March 25, 1999, I hereby certify that the United States Government will not engage in any multilateral activity in the field of international nuclear regulation or nuclear safety that unnecessarily duplicates a multilateral activity undertaken pursuant to the Convention.

Thank you for your consideration on this important matter.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 2117potusmemo.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER

SUBJECT: Proposed Ratification of the Convention on Nuclear Safety

Purpose

To sign the instrument of ratification for the Convention on Nuclear Safety ("CNS" or "Convention"), and four letters of certification.

Background

Madeleine has forwarded the instrument of ratification for the CNS for your signature.

Attached for your signature are the instrument of ratification of the treaty (Tab A), and letters of certification (Tab B). Also attached are the State Department's memorandum on the Convention (Tab C), and the text of the Convention (Tab D).

The CNS was negotiated with strong U.S. support and leadership, and represents the first international legal instrument to address nuclear reactor safety

specifically. It strengthens nuclear safety around the world by having each country's civilian nuclear power program held up for peer review every three

years. Forty-seven of the sixty-five countries that are signatories have deposited their instruments of ratification, including all states with significant nuclear programs except the U.S. and India.

Speedy ratification is crucial. The United States is the only G-8 state that has not met the commitment to ratify made at the 1996 Moscow Summit on Nuclear Safety and Security. The Convention is not controversial, but its ratification was held up in the Senate, in part when it became linked to the issue of appointing a Republican to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Completing ratification now will allow the United States to participate in the civilian nuclear program peer review mechanism laid out in the CNS. U.S. involvement in these reviews maintains our ability to provide international leadership in nuclear safety fora, especially with regard to states with weak nuclear safety records and practices. The United States is already in compliance with all obligations under the CNS.

The Senate has prohibited U.S. participation in the "operation" of the Convention (which could be read to include attendance at an important April 1999 meeting of the Contracting Parties) until you certify that the U.S. Government will not engage in any unnecessarily duplicative multilateral activity in international nuclear regulation or safety. In our view, to the extent that the Senate is attempting to prohibit U.S. participation in an international forum, such a prohibition would be an unconstitutional interference with your foreign affairs power. Nevertheless, because other portions of this certification requirement are not unconstitutional, and because our compliance with the certification requirement can be met without undue difficulty, we recommend that you sign the attached letters of certification (Tab B) to the Chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee (with copies to the ranking minority members) at the same time as the Instrument

of
Ratification. The letters confirm that we will meet the Senate's
condition.

In addition, the Senate has imposed two other conditions requiring
Presidential
certifications. You have forty-five days after the deposit of the U.S.
instrument
of ratification to make these certifications, and they will be
transmitted at a
later date.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the instrument of ratification and the letters of
certification.

Attachments

Tab A Instrument of Ratification

Tab B Certification Letters

Tab C Department of State Memorandum (Kenney-Davies memo)

Tab D Convention on Nuclear Safety

2

2117

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 2117srb.doc

April 2, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL R. BERGER

THROUGH: CARLOS PASCUAL

FROM: JONATHAN ELKIND

SUBJECT: Proposed Ratification of the Convention on Nuclear
Safety

The United States signed the Convention on Nuclear Safety (CNS) on

September 20,
1994. The Senate ratified it on March 25, 1999. The memorandum at
Tab I
recommends that the President sign the attached Instrument of
Ratification of the
CNS, along with the attached letters of certification required by the
U.S.
Senate.

Concurrence by: Jack Caravelli, Caroline Krass, Mark Tavlarides

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum for the President at Tab I.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for the President

Tab A Instrument of Ratification

Tab B Certification Letters and copies

Tab C Department of State Memo (Kenney-Davies memo)

Tab D Convention on Nuclear Safety

2

2117

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/8/99 8:32:14 AM
FROM Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Background Paper for Jim on Sanctions Deputies Meeting Tomorrow [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

FYI -- I also read Jesse Helms article on sanctions reform last night in Foreign Affairs. What was frightening is that I agreed more with him than with the USAEngage people. It also seemed pretty clear to me that sanctions reform legislation along the lines discussed here is going nowhere if Helms has anything to do with it...

-----Original

Message-----

From: Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)

Sent: Thursday, July

08, 1999 8:25 AM

To: Schaefer, Matthew P. (INTECON); Crocker, Bathsheba

N.; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor

Cc: @INTECON - Economic Affairs;

@LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @MULTILAT - Multilateral and Humanitarian Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs

Subject: RE: Background

Paper for Jim on Sanctions Deputies Meeting Tomorrow [UNCLASSIFIED]

I

think it's worth noting that this paper is almost entirely about legislative strategy so the views of the legislative directorate are probably the most critical here. (No offense to others; just makes the "clearance" below a little misleading.)

-----Original

Message-----

From: Schaefer, Matthew P. (INTECON)

Sent: Wednesday,

July 07, 1999 8:52 PM

To: Crocker, Bathsheba N.; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor

Cc: @INTECON - Economic Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;

@MULTILAT - Multilateral and Humanitarian Affairs; @LEGISLAT -

Legislative

Affairs

Subject: FW: Background Paper for Jim on Sanctions Deputies

Meeting Tomorrow [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Please pass

to Jim (cleared by intecon, multilat, and legal)

Note: Legis.

did not have the opportunity to review this document due to the fact the draft of this paper was finalized so late today. Many deputies will bring their leg. folks to the meeting, however.

Background

Paper for Tomorrow's Sanctions Deputies Meeting (Room 324 at 9:45 AM)

I. Review of Existing Sanctions Reform Bills

Sanctions

reform bills can be divided into two categories: general and agricultural. The deputies discussion will likely focus on the general sanctions reform bills. However, it will also be important to discuss the agricultural sanctions reform bills for two reasons: 1) our concerns over these bills (e.g. reducing Executive Branch flexibility) parallel our concerns with the general sanctions reform bills; and 2) passage of an agricultural sanctions bill might take the steam out of the general sanctions reform effort.

General Sanctions Reform Bills

1.

Lugar (S757) and its House Parallel Crane (HR 1244)

The Lugar

bill with 37 co-sponsors is the main existing general sanctions reform bill. The Crane bill with 91 co-sponsors is the Lugar equivalent in the House with nearly identical provisions. An outline of the major provisions of Lugar-Crane follows below along with our views on the major provisions.

* Lugar-Crane contains a conceptual definition of unilateral economic sanctions followed by an extensive list of measures that are included within that definition. (We find the list approach problematic because it invites groups to seek to exclude particular sanctions).

* Lugar-Crane states that future unilateral

economic sanctions bills "should" adhere to guidelines, including the following:

- * "sunset" after two years unless specifically re-authorized. (We disagree because encourages targets to wait out sanctions and undermines our arguments in UNSC against time-bound sanctions).
- * provide for contract sanctity (although Crane bill provides some minor exceptions). (We believe there should be an exception if the President finds it will reduce the effectiveness of sanctions).
- * not involve agriculture, food or medicine unless national security concerns or armed conflict. (We agreed that these items should generally be excluded absent compelling circumstances but do not think this provides enough flexibility and we would also be concerned how agricultural commodity is defined, i.e., does it go beyond what is food or what is "ingestible").
- * provide national interest waiver for President (We agree but again the language is "should" and therefore no requirement -i.e. no freestanding "national interest" waiver is provided).
- * Lugar-Crane requires that unilateral sanctions acts be treated as private sector mandate and require report of Congressional Budget Office. (We support this requirement).
- * Lugar-Crane requires that future unilateral economic sanctions bills allow for public comment prior to committee consideration, that committee reports state whether the act complies with the guidelines, and the Lugar bill only further allows a point of order objection if committee report is not provided. (We believe that point of order provision is necessary in order to provide at least some constraints on the Congress realizing that later-in-time legislation always prevails).
- * Lugar-Crane requires ("shall") the President to follow nearly identical guidelines when imposing sanctions in the future. (We object to the lack of flexibility in many of the guidelines as noted above and believe that constraints on the President must also be phrased as "should" rather than "shall."
- * Lugar-Crane contains numerous reporting requirements on the Executive Branch, not only for our own sanctions but also for those being considered by the Congress. (We find these reporting requirements to be too onerous).
- * Lugar-Crane requires that the Executive Branch publish a notice in the federal register 45 days prior to imposing a sanction unless finds that the national

interest would be jeopardized. (We object to advance notice provisions).

* Lugar-Crane

contains compensation provisions for the agricultural sectors - i.e. if agriculture is involved in the sanctions then this sector receives extra export assistance. (We have questioned this provision noting that it is not available for other sectors).

* Lugar-Crane requires

the Executive Branch to set up a sanctions review committee comprised of principals. (We are in all likelihood going to establish a sanctions interagency work group (IWG) on our own and would not like the Congress telling us to do so and at the principals level).

2. Dodd's Bills

(S1161 and S927)

Senator Dodd has introduced two bills. His general sanctions reform bill (S1161 with zero co-sponsors) is much more in line with the Administration's views (although not entirely our "non-fingerprinted" version that you will recall that Al Maldon delivered after obtaining interagency clearance). In particular, Dodd's bill contains the following features:

* contains "point of order" and

federal private sector mandate provisions.

* excludes agricultural

commodities unless President finds the inclusion of such items in the "national interest." (although again we might have concerns depending on how agricultural commodity is defined, i.e. does it go beyond food or what is "ingestible.")

* instead of a "sunset" provision,

the bill calls for annual reviews of sanctions.

* allows exception

for contract sanctity where President finds it would detract from effectiveness of the sanction.

* only states that the "President

should, through the issuance of Executive orders or other comparable means, adopt guidelines, comparable to" those the bill places on Congress.

* provides "national interest" waiver authority to the

President to suspend, terminate or not impose sanctions (with procedures for an expedited Congressional disapproval motion).

Dodd's other

bill (S927 co-sponsored by Hagel) provides for freestanding "important national interest" waiver authority for the President

3. Helms'

Forthcoming Bill

Sen. Helms will hold a SFRC hearing on July 15th focusing on existing sanctions reform bills. The bills' sponsors and possibly some academics will testify. Helms has indicated that he will subsequently come up with his own "consensus" bill.

Agricultural Sanctions Reform Bills

Numerous bills have been introduced, including the following: Ewing HR 17 with 47 co-sponsors, Ashcroft S315 with 15 co-sponsors, Nethercutt HR 212 with 29 co-sponsors, Hagel S327 with 18 co-sponsors, Ashcroft S425 with 5 co-sponsors.

While we support the goals of these bills, we have concerns over them as drafted because they limit Presidential flexibility (i.e. go beyond requiring a national interest finding to include such items in sanctions regimes) and some contain onerous reporting requirements. Stu also has concerns that passage of an agricultural sanctions bill would halt any momentum for sanctions reform generally (since the agricultural community would no longer be engaged).

II. Our Priorities, Features We Will Accept, and Features We Want to Avoid

Deputies are likely to largely agree on these matters -- most have been outlined or at least hinted at in Stu's testimony.

Priorities

Our single biggest priority is to obtain freestanding "national interest" waiver authority for all future sanctions legislation. (We would actually like such authority for existing sanctions legislation but realize that this is too difficult politically, e.g. visa provisions of Helms-Burton).

Features We Will Accept

Stu has indicated that the Administration could agree (or at least is willing to consider subjecting itself to a requirement) to do a cost-benefit analysis (and share some type of report with Congress provided we maintain flexibility over the content and other features of the report). Stu has also indicated that the Administration could agree to conduct an annual review of sanctions, and depending on our review of the continued effectiveness of such measures, determine whether some of them should be modified or terminated. He has also noted that if Congress does not approve of the President's

recommendation, it could enact a motion of disapproval.

Features

We Want to Avoid

The outcome we most want to avoid is legislation that places significant constraints on the Executive Branch and little or no constraints on the Congress. Since Congress can always pass later-in-time legislation that will prevail over restraints in sanctions reform legislation, we have always indicated that restraints on the Executive Branch should largely be hortatory ("should" rather than "shall") and that we would subject ourselves to similar guidelines as those adopted by the Congress.

In addition to one-sided constraints imposed on the Executive Branch, particular features in a sanctions reform bill that we would want to avoid include the following (many of them noted in the context of the Crane-Lugar analysis above):

- * advance notification requirements
- * burdensome reporting requirements
- * (near) automatic "sunset" of sanctions
- * contract sanctity in all instances without regard for effectiveness of sanctions

III. Strategy

Deputies

should make some sort of calculation of whether a sanctions reform bill is likely to come to a vote and the likelihood that we can achieve our priority (freestanding "national interest" waiver authority for all future sanctions legislation) in such a bill. These calculations will dictate which strategy to pursue.

Issues for Decision

1)

Do we engage the Congress?

Albright recently sent Gene and Sandy a memo, almost certainly drafted by Stu, stating "the time has come to engage the Hill in a serious way on sanctions reform legislation." Additionally, Stu has stated in testimony that "we hope to work with key Congressmen and Senators to craft an effective sanctions reform package in 1999." The number of bills (including the number of co-sponsors to several bills) indicates the great interest on the Hill. Thus, the major questions appear to be not whether we engage but whom, how, and what do we seek.

2) Whom do we engage?

Helms

has indicated that he will come up with his own bill after the July 15th hearing and indicated that we should not deal with Lugar. Stu has dealt quite closely with Lugar throughout the process, however, and many are leery of what sort of bill Helms will introduce.

3)

How do we engage?

Some might propose forwarding actual language to relevant players (such as was suggested in Albright's memo to Sperling and Berger). There may be differences in how much actual language to provide (e.g., "national interest" waiver language or a total bill). Others may want to engage less formally until Helms' intentions become clearer.

4) What do we seek?

We may be willing

to work on correcting current bills if they will include freestanding "national interest" waiver authority for the President. However, if the deputies determine that obtaining such waiver authority is unrealistic, then we may wish to seek only a "hortatory" bill or simply issue an EO or some other form of guidelines and simply fight any Executive Branch limits in legislation.

Multilateral view:

As we have argued before, we believe that Stu's extensive engagement on the Hill will help create momentum for legislation that will not serve the Administration's interests. If we need to demonstrate our bonafides here, we ought to issue an EO and welcome any congressional efforts to impose guidelines on congressional behavior, but fight any congressional attempts to limit what we can do.

Intecon view:

We share the concern over avoiding "bad legislation" with one-sided constraints on the Executive Branch. However, if a bill is going to move, then it may very well be counter-productive to our interests not to engage the Congress. Furthermore, we need to explore further in the deputies meeting the likelihood of being able to achieve our priority -- a freestanding "national interest" waiver authority -- prior to determining our strategy. Lastly, we believe most of the momentum for a bill is coming from the Hill itself and the business community, not from Stu's efforts (which are much more cautious than those emanating from the Hill).

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Cathy Millison to Antony Blinken, Susan Braden, Sue Bremmer et al. Subject: 5032-Helms Burton. (13 pages)	07/09/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange-Record (Sept 97-Jan 01) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/25/1999-09/08/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5637

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/21/99 1:15:46 PM
FROM Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Pkg 4896 -- Ltr to Helms [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bartlett, L. June (EXSEC)
Dejban, Donna D. (NSA)
Hilliard, Brenda I. (EXSEC)
Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)
Snip, Sarah E. (EXSEC/INTERN)
Wasserman, Elaine P. (EXSEC)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

ON DISKETTE.

-----Original Message-----

From: Norland, Richard
B. (EUR)
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 1999 9:09 AM
To: Joshi, M.
Kay (EXSEC)
Cc: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary; @EUROPE - European
Affairs
Subject: FW: Pkg 4896 -- Ltr to Helms [UNCLASSIFIED]

Let's
see if this worked -- revised letter attached. Dick.

-----Original
Message-----

From: Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)
Sent: Wednesday, July
21, 1999 8:51 AM
To: Norland, Richard B. (EUR)
Cc: @EUROPE - European
Affairs
Subject: Pkg 4896 -- Ltr to Helms [UNCLASSIFIED]

Per
your conversation with Steve, attached is the letter to Helms. Track
changes have already been turned on. Please e-mail back to

@EXECSEC
as soon as possible. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 4896helmsletterredo.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter concerning the peace process in Northern Ireland. I agree that the Good Friday Accord represents the best chance to secure a lasting and just peace.

Despite the recent setback in efforts to resolve the impasse over decommissioning and establishment of a power-sharing government, the peace process remains on track. The Irish and British Prime Ministers on July 20 commenced a review of implementation of the Good Friday Accord, as provided for in the agreement. Senator Mitchell is serving as facilitator, and has begun meeting the parties. The review will be tightly focused on forming an inclusive government and on decommissioning, and should reach a speedy conclusion early this fall.

The Accord put forward a balanced set of opportunities and responsibilities for both communities. It is vital that the parties comply with all aspects of the agreement.

Again, thank you for writing on this important matter. I look forward to your continued support as we work for a lasting peace.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse Helms
Chairman
Committee of Foreign Relations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510-6225

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 8/3/99 5:14:06 PM
FROM Allen, Charles A. (LEGAL)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: For comments and concurrence -- Mark and Chuck
[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Quinn, Mary E. (EUR)

CARBON_COPY Blinken, Antony J. (EUR)
Bremner, Sue L. (EUR)
Flanagan, Stephen J. (CEE)
Gordon, Philip H. (EUR)
Holtzapple, Richard A.
Hurley, C. Michael (EUR)
Maxfield, Nancy H. (EUR)
Moyn, Samuel A. (EUR/INTERN)
Norland, Richard B. (EUR)
Quinn, Mary E. (EUR)
Sapiro, Miriam E. (EUR)
Schulte, Gregory L. (EUR)
vonLipsey, Roderick K. (EUR)
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)
Allen, Charles A. (LEGAL)
Baker, James E. (LEGAL)
DeRosa, Mary B. (LEGAL)
Hunerwadel, Joan S. (LEGAL)
Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)

TEXT_BODY Legal clears with changes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Quinn,
Mary E. (EUR)
Sent: Monday, August 02, 1999 10:51 AM
To: @LEGAL
- Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Subject: For comments
and concurrence -- Mark and Chuck [UNCLASSIFIED]

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 5600srb.doc

July 30, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL R. BERGER

THROUGH: ANTONY BLINKEN

FROM: PHILIP GORDON

SUBJECT: President's Report to Congress on Cyprus

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President transmitting his bimonthly Report to Congress on Cyprus, submitted in accordance with the International Security Assistance Act of 1978. This report covers the April - May 1999 timeframe and should be submitted as soon as possible.

Concurrence by: Chuck Allen, Mark Tavlarides

RECOMMENDATION

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

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Transmittal Letters to Congress

Tab B Report to Congress

Tab II Incoming from State

1

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

5600potus.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Report to Congress on Cyprus

Purpose

Forward the bimonthly Presidential Report to the Congress on Cyprus.

Background

The International Security Assistance Act of 1978 requires that you submit a bimonthly report on progress made during the period toward "the conclusion of a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem," including any relevant reports prepared by the UN Secretary General for the Security Council. The Department of State has prepared for your approval a draft Presidential Report on Cyprus, which is at Tab B. At Tab A are transmittal letters to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The previous report covered progress during February 1999 to March 1999. The current report covers the period April 1999 to May 1999.

The United States remains actively engaged in efforts to promote a negotiated settlement to the Cyprus dispute, under UN auspices and on the basis of a bizonal, bicomunal federal solution. Secretary Albright underscored

the U.S.
commitment to finding a comprehensive solution to Cypriot Foreign
Minister
Kassoulides during their February 17 meeting in Washington.

Our efforts also continued in the region. Special Cyprus Coordinator
Thomas J.
Miller traveled to Turkey, Cyprus and Greece during March 8-13, and
Ambassador
Brill continued discussions with the Greek Cypriot and Turkish
Cypriot leadership
on next steps. Ambassador Miller also discussed prospects for
progress with
counterparts in EU capitals and in Moscow.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letters to the Congress at Tab A.

Attachments
Tab A Transmittal Letters to Congress
Tab B Report to Congress

2

2

5600

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 5600helms.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with Public Law 95-384, (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit

to you this
report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus
question covering
the period April 1, 1999, to May 31, 1999. The previous submission
covered
events during February 1999 and March 1999.

NATO's 50th Anniversary Summit in Washington this past April
brought an
opportunity to engage with Greek and Turkish leaders on the Cyprus
problem. I
met there with Turkish President Demirel and Greek Prime Minister
Simitis to
underscore the importance of a just and lasting solution for all
Cypriots.
Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright delivered a similar message
to her Greek
and Turkish counterparts in discussions on the possibilities for
resuming
negotiations in the fall. This Administration will continue efforts to
bring
about a settlement based on a bizonal, bicommunal federation.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse Helms
Chairman,
Committee on Foreign Relations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

1

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 5600 report on Cyprus.doc

President's Bimonthly Report on Cyprus
April - May 1999

In a series of meetings with both sides in April, UN Deputy Special Representative for Cyprus Ann Hercus continued UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan's

September 30, 1998, initiative to reduce tensions and promote a just and lasting settlement.

President Clinton met separately with Turkish President Demirel and Greek Prime

Minister Simitis during the April 23-25 NATO Summit to discuss ways of restarting

negotiations on Cyprus. The President encouraged President Demirel and Prime

Minister Simitis to be flexible and urged them to work toward a settlement based

on a bizonal, bicomunal federation.

Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright met separately with Greek Foreign

Minister Papandreou on April 22 and Turkish Foreign Minister Cem on April 25 in

Washington on the margins of NATO's 50th Anniversary celebration.

The Secretary

and her counterparts discussed a wide range of issues, including the situation in

Cyprus.

Also on April 22, U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus Kenneth Brill held separate meetings

first with Cypriot Foreign Minister Kasoulides and then with President Clerides

to discuss the prospects for a Cyprus settlement. Ambassador Brill told Mr.

Clerides that the United States is committed to doing all it can to move the

Cyprus issue towards negotiations in coming months.

On April 26, Ambassador Thomas Miller (who had participated in Secretary

Albright's earlier meetings with her Turkish and Greek counterparts) met with

Turkish Deputy Under Secretary Logoglu in Washington on the margins of the NATO

Summit. They discussed ways to advance the settlement process.

On May 4, Ambassador Brill met with Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash to discuss

prospects for comprehensive negotiations. The Ambassador urged the Turkish

Cypriots to come to the negotiating table without preconditions. He also

underscored the U.S. commitment to a Cyprus settlement based on a bizonal, bicommunal federation.

Ambassador Brill met on May 14 with Mr. Kasoulides on the Cyprus situation.

Alternate U.S. Representative to the United Nations for Special Political Affairs

Nancy Soderberg traveled to Cyprus May 19-20. Ambassador Soderberg, accompanied by Ambassador Brill, met separately with President Clerides and Mr. Denktash on May 19.

On May 26 Secretary Albright met with Greek Foreign Minister Papandreou in Washington on a wide range of bilateral issues, including Cyprus.

3

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 5600 hastert.doc

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with Public Law 95-384, (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 1999, to May 31, 1999. The previous submission covered events during February 1999 and March 1999.

NATO's 50th Anniversary Summit in Washington this past April brought an

opportunity to engage with Greek and Turkish leaders on the Cyprus problem. I met there with Turkish President Demirel and Greek Prime Minister Simitis to underscore the importance of a just and lasting solution for all Cypriots. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright delivered a similar message to her Greek and Turkish counterparts in discussions on the possibilities for resuming negotiations in the fall. This Administration will continue efforts to bring about a settlement based on a bizonal, bicomunal federation.

Sincerely,

The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert
Speaker of the House
of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 8/19/99 7:07:06 PM

FROM Stromseth, Jane E. (MULTI)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Jesse Helms and the ILO Child Labor Convention [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)

CARBON_COPY Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

TEXT_BODY

Dan: the President transmitted the ILO child labor convention to the Senate this month just before it went out of session. As you may remember, we discussed whether we should transmit the convention sooner (yes) and in a low-key manner (yes) in order to maximize prospects for favorable consideration by the SFRC. We received some good press and some positive noises from Biden's and Helm's staff.

Gene

Sperling had hoped to do a big roll-out for the transmittal but was persuaded by Labor, us, and others to keep it low-key. The question of a big event has arisen again: the Director-General of the ILO will be in Washington in late September, and Secretary Herman (and others) are seeking a mtg with the President. If that happens, the Director-General's presence in DC presents an opportunity for a child labor event, including to highlight the ILO convention. Sarah Rosen Wartell of the NEC would like your and Miles' views on whether a big event focussing on the ILO convention is a good idea or not in terms of good relations with Helms and the SFRC more generally on ratification. I'll be out tomorrow, but Sarah would appreciate it if you could give her a call on this at 65386. Thanks!

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Caroline Krass to Gary Samore. Subject: FW: KEDO Reprogramming. (34 pages)	09/08/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange-Record (Sept 97-Jan 01) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/25/1999-09/08/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5637

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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