

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Johnathan Elkind to Michael Roberts. Subject: New Cards. (12 pages)	03/11/1998	P1/b(1)
002. email	Leslie Davidson to John Norris. Subject: Draft LF-VP Memo on Prescott Meeting (3 pages)	04/21/1998	P1/b(1)
003. email	Leslie Davidson to Douglas Babcock. Subject: Prescott e-mail. (3 pages)	04/21/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/11/1998-04/27/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5653

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Johnathan Elkind to Michael Roberts. Subject: New Cards. (12 pages)	03/11/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/11/1998-04/27/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5653

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 3/11/98 12:33:26 PM
FROM Rossi, Christopher R.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: DRAFT POTUS reply to Helms letter [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Naplan, Steven J.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Steve: I just found a package (1562) in my in-file from Gephardt, Bonior & Pelosi. I believe you mentioned this and have included it as part of the reply. Am I correct? If so, you should collect it as part of the larger package to be sent to records.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Naplan, Steven J.

Sent: Wednesday, March 04,
1998 8:39 PM

To: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs

Subject: DRAFT

POTUS reply to Helms letter [UNCLASSIFIED]

DRAFT POTUS reply
to Helms letter advocating aggressive U.S. sponsorship of a China
resolution at Geneva.

Guys, I'd like an internal chop on this
thing before I put a package together for @Asia and @Leg
concurrences.

Thanks.

SN

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

DRAFT Helms letter.doc

DRAFT 3/4/98 8:30p

Dear Senator Helms:

Thank you for your letter of January 12 favoring United States support for a human rights resolution on China at this year's meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva.

Your unyielding leadership for the promotion of human rights the world over, and in China specifically, has brought honor to the American people and strength to those Chinese citizens who look to our great nation as a leading light for democracy and freedom.

I know that you share my longstanding conviction that vigorous support for human rights must continue to be a key element of our relationship with the People's Republic China. Indeed, human rights was a focal point of the discussions held during our recent Washington summit with the Chinese, both in formal diplomatic exchanges and repeatedly in my private conversations with President Jiang.

While we have seen positive steps by China over the past year, including their signing of the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, as well as the release of Wei Jingsheng, more needs to be done. Our views on this are very well known to the Chinese and we will reassert the same in our consultations on a resolution with the other members of the Human Rights Commission.

Any and all efforts we make on a resolution will be informed entirely by concrete Chinese actions taken in advance of the Geneva conference. I have directed my staff to keep you and your colleagues abreast of the status of these consultations at Geneva.

Sincerely,

[Name/Title in Initial Caps]
[Title/Senate/House in Initial Caps]
[Organization/Position - Initial Caps]
[Address - Initial Caps]

1

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/26/98 7:50:09 PM
FROM Busby, Scott W.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Helms Q&A [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

CARBON_COPY Allen, Charles A.
Baker, James E.
DeRosa, Mary B.
Highsmith, Newell L.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.

TEXT_BODY Diana -- Here it is.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Helms Q&A.doc
What is your view of the position expressed yesterday by Senator Helms in a letter to Secretary Albright that he would adamantly oppose a treaty that did not provide the U.S. with clear veto power over any ICC action?

* I share Senator Helms' concern that the ICC not become a vehicle for political attacks on citizens of the United States or other law-abiding members of the international community.

* At the same time, we very much need an effective International Criminal Court to deter and punish those who would commit atrocities of the sort I

learned about
first-hand during my stop in Rwanda. And we must be willing to work
with our
allies and the international community to accomplish this result.

* I believe we can achieve both of these goals.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/26/98 8:05:52 PM
FROM Helweg, M. Diana
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT potus3-26.doc [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Storey, Sharon V.
Malley, Robert
Davies, Glyn T.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Joshi, M. Kay
Elkon, Nicole L.

CARBON_COPY

Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.
Crowley, Philip J.
Dehqanzada, Yahya A.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
Hill, Roseanne M.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Widmer, Edward L.
Bartlett, L. June
Cosgriff, Kevin J.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Elkon, Nicole L.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hurwitz, Marc I.
Joshi, M. Kay

Kerrick, Donald L.
Millison, Cathy L.
Poole, Jennifer C.
Rice, Edward A.

TEXT_BODY

Here are the Q&As, fully cleared by Jim. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

potus3-26_.doc

Foreign Policy Q's and A's
Presidential Press Conference
March 26, 1998

RUSSIA
MEPP
IRAQ
IRAN
KOSOVO
NATO EXPANSION
AFRICA TRADE
GENEVA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
MEXICO
COLOMBIA
INDONESIA
INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT
LANDMINES

RUSSIA

Background on the Yeltsin-Kohl-Chirac discussion: Baltics and NATO did not come up in the trilateral discussions. EU membership did come up at the press conference. Kohl, with support from Chirac, said that Baltic EU membership would be looked at in the context of the so-called Copenhagen criteria (human rights, economic and political stability) FYI -- Estonia has been extended an invitation to be among next six new EU members currently negotiating accession agreements.

Wasn't the Moscow trilateral summit a deliberate slap at the United States,

taking advantage of you being in Africa?

* To the contrary, we welcome this meeting of close friends of the United States.

It's another sign of Russia's growing ties to the family of European democracies

and an indication of movement towards a Europe free of rivalry.

* I am delighted that my good friends Boris Yeltsin, Helmut Kohl and Jacques

Chirac were able to take time from their schedules to meet today. I look forward

to hearing from them on their discussions.

What about Yeltsin's comment that the Summit was evidence of Russian membership

in a "greater Europe," on a par with the U.S.?

* We favor Russian cooperation with Europe. America's ties to Europe are

exceptionally close, through NATO and many other arrangements and economic links.

The Russians claim that Chirac spoke out against Baltic membership in NATO?

Isn't this contrary to the Open Door commitment which the Alliance made at the Madrid Summit?

* I understand that the question of Baltic admission to NATO was not raised in

Moscow. I want to reaffirm my own strongly held view and the confirmed policy of

the Alliance: the door to membership remains open to all democracies in Europe.

* As I said when we signed the Baltic Charter in Washington in January, we are

working to advance the integration of the Baltic states into the transatlantic community.

Russia and France have been at odds with the U.S. on our approach to Iraq and

Kosovo, watering down U.S. proposals for decisive action. Are you concerned that

this meeting was aimed at the United States?

* We have many mutual interests and ties with these governments, but also some disagreements. This is normal.

* As Chancellor Kohl noted at his news conference, the summit was not aimed against anyone. We are in favor of contacts which foster mutually beneficial Russian links to European Euro-Atlantic institutions.

Do you have any lingering concerns about Yeltsin's abrupt dismissal of government?

* President Yeltsin exercised his constitutional prerogative as president of the Russian Federation. It's not my place to second-guess internal decisions taken by President Yeltsin as Russia's legitimately elected leader.

* We are encouraged, however, by his public reaffirmation of his commitment to reform, and that his priority in naming a new government will be to give impetus to economic reform.

* We will continue to support Russia in its transition to a market-based democracy and its integration with global and regional institutions.

Have you heard directly from President Yeltsin?

* I have sent him a message that we support his continued emphasis on economic reforms. I would expect to hear from him after I return home.

Do you still think that you and Yeltsin will meet sometime this year?

* We will see each other at the Summit of the Eight in Birmingham in May.

* After Russia ratifies START II, I will look forward to a Moscow Summit where President Yeltsin and I can review the full range of issues in our relations and give impetus to START III negotiations.

Should we be concerned that this could lead to further political infighting or postpone reform initiatives or START II ratification?

* The Russian Federation has clear constitutional guidelines for installing a new government. President Yeltsin's spokesman indicated that Yeltsin is expected to move quickly in naming a new prime minister.

* President Yeltsin has said economic reform should have more impetus, and we see this as a very positive direction.

* We will continue to work with the Russian government on all issues of mutual interest, including START II ratification that we hope to see achieved within the next few months.

Will Vice President Gore's Commission be suspended?

* As the new Russian government comes on board, we will continue to engage at a variety of levels, including to promote reform integration of Russia into global economic institutions, and a range of mutually beneficial cooperative programs.

* For five years the Vice President has ably co-chaired our joint U.S.-Russia Commission, which has strengthened concrete cooperation in areas ranging from energy to space.

* We hope that President Yeltsin will want to continue the work of the Commission which he and President Clinton began at Vancouver in 1993. We certainly want to do so.

Is the situation stable or have we seen any reaction by the military that would cause concern?

* We will continue to follow events there very closely. Russia appears completely calm, with no unusual military activity. The financial

markets are
behaving normally. There have been no indications of any instability
whatsoever.

What's your current assessment of Yeltsin's health?

* President Yeltsin appears to be back at work. We have no particular
details on
his recovery from his respiratory illness.

If Kiriyenko is nominated as Prime Minister, what is your reaction?
Will the
Duma approve him?

* Personnel decisions are President Yeltsin's to make.

* U.S. officials have had an excellent working relationship with
Kiriyenko during
his tenure as deputy minister and then minister of fuels and energy.
He appears
to be a strong supporter of economic reform.

With all this uncertainty in Russian, isn't this a bad time to press
forward with
NATO enlargement?

* NATO enlargement will help stabilize Europe, which will benefit
Russia.

* Russia has moved forward with NATO-Russia Council and
Partnership for
Peace, even in the wake of NATO's decision to enlarge in Madrid.

* Delaying now will create uncertainty, not cause it.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Are you at all optimistic that Dennis Ross will be successful in
winning
agreement from Netanyahu and Arafat for the U.S. proposal regarding
a West Bank
withdrawal?

* I won't go into specifics about our ideas on what needs to be done.

Dennis

Ross is going to the region to finalize those ideas with the parties. He will report back to me in the coming days.

* Needless to say, we believe we have reached a critical point where the parties need to make the hard decisions necessary to move the peace process forward.

* I have spoken to the Prime Minister twice in the past week. Secretary Albright has spoken with Chairman Arafat as well. In the dialogue that we have had in recent days and weeks, we have presented ideas that reflect our best judgment of what is necessary to move forward at a time when the peace process needs to be resumed.

Prime Minister Netanyahu appears to be publicly pressuring you to back off your proposal regarding the West Bank?

* This is not about pressuring Israel or Israel pressuring the United States. The ideas we have presented represent our best judgement about what it will take to resume the process.

* I understand from my discussions with both Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat the difficult challenges that we face. But the hard decisions must be made if we are to restore confidence in the peace process.

Your proposal appears to call for a 13 percent withdrawal from the West Bank? Is that right? The Israelis have called this unacceptable?

* I'm not going to discuss specifics with you before Dennis Ross has had the opportunity to finalize our ideas with the parties.

* We can't impose anything on the parties. However, it is clearly time for the parties to make the hard decisions necessary to put the peace process back on

track.

Is Dennis presenting a final U.S. plan to the Israelis and Palestinian Authority?

Is he seeking a commitment from Arafat? Will you try to isolate Netanyahu to pressure him to accept a higher withdrawal number?

* Our ideas reflect our best judgment of what is necessary to move the peace process forward, about what it will take to get the parties back to the table.

These are not proposals about the final outcome of the process but about a way to get back into negotiations. Dennis will finalize these ideas during his discussions in the region and report back to me.

* Trying to isolate one side or the other will be counterproductive. We are trying to help the parties themselves bridge the gap that has formed between them, suggest a basis on which the parties can make progress and restore some trust and confidence in the peace process. We have made no final judgment on what it will take to accomplish this.

What about Israeli allegations that the U.S. is abandoning a long-standing policy that Israel alone makes decisions relating to Israeli security?

* The United States continues to stand by Israel and its security needs. Our commitment to Israeli security is unbreakable.

* The United States has been and continues to be heavily involved in the Middle East peace process. We would like to see the process move forward. These are difficult decisions that must be made by the parties themselves if the process is to move forward. The United States does not intend to make these decisions for them.

Has the Prime Minister's vocal opposition forced you to change your plan?

* Beginning in January, we have been engaged in a determined effort to develop ways to unlock the peace process. Beginning with my meetings with Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat and continuing to this point, we have maintained a constructive dialogue, providing our best judgement of what needs to be done. Clearly the parties have their own ideas as well.

* There is a great deal of uninformed speculation that there is a U.S. plan that we will attempt to impose on the parties. The peace process will move forward only when the parties themselves are prepared to make the hard decisions necessary to put the peace process back on track. We continue to refine our ideas on how to make that happen.

* The purpose of Dennis Ross's trip to the region is to continue our dialogue with the parties so that we can finalize our ideas on how to move the peace process forward. I expect Dennis to present our best judgement on what needs to be done to break the stalemate. We will continue to encourage the parties that they have to make the hard decisions necessary to move the process forward. And Dennis will report back to me with his recommendations regarding the next steps.

What if he can't persuade the Israelis to accept those ideas?

* Ultimately, it's up to the parties to make the hard decisions necessary to move the peace process forward. We will continue to do everything we can to help them.

IRAQ

Chairman Butler reports that Iraqis appear extremely cooperative. Any reaction to this apparent change in Iraqi behavior?

* We are pleased to hear Chairman Butler report that the Iraqis are cooperating with UNSCOM. We hope that they will continue to follow-through on their commitments and fully comply with all United Nations resolutions.

Is this sudden change in Iraqi behavior a ploy to dupe UNSCOM? How can you really be sure that they are fully cooperating?

* The criteria for full compliance are stated explicitly in the United Nations resolutions. The burden is on Iraq to answer UNSCOM's questions about its WMD programs and to satisfy UNSCOM Chairman Butler fully about the past, present and future of its programs. Iraq should make all relevant information and all personnel available if it hopes to gain relief from sanctions. Iraq has failed to do that for seven years.

* I have full confidence in the judgements and capabilities of the UNSCOM experts to assess when Iraq has fully disclosed all of its programs to develop missiles and weapons of mass destruction.

* In the meantime, we continue to maintain a strong monitoring presence in the Gulf to pursue our options in the event of Iraqi-non-compliance.

Can the inspectors really expect to find anything? The Iraqis have known for weeks that the inspectors would visit. the Presidential sites soon? How can UNSCOM do their job?

* The UNSCOM inspection team is being led by the Deputy Chairman of UNSCOM, Charles Duelfer, an arms expert. We are confident that he and the other

inspectors will conduct a thorough inspection.

* The MOU which Iraqi Deputy Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz signed explicitly re-affirms no-notice, surprise inspections by UNSCOM. The inspections occurring today are a baseline survey of all buildings in the Presidential sites. No-notice inspections could occur at any time in the future.

* The purpose of the inspections is not only to discuss relevant activities and information, but also to provide a basis for permanent monitoring so that the sites cannot be used for WMD activities in the future.

* The burden is not on the inspectors to find the information - it is on Iraq to prove it has accounted for and destroyed all WMD.

Are the Iraqis still up to their old tricks by arresting one of their scientists so he can't talk with UNSCOM inspectors?

* It is not clear why Iraq arrested Nassir al-Hindawi. He was a key figure in Iraq's biological weapons program, and has spoken to UNSCOM inspectors in the past.

* If Mr. Hindawi has information about Iraq's biological weapons program, UN inspectors should have unfettered access to him so they can learn what he knows.

Is this a setback to UNSCOM's efforts to get answers from Iraq?

* You should ask UNSCOM for its views. Our position is simple. The UNSC resolutions require that Iraq provide access to any individual it wants to speak to in order to get information on Iraq's programs.

* The burden is on Iraq to answer UNSCOM's questions about its WMD programs and to satisfy UNSCOM Chairman Butler fully about the past, present and future of its programs. Iraq should make all relevant information and all personnel available

if it hopes to gain relief from sanctions. Iraq has failed to do that for seven years.

IRAN

What is the US doing to deal more effectively with Iran - is there a change in policy?

- * We are seeking to encourage changes in Iranian policies and actions that threaten our interests.

- * We have noted the positive changes in rhetoric from the Iranian Government and have responded to President Khatami's call for "civilizational" - people-to-people -- dialogue.

- * Recent people to people exchanges, which have included academics and athletes, have gone well. We expect more such exchanges to occur.

- * Such events are valuable in developing understanding between the two countries. Yet we believe that the only way to solve the policy issues that have divided the US and Iran for too long is a direct dialogue between the Governments.

- * In such a dialogue, we would raise aspects of Iranian policy and practice, such as support for terrorism, attempts to acquire and develop weapons of mass destruction and support for violent opposition to the Middle East Peace Process. Such a dialogue would also offer Iran the opportunity to raise its issues of concern.

What about press reports that describe actions that the US is taking to improve its relations with Iran - are such reports accurate?

- * We have said that we want to facilitate people to people exchanges by working with private American organizations who wish to host Iranian visitors or send

groups to Iran.

* [IF ASKED: We have no master list of such exchanges, nor to we have any plans to put a USIA officer in Tehran.]

* In that context, we recently gave permission for the Iranian UN PERMREP to travel outside New York City to deliver a speech to a private American group in Los Angeles.

* We are working closely with the Congress to enhance our capability to use radio transmissions to reach the Iranian people directly. Any effort we pursue would be to offer alternative information, not to act as an antagonistic element.

Do these recent exchanges indicate a reduction in Iran's pursuit of terrorism?

* We remain concerned about Iran's support of terrorism. We are watching carefully for any credible change in this behavior.

Have recent press accounts accurately defined Secretary Albright's role in Iran policy?

* The President relies on the Secretary of State and her Department to take the lead in developing and implementing the President's foreign policy in this very sensitive and important area.

* Secretary Albright shares the President's desire for an improvement in our relations with Iran and is determined to seek that objective in a careful and modulated manner in ways, consistent with our national interests.

There are media reports that you are trying a variety of ways to delay a decision on applying ILSA sanctions against Total and its partners. Has there been any rethinking of the U.S. position on the Total deal? What is taking so

long?

* There is no change in our position. We will follow the law and apply sanctions if appropriate. We continue to study the deal and have made no decisions at this point.

* The ILSA law was designed to strengthen international cooperation to force Iran to change its behavior. And, in fact, I think we have a common understanding with our allies on what we are trying to accomplish, even if we continue to disagree in some instances on tactics.

* I would also note that we continue to closely monitor the oil market. Should the current situation cause the Total-Gazprom-Petronas consortium to fall apart, there would be nothing to sanction.

KOSOVO

What's your reaction to the Contact Group meeting in Bonn?

* The Contact Group demanded an urgent start to authoritative talks between Belgrade and Kosovar Albanians, and pledged to consider further measures in four weeks if Belgrade prevents progress.

* Milosevic has taken some small steps but has so far failed to meet the requirements established by Contact Group Ministers in London on March 9.

* We are pleased that the 1996 education agreement has finally been signed, but it is long overdue and does little to bring Belgrade into compliance with Contract Group demands. We will watch the implementation of this agreement closely.

* We warmly welcome announcement of the Kosovar Albanian advisory group, an essential step towards serious dialogue on the political status of Kosovo. But

Milosevic has not yet provided a basis for the kind of talks necessary to prevent more violence.

* The Contact Group will maintain the pressure for unconditional dialogue and we are prepared to take further steps if the FRY does not comply.

What about the renewed violence in Kosovo? There is no movement by either side to negotiate a settlement.

* We are concerned about renewed clashes between Serbian security forces and armed Kosovar Albanians. The difficulties in Kosovo cannot be solved by force.

* It is critical to get a serious dialogue underway, without preconditions. Kosovar Albanian leaders have taken essential steps toward dialogue, but President Milosevic has not.

It doesn't appear that Milosevic plans to back down?

* There should be no doubt about the seriousness with which we view the situation in Kosovo. We hold Milosevic responsible for the recent violence and will make every effort to bring him to a serious and constructive approach.

* We have also made clear to President Milosevic that we will respond to actions that inflame the situation. We have a broad range of options available to us. We do not rule anything out.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

Senator Lott has put off the vote on NATO enlargement until you return. Are you concerned that this will give more time for opponents of NATO expansion to find ways to block it?

* First of all, I understand that Senator Lott temporarily stopped debate on NATO expansion because of scheduling problems, not based on the merits.

* The fact is that, as was demonstrated last week, there is broad, bipartisan support for NATO expansion. We have an historic opportunity to make Europe more stable, NATO stronger and America safer. Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic will help erase the Cold War dividing line and help build an undivided, democratic and peaceful Europe.

* Even as Russia goes through its political transition, we expect the strategic partnership between NATO and Russia to continue to develop.

AFRICA TRADE

Is the Administration open to changes in the Africa trade bill in the Senate as Trade Representative Barshefsky suggested?

* As I've said since arriving here, this is a new Africa, and we need fresh, innovative approaches that support democracy, prosperity, economic opportunity and increased trade. Many African countries have undertaken massive, and often difficult, political and economic reforms in the past decade. The Africa trade bill will reinforce those efforts.

* I have seen first-hand during this trip the economic promise that Africa holds for both Africans and Americans as economic partners. Increased trade and investment will be good for Africa and good for American workers.

* We'll continue to work with the leadership in the House and Senate to pass this bill as quickly as possible. That's the best way we can help Africa help itself.

Despite your decision last week not to sponsor a resolution criticizing the Chinese for their human rights record, Ambassador Richardson had some pretty strong words regarding China's poor track record. What makes you think that they will do better once the pressure is off in Geneva?

* China's decision to sign the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights represents a formal commitment to the principles codified in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

* The Covenant provides a strong multilateral mechanism for the United States and other nations to examine China's human rights record. I made it clear to President Ziang that China needs to do more to respect human rights and freedom of political expression. Some progress has been made, but we will continue to speak out publicly about that record, as Ambassador Richardson did today.

Ambassador Richardson also had some things to say about some African nations. Did you raise human rights in your meetings and what did you tell them?

* A key objective of this trip is to promote democracy and human rights. I have told the leaders that I have met that the only way for Africa to develop its potential is by ensuring that basic human rights are respected, backed by the rule of law and full accountability.

* My message has been clear and consistent: relations between the United States and governments in the region are directly linked to progress on human rights and democratization.

MEXICO - MILITARY DRUG CORRUPTION

What can you say about drug corruption in the Mexican military?
Getting worse?

Does corruption in fact make our efforts "futile"?

* There is no doubt that Mexico's law enforcement institutions, as well as the military, are under attack from the drug traffickers. We are working with Mexico to confront this threat as vigorously as possible.

* Mexico's Attorney General Jorge Madrazo has himself stated publicly that entrenched criminal elements are a major problem for Mexico's police forces.

* Our efforts not futile. President Zedillo has indicated he is committed to tackling corruption and rule of law issues head-on. He recently announced a new nationwide program against crime and corruption. We will continue to work with him as he addresses this long-term challenge.

* Mexican military is investigating its own, arresting and prosecuting where necessary those who are involved with the traffickers. Five general officers are now under arrest and in jail as a result. Our assessment is that the Mexican military is carrying out its anti-drug mission in a responsible manner.

* We also believe Mexico's Attorney General is working diligently, and making slow but steady progress against the traffickers.

* Important to remember that expanded use of the Mexican military in counternarcotics operations was conceived by the Zedillo Administration as a temporary measure to cope with what President Zedillo has identified as Mexico's most serious national security threat, while Mexico's police forces, and in particular its counternarcotics police, are revamped, vetted, trained

and
professionalized.

* Military has meanwhile increased pressure on the traffickers, helped boost Mexican cocaine seizures by almost 50 percent in 1997, and eradicated more marijuana and poppy acreage than ever.

* With a \$57 billion U.S. drug market and corruption on both sides of the border, it's impossible to imagine that the Mexican military, like other Mexican institutions, will not be challenged by corruption attempts.

What about former drug czar Gutierrez Rebollo's allegations of a broad narco-conspiracy within the Mexican military? Is there a DEA report to this effect?

* Not going to comment on any alleged intelligence document. But I can say that Gutierrez Rebollo's allegations have been carefully considered by all relevant U.S. agencies. His charges are self-serving, contain significant gaps, and are therefore in many respects suspect. We believe the Mexican military is vigorously investigating, prosecuting and punishing corruption within its ranks.

[If asked] Why does DEA differ with that positive assessment?

* Not going to comment on agency positions. U.S. authorities have concluded that the Gutierrez Rebollo version of events is not supported by available intelligence data.

COLOMBIA

What can you tell us about the fate of the American citizens held hostage by the FARC guerrillas in Colombia?

* The U.S. Embassy in Bogota is still seeking confirmation of reports

that up to
four American citizens are being held hostage by elements of the
Revolutionary
Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). On March 23, during a violent
road block of a
major highway outside Bogota, a number of individuals were seized
by the FARC.

* We are in the process of notifying their next of kin and cannot say
for sure
that any American citizens are held captive, but we understand the
group was on a
bird-watching expedition outside Bogota. Our Embassy is in close
contact with
Colombian authorities and the International Committee of the Red
Cross, who are
in contact with the FARC units believed responsible for this violent
act.

[IF ASKED]

Q. Do you believe that this incident means the FARC is carrying out
its recent
threat to start targeting U.S. citizens and personnel in Colombia?

* We have declared the FARC a foreign terrorist organization for their
history of
attacks on U.S. citizens and interests in Colombia. It is unlikely that
American
citizens were targeted for attack in this particular operation, which
directly
affected hundreds of travelers on a busy holiday weekend.

Is USG assisting the Colombian Government in fighting the armed
insurgency? If
not, why not?

* USG has a significant program of counternarcotics assistance to the
Colombian
Government, including the Colombian National Police and elements
of the Armed
Forces engaged in supporting counternarcotics operations. Such
assistance is
used for counternarcotics purposes in some areas of Colombia where
armed
insurgents are involved in narcotrafficking activities, e.g. protection of
coca
fields and drug labs. In addition, we provide some professional
military

education to the Colombian armed forces through the International Military Education and Training program. Our assistance is carefully crafted to assure full protection with respect to human rights.
INDONESIA

Is there any chance that Suharto and his new economic team will agree to what the IMF is asking in their ongoing negotiations in Indonesia?

* There appears to be progress in the continuing negotiations between the new economic team in Indonesia and IMF officials. I am hopeful that the two sides can work through these complex issues and reach an agreement that gives Indonesians more hope for the future.

* As we have said all along, the best route to restoring financial stability and growth in Indonesia is through decisive and effective implementation of financial reforms.

* Meanwhile, as we announced earlier this week, we will send \$70 million in emergency food and medical aid to Indonesia to help alleviate the hardship suffered by the Indonesian people.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

BACKGROUND: The United States has tabled a provision to permit countries with working legal systems to defer International Criminal Court action in cases involving their own citizens, for a limited period of time. This delay would only occur if the country agreed to investigate and, if warranted, prosecute the crime itself.

Why is the U.S. tabling a proposal that would limit the jurisdiction of the court?

* Our proposal builds on a principle that all states in the negotiations

have
accepted: that we should encourage national courts to prosecute war
criminals,
and only use the ICC when such courts fail to do so.

* It is very important that countries with developed legal systems have
the first
opportunity to prosecute their own nationals.

* We also want to ensure that the court does not become a forum for
political
attacks against the United States or our allies.

Won't this provision permit lawless states like Iraq to delay or avoid
prosecutions before the court?

* No. This provision wouldn't apply, and the ICC could proceed,
when it could be
shown that a state lacked the ability or will to investigate its own
nationals.
[Note: prosecutor would make this decision, which would need to be
confirmed by
ICC judges.]

What is your view of the position expressed yesterday by Senator
Helms in a
letter to Secretary Albright that he would adamantly oppose a treaty
that did not
provide the U.S. with clear veto power over any ICC action?

* I share Senator Helms' concern that the ICC not become a vehicle
for political
attacks on citizens of the United States or other law-abiding members
of the
international community.

* At the same time, we very much need an effective International
Criminal Court
to deter and punish those who would commit atrocities of the sort I
learned about
first-hand during my stop in Rwanda. And we must be willing to work
with our
allies and the international community to accomplish this result.

* I believe we can achieve both of these goals.

LANDMINES

Is the U.S. willing to pledge to end the use of anti-personnel landmines on the African continent?

* Since 1992, the United States has by law prohibited itself from exporting any APLs to Africa or anywhere else in the world.

What is the United States doing to keep APLs from coming into Africa?

* We are redoubling our efforts in the Conference on Disarmament, and, as our next step there, are seeking a truly worldwide export ban. This effort will have the benefit of engaging some key landmine states that have produced and exported APLs but have not signed the Ottawa Convention.

Is the United States involved in getting rid of the millions of APLs already spread through Africa?

* We have already led the world in removing landmines and thereby saved many lives. To date, we have provided almost as much funding for demining efforts as the rest of the world combined.

* Since 1993, the United States has contributed more than \$150 million to humanitarian demining programs. Roughly one quarter of the active deminers in the world were trained and equipped by the United States.

* In Africa, since 1993, we have provided a total of about \$58 million for demining assistance programs in Angola, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Namibia, and Rwanda. In 1998 we anticipate expanding our Africa programs to include Chad and Zimbabwe.

* In 1998 the United States will contribute a total of about \$80 million to

demining efforts worldwide, more than doubling our previous year's budget.

Is the United States pressuring its allies not to ratify the Ottawa Convention so it can keep its landmine stockpiles in Europe?

* No, we have not in any way sought to discourage Ottawa Convention signatories from ratifying the Convention.

* We have repeatedly conveyed to our allies that the decision to sign the Convention is one that is theirs to make and we respect that decision.

* However, our allies' signature and impending ratification of the Convention have raised a number of questions we must resolve concerning NATO military plans and interoperability.

* We are engaged in close consultations with our allies on these questions in search of mutually satisfactory solutions that are consistent with NATO's military requirements and, for those who are signatories, consistent with the Convention's provisions.

* With the exception of those for use in Korea, the only type of anti-personnel landmine (APL) that remains in our active stockpiles do not pose a long-term humanitarian hazard.

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND

* In 1994, I was the first world leader to call for the global elimination of anti-personnel landmines.

* In 1996, we stopped using and began destroying the kind of anti-personnel landmines that lie in the ground for years ("long-lived"), with the sole exception of those we need in Korea.

* It is this kind of long-lived landmine -- which we are in the process of eliminating -- that plagues the African continent.

* On September 17 of last year, we set a deadline for the development of anti-personnel landmine alternatives so that by 2003 we can phase out even our self-destructing ("short-lived") mines everywhere around the world except for Korea.

* These kinds of APLs self-destruct within a very short period of time, and thus do not pose a residual humanitarian hazard after hostilities have ended. There are no known civilian casualties from these systems.

* We have also set the objective of have APL alternatives ready for Korea by 2006.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/27/98 12:05:03 PM
FROM Schwartz, Eric P.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Clarke, Richard A.

CARBON_COPY Baldwin, Kenneth
Benjamin, Daniel
Bobbitt, Philip C.
Clarke, Richard A.
Dollar, Carolyn J.
Fung, Mark T.
Gordon-Hagerty, Lisa E.
Hawley, Leonard R.
Klein, Brian P.
McCarthy, Mary O.
Metzl, Jamie F.
Mulligan, George D.
Rosa, Frederick M.
Roundtree, Beverly
Schwartz, Eric P.
Simon, Steven N.
Wechsler, William F.

TEXT_BODY Hey boss, you can curse the darkness or seek creative ways to see some light.

The guy I used to work for argued for the latter, and gave the back of his hand to the former.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Clarke, Richard A.

Sent: Friday, March 27,
1998 7:49 AM

To: Farrar, Jay C.; Busby, Scott W.

Cc: @DEMOCRACY

- Dem/Human Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs

Subject: RE: Helms letter on ICC

[UNCLASSIFIED]

well, Jay, I AM surprised...shocked actually.
to think that the Senate would be concerned about us giving up our
Security Council veto on something, something that could put Americans
in a non-American court....wow...who ever would have thunk it?.....hmmmmmm

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

From: Farrar, Jay C.

Sent: Thursday,

March 26, 1998 8:54 PM

To: Busby, Scott W.

Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human

Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;

@GLOBAL - Global Affairs

Subject: RE: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

I

hope no one is surprised by the letter! And I think we should be
mindful of this point of view as we argue the esoteric and academic
merits of the ICC.

If the US agrees to the ICC without anything
but full protection for our citizens through a veto action, the Senate
will send it down to a terrible defeat. Helms' letter speaks for
a good many Senators on this.

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

From: Busby,

Scott W.

Sent: Thursday, March 26, 1998 6:53 PM

To: @NSA - Natl

Security Advisor

Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal

Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs

Subject: Helms

letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Please pass to Jim (urgent):

Jim

--

We've just obtained a copy of a letter sent today by Sen.
Helms to Albright on the ICC. In essence, Helms expresses his "dismay"
at press reports indicating that there may be "new flexibility" in
the U.S. negotiating position. In particular, he is concerned that
the U.S. may be giving up its Security Council veto power over ICC
action. He concludes: " ... a treaty establishing such a court without

a clear U.S. veto ... will be dead-on-arrival at the Senate Foreign Relation Committee." We are faxing a copy of the letter to you (as well as all cc-ed on this e-mail) now.

We'll work up an additional Q & A for POTUS in case this letter comes up at the press conference tomorrow.

-- Scott

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/27/98 1:38:43 PM
FROM Wechsler, William F.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Farrar, Jay C.

CARBON_COPY Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Rudman, Mara E.

TEXT_BODY No problem. Reminder taken. I never have and never will do anything with Congress without your office's full involvement. The next time you meet Bill Danvers or Will Davis feel free to check my track record in this regard.

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

From: Farrar, Jay
C.

Sent: Friday, March 27, 1998 10:27 AM

To: Wechsler, William
F.

Cc: @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs

Subject: RE: Helms letter
on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks Will.

By the way, when you called the other day and asked about Senators on a particular committee, it got my cerebral juices flowing. Just wanted to offer another reminder that our office must be involved in any Congressional activity Global decides to initiate - and more than just notifying us immediately prior to something happening. Just as I wouldn't think of stepping into your substantive areas and "mucking around," I would hope you would give us the same courtesy. I know you will - thanks!

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

From: Wechsler, William F.

Sent: Friday, March 27,

1998 8:35 AM
To: Farrar, Jay C.
Subject: RE: Helms letter on ICC
[UNCLASSIFIED]

I couldn't have said it better

-----Original

Message-----

From: Farrar, Jay C.
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 1998
8:54 PM
To: Busby, Scott W.
Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs;
@LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @GLOBAL
- Global Affairs
Subject: RE: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

I
hope no one is surprised by the letter! And I think we should be
mindful of this point of view as we argue the esoteric and academic
merits of the ICC.

If the US agrees to the ICC without anything
but full protection for our citizens through a veto action, the Senate
will send it down to a terrible defeat. Helms' letter speaks for
a good many Senators on this.

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

From: Busby,
Scott W.
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 1998 6:53 PM
To: @NSA - Natl
Security Advisor
Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal
Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs
Subject: Helms
letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Please pass to Jim (urgent):

Jim

--

We've just obtained a copy of a letter sent today by Sen.
Helms to Albright on the ICC. In essence, Helms expresses his "dismay"
at press reports indicating that there may be "new flexibility" in
the U.S. negotiating position. In particular, he is concerned that
the U.S. may be giving up its Security Council veto power over ICC
action. He concludes: " ... a treaty establishing such a court without

a clear U.S. veto ... will be dead-on-arrival at the Senate Foreign Relation Committee." We are faxing a copy of the letter to you (as well as all cc-ed on this e-mail) now.

We'll work up an additional
Q & A for POTUS in case this letter comes up at the press conference tomorrow.

-- Scott

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/27/98 2:14:18 PM
FROM Wechsler, William F.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Busby, Scott W.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Should I call them to make sure, or will you?

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

From: Busby,
 Scott W.
 Sent: Friday, March 27, 1998 2:11 PM
 To: Wechsler, William
 F.
 Subject: RE: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

I assume so.

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

From: Wechsler, William F.
 Sent: Friday,
 March 27, 1998 2:00 PM
 To: Busby, Scott W.
 Subject: RE: Helms letter
 on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

I assume that State plans to clear their
 response with NSC, right?

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

From: Busby,
 Scott W.
 Sent: Thursday, March 26, 1998 6:53 PM
 To: @NSA - Natl
 Security Advisor
 Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal
 Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs
 Subject: Helms
 letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Please pass to Jim (urgent):

Jim

--

We've just obtained a copy of a letter sent today by Sen. Helms to Albright on the ICC. In essence, Helms expresses his "dismay" at press reports indicating that there may be "new flexibility" in the U.S. negotiating position. In particular, he is concerned that the U.S. may be giving up its Security Council veto power over ICC action. He concludes: " ... a treaty establishing such a court without a clear U.S. veto ... will be dead-on-arrival at the Senate Foreign Relation Committee." We are faxing a copy of the letter to you (as well as all cc-ed on this e-mail) now.

We'll work up an additional Q & A for POTUS in case this letter comes up at the press conference tomorrow.

-- Scott

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/27/98 2:29:43 PM
FROM Wechsler, William F.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Busby, Scott W.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

thanks

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

From: Busby, Scott W.
Sent: Friday,
March 27, 1998 2:13 PM
To: Wechsler, William F.
Subject: RE: Helms
letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

We will. I'm sure Scheffer will
be doing it and he's very good about making sure we see stuff like
this.

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

From: Wechsler, William F.
Sent: Friday,
March 27, 1998 2:14 PM
To: Busby, Scott W.
Subject: RE: Helms letter
on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Should I call them to make sure, or will
you?

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

From: Busby, Scott W.
Sent: Friday,
March 27, 1998 2:11 PM
To: Wechsler, William F.
Subject: RE: Helms
letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

I assume so.

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

From: Wechsler,
William F.
Sent: Friday, March 27, 1998 2:00 PM
To: Busby, Scott
W.
Subject: RE: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

I assume that
State plans to clear their response with NSC, right?

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

From: Busby, Scott W.
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 1998
6:53 PM
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human
Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
@GLOBAL - Global Affairs
Subject: Helms letter on ICC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Please
pass to Jim (urgent):

Jim --

We've just obtained a copy of
a letter sent today by Sen. Helms to Albright on the ICC. In essence,
Helms expresses his "dismay" at press reports indicating that there
may be "new flexibility" in the U.S. negotiating position. In particular,
he is concerned that the U.S. may be giving up its Security Council
veto power over ICC action. He concludes: " ... a treaty establishing
such a court without a clear U.S. veto ... will be dead-on-arrival
at the Senate Foreign Relation Committee." We are faxing a copy
of the letter to you (as well as all cc-ed on this e-mail) now.

We'll
work up an additional Q & A for POTUS in case this letter comes up
at the press conference tomorrow.

-- Scott

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/31/98 1:36:05 PM
FROM Countryman, Thomas M.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Annan Press Conference at National Press Club [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Simon, Steven N.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

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

From: Wright, Joseph (Larry)
Sent: Thursday,
March 12, 1998 10:50 AM
To: @PRESS - Public Affairs; @IRAQ Media
Subject: Annan
Press Conference at National Press Club [UNCLASSIFIED]

UN
SECRETARY-GENERAL DELIVERS REMARKS AT THE NATIONAL
PRESS CLUB

MARCH 12, 1998
Elapsed Time 00:00, Eastern Time 09:11

SPEAKER: KOFI ANNAN, UN SECRETARY-GENERAL
ANNAN: Thank you
very much, Peter. I think you've defined the
problem that it has
always been still is a (OFF-MIKE) problem.
Let me thank -- tell
you how happy I am to be back in
Washington. I enjoyed my visit
here last year and it's good to have
your convictions tested once
in a while.
And Washington is always ready to do so when it
comes to the
role and value of the United Nations. Joking aside,
let me say how
grateful I am for every -- for very warm and constructive
meetings
that I've had since I came to Washington with the president,

with
Mrs. Albright, with Secretary Cohen and Sandy Berger on the
administration
side.

I also had very positive meetings with Senators Helms,
Grams and
Biden yesterday. And today I met with a group of 17 senators
organized
by Minority Leader Daschle, and we also had very
constructive and
useful discussions.

Elapsed Time 00:01, Eastern Time 09:12

And right after this press conference I'm going to the Pentagon
to
talk to Secretary of Defense Cohen and his senior advisers.

As you know, I came to Washington with two main reasons in mind

--

to discuss Iraq's compliance with the demands of the Security
Council
and to find a way to end the debilitating question of
United States
arrears.

I've believe we've made real progress on both tracks.

On the
issue of Iraq, allow me to reiterate what I said at the Security
Council
upon their endorsement of the agreement I extracted from
the Iraqi
leadership on the 23rd of February. Iraq's complete
fulfillment
of these obligations is the one and only aim of the
agreement.

Elapsed Time 00:02, Eastern Time 09:13

I am under no illusion
about the inherent value of this or any
agreement. Commitments
honored are the only commitments that count.
The -- with the Security
Council's unanimous endorsement of the
agreement, however, the government
of Iraq should understand that
if this effort to ensure compliance
through negotiations is
obstructed by evasion or deception, as well
the previous efforts,
diplomacy may not have a second chance.

No promise of peace and no policy of patience can be without limits.

It is my sincere hope that the government of Iraq does understand this and allows UNSCOM to continue its work by giving it full, unfettered and unrestricted access to all sites.

Elapsed Time 00:03, Eastern

Time 09:14

Since the agreement, I am pleased to tell you that we have had a very successful visit -- inspection -- a very successful inspection, led by Scott Ritter and they entered a site they have not been able to enter for the past seven years. They did a very credible job.

And I applaud the men and women of UNSCOM.

On the issue of U.S.

arrears, I would also like to thank the president for his strong support of the United Nations and I think some of you had both him and the Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, appealing for settlement of this debt. In his State of the Union address, and elsewhere, he has also said, better than anyone, why a strong and fully-funded United Nations is in the national interest of the United States.

Elapsed Time 00:04, Eastern Time 09:15

He reiterated this to again yesterday in private and publicly, and I hope we will see progress in Congress this year. The United Nations is, as the Iraqi crisis has showed, a unique and irreplaceable instrument of achieving through diplomacy, what the world demands.

A stronger United Nations can do even more for the United States and for the rest of the world.

I am now happy to take your questions.

HICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Secretary-General. Now, as I said, please line up behind the two mikes and give your name and

affiliation from that.

ANNAN:

Yes, please.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) How would you (OFF-MIKE) the integration of Russia into the peace process until (OFF-MIKE)?

Elapsed Time 00:05, Eastern Time 096

That is the first question and the second one is, there were rumors that -- information that you are going to come to Moscow recently. Is that true? And if yes, then when? Thanks.

ANNAN: OK. I think by the peace process, you mean the Iraqi peace accord. You know, Russia played a very important role and right from the beginning sought a diplomatic solution, sending a deputy foreign minister as an envoy. And he worked very hard at getting an agreement. In fact, he stayed on the ground for about a month. When I got there, he was still on the ground and was able to brief me on his efforts. I was also in touch with Foreign Minister Primakov and President Yeltsin, as I were with other leaders around the world in my preparation for the trip.

So, Russia did play an important role. Yes, I do intend to go to Moscow and I'll be in Moscow beginning of April, and again to assure that we all stand together on this Iraqi crisis and send a message to the Iraqi leadership that they've signed and agreement and the whole international community intends to hold them to its fulfillment.

HICKMAN: It's with alternating whether this might become (OFF-MIKE)

ANNAN: I think so.

QUESTION: Good morning, Mr. Secretary-General.

I have two questions for you. You mentioned in your opening remarks that the president reiterated to you in public and private that he wants to resolve the issue of the arrears.

Now yesterday, a group of House Republicans came out very loudly saying that they are going to tie this legislation with family planning and that they gave the president a deal last year and he turned it down, he didn't want to cooperate.

Has the president given you assurances that he's going to yield some ground on this issue and will he try to free up these arrears and meet the House Republicans sort of half way on this?

Elapsed Time 00:07, Eastern Time 09:18

QUESTION: And my second question to you -- I'll let you answer the first one.

ANNAN: No, go on, go on with the second question.

QUESTION: The second question is do you think it's appropriate, in light of the fact that the U.S. has so many back dues owed to the UN, for them to be so vocal in this negotiation with Iraq and the standoff?

ANNAN: On the first question, let me say that it's internal U.S.

politics, and I would prefer not to be drawn on it.

What I can say

is that not a cent of the amount of money due to the UN that we are discussing is intended for abortion or any abortion-related issue.

Most of it is for payment of peacekeeping arrears, is for us to reimburse governments that put men and women in harm's way so that this world will be a better place. These are -- the countries that offered troops for operations in places like Bosnia, Mozambique,

Haiti and elsewhere.

Elapsed Time 00:08, Eastern

Time 09:19

So I will leave the American politicians, the administration and

the Congress to sort out this internal abortion issue. What

I'm

interested in is at the end of the day, that this is sorted out the

right thing is done and the UN is paid.

Because by

withholding the funds, I think U.S. is offending friends and foes

alike. And even allies like the European Union

issued a strong statement

last year when the payment was not made,

saying that, by the way,

the withholding of our payment is

destroying trust among nations

and I think that was a strong

statement. And some of you well recall

that the previous foreign

minister, Malcolm Rifkind, from the General

Assembly podium said

there can be no representation without taxation.

Elapsed Time 00:09, Eastern Time 09:20

And, in fact, you have

to know that Mrs. Albright, who was then

your secretary of state,

was very quick. She came back with a quick

retort. She said the

Congress has allowed the United Kingdom to

crack a joke they've

been waiting for more than 200 years to crack.

(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: And the second question.

ANNAN: Your second question

deals -- please remind me on the

second question.

QUESTION:

Do you feel it's appropriate...

ANNAN: Oh, yes. On the Iraq,

yes.

QUESTION: ... to be so vocal and outspoken.

ANNAN:

I think the U.S. does have the right to speak about Iraq.

First

of all, it was a country that committed troops on the ground.

It
was a country that was perhaps much more exposed and the country
that
also led the alliance and is a permanent member of the
Security
Council.

Elapsed Time 00:10, Eastern Time 09:21

But I think
its voice would even be clearer and louder if it
paid its way.

But it does have the right to speak.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary-General
(OFF-MIKE)

ANNAN: Assalam Alaikum.

QUESTION: Sir, you were
in the east, you went visiting some
countries in the Middle East
and the perception there is that there
is double standard as far
as the implementation of the UN
resolutions --Security Council's
resolutions in particular.
What are you going to tell the leaders
in these countries about
the role of the UN now that you just said
that the UN is
indispensable in keeping peace? Why there is this
problem is far
from the UN and also I want, if you can, you are
going to visit
Egypt visiting with President Mubarak?

ANNAN:

Yes.

QUESTION: Would elaborate a little bit about what are the
topics
you're going to discuss there?

ANNAN: Yes. Let me first
address a perception of a double
standard. I know it was the perception
in some situations becomes a
reality.

Elapsed Time 00:11, Eastern
Time 09:22

First of all, there is a qualitative difference between
the
United Nations resolutions affecting Iraq and the ones dealing
with
Lebanon and Israeli-Syrian relationship.
The Iraqi resolution
is under Chapter 7 and an enforcement

resolution. Apart from that,
there is a history. We know what
happened in the region. We know
the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait
and what the international community
had to do to restore normalcy.
And so, I think we need to look
at the facts. There are
differences here. On the question of the
Israeli-Palestinian, and
if I may add, the Syrian-Lebanese (OFF-MIKE),
the Security Council
and the UN have not been absent.

Elapsed

Time 00:12, Eastern Time 09:23

We have passed our Resolutions
425 and 338 and we have troops on
the ground. In fact, I'll be visiting
the UN troops on the
Lebanese-Israeli border. I'll visit them on
the Golan Heights and
I'll see our people in Jerusalem.

So,

the UN has been present, but when it comes to mediation, the
parties
have agreed on a mediator, and that is the United States.

The process

is at an impasse and every effort is being made by
President Clinton
and Mrs. Albright to break this impasse.

And I was able to discuss
some of these issues with the
president, Mrs. Albright and Mr. Sandy
Berger and Secretary of
Defense Cohen. So, efforts are being made
to break the impasse. In
Egypt, I will discuss with their President
Mubarak, the Iraqis
settlement and the need for all of us to keep
the pressure on
President Saddam Hussein to implement the agreement
that we agreed
to and to discuss the Middle East process and to
hear what he has
to say.

Elapsed Time 00:13, Eastern Time 09:24

Thank you.

QUESTION: If you don't mind, I'm going to ask my
question in

French.

HICKMAN: As long as we get a translation
(OFF-MIKE).

QUESTION: OK. I'm going to -- first of all...

(IN FRENCH)

ANNAN: I think that there are two questions. The
first question
is, what would be the role of the diplomats who will
be attached to
the inspectors when it comes to the inspection of
the eight
presidential sites?

Elapsed Time 00:14, Eastern Time
09:25

And the second question is, you saw Senator Helms yesterday,
he
has been a bit critical about the UN. Did he give you a firm
and
concrete promises about settling the debt with the United Nations?

ANNAN: (IN FRENCH)

Elapsed Time 00:15, Eastern Time 09:26

Elapsed Time 00:16, Eastern Time 09:27

Basically, I just said
-- observed that the diplomats who are
going on the inspection will
play the role of observers, ensuring
that Iraq keeps at it -- keeps
up its promises. And we on our side
are sensitive to the fact that
we are operating in the presidential
sites.

On the question
of Senator Helms, I indicated that we had a very
friendly discussion,
and the senator has indicated that he wants to
push for the Helms-Biden
bill, which was agreed to last year. That
will release \$926 million
to the UN with all sorts of conditions
and benchmarks.

Thank
you.

Elapsed Time 00:17, Eastern Time 09:28

QUESTION: Even
though you've been in this country a long time,
it's possible that
some people may not feel that they know a lot

about you. And if
you could be reflective, just for a moment --
what are some of the
forces that shaped your life, and particularly
your approach to
handling crisis?

ANNAN: That's a tough question, you know.

(LAUGHTER)

Yes, it's always (OFF-MIKE) to talk about yourself.

You have to

be careful not to be boastful, apart from the fact that

I'm a bit

bashful about this sort of -- let me say that I think

I have

traveled the world. I have worked and lived on three continents.

My

early years were shaped in Africa in Ghana.

I was growing

up during the years of the independence -- the

struggle for independence.

So as a teenager, as a young man, I saw

lots of change taking place

around me, and major changes, where the

colonial powers handing

over the country to what we called then

"freedom fighters," who

were people like Nkrumah (ph) and others

--came from jail and became

prime ministers and presidents.

Elapsed Time 00:18, Eastern

Time 09:29

And so you grow up believing that change is possible,

that all

is possible, and that one can dare make a difference, one

can dare

change. And that spirit is helpful. One is not easily

intimidated

or impressed by threats and this sort of thing.

Then of course, I was -- had the opportunity to work -- to study
and

work in America and in Europe. I've also worked in the Middle
East

-- in Egypt in Ismailia and other cities. So you learn to

appreciate

and respect other cultures.

Having worked with 185 countries

over time, you also learn how

to raise issues with different nationalities.

The way I would raise
 an issue and try to convince a Chinese about
 something would be
 quite different from the way I would try to do
 it with you or with
 an Iraqi or with a Russian.
 And those aspects
 also help.
 Elapsed Time 00:19, Eastern Time 09:30
 And I
 also try to respect those I deal with regardless of their
 rank.
 And I treat everybody from a messenger to president with
 respect.

And I consult, but at the end of the day, I have to reach deep
 inside
 myself to find inspiration to take a right decision. And
 this is
 a very lonely position. But there's been lots of support
 and lots
 of encouragement.
 And with that, one gets the feeling that perhaps
 this impossible
 job is doable. And you learn -- I told you about
 a lesson I learned
 as a young student in Minnesota, for example.
 As a young tropical
 person, my first winter ever in Minnesota --
 I mean, we had the
 same syllabus as the British. And I think some
 of my British
 colleagues here -- Evelyn, Leopold and others -- well,
 we had to do
 the same syllabus as the British students.
 Elapsed
 Time 00:20, Eastern Time 09:31
 We did the (OFF-MIKE) school
 certificate, the ordinary and the
 advanced level.
 So you read
 about the seasons. I knew all about the winters. I
 knew about spring,
 you know. But in my own country, we have two
 seasons -- wet and
 dry.
 (LAUGHTER)
 But intellectually, I thought I knew about
 it until I got to
 Minnesota, you know.

(LAUGHTER)

The
first thing that I didn't like was the fact that I had to
put on
layers and layers of clothing to keep warm. But I decided
that was
useful enough. But there was one item that I was
determined not
to use -- the earmuffs.

(LAUGHTER)

I thought they were
inelegant...

(LAUGHTER)

... and ugly.

(LAUGHTER)

Until one day, I went out to get something to eat and I almost
lost
my ears.

(LAUGHTER)

And I went out and bought the biggest
pair I could find the next
day...

(LAUGHTER)

... and walked
away with a lesson that you don't walk into any
situation and pretend
you know better than the natives do.

Elapsed Time 00:21, Eastern

Time 09:32

(LAUGHTER)

And that lesson has stayed with me
all the way through. Thank
you.

(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: Mr.

Secretary-General, you're going to visit the UN
troops in south

Lebanon. There's a debate now about 425 and 426,
and Israel is saying

it's willing to withdraw. You said change is
possible. Do you think

you can change anything there, you can play
a role in asking Israelis,

or playing a role (OFF-MIKE) Israelis

asking them to leave? (OFF-MIKE)

negotiations unconditionally?

ANNAN: Well, yesterday there was

a report emanating out of

Jerusalem that I was going to Jerusalem

with a seven-point plan to
try and deblock the impasse between Israel
and Lebanon, and that
the Israeli troops would withdraw from Lebanon
and the Lebanese
army would fill the vacuum and the UN troops will
be strengthened.

There is no such plan as far as I know of,
and I'm carrying no
such plan.

Elapsed Time 00:22, Eastern
Time 09:33

But whenever I'm in the region, I do talk to all
the leaders
about the peace process and the need for us to double
our efforts
for peace. I would hope that as the U.S. works hard
at breaking the
impasse and getting the parties to the table, that
the parties will
have the courage and the wisdom required to take
the tough
decisions. At the end of the day, it is the parties that
have to do
it. It is the parties that have to take those hard decisions
that
will ensure peace and eventual prosperity in their region.

We have two examples in the region -- Egypt and Israel were able
to
talk and resolve this. Of course, there were Security Council
resolutions.

Jordan and Israel talked and resolved it. And I would
encourage
the other parties to really engage each other
constructively, seriously.

And I know it is difficult. It requires
courage and vision and wisdom,
and I think they are capable of it.

Elapsed Time 00:23, Eastern
Time 09:34

And I would ask them to do it and work with the United
States
government in resolving these issues.

HICKMAN: I know
it's just a coincidence, Mr. Secretary-General,
but the ambassador
of Egypt just walked in as you were talking.
(LAUGHTER)

Glad to have you, sir.

Yes, ma'am.

QUESTION: Good morning,
Secretary-General. I'm wondering if you
feel as I do, that if women
gain greater financial and business
opportunities in the global
marketplace, this will ultimately lead
to greater conflict resolution
and world peace.

ANNAN: I will go beyond that.

(LAUGHTER)

I will not limit it to economic independence. I will limit it to
their
role in everything we do -- in political decision-making, in
the
work of the UN. And I've started -- what better -- I have a
deputy

here who is making a dynamic input into it.

Elapsed Time 00:24,

Eastern Time 09:35

And I think the role of women is extremely
important. And it has
been demonstrated, with the microcredits and
some of the efforts
that are going on around the world, that women
-- given the chance,
given

the credit, given business advice

-- can do as well, if not

better, than men.

QUESTION: Well,

I'm happy you feel that way. I have a copy of my

Women's International

Business Directory...

(LAUGHTER)

ANNAN: Good.

QUESTION:

And don't worry about Senator Helms. I'll soften him
up with my
chocolate cake.

(LAUGHTER)

ANNAN: Thank you very much.

Thank you very much.

(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: Sir. Looking

to the future, back on Iraq, since you
signed the agreement with
the Iraqis, to what extent would you be

out in front if there are further difficulties implementing the agreement? Would you wait for the U.S. to complain and react to that? Or would you jump in, in front?

Elapsed Time 00:25, Eastern Time 09:36

And to what extent are you responsible for the agreement?

ANNAN: We are all responsible for the agreement. I negotiated the agreement with President Saddam Hussein. But the agreement was unanimously endorsed by the 15 members of the Security Council on behalf of the 185 member states of the United Nations.

And so that agreement is no longer an agreement of the secretary-general. It's an agreement of the entire international community. And we all need to make it work. And in fact, on my trip to the Middle East, this is one of the issues I will discuss and on my trips to Moscow, Beijing and London, we will discuss this.

Elapsed Time 00:26, Eastern Time 09:37

And I have made it clear -- even in preparing for my trip to Baghdad -- I got lots of help from Senator -- from President Mubarak,

King Hussein, the Turkish foreign minister, from the French president and the foreign minister from the Russian president, and their foreign minister as well as the U.S. and British military presence. And so all forces were brought bear, and I could tell President Saddam

Hussein that I'm speaking in the name of the international community and they're all with me.

We have the responsibility, all of us, to hold his hand to the fire. We also need to in place mechanisms that will allow us to resolve conflicts as they arise rather than allow it to fester and

develop into major crisis.

And to ensure
that, we have better communications with the
Iraqis and that some
of these small crises can be nipped in the
bud. I have just appointed
a special representative for Baghdad who
will be my man in providing
a political link with the political
leadership so that we can try
and smooth out some of these things
and avoid any repetition of
what we went through.

QUESTION: How does that work in practice?

Who is the first
sentinel in this process?

Elapsed Time 00:27,

Eastern Time 09:38

ANNAN: I don't understand the question.

QUESTION: The first sentinel, the first person, the first layer
that

once there are difficulties, then he takes...

ANNAN: OK. I think,
if there are -- it depends. We have several
programs in Iraq. If
there are difficulties on the inspection side,
the man in charge
is Richard Butler.

And he will have to try and resolve it. If
at any time he thinks
he needs my help or it is necessary for them
to bring the attention
to my level, I will try and resolve it. If
I am not able to do it,
then of course the council is the one that
is responsible. I mean,
my role is one of good offices.

We
also have the huge oil-for-food program, and our man on the
ground
there is a man called Dennis Holiday (ph), who oversees the
oil
for food and all the other UN agencies -- welfare program,
UNICEF
and all of them that are operating there.
The special representative
who will be the
undersecretary-general would also ensure that other
humanitarian UN

activities are effectively coordinated.

Elapsed

Time 00:28, Eastern Time 09:39

Thank you.

QUESTION: I will

ask you the question in English (OFF-MIKE). I

have a question...

ANNAN: Sorry, you said you would ask me in English...

QUESTION:

No, I could ask it in (OFF-MIKE)...

ANNAN: No, ask me in French.

That's fine.

QUESTION: I'll ask it in English.

ANNAN: I

think it's better for everybody. Yes.

QUESTION: I have a question

on the Western Sahara. In recent

months, the (OFF-MIKE) has been

obstructing the identification

process leading to a referendum.

What is your view on that, sir?

And according to Newsweek, your

special envoy to the Sahara, Mr.

James Baker, was said to be considering

convening a second round of

talks in Houston next April.

Elapsed

Time 00:29, Eastern Time 09:40

Is that correct, sir?

ANNAN:

Let me say that, first of all, let me pay tribute to
former Secretary

of State Jim Baker for the outstanding work he's

done on the Western

Sahara issue by getting the parties to agree to

move forward and

really getting them to understand some of the

difficulties they

had could be worked out.

Since his involvement, we've resumed

the identification process

and have identified thousands of people.

We have had some hiccups

and we do have some problems that we are

working on, but I don't

think they are insurmountable at this stage.

You know, the future is something that you cannot help. But at
this

stage, I don't think they are insurmountable.
Mr. Baker is still
engaged in the process. And if -- and it has
always been agreed
that if necessary he can bring the parties
together for another
meeting. And so the possibility of a meeting
in Houston cannot be
excluded.

Thank you.

Elapsed Time 00:30, Eastern Time 09:41

QUESTION: Allow me to say this morning that I'm very happy that
you
came to Washington to visit us. I speak in behalf of many parents
who -- I believe
most of us -- you stand as a model for all of us
to pursue peace.

ANNAN: You flatter me.

QUESTION: Thank
you for pursuing your dreams. As a mother
myself, I'm trying to
build the kind of peaceful world in my small
community. I'd like
to know if you have a message for the youth of
today and tomorrow
to perhaps pursue a peaceful and more
understanding global society.

Thank you.

ANNAN: I think my message to the youth of today
is for them to
understand that the world is a diverse place and
that there are
many cultures. And we need to learn about other cultures
and
respect other cultures.

Elapsed Time 00:31, Eastern Time
09:42

We need to respect and accept the religions of others.
We need
to respect what is sacred to others. And we need to understand
that
we live in an interdependent world -- if not in a global village
--and
we should encourage the children to think beyond their own
national
boundaries, to understand that in the world today and in
the world
they are going to live in we have lots of crossborder

issues that
will need to have crossborder solutions, which implies
greater cooperation
amongst nations and amongst people, and that
tolerance and diversity
is to be celebrated, is to be embraced and
not to be rejected.

HICKMAN: We only have about three or four minutes left, so I'll
hold
the questions to those of you that are already at the
microphones.
This gentleman here, and then you'll be the last
questioner.

QUESTION: Thank you. I have a basic question about the
(OFF-MIKE)
team. You clinched a deal with the Iraqis in the name of
the United
Nations with the full support of the Security Council.
Now,
Mr. Secretary-General, should the Iraqis fail to comply
this time,
would you support taking military action against the
Iraqis in the
name of the United Nations, not just the United
States and the United
Kingdom?

Elapsed Time 00:32, Eastern Time 09:43

ANNAN:
I think the resolutions are council resolutions, and I
have indicated,
if Iraq were to fail to comply, it well may not
have a second chance
for diplomacy. I have also indicated that if
it became necessary
to use force, some sort of consultation with
council members will
be required, and I maintain that position.

HICKMAN: Last question.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary-General, I'm just wondering -- in your
discussions
with President Clinton and Secretary Albright, did you
talk about
the situation in Kosovo, and what is the position of the
United
Nations on the issue?

ANNAN: Yes, we did discuss Kosovo.

Elapsed Time 00:33, Eastern Time 09:44

We did discuss the latest meeting of the contact group in London and the decisions they took regarding Kosovo and also their requests that the UN high commissioner for human rights plays a bigger role in Kosovo.

We also discussed the UN's military presence in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the fact that the crisis in Kosovo may have an impact not just there but possibly in Macedonia and in Albania, and the desirability of maintaining the force because the last decision the council took was that we should withdraw the force in August.

But given the current developments, I intend to review the situation and make a fresh recommendation to the council. And my sense is that, given this crisis, the council is not going to insist or push for withdrawal of the troops in August. Thank you very much.

HICKMAN: We do have time for one more.

Elapsed Time 00:34,

Eastern Time 09:45

QUESTION: I want to come back to the question of the payment of the debt by the United States. Did you talk about possible consequences it would have if they don't pay (OFF-MIKE)?

What would these consequences be?

And do you have minimal expectations in the very near future about U.S. payment?

ANNAN: Yes, we did talk about consequences. We did talk about possible application of Article XIX, where governments that are behind their payments lose their vote. And in fact, I had the undersecretary-general for administration and management here with me, Mr. Connor (ph), who

unfortunately is not able to join us here this morning. And he's also someone who knows something about figures -- a former chairman and chief executive officer of Price, Waterhouse.

Elapsed Time

00:35, Eastern Time 09:46

And he did indicate that if we do not get a (OFF-MIKE) -- \$600 million payment this year, the U.S. in January could get -- could come into default, and application of Article XIX will kick in and may lose its vote.

And so, apart from paying their arrears, it is essential that at least \$600 million be paid, because we don't want to see the U.S. in that situation.

And I'm sure the U.S. government would not want to be in that situation, nor the people of America would want to be in a situation where the United States loses its vote in the UN because of lack of payment.

Thank you.

END

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 4/2/98 1:48:21 PM
FROM Allen, Charles A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT LOS Convention [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Baker, James E.

CARBON_COPY Allen, Charles A.
Baker, James E.
DeRosa, Mary B.
Highsmith, Newell L.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.

TEXT_BODY

Jamie, you asked for a paragraph, but the following several paragraphs are what came out. I'm sending it because it may be useful if the idea gets any front office interest. Also, maybe it can be easily condensed to give Kerrick what he needs today.

I have not yet read this to Joe Bouchard. I'll call him now and give him the gist and let you know his response. Let me know what you want me to do next.

Second half priorities - justification for effort to become Party to LOS Convention.

Defense, State and other departments have been working hard to get Senate action on the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention, which the President transmitted to the Hill in the Fall of 1994 after Madeleine Albright signed the Implementing Agreement on Seabed Mining. This successfully corrected the serious flaws in the original treaty, clearing the way for wide accession (from 60 Parties in 1994 to nearly 130 today). The U.S. got what it wanted in the 1994 modifications, with President Clinton successfully concluding an effort begun by President Bush.

In this light, it seemed unfathomable in 1994 that the U.S. would not be a Party by 1998. But Senator Helms has not seen fit to take SFRC action so that it might come to a vote.

One of the big victories in the 1994 Agreement is that the U.S. as one of the major industrialized nations is guaranteed

seats on critical deep seabed mining executive bodies. We have held these positions provisionally since 1994, but the final extension of provisional membership expires in November 1998. Thus, if we are not Party by then, we lose those positions, and it is unclear when we would be able to assume them again even if we become Party next year.

This is why Presidential action to urge Senate action in the next few months is important.

The LOS Convention does not receive a great deal of attention compared to arms control treaties. But it is a comprehensive, multilateral treaty the likes of which comes along very seldom, perhaps every generation or so. It is the first time in history, after several failed multi-year efforts, that the international community has developed a comprehensive legal regime covering the world's oceans, comprising 72% of the Earth's surface. It may be the most enduring body of international law since the Geneva Conventions of 1945.

The LOS Convention lends the certainty of the rule of law to an area critical to national security -- maintaining global access and freedom of navigation as needed to protect important national interests. We worked hard in 9 years of negotiations to preserve freedoms in the face of intense challenge. By not being a Party, we find our influence in the constant effort to urge compliance by other countries more and more eroded.

Although Defense has been in the lead because of the critical security interests, the LOS Convention also serves important economic and environmental interests and is fully supported throughout the Administration. Now that the seabed provisions have been modified, there are very few objectors. A solid foundation has been emplaced through extensive Hill briefings, including key members of Senator Helms' staff in recent months. Secretaries Albright and Cohen have been supportive, and several Unified Commanders have testified this year about how important it is to them for the U.S. to become a Party.

If the President were to lend his personal support to this effort and get Senate action this year, it would reflect very well upon his Presidency. This accomplishment would show bipartisan cooperation, show commitment to the rule of law, and restore our leadership in oceans matters. Not only now but in decades to come, President Clinton would be remembered as the President in power when the United States became Party to this historic Treaty.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Leslie Davidson to John Norris. Subject: Draft LF-VP Memo on Prescott Meeting (3 pages)	04/21/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/11/1998-04/27/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5653

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Leslie Davidson to Douglas Babcock. Subject: Prescott e-mail. (3 pages)	04/21/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/11/1998-04/27/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5653

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 4/23/98 11:13:17 AM

FROM Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(d)

DATECLASSIFIEDON 04/22/1998

DECLASSIFYON 04/22/2008

SUBJECT RE: U.S.-UK Dispute on U.S. Air Slots for Gatwick [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]

TO Rudman, Mara E.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526 5/10/2017
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VR NARA, Date 2/7/2019
2006-1363-F(?)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

It was me from home and the call was as smooth and anodyne as Malcolm said in his e-mail. I told him if he got the meeting time I'd like to be there, but didn't hear back. I suppose we have nothing to say about NSC/NEC staff (presumably Sperling) talking to Nance with no feedback.

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

From: Rudman, Mara E.

Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 1998 7:24 PM

To: Abercrombie-Winstanley,

Gina K.; Farrar, Jay C.

Subject: FW: U.S.-UK Dispute on U.S. Air
Slots for Gatwick [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]

Importance: High

Gina or Jay

(I'm guessing Gina) -- who was on the call w/ Malcolm and Helms' staff that Malcolm references in this email? (I just need a quick brief; don't recall hearing anything about it other than facts in Malcolm's prior email...) Thanks.

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

From: Lee,

Malcolm R.

Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 1998 3:30 PM

To: @LEGISLAT

- Legislative Affairs

Subject: FW: U.S.-UK Dispute on U.S. Air Slots

for Gatwick ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~
Importance: High

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

From: Lee, Malcolm R.
Sent: Wednesday, April 22,
1998 3:30 PM
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor
Cc: Baker, James
E.; @INTECON - Economic Affairs; @EUROPE - European Affairs
Subject: U.S.-UK
Dispute on U.S. Air Slots for Gatwick ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~
Importance: High

Diana:

Please pass to Jim. Bob and I would like to speak with him today if he has a moment. Larry Butler and/or Don Bandler should join as well. Need your views on strategy moving forward, given many equities with UK now. Agency contacts with UK have been unsuccessful. Would like to recommend Sperling make call to David Milliband (whom he says he know well) in PM's office Thursday morning. This is a matter of interest to Erskine.

Objective: Avoid escalation
of U.S.-U.K. Dispute over U.S. Airways Slots at Gatwick Airport

Background:

U.S. Airways has been unable to obtain commercially viable landing slots for new Charlotte-Gatwick service originally scheduled to commence on May 8. The arrival time for the slot they have obtained at Gatwick through usual slot allocation procedures is too late to allow for viable connections with U.S. Airways incoming feeder flights at its Charlotte hub. U.S. Airways has tried to trade slot times with other carriers, without success. British Airways has a substantial pool of Gatwick slots, but is unwilling to trade with U.S. Airways, its former partner, while litigation initiated by U.S. Airways over its dissolved partnership with British Airways is pending.

Our
bilateral civil aviation agreement (Bermuda II) provides carriers of both sides "fair and equal opportunity to compete". Counsels offices in DOT and State say it would be "an aggressive legal reading"

to say the agreement guarantees U.S. Airways the slots it wants. However, DOT counsel says the British Government's refusal to allow U.S. Airways to sell tickets for the Charlotte-Gatwick service (even at inconvenient slot time) is a violation of our agreement, because the UK has approved the underlying route.

Developments

* Senator Helms called Erskine on April 8, and asked him to speak with U.S. Air CEO Wolf. Erskine informed Wolf he could not discuss any regulatory issues pending at DOT (petitions by U.S. Air to take down BA's New York service and to deny new Denver service)

, but indicated we would do what we ethically, legally and morally could to help an American company. Erskine asked Gene Sperling to follow up with State and DOT.

* On April 9, Senator Helms wrote to Secretary Albright threatening hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, alleging British arrogance and violation of our aviation rights. He called upon the Administration to retaliate against the UK government and BA by terminating BA's existing New York-Gatwick service and delaying BA's new Denver-Gatwick service. Erskine was very concerned about this letter. (I will supply copy)

* At

Erskine's request, Gene Sperling and I informed Helms staff (Admiral Nance and Wayne Boyles) last week that Albright and Slater planned to call their counterparts to try to resolve this. NSC Leg participated in my call with Wayne Boyles. Sperling spoke with U.S. Air's Wolf several times, and has kept Nance informed. Helms staff has appreciated our support.

* Last week, State Secretary Glenda Jackson (with Transport responsibility) told DOT A/S Hunnicutt she would look at some ideas, then called late in week to say the UK government would do nothing.

* Shocas called her counterpart to urge resolution last week.

* Albright had spoken to FM Cook about this in the past. On Monday, April 20, Foreign Minister Cook told Albright in a phone call that U.S. Airways got the best slot available, that the UK Government has limited control over this issue, but he understands

we have a political problem and will try to find a solution to our political problem.

* Deputy Prime Minister Prescott told Secretary Slater today that he is not prepared to do anything, and to let the airlines do what they will. Prescott is seeking meetings with Slater and VP Gore next week. Prescott's office cited this issue as one for discussion with VP. Prescott will be in New York on climate change. (Gore's office has declined)

* Today, U.S. Air postponed indefinitely its Charlotte service, citing "unlawful" behavior by UK. Release also stated appreciation for "continuing support of White House, the State Department and the Transportation Department,

and for leadership of Helms. (no Helms reaction yet). US Air told us they cannot continue to offer a service that is to begin in two weeks unless this is worked out. Its release said it will commence service as soon as it gets timely and commercially usable landing slot.

* Albright will speak with Cook tomorrow again on other issues, and will follow up on last conversation..

* City of Denver and UK Government pressuring Slater to approve BA's new Denver service.

Recommendations

Unclear
how Helms will react to U.S. Airways pulling the plug, but I think we should continue to work diplomatic channels hard, to attempt to avoid escalation.

* Continue to pursue Albright-Cook channel.

* Keep
Helms and Wolf informed.

* Sperling call his counterpart in PM's office (Milliband) on Thursday morning to ask he use his good offices to help resolve this. Will supply points to you cleared by NSC Europe and NSC Legal and WH Counsel's office.

* You mention to appropriate
UK counterpart in sherpa meetings.

(We cannot communicate with
DOT regarding its regulatory proceedings).

Possible Outcomes

* BA

agrees to trade slots because friction with DOT and Helms not worth risk of being publicly painted as monopolist while their alliance with American Airlines is pending at DOT or because UK Government pressures BA. (best outcome)

* Stalemate: UK and USG hold firm

but do not escalate. DOT holds up new BA Denver-Gatwick service until fall. US Airways unable to begin Charlotte-Gatwick service. (possible)

* Escalation: UK and USG hold firm. Helms ratchets

up pressure. DOT takes down BA's New York service in regulatory proceeding (no fixed deadline). UK counterretaliates against US Air Philadelphia service. Possible spiral. (possible)

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 4/27/98 4:40:15 PM
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT April 27 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Blinken, Antony J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Widmer, Edward L.
Miyaoka, Lester H.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Press Briefing
April 27 McCurry Press Briefing

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

mike0427.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 27, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING BY
MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

2:50 P.M. EDT

Q Not a lot of interest today.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, that's good. All right, we'll dispense with this in short order then. Anybody got anything for today?

First of all, before I start, on behalf of the President and the White House Press Office staff, and other members of the White House staff, thank you to you and your association for an enjoyable dinner Saturday night. We appreciate your hospitality. Had a good time. Thank you to all of you.

Q The new President, Mr. Powell, is here.

MR. MCCURRY: And thank you to Mr. McQuillan, who looks like he took the day off. But Mr. McQuillan and the board members are to be congratulated for a very splendid evening of entertainment.

Q Did the President enjoy himself?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, he had a good time. Enjoyed himself.

Mr. Hunt.

Q Last January, when the First Lady -- January, I guess, '97, when she testified before the grand jury, the White House was happy to say that she answered all the questions that were put before her. Can you say that when -- on Saturday, when she took a deposition, did she answer all the questions or did she reserve any --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, she was not appearing before a grand jury, but at the same time, I am not familiar with the proceeding that she underwent on Saturday. So you'd have to direct that question to her attorney, Mr. Kendall. My guess is he's probably not going to comment beyond the statement that was already made.

Q Well, do you know if she asserted any privilege?

MR. MCCURRY: I do not know. Do not know.

Yes, sir. It's a slow day, so you're on. (Laughter.)

Q Thank you. Mr. McCurry, in your professional analysis of media impact on the presidency, do you believe that Saturday nights booing and heckling of Ms. Jones and the standing ovation for the President has as much impact as Sunday morning's Broder column, "Don't Write Off Character," Doonesbury's column on "Arkansas Ladies," and Elizabeth Ward Grason's confession?

MR. MCCURRY: I have absolutely no idea. I'm not familiar with the circumstances.

Q I mean you do analyze the --

MR. MCCURRY: I wasn't there Saturday night when Ms. Jones arrived, so I am not familiar with --

Q You read the paper on Sunday.

MR. MCCURRY: I barely did, but I didn't -- (laughter.)

Q Mike, the President and the administration are coming out against this bilingual referendum in California. What effect do you think the President's opposition to that will have on the voters on June 2nd, and what does the President plan to do while he's in California to raise that issue --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, several points on that. It is rare, as you all know, for the White House to take a position on a ballot initiative that presents itself at

a state level. We have done so on rare occasions, when the President and White House deems the issue of such significance that it could have an impact on overall national policy. We've done that, frankly, in some cases with respect to measures on the ballot in California because California, as our nation's largest state, does very often serve a trend-setting function, just as we did on Proposition 209, where the President both spoke against and campaigned against that measure.

The Department of Education, who made the recommendation to the President on the N's* initiative, felt that it is important to take the posture that with bilingual education, we need to help those who are English-language deficient make the transition into all-English environments, which is the purpose of the bilingual education programs that the federal government supports. There's some reason to believe that federal bilingual education programs are at some risk because of measures pending in Congress that would cut funding for those programs.

We recommend, as some of you know, a slight increase --about a 17-percent increase in current funding levels in our FY '99 budget proposal. They are designed principally to help local school districts and state education agencies hire teachers who are proficient in helping foreign language students learn English, or at least improve their English language skills. And those programs we believe are important.

They're important because local communities and states need to make decisions about how to help their affected populations make this transition. And you cannot adopt either nationally or statewide in a state as large as California a one-size-fits-all conclusion. So for all those reasons, and because of the value of these programs in helping people get into learning situations in which they could use English as the President believes they should, as their principal tool for learning, the President is concerned about the impact of that state ballot initiative.

Q What will the President do, then, to do better than he did when he came out against 187?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we understand the public sentiment in California and one can

easily say we are flying in the face of whatever the conventional wisdom is in California about the popularity of that measure. At the same time, the President thinks you can make a good argument that communities need to make these decisions based on what's best for their public school population and that trying to adopt a single model of how this should work is not useful.

In any event, the President will proceed with the measures that have been outlined by the Department of Education today, believing that students who -- language needs some skills in English language proficiency over a period of three years ought to be able to graduate out of those programs and into settings in which they use English as their learning language.

Q Mike, last week the message in the Rose Garden was that the House Republicans seemed to be mouthpieces for tobacco, and today it was a much more bipartisan emphasis. Why the shift in tone?

MR. MCCURRY: I think we made the point sufficiently that we need more bipartisanship and less catering to the preferences of the industry. And I think that we see on Capitol Hill -- maybe not yet in the ranks of the leadership of the Republican majority, but certainly in the ranks of the Republican caucus -- a great willingness to work with the President to adopt comprehensive tobacco legislation.

We continued extensive consultations on Capitol Hill with the Majority Leader, the Speaker and a range of other members on the other side of the aisle who we think will be critical in helping the administration and Democrats who are supportive of this legislation move forward with a truly historic piece of legislation, and we remain optimistic we can get the job done. Certainly, the statistics from the Surgeon General's report today give us yet more evidence of why we need to do so.

Q Mike, there seems to be a problem still -- on another subject -- there still seems to be a problem of General McCaffrey and the Congressional Black Caucus. Is the President going to be like a big father and sit both sides down -- they're fighting like children over this needle exchange -- is he planning on sitting them down anytime soon to talk it out?

MR. MCCURRY: He asked the Chief of Staff to make sure that we keep things orderly and the Chief of Staff has had a good conversation with General McCaffrey last week, and we expect that we can go about the business of building support. I know that there were some things said today, but I think that was by way of trying to explain what some of the controversy was about last week. And we believe it's possible for those who believe in protecting kids, especially minority kids, from the dangers of drugs and, as we were talking about today, from the dangers of other addictive substances, that we can all work together towards a common goal and a common strategy.

Q Those two groups seem to have to work together closely, and for them to have that kind of friction, and you have pretty much the whole body of the CBC saying "McCaffrey, leave, step down now." Isn't that a pretty bad reflection on McCaffrey --

MR. MCCURRY: I've heard Congresswoman Waters -- she was very careful to explain that she had endorsed a recommendation that was made by Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton. We have said, here's why we think General McCaffrey is providing very valuable and important leadership and we think all these sides can come together to work on the things that they clearly all believe need to be done. They have some disagreements as to tactics, but we think we can work through those and we think we can continue to have an effective working relationship both with the Caucus and with all of its members.

Q Mike, you said the White House has been working with the Majority Leader in the Senate. Today he said that all you've offered on the tobacco bill is lots of rhetoric, lots of talk, and no real courage, in terms of what should be done. Can you respond to that and will the White House promote its --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I can easily respond to that. It's impossible to name any other President of the United States of America who has been as forthcoming and demonstrated as much leadership when it comes to the issue of tobacco.

This is the President who took on the tobacco lobby, took on this issue, began the process of asserting a federal regulatory role, took on the political costs of saying no to the interests that for so long were dominant here in Washington. I believe the Majority Leader, it's safe to say, recognizes that. We're at a

point now where the legislation requires some deft handling on the part of the White House; that's what we're doing.

The Chief of Staff has worked very closely with the Majority Leader himself. More importantly, he's worked closely with the chief Senate sponsor of the legislation, Senator McCain, to talk about the specific ways in which we can move this legislation forward, as Senator McCain, himself, indicated this weekend. So we're very much involved in the work now of bringing this legislation to what we think is a very good and likelihood of passage.

And remember that at the moment the Republican leadership in Congress has elected to be outside that process. So the fact that they're taking a few shots is not too surprising to us, but we're going to continue to work in a bipartisan way to try to build support necessary to pass the bill.

Q Do you envision anytime in the near-term where the President would lay down specifics, or is the plan still to stick with the broad principles and let the legislative process --

MR. MCCURRY: We are working with those who are now moving this legislation through the legislative process, dealing in very specific ways in which we can both improve, from our perspective, the Senate committee-passed version of the bill and then move it on through the full Senate and hopefully to the House.

Q I mean publicly, though.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we're making progress doing what we're doing, which is consulting closely with the chief sponsors, working on specific legislative provisions in a fairly technical way. And I think we have no complaints about the ways in which the administration views have been reflected in some of the work that's being done on the Hill. So what we're doing, the process that we have now is working.

Q Mike, in opening Senate debate on NATO expansion, Senator Helms said today that the ratification resolution will contain a condition that the administration has accepted that Russia will have neither a voice, nor a veto in NATO affairs, and that the joint Russia-NATO council will not have a consultative role with

Moscow, but will nearly inform the Russians of decisions taken by NATO. Now, this goes counter to what the President has said all along that the Russians would have a voice. How do you square these three things?

MR. MCCURRY: We see those provisions as being directly consistent with what the White House stated in May of 1997, when we first announced the charter. We said at the time that even under the foreseen charter arrangement between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Russian Federation, NATO would retain its full prerogatives, and while Russia will work closely with NATO, it will not work within NATO.

The Founding Act of the Council itself makes clear that Russia has no veto over Alliance decisions, and NATO retains the right to act independently when it so chooses. Our view is that if it's reflected in the Senate consideration of the instrument of ratification, that that is consistent with what the administration has identified as the purposes of the partnership.

Q Wait a minute. At the time and since then, while the administration has made it clear and NATO has made it clear that Russia was not going to get a veto, nevertheless, Russia was going to get a voice through the joint partnership council to discuss ahead of time with NATO decisions that NATO might take. And Senator Helms' point in terms of the condition that is attached to the ratification resolution is that Russia now won't even get to a point of discussing with NATO about its interest in European security.

MR. MCCURRY: Our views of that condition is consistent with Section IV of the Founding Act of the joint NATO-Russian Federation Council. It is not meant to supercede what already occurs through the Partnership for Peace program, a fact which pre-dates the discussion of NATO expansion through the North Atlantic Coordination Council, the NACC, which was long the vehicle for that type of consultation.

There have even been, as you know, important military-to-military consultations with the Russian Federation as we have engaged in some joint deployments -- witness Russian participation in the deployment in Bosnia. So the degree to which there is consultation and conversation on those types of issues, of course, that's all consistent with what we already take to be the mechanism for

collaboration and coordination under the Founding Act.

Q Well, did Senator Helms misspeak?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he's making it clear that the condition that the Senate will apparently insist upon is consistent -- we will take the view that it is consistent with exactly what we've said are the full prerogatives that NATO retains and must retain as a treaty alliance.

Q What do you know about the Russians helping India with missile technology?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, all we have established, since we watch these matters extraordinarily carefully, is that we have made no determination at this point that any cooperation that we've detected is a violation of MTCR guidelines -- Mission Technology Control Regime guidelines. We watch that very carefully. As you know, there are sanctions that arise when we see any type of export activity that is in controvention of MTCR guidelines, and we have not made that determination or finding, nor have we imposed any sanctions.

Q Have you discussed the issue?

MR. MCCURRY: We have had very high-level conversations with the Russian Federation reflecting a broad range of our proliferation concerns, and this matter in particular has been discussed.

Q With the Supreme Court taking up the line item veto issue today, is the President having any second thoughts to the way it's actually being implemented? Is he disappointed, is he happy, is he surprised at some of the ways it's actually working out?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I think he's satisfied that he's protected American taxpayers from over a billion dollars worth of wasteful spending, and done so in a way that is constitutional. And that was so argued by the Solicitor General today.

Q Did the President have a role in the drafting of the arguments that were made on behalf of defending the line item veto?

MR. MCCURRY: To my knowledge, there have been some conversation between the Justice Department and the Counsel's Office about the nature of the briefs that are filed. Today, of course, was just an oral argument consistent with those briefs. But as to the detail of law, I don't know if the President has been that actively involved. Part of the discussion today, as you know, in front of the court was about judicial standing, and I think the President probably elected not to be that involved in the detail of that conversation. But certainly the broad constitutional principle, which is the constitutionality of the line item veto similar to what many governors including when he was governor of Arkansas, and the executive power they have, I think he's familiar with those arguments to be sure.

Q Mike, the Ohio Democratic Party recently filed suit against the Federal Election Commission and it's arguing, as I understand it, that it has no authority, the FEC has no authority to regulate soft money when the state parties are involved. Is that a breakaway action by the Ohio party, or does the President support what the party is doing?

MR. MCCURRY: No, we take a contrary view, as you know, because we have petitioned the Federal Election Commission to take that regulatory stance and to prohibit nonfederal funds. But state parties, by their bylaws of the Democratic National Committee, can act independently on an issue of that nature.

Q With Richard Butler releasing his report on Iraq's compliance with the weapons inspections, is the administration prepared to take some steps to ease the sanctions against Iraq?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have been very skeptical about sanctions relief lacking the full compliance that we expect from the government of Iraq, growing out to the post-Gulf War-U.N. Security Council resolutions. There's one narrow area involving nuclear weapons programs that have been reviewed carefully by the International Atomic Energy Agency; we're recommending that the IAEA continue to work carefully to determine whether there's been full compliance. And part of that, as you know, involves the availability of facilities for inspections at the request of both the IAEA and the U.N. Special Commission when it involves other weapons of mass destruction programs. But aside from that one narrow area, we think that the conditions that would be necessary for broad-based sanctions

relief don't present themselves because Saddam Hussein has not fully complied with the requirements the international community placed on him.

Q -- sanctions relief then?

MR. MCCURRY: We have been very skeptical and dubious about the case for sanctions relief.

Q So, in other words, they have to comply on everything before there's any easing of sanctions, or can there be some piecemeal compliance and piecemeal easing of the sanctions?

Q I identified one narrow area, where there's been discussion about adjusting the file in one of the four areas, and that's nuclear weapons program, but nothing sufficient to make a case for overall sanctions relief.

Q Mike, when was the last time the President was in direct contact with any of the parties in the Middle East, any of the leaders?

MR. MCCURRY: I'd have to check. I recall one time fairly recently. But, of course, the Vice President will be in a position to see them later this week when we have our special -- his special envoy, Ambassador Ross, is in the region meeting with the parties now and reporting directly on his conversations. And we await the outcome of the meetings that we previously announced on May 4th that the Secretary of State will be having.

Q Are you saying that the Gore trip goes beyond just the ceremonial niceties of this anniversary that's coming up?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I think given the process itself and the arguments we're making to the parties about the need for them to really focus on some serious decisions that have to be taken at this point, it does go beyond ceremony. Although he will not -- the work the Vice President will do will be consistent with what we hope the purpose and outcome of the May 4th meetings will be.

Q At what point, Mike, does the President personally once again get involved?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, this President has never been reluctant to play a direct role in this process when there's a reason to believe that we can achieve a significant outcome. There's no reason at this moment to believe that. But that's one of the reasons why we are pressing the parties hard to make the kinds of decisions that need to be made if we're going to move ahead on the four-part agenda that we've identified, and make progress on the other kinds of multilateral economic issues that have been a part of the discussions that others, including the European Union, have had with the parties.

Q Is it felt that the Canadian Prime Minister's visit to Cuba today is helpful or hurtful to the cause of human rights in Cuba? And perhaps you can characterize your earlier reaction to Castro's remarks comparing the embargo to genocide.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we believe that Prime Minister Chretien's visit will ultimately be helpful, because one thing that he will surely do is to remind Fidel Castro of the insistent desire of the international community to see peaceful change occur in Cuba, to see respect for human rights and democracy.

Now we have, as you know, a disagreement as to tactics with the government of Canada, but no disagreement, whatsoever, as to what we want history to write, which is the chapter of change that needs to come and come soon to Cuba so that the people of Cuba can enjoy the freedoms, the liberties, the economic prosperity that we believe will flow naturally from democracy and from market institutions, which are woefully lacking in Cuba and have been for quite some time.

A measure of how out of step Fidel Castro is with the truth of history is this astonishing argument he made about genocide, which in no way, shape, or form can you make with any degree of logic. You can make an easy argument, which is command and control economics matched with totalitarian political forums have ruined the lives of millions and millions of people in this world. In most places in this world, the yoke of communism has been thrown off. And, unfortunately, in the Americas, Cuba is the lone remaining country that has not chosen to be on the right side of history.

Q Mr. McCurry, it's my understanding -- and I know you'll correct me if I'm inaccurate -- that the President is a close friend of Baltimore's Mayor Schmoke.

Is that correct?

MR. MCCURRY: He's a valued ally of the President. I don't know -- friends -- I'm sure he would consider the Mayor a friend.

Q Well, will the President support the Mayor in his well-publicized and furious battle with the Governor. And does your affirmation that General McCaffrey is a valuable and important part of leadership repudiate Delegate Norton's description of him as, "a skunk"?

MR. MCCURRY: The President, often, even with friends, can have disagreements as to things they might do or say.

Q You said this morning you'd say some more about the IRS probe.

MR. MCCURRY: I was awaiting the outline of the steps that the Treasury has now made. I can't add much to what they have already said at Treasury about some of the things they're going to do. Commissioner Rossotti I think has been very forthcoming in addressing what they believe are the need to ensure the integrity of the Criminal Investigations Division. And the White House is supportive of what Treasury has indicated they're going to do with respect to some of the practices they will now examine more carefully.

Q Mike, with respect to Maryland, is it a disagreement or has he just taken no position on that?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't believe he's taken a position in what is a dispute between Democrats who see things differently.

Q Any administration reaction to the killing of the bishop in Guatemala?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that the State Department was doing something on that. We can check -- NSC can check with you and see if -- my understanding is they were going to issue something.

Q Mike, it wasn't quite clear from your answer to Stu's earlier question on bilingual -- when the President is in California this weekend, will he speak out

publicly against that ballot initiative?

MR. MCCURRY: There is some discussion about how the President could reiterate things that Secretary Riley said today. Whether or not he does so when he's in California remains to be seen at this point. I wouldn't rule it out.

Q Mike, at an appeals court hearing a couple of weeks ago, White House lawyers said that you were trying to redact information so the press could get some information on the executive privilege dispute. It's now been about five weeks since the first hearing -- or, actually, the last hearing took place on that subject. Do you have any update for us on how the effort to parse that information so we can get some of it?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't. You may want to check with Mr. Kennedy. I was not aware that the court had rendered any ruling on the motion that was argued at that point. If they have, that would be news to me. But you may want to check with Mr. Kennedy further.

Q Mike, Senator Hatch and other Republicans have said for a comprehensive tobacco bill to be workable there has to be some degree of industry cooperation -- the advertising provisions are not challenged. Is there any sympathy here at the White House at all for that argument?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. I mean, I think that's not an ill-begotten argument. I mean, in order for this program to work and to protect kids, the active cooperation of the industry it would be far preferable from their defiance in courts. We've said that much the same with respect to the issue of FDA regulation, where we've always indicated that we'd prefer to see an environment in which the industry accepted its responsibilities under the program envisioned as opposed to seeing it challenged endlessly in court, as they challenged the truth that we now have seen revealed for years and years and years.

Q But isn't the White House really going in the opposite direction by seeking to strengthen the McCain bill which they oppose, and also lambasting people for being in bed with the industry?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we make a reasoned judgment that given the kind of support

we think exists in the Congress reflecting the will of the American people, that this industry, which has evidenced such a pathetic record over time, would see it in its interests to change course and to do something to help protect kids from what we know is the number one leading cause of endangerment to the health of children, to all Americans.

So our view is that the industry is going to want to get with this program and that as we build sufficient, strong bipartisan support for legislation, they may do some rethinking and recalibration on where they've been on some of these issues.

Q That's what your strategy is, to wait for them to come back to the bill they've walked away from?

MR. MCCURRY: No, no, manifestly not. We're proceeding full speed ahead with the bill and continue to work hard on --

Q I understand that, but are you doing anything to try and obtain their cooperation in advance so that they don't challenge the marketing restrictions?

MR. MCCURRY: We think that may have a very powerful effect, if the industry sees that that's the direction it's going, that an effort to put a roadblock up in front of the bill is to no avail, that they may wish at some point to change course and see if they can't be a part of the solution.

Q Mike, Japan's finance ministry has reprimanded about 112 of its officials, including its top minister for international affairs. Does the White House -- given the fact that the Ministry of Finance is the organization that controls Japan's economy, is this a cause for concern of the administration?

MR. MCCURRY: When the President recently addressed the status and health of the Japanese economy, he did so at some length. He talked about the important role that bureaucracies play in being supportive of programs articulated by governments. You know what we have said about the stimulus package that's been unveiled by the Prime Minister. I think you know what the President said about the functioning role that the powerful ministries play within the Japanese government. I think I'd refer you to what the President has already said on the

record as being indicative of what his concern is.

Q Could you talk about what he would be willing to support in terms of bilingual education?

MR. MCCURRY: We did a little bit of that already. As the Department of Education indicated today, we see three years as being a useful general role model of -- general model of the amount of time it ought to take someone who is language deficient in English to move through the kinds of bilingual education programs that exist at the local level and move into settings in which they can use English as their primary learning language.

And our role will be to continue to support those programs that we think are valuable and critical in helping children learn the English language skills they need to be successful in school.

Q Is the President doing anything tomorrow other than going to New York for that fundraiser? And he makes a statement on Thursday -- can you shed any light about that?

MR. MCCURRY: Tomorrow we are considering a statement on a domestic matter here in Washington, before he goes up to New York. I'm not aware that he's planning anything else in connection with his New York schedule tomorrow.

On Thursday, I can't shed anything on his plans for a public statement yet, but we should be able to let you know by Wednesday or so.

Q Can you give us a hint?

Q So if you would let us know a day ahead --

MR. MCCURRY: Protecting the long-term retirement income security of the American people.

Q Mike, can you talk a little bit about the timing of the Treasury Department's announcement of its IRS probe? Is it an attempt to deflect attention from or preempt this week's --

MR. MCCURRY: Depends on whether it works or not. I don't know. (Laughter.) No, I think there's been an ongoing effort at the Treasury Department and at the Internal Revenue Service, particularly since the arrival of the new commissioner, to address these shortcomings at the IRS, and they're moving aggressively to correct the deficiencies and to make sure that they have a customer-friendly, taxpayer-friendly Internal Revenue Service. And the fact that they would want to talk about that before what are likely to be incendiary hearings on Capitol Hill is no surprise.

There has been some concern that our allies on the Hill have been expressing about the form and substance of those hearings, and I'll leave that debate for those on Capitol Hill. But I think it's an equally important -- or it makes more important the argument to remind people of all the work the administration is already doing to improve the IRS.

Q How worried is the President about the recent rash of shootings by students, and what can be done about it?

MR. MCCURRY: Very concerned. And as you know, he, after the Jonesboro incident, had asked a group of experts to come together. They had a session here the other day that pointed to some of the things that communities need to do to avert the kinds of incidents that tragically we saw again over the weekend.

So the President believes that we need to think very long and hard about what experts can tell us, what science tells us, what sociologists can tell us about the cause, the root cause, of some of these incidents, and to see if there is anything that suggests itself in a role that leaders can play or that government can play.

But it's very clear that we also need to see more involvement by communities and parents in addressing what perhaps are some of the underlying causes of what are now just seen to be isolated events.

Q Were there any recommendations at that meeting the other day?

MR. MCCURRY: There were some ideas that are not -- it would be moving them to

far forward to say that they were recommendations -- some ideas that grow out of that conversation that need to be worked further. And the President instructed some of those participating to do additional work to see if they might lead to some specific policy recommendations. It was not a decision-making meeting; it was more of an informational meeting. But some work is going to result as a byproduct of the conversation that they had.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

3:20 P.M. EDT