

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Lawrence Butler to Robert Kyle. Subject: RE: U.S.-EU Trade Issues. (3 pages)	04/30/1998	P1/b(1)
002. email	Robert Kyle to Lawrence Butler. Subject: RE: U.S.-EU Trade Issues. (4 pages)	05/01/1998	P1/b(1)
003. email	Lawrence Butler to Donald Bandler. Subject: RE: U.S.-EU Trade Issues. (4 pages)	05/01/1998	P1/b(1)
004. email	William Wechsler to Eric Schwartz. Subject: RE: ICC Papers. (3 pages)	05/15/1998	P1/b(1)
005. email	Mary McCarthy to Eric Schwartz. Subject: RE: ICC Papers. (4 pages)	05/16/1998	P1/b(1)
006. email	Eric Schwartz to Joseph Bouchard, Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley, Christina Burrell et al. Subject: ICC Papers. (12 pages)	05/19/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/28/1998-05/19/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5654

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 4/28/98 4:26:53 PM
FROM Elkind, Jonathan H.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: April 28 NSC Press Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Pascual, Carlos E.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Carlos:

Plan to do anything on the aid certification?

Jon

-----Original

Message-----

From: Rubin, Eric S.

Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 1998

3:59 PM

To: @ALLNSC - NSC Staff; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs

Subject: April

28 NSC Press Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]

Please provide updates/changes/additions/deletions/nitpicks
no later than 10am Wednesday to @PRESS. Many thanks

P.S. -

This may not reflect updates you sent us after noon, but rest assured
they will be incorporated tomorrow morning

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

apr28gui.doc

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

April 28, 1998

Sanctions Flexibility

MEPP

MEPP/Albright Trip

Libya

Guatemala/Killing of Bishop Gerardi

German Elections

Domestic Preparedness/New PDDs

Russia/India

Poland

Iraq/UN

Nigeria

Rwanda

Cuba/China

Cuba/Chretien/Human Rights Vote

Cuba/Food and Medicine

Iran

Radio Free Iran

Iran/Azerbaijan

Afghanistan

Northern Ireland

State List of Russian Entities

China Satellite Launches

SANCTIONS FLEXIBILITY

April 28, 1998

Q: Does the Administration fudge the law when determining the compliance of foreign governments to sanction-related legislation/

A: Our interest here is to make sure that we develop policies that promote our objectives -- in this case religious freedom abroad. As we have said

about the
Wolf-Specter bill and other legislation that mandates automatic
sanctions is that
it may not in all cases help us achieve our objectives -- in fact, may
conflict
with our goals.

Share goals of Congress, but need enough flexibility for the United
States to
solve international problems through effective diplomacy.

Under such "hand-tying" laws, bureaucratic tendency may be to
define
requirements as narrowly as possible in order to preserve
Administration's
flexibility to conduct and implement policy effectively.

MEPP
April 28, 1998

NETANYAHU REMARKS

Q: What is your reaction to Netanyahu's remarks that the May 4
meetings in London
are not make or break for the peace process and warning against any
declaration
of Palestinian statehood?

A: We have made clear the importance we attach to the London
meetings -- we have
been going in circles too long. Permanent status talks are to have been
concluded by May 4, 1999. Every effort should be made to meet that
target.

To get those talks started and to make them successful requires the
leaders to
make hard decisions and a recommitment to the spirit of partnership
and a
determination to work with, not against each other.

It is that spirit that we will expect to see in London.

Q: What is Ross up to? Any progress?

A: Ambassador Ross is continuing to work with the parties to narrow

gaps in their
positions on the basis of U.S. ideas.

Q: What is the United States' view of the possibility of Palestinian statehood --

Arafat says he will declare a state by May 4, 1999, the Israelis warn against it?

A: This is a permanent status issue for the parties to decide. The recent public exchanges only underscore the need for permanent status talks to begin as quickly as possible.

MESSAGE FROM ISRAEL THROUGH THE CIA

Q: Was there a message from Netanyahu to the President passed through the CIA?

Was it an attempt to bypass the Secretary of State?

A: We have no comment.

MEPP/ALBRIGHT TRIP

April 20, 1998

Secretary Albright Trip Announcement

* Secretary of State Albright has asked Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman

Arafat to see her separately in London on May 4.

* The purpose of the meetings is to determine whether the ideas the U.S. has shared with the parties can provide a basis for a breakthrough on the four-part

agenda and the beginning of accelerated permanent status negotiations. SMEC

Dennis Ross will meet with the leaders next week in an effort to focus on the

issues that need to be addressed in order to make the London meetings productive.

* The United States has been working with the parties for months now to put the

Israeli-Palestinian negotiations back on track. We are prepared to

continue that
effort if the parties are prepared to take the decisions required to make
this
effort succeed. It is clear that the time has come to make those
decisions.

LIBYA: ITALIAN SANCTIONS VIOLATIONS

April 28, 1998

Q: What is your reaction to the flight of two Italian private aircraft to
Libya?

A: These flights were a violation of UN sanctions against Libya. The
Italian
government has told us that it will seek to prosecute those involved,
both for
the violations of sanctions and for Italian aviation regulations.

The Italian government has also reported these flights to the UN
Sanctions
Committee. We will pursue a strong statement by the Sanctions
Committee
concerning this violation.

GERMAN ELECTIONS

April 27, 1998

Q: Do you have any reaction to this weekend's German elections and
the poor
performance of Kohl's CDU party? What does this mean for the
President's May
trip to Berlin?

A: Germany's on-going state elections and the upcoming federal
election in
September are an internal matter. Have no comment on the domestic
political
debate.

As you know, President will visit Germany on May 13-14. Purpose of
visit is to
continue policy dialogue with our German allies about construction of
integrated
Europe.

Discussions will focus on upcoming agenda for work within NATO, EU, and OSCE, in effort to build security, democracy, and prosperity across Europe.

President will deliver speech in Berlin outlining our vision for Euro-Atlantic partnership into next century.

President will also visit other cities in eastern Germany (Potsdam, Eisenach) to see first hand the benefits of unification and the work that continues. (Details of itinerary not yet final; will provide later.)

President deeply committed to building better future for Europe and America -- Germany key partner in that effort.

DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS/NEW PDDS

April 27, 1998

* On PDDs, there is an on-going review of Unconventional Threats (WMD, terrorism, computer warfare).

* (If pressed): This review may result in presidential instructions.

RUSSIA-INDIA MISSILE COOPERATION

April 27, 1998

Context: An article in the April 27 New York Times reports that, for at least three years, Russia has been assisting India in developing a 200-mile-range submarine-launched ballistic missile called "Sagarika." The Times says that Russia provided the U.S. with certain commitments on limiting the type of assistance provided to Sagarika, but that it was unclear whether these commitments were being adhered to. It also was unclear whether this assistance is inconsistent with the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) Guidelines, the Times reports. This story comes in the wake of Amb. Gallucci's talks

in Moscow

April 22-23 on the issue of Russian entities' cooperation with Iran's ballistic missile program.

Q: What can you say about Russia's help to India's Sagarika missile program?

A: India is working on a sea-launched missile project called "Sagarika."

India has received assistance from Russia in pursuing the project. We have raised this issue with Russia in the past. The Russian Government stated that it was acting in a manner consistent with the missile technology control regime (MTCR) guidelines. Russia has also provided us with certain assurances about its assistance to the Sagarika program.

(If asked for more details on the Russian assurance:)

The Russian assurances were part of a confidential diplomatic dialogue. I cannot describe those assurances.

(If asked if Russia has abided by its assurances:)

We have made no determination whether Russia's assistance to the Sagarika program is inconsistent with its assurances to us.

(If asked for more details on Sagarika:)

I am not in a position to describe further the Sagarika program or the nature of Russian assistance to it.

Q: Does this Russian assistance violate the MTCR?

A: We have made no determination that Russian assistance to the Sagarika program is inconsistent with the guidelines of the missile technology control regime.

Q: Does this Russian assistance require the imposition of sanctions under U.S. law?

A: We have made no determination that Russian assistance to the Sagarika program would be sanctionable under U.S. Law.

(If pressed on whether the Russian assistance is troubling in terms of South Asian Security:)

The U.S. has long made clear its belief that India and Pakistan should exercise restraint in their missile programs. Such restraint is facilitated to the extent that outside suppliers restrain their exports to such programs.

(If pressed on whether the Russian assistance is troubling in terms of South Asian Security:)

The U.S. has long made clear its belief that India and Pakistan should exercise restraint in their missile programs. Such restraint is facilitated to the extent that outside suppliers restrain their exports to such programs. This is one reason for the assurances provided to US by Russia on the Sagarika Program.

Q: What did Ambassador Gallucci's visit to Moscow last week accomplish on the Iran missile issue?

A: Ambassador Gallucci met in Moscow April 22 with his counterpart, Yuri Koptev, and on April 22 and 23 with other Russian officials.

His visit is part of an eight-month dialogue aimed at working with the Russian government to curtail Iran's efforts to obtain technology for its ballistic missile program from Russian entities.

As Ambassador Gallucci has only just returned, and is still making his reports to his superiors, it would be inappropriate for me to comment further at this time.

POLISH-AMERICAN ENTERPRISE FUND

April 27, 1998

Q: What is behind the Administration's "battle" with the Polish-American community on the Polish-American Enterprise Fund?

A: There is no battle. The Administration is in the process of consulting with Congress, the Polish government, and the Polish-American community over the disposition of the proceeds from the liquidation of the assets of the Polish-American Enterprise Fund (PAEF). We have made no final decisions on this matter.

The Fund was established in 1989 with a grant from the U.S. government. It has used \$257 million in U.S. -provided capital and technical assistance to invest in and make loans to thousands of Polish companies. It has stimulated a vibrant Polish capital market, created thousands of jobs, and converted assistance into a profit.

There was no expectation of reflows from the PAEF when the East European assistance act (SEED) was passed in 1989; the legislation is silent on the issue. However, in October 1992, the Bush Administration recognized that disposition of the assets created by or which remain from the investment of the U.S. grant would have to be addressed. The PAEF's charter and Grant Agreement with the U.S. government were therefore amended in 1993 to stipulate that the assets could be distributed to charitable groups to support the purposes of the SEED act, to the U.S. Treasury, or a combination of the two, following consultations between the Board and the Executive Branch. Both the Bush and Clinton Administrations pledged to consult Congress on this matter before acting, and this process is still underway.

In January 1997, the PAEF Board requested permission to privatize its management team and rid itself of restrictions under the grant agreement with USAID by no longer re-investing U.S. government capital. The Board also requested the Administration's guidance on the use of the assets created with the U.S. government funds, as required by the grant agreement.

The PAEF has been a tremendous foreign assistance success story. It has returned value, vindicating Congressional support for this unique public-private partnership to stimulate investment in transitioning economies. We believe the final disposition of the PAEF's assets can be achieved in ways that will continue to benefit Poland, the United States, and our mutual interests in building a prosperous and democratic Europe.

[If asked]

Mr. Berger did meet with Dr. Brzezinski and Lane Kirkland, two members of the PAEF Board, on April 13 to hear out their views on this matter as part of the Administration's consultation process. It was a cordial exchange.

IRAQ: ACTION AT UN April 27, 1998

Background: On April 27 at 10:30, the Security Council will hear reports from IAEA and UNSCOM, after which it will decide whether to renew sanctions for another six months (little question that they will be renewed). In the afternoon, there will be an "Arria-style" meeting, at the Iraqi FM will speak to the Council upon invitation. We expect sanctions review to be over today, but could stretch until tomorrow.

The Russians have circulated a draft resolution which would close the investigation of Iraq's past nuclear program and shift the IAEA to long-term monitoring. We believe it is too early to close the nuclear file because

Iraq
has not yet disclosed fully its nuclear program, particularly its
concealment
activities. We have countered the Russian draft with a draft
Presidential
Statement that would hold out the prospect of a move to monitoring at
the time of
the next sanctions review in October, if Iraq fully discloses its nuclear
program
and continues to cooperate with UNSCOM.

Q: What is the U.S. view of the UNSCOM six month report?

A: This report presents clear and disturbing evidence that Iraq has not
complied
with either UN Security Council resolutions or the UN/Iraq
Memorandum of
Understanding in any area of substance.

The report acknowledges Iraqi cooperation by recently allowing
access to
Presidential sites.

Yet, the UNSCOM report states that there has been virtually no
progress in
disarmament over the past six months.

The report points out that while Iraq was escorting teams around
palaces, it was
blocking progress at a technical evaluation meeting in Vienna on the
Iraqi
biological weapons program.

This report confirms that Iraq continues to hide the truth regarding its
long
range ballistic missiles, its VX and sarin chemical weapons, its
anthrax and
other biological weapons.

Q: What is the US view of the Russian proposal to allow the closure
of the Iraq
nuclear file?

A: We believe it is too early to shift the IAEA investigation of Iraq to
a
program of long-term monitoring. Iraq has yet to answer many
questions about key
aspects of its program, especially its efforts to conceal the program's
existence

and scope.

We agree with the IAEA that its years-long investigation has led to a "technically coherent picture" of Iraq's nuclear program. We applaud the IAEA effort.

If the IAEA states in its next report to the Security Council in October that Iraq has satisfactorily responded to all its concerns, we could support Council action to shift fully to long-term monitoring of the Iraqi nuclear program.

Doing so would also depend, however, on Iraq's provision of immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to UNSCOM and IAEA. And we note that surprise inspections always remain an option even after any potential transfer of the nuclear file into long-term monitoring.

NIGERIA: NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS April 27, 1998

Q: What is your reaction to National Assembly elections held in Nigeria over the weekend?

A: The April 25 Nigerian National Assembly elections provided the strongest evidence yet that the people of Nigeria do not have confidence in the government's transition program nor do they support the nomination of Head of State General Sani Abacha to succeed himself.

Voter turnout appears to have been the lowest in recent Nigerian history, and was much lower than in either of the previous two elections conducted as part of the transition program in 1997. Observers estimate that turnout averaged between ___ and ___%, dipping as low as 8% or less in the Lagos region.

For the most part the election passed peacefully, though disturbances in the

Lagos and the city of Ilorin (ee-lor'-inn) interrupted the proceedings. However, press reports indicate much more serious disturbances occurred in the oil-region city of Warri (wahr'-ee), apparently preventing voters from casting ballots in several constituencies there.

Abacha and the government of Nigeria committed themselves to holding an open, transparent process resulting in a civilian, democratically elected government.

We have consistently urged the Government of Nigeria to honor its own commitment to make a genuine transition to civilian democratic rule.

True civilian democratic rule means a credible process that includes free political activity, release of political prisoners, freedom of the press, and free, fair and transparent elections. The current transition process appears to be flawed and failing.

We do not see how the process, as it is now unfolding, will lead to a democratic government.

We are disappointed that the Nigerian government is not living up to those commitments.

RWANDA
April 24, 1998

Q: Any reaction to Rwandan officials stating that execution of defendants involved in genocide will take place again in the future?

A: First off, let me say that capital punishment is not a violation of internationally recognized human rights if it meets recognized due process standards. Our concern is that the accused is afforded adequate protection in mounting both a defense and any appeal.

Generally speaking, the Rwandan judicial system has attempted to provide adequate protections, and has been making improvements in the conduct of genocide trials. We are not aware of the circumstances of the individual cases involved here, nor do we have expertise in Rwandan law. But we understand the accused were tried in Rwandan courts in accordance with Rwandan law and procedure.

Should the Rwandan government proceed with further executions, we would urge them to do so only upon the exhaustion of all avenues of appeal open to the defendants and a proper review of the cases by appropriate judicial authorities.

Q: Any comment on the fact that executions will be conducted in public for observation to serve as an example?

A: Capital punishment is a government sanctioned act that should only be resorted to for the most serious crimes, after proper trial and review. We urge the Government of Rwanda to avoid any sensationalizing of the punishment.

Q: Any comment on the appeal by the Pope to the Rwandan Government to halt the executions?

A: We urge the Government of Rwanda to ensure that these executions are being conducted after a proper review of the cases by appropriate judicial authorities.

CUBA: U.S. POLICY -- CUBA VS. CHINA
April 27, 1998

Q: What about China, a country with a deplorable human rights record? You even dropped the resolution criticizing China at the UN Human Rights Commission in

Geneva. You engage with China, why not Cuba?

A: China is a dynamic society. We believe our engagement will help channel these fast-moving developments in a constructive direction that enhances human rights.

Cuba, in contrast, is in a time warp. It is, as Secretary Albright has pointed out, the last dictatorship in a hemisphere of democracies.

In each case, whether it is China, Cuba, or any other country, our policy is guided by how best we believe we can promote our objectives and interests. Our goal of support for democracy and human rights is the same, but our approach will vary with circumstances.

CUBA: PRIME MINISTER CHRETEN'S VISIT/HUMAN RIGHTS VOTE

April 28, 1998

Background: PM Chretien ends his two-day visit to Cuba today. Press reports indicate that he did raise human rights and the need for democratic change with Castro, asking him to free the four members of the Internal Dissident Working Group arrested last July (Marta Beatriz Roque, Vladimiro Roca, Felix Bonne, and Rene Gomez Manzano). Chretien received no guarantees. Unconditional release of the four is key since all have indicated they want to remain in Cuba. They would resist being exiled to Canada if Castro and Chretien were to work a deal. While Chretien did not meet with dissidents himself, two of his top foreign policy advisors met separately with prominent dissident Elizardo Sanchez, president of the National Council for Human Rights and National Reconciliation.

Q: Does the Administration have any further comment on Prime Minister Chretien's visit to Cuba?

A: We understand that the Prime Minister will be departing Cuba later today.

Press reports indicate that Prime Minister Chretien did raise human rights and the need for democratic change with Castro.

On the human rights front, we understand that PM Chretien asked for the release of the four members of the Dissident Working Group, Marta Beatriz Roque, Valdimiro Roca, Felix Bonne and Rene Gomez Manzano.

These four were arrested last July after publishing a paper questioning the contents of a government-published document prior to the Fifth Communist Party Congress.

Other international leaders and non-governmental organizations have also sought the unconditional release for the four Dissident Working Group members.

We hope that the Cuban Government will respond to these requests by releasing not just the four Dissident Working Group members, but all political prisoners and reintegrating them into Cuba society.

Q: What about reports that the Cuban Government has offered Canadian insurance company (Confederation Life) \$12 million in compensation for assets confiscated after the 1959 revolution? Doesn't this show that engagement with Cuba is the way to get compensation for confiscated property?

A: We have seen the press reports about this but have no further details.

We stand by our policy of promoting democratic change by maintaining economic pressure on the Cuban Government while reaching out to the Cuban people to help strengthen Cuban civil society.

We have seen no indication that a policy of engagement has resulted in systemic, democratic change in Cuba.

With regard to the compensation issue, the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has certified 5,911 claims by U.S. nationals, currently worth \$6 billion.

The Government of Cuba has never made a serious proposal for satisfactorily resolving these claims.

CUBA: PROPOSED FOOD AND MEDICINE LEGISLATION

Background: (For the briefer only) On March 20, the President announced several measures on behalf of Cuban people in response to the Pope's visit to Cuba. These included: (1) simplifying and expediting the sale of medicines and medical supplies consistent with existing law; (2) restoring direct humanitarian charter flights; and (3) developing new licensing arrangements to restore authorization for remittances. He also announced a willingness to work on a bipartisan basis with the Congress to fashion a new approach to the transfer of food for the Cuban people. The Los Angeles Times reported on Tuesday that President Clinton told Dr. Peter Bourne, chairman of the American Association for World Health, that he supports legislation to exempt food and medicine from the U.S. embargo against Cuba.

Q: Does the President support legislation exempting food and medicine from the U.S. embargo against Cuba?

A: As you know, on March 20, the President announced a series of measures to strengthen our support for the Cuban people in response to the Pope's

visit.

The measures were designed to build on the success of the visit, support the development of civil society in Cuba, expand religious freedoms, and ultimately help prepare the Cuban people for a peaceful transition to democracy.

The President also asked Secretary Albright to work with the Congress to seek a bipartisan approach to the transfer of food to Cuba. That effort will get underway when Congress returns from recess.

The starting point are pending bills before Congress by Torres/Leach and Dodd/Warner and a proposal being developed by Senator Helms to facilitate humanitarian assistance to Cuba. There is also the trip report from Senator Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committee staff who visited Cuba during the Papal visit, which among other things, calls for increased humanitarian donations for needy Cubans.

Based on these various initiatives, the Administration is seeking to work with the Congress to fashion a new bipartisan approach to the transfer of food.

We will continue to pursue policies that help the Cuban people without strengthening the regime, in keeping with a bipartisan U.S. policy over the last 40 years.

Q: What about the sale of medicines?

A: The Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 permits the export of medicine, medical supplies and equipment to Cuba by American companies and their subsidiaries, provided appropriate end-use monitoring arrangements are in place.

On March 20, the President directed the Departments of Treasury, Commerce and State to simplify and expedite procedures for medical sales, while maintaining adequate measures to verify against inappropriate diversions. These

new
procedures will be announced shortly.

IRAN
April 22, 1998

Q: What is our policy toward Iran?

A: Our approach toward Iran is straightforward: We are concerned about some policies of the Iranian Government. We want to discuss these policies and any concerns that Iran might have in an official and acknowledged government to government dialogue.

In the meanwhile, we agree with those in the Iranian government that people to people contacts are valuable and should be encouraged. We are doing so wherever possible.

Q: Is Iran continuing to support terrorism?

A: We have made clear on several occasions that terrorism is one issue we want to discuss officially with the Iranian government.

Our upcoming report on global patterns of terrorism describes the situation as it existed last year. We are in the process now of assessing whether and the extent to which Iran under its new government has changed its policies in this area. This process will take time.

Certainly, in public statements, Iran has indicated that it does not support terrorism. We welcome such statements. We would urge the Iranian government to ensure that its policies match its public declarations.

The US will be prepared to respond positively to any such changes.

RADIO FREE IRAN
April 16, 1998

Background: Story leads w/ "Clinton administration, under pressure from Congress, has agreed to create a Persian-language radio service to beam anti-government propaganda into Iran." The basic problem with this lead is the statement that we "agreed" -- fact is we were unable to convince Congress to change the position it had taken in the appropriations act in the fall. We "agreed" only in the sense that the President signed the bill into law. Bottom line: Administration continues to pursue some accommodation on the Hill to our view that entity should not be called "Radio Free Iran" and that entity should not be based in Prague, understanding that proponents want it based outside U.S. We pushed hard but with no luck to get Congress to accept that some of the funds should initially go to augmenting existing VOA Farsi-language service.

* Congress mandated in report language in P.L. 105-119 (appropriations act for Commerce, State, Justice) that in the international broadcasting operations account, \$4M must go to the development of a Farsi-language surrogate broadcasting service to Iran.

* Administration supports increased Farsi-language broadcasting to the region.

* Administration view is that such increased Farsi-language broadcasting is best done through VOA.

* We do not believe it is necessary to create a separate entity to carry out these broadcasts, and we have not supported creation of a "Radio Free Iran." We still do not support these proposals.

* We have consulted closely with Congress and with the international broadcasting services to work out a plan that satisfies our concerns. We will continue to

pursue with Congress a solution that accommodates our view that the entity should not be called "Radio Free Iran" and that the entity should not be based in Prague.

IRAN/AZERBAIJAN
April 27, 1998

Q: Can you comment on the Azeri report that they stopped a shipment of steel bound for Iran?

A: Azerbaijan informed the United States on March 25 that their Customs officials had detained a shipment of steel at the Azerbaijan/Iran border because the shipping documents were not in order. The materials described in the shipping documents did not match the cargo. The shipment was transiting Azerbaijan from Russia.

The United States Government analyzed a sample of the cargo and determined that it is a type of stainless steel suitable for use in the production of liquid-propellant missiles. It is highly corrosion resistant.

The United States Government asked the Government of Azerbaijan to detain the shipment for further investigation.

The United States has shared with the Governments of Azerbaijan and Russia information on this matter.

The Russian Government has announced that this matter is under investigation, and several persons have been arrested.

This matter was discussed in detail at the meeting earlier this week between Ambassador Gallucci and Russian space Agency director Koptev on ending cooperation by entities in Russia and the Iranian missile program.

AFGHANISTAN

April 22, 1998

Q: What can you tell us about the talks between the Taliban and the Northern Alliance?

A: During talks with Ambassador Richardson on April 17th, both the Taliban and the Northern Alliance committed to entering into face-to-face talks under the auspices of the UN and the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) to be held in Islamabad on or before April 27th.

During preliminary discussions yesterday, both sides agreed that such talks would start on Saturday, April 25th. We hope these talks will begin the process of ending the fighting.

The agenda for these talks will include discussion of:

Modalities pertaining to a meeting of Taliban and Northern "ulema" (religious scholars),

Simultaneous cease-fire and prisoner exchange, and

Internal blockages, including the one affecting Hazarajat.

Q: Is there any particular significance to the April 27th date?

A: April 27th marks the 20th anniversary of the communist-led coup that started the initial phase of the Afghan conflict. The U.S. hopes the parties will make the hard decisions needed to end this conflict. As the President said in January, we pray that a "time of healing" will come to Afghanistan.

Q: Any comment on the refusal of Taliban leaders to meet with the head of the UN's humanitarian assistance office?

A: The United States fully supports the UN's efforts to provide assistance to the people of Afghanistan.

We urge Taliban officials to do everything possible to assist UN agencies in providing humanitarian assistance to the people of Afghanistan.

Q: Who will chair the talks?

A: The talks will probably be chaired by the acting head of the UN Special Mission in Afghanistan, James Ngobi.

Q: Are there any details on Afghan prisoner releases?

A: We understand that the Taliban has released ten political prisoners held in Kabul.

NORTHERN IRELAND April 22, 1998

32 County Representatives

Background for briefer: A number of Sinn Fein and IRA members split off from the mainstream last fall protesting Sinn Fein's involvement in the peace process when it became obvious that a united Ireland was not going to result.

32 counties refers to an united Ireland. Some persons associated with this splinter group are already in custody for involvement with attempted bombings. The most prominent leader, Bernadette Sands, is the sister of the IRA hunger strike victim, Bobby Sands, and lives with a person reputed to have been a very senior figure in the IRA who had access to explosives and weapons. She has been planning a round of meetings in Washington and New York to build support for her cause. Few observers think there is any support for her opposition to the Good Friday agreement. Her travelling partner, a recently suspended Sinn Fein councilor, Frances Mackey, has a number of minor convictions in Northern Ireland that make him ineligible to travel here without a visa. She has a visa from 1991 and will be required to apply for a new one after this trip. Mackey was not

allowed to board the Aer Lingus noon flight from Dublin to New York, while Sands proceeded. There may or may not be any press interest in this development.

Q: Why was Francie Mackey not allowed to fly to the United States today? Is the Administration concerned that the 32-County group is seeking to undermine the Good Friday agreement? If so, why did you let Bernadette Sands travel? Are there any plans for her to meet with officials here?

A: I refer you to the State Department for details of Mr. Mackey's case; Bernadette Sands was properly documented for travel. Our understanding that Mr. Mackey was ineligible to enter the United States under the Visa Waiver pilot program. Should he apply for a visa, the Embassy and State Department will evaluate his case. There are no plans to meet with Ms. Sands.

(if pressed: Mr. Mackey has previous legal problems that disqualify him from coverage under the Visa waiver pilot program. Persons in his situation require a visa to travel to the United States.)

Q: There seems to be substantial opposition to the President visiting Ireland before the May 22 referenda there. Has he made a decision whether to go?

A: The President intends to talk to Prime Minister Blair and Prime Minister Ahern regarding the usefulness of visiting Northern Ireland later this spring. They have a lot of work to do there to get ready for referendums and subsequent elections to the Northern Ireland Assembly; we want to be helpful and not complicate their efforts.

Q: Following Trimble's overwhelming victory in the UUP Council on Saturday, what do you think the chances are for the referendums to pass next month?

A: This is a question for the voters of Ireland and Northern Ireland

who go to
the polls on May 22. I would note that this agreement comes out of an
inclusive
process that involved eight parties representing a broad spectrum of
opinion from
both communities.

We want to reassure the people there that they can count on the United
States to
continue to support their efforts to make peace work and build a better
future.

Q: Reaction to Gerry Adams' failure to get Sinn Fein to endorse the
agreement
this weekend?

A: This is a question for the voters of Ireland and Northern Ireland
who go to
the polls on May 22. I would note that this agreement comes out of an
inclusive
process that involved eight parties representing a broad spectrum of
opinion from
both communities.

We want to reassure the people there that they can count on the United
States to
continue to support their efforts to make peace work and build a better
future.

Q: Were Representatives Neal and King at the Sinn Fein conference
as
representatives of the President?

A: No.

Q: How about reports that you have a package of \$100 million to offer
Northern
Ireland to help solidify the peace?

A: As the President has said, the answer is no. No new financial
package was
sought as an incentive for the peace agreement, nor did we offer one.
As you
know, this administration was the first to request an appropriation for
the
International Fund for Ireland. This year that amounts to almost \$20
million,
and we have a similar request for the next fiscal year. The IFI does
important
economic development and cross-community work in Northern

Ireland and Ireland's border counties. The main impact of the Good Friday agreement is that the people of Northern Ireland can now unlock the full benefit of trade and investment that already exists with the United States. We are certain that even more will flow in response to peace as it takes root.

To enhance prospects for that, the President named Jim Lyons last fall to succeed George Mitchell as his Special Advisor for economic initiatives for Ireland. Jim Lyons, the NSC, the Commerce Department, the State Department and other agencies are working together to identify additional initiatives to help make this precious peace a reality.

Q: Are you worried that renewed violence could derail the agreement?

A: As the President said, in the days to come there may be those who will try to undermine this great achievement - not only with words, but perhaps also with violence. All the parties - and all the rest of us - must stand shoulder to shoulder to defy any such appeals.

STATE LIST OF RUSSIAN ENTITIES

April 16, 1998

Background: USA Today has obtained a DOE memo transmitting a "State Department" list of Russian entities of concern with respect to assisting Iran's missile program. such entities were not to be involved in projects under DOE's Initiative for proliferation Prevention (IPP) program, which funds projects with NIS entities as a means of keeping weapons-related expertise from going to countries of concern. Although USA Today reports this as a "new" step related to recent Israeli and Congressional pressure on the Russia-Iran missile issue, for over a year we have been stopping IPP and International Science and Technology

Center (ISTC) projects involving entities we are concerned have cooperated with Iran's missile program. The list of entities provided to DOE should have been classified; we cannot comment on any specific entities. Moreover, the USG routinely reviews all assistance going to Russian entities that were engaged in WMD/missile activities for the FSU. Given next week's Gallucci-Koptev meeting, we need to avoid public USG statements that will give the Russians issues that could take the focus off their effort to cut off missile-related assistance to Iran.

Q: What can you tell us about the "blacklist" of Russian entities that may have aided Iran's missile program?

A: We evaluate very carefully proposals to use U.S. Government funds in cooperative projects with foreign entities. This is both natural and responsible.

These projects include efforts to work with entities in Russia and the CIS to redirect their expertise to the civilian economic sector, so that they are provided with legitimate alternatives to cooperating with programs of proliferation concern.

And, of course, we would want to look very carefully at proposals involving entities that might be engaged in activities of concern to us.

For over a year, we have been extremely concerned about reports that Iran's missile program has been able to obtain technology from some Russian entities. For about as long, this concern has been incorporated into our review of proposals for U.S. Government-funded cooperative projects.

I am not in a position to describe how many or which entities we might be concerned about, the basis for any concerns, or specific actions that we might have taken with specific entities.

Q: What projects has the USG denied funding for based on this list?

A: I am not in a position to describe how many or which entities we might be concerned about, the basis for any concerns, or specific actions that we might have taken with specific entities.

Q: Is the Russian Space Agency on the list? Was it put on the list erroneously?

A: I am not in a position to describe how many or which entities we might be concerned about, the basis for any concerns, or specific actions that we might have taken with specific entities. However, the list referred to in the article is not definitive, and in some cases, the list is incorrect.

(On Background: We do not believe that the Russian Space Agency is providing assistance to Iran's missile program.)

Q: Is the Russian Government involved in providing assistance to Iran's missile program? Has the U.S. talked about this to Russia?

A: Over the past year, the United States has raised its concerns at the highest levels with Russia -- particularly through the Wisner -Koptev (now Gallucci-Koptev) process, to stop the flow of missile technology to Iran.

President Yeltsin has taken new steps to ensure that such transfers do not occur. The key is now implementation of these steps.

We are continuing to work intensively with Russian authorities on the need to ensure strong implementation and on the overall problem of creating and implementing effective controls to block the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

CHINA SATELLITE LAUNCHES

April 16, 1998

Q: Did the President issue a waiver for the launch of a US commercial satellite by China because a senior officer of the company involved was a major contributor?

A: On Feb. 18, the President issued a national interest waiver to permit the launch of a U.S. commercial communications satellite by China. This waiver decision was based solely on consideration of U.S. national interests.

Any suggestion that campaign contributions were a factor is nonsense.

This is the latest in a series of such waivers under a policy dating back to Reagan Administration.

Q: Won't this waiver undermine a Justice Department investigation of prior export violations by this company?

A: Of course, I cannot comment on activities of the Justice Department.

I would just say that, in deciding whether the waiver was in the national interest, the views of all agencies were carefully weighed, along with other factors, such as U.S. practice over the last few years and the availability of a wide range of sanctions to deal with any company that is determined to have violated our export control laws.

Q: Won't this waiver further assist China in developing its missile capabilities?

A: No.

The terms of all such licenses include stringent safeguards against the unauthorized transfer of the U.S.-origin goods and technologies related to satellite launches.

We have closely scrutinized this license and taken measures to ensure

that no
technology is transferred other than what is authorized in the license.

We are confident the procedures in place for this waiver will guard
against
unauthorized transfers.

Q: Is the Administration promoting business interests at the expense
of U.S.
national security by allowing U.S. companies to launch satellites on
Chinese
rockets?

A: No.

Under President Reagan, the U.S. established the policy of permitting
U.S.
commercial satellites to be launched from China. This policy has
continued under
Presidents Bush and Clinton.

However, the USG has maintained a very strict policy, including
safeguards, to
prevent the unauthorized transfer of sensitive missile technology to
China.

For example, the U.S.-China Agreement on Satellite Technology
Safeguards
specifically precludes U.S. companies from providing assistance to
China with
respect to the design, development, operation, maintenance,
modification or
repair of launch vehicles.

Q: Was the Administration's decision to transfer licensing jurisdiction
or waive
sanctions a favor to domestic supporters in the aerospace industry?

A: No.

The Administration's decisions have been based on national interest.
We are
seeking to promote legitimate commercial activity, such as civilian
satellite
launches, while safeguarding our national security interest.

Promoting commercial space activity with China is part of our broader
engagement
policy, which includes creating a stronger basis for U.S.-Chinese
cooperation on

missile nonproliferation issues.

When China violates U.S. laws, we have imposed sanctions, as we did in 1993.

The basis for the waiver of these sanctions in 1994 was additional Chinese nonproliferation commitments.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 4/29/98 2:41:02 PM
FROM Blinken, Antony J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT NATO insert [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

TEXT_BODY I'm coming over to work this

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Doc2.doc
NATO INSERT

Before I begin, let me say that I just had a very good meeting with Senate Majority Leader Lott and Minority Leader Daschle. We spent some time talking about what I believe is one of the most important votes this Senate will face: approving the enlargement of the NATO alliance. We agree that bringing Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic into NATO will make the alliance stronger, Europe more stable and America more secure.

I am very pleased that, four years after my administration first proposed opening NATO's doors to Europe's new democracies, the Senate is on the verge of giving its strong, bipartisan consent. I am grateful for the leadership of Senator Lott, Senator Daschle, Senator Helms, Senator Biden and many

others. We're
seeing a very impressive, high level Senate debate. I very much look
forward to
a positive vote by the end of the week.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 4/29/98 3:55:42 PM
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT April 29 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.
Miyaoaka, Lester H.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Press Briefing
April 29 McCurry Press Briefing

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

mike0429.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 29, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:05 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: Good afternoon, everyone. Let me start with just a quick couple of points on the President's brief --

Q Could we have quiet, please?

MR. MCCURRY: Thank you, Mr. Donaldson. I appreciate that assistance. Mr. Donaldson is asking for decorum in the White House press lobby/briefing room. Please. Something unusual.

Okay. The President's very brief meeting with President Isaias of Eritrea. Obviously the President extended congratulations on the tremendous progress the government of Eritrea has been making as it reconstructs its own civil life, as it deepens and strengthens democratic institutions, as it continues on the road of progress it has marched since independence. They also compared some notes on --Mrs. Clinton has visited there. They talked a little bit about some of her fond memories of her travels there.

They discussed a number of issues growing out of the President's recent trip to Africa, including cooperation on countering genocide, issues related to central Africa, the Great Lakes Region, how we can continue to support regional development and promote democracy, and ways in which we can sustain the dialogue and further exchanges between the United States and Africa. A brief but good meeting with someone that we well respect. Obviously the President had a lengthier discussion with National Security Advisor Berger.

Anything else?

Q Is Richard Riley going to Ireland?

MR. MCCURRY: He's welcome to travel anytime. I think all of us enjoy going there.

Q Appointed as envoy?

MR. MCCURRY: He is highly valued and respected as Secretary of Education. I'm not aware that we've made any decisions with respect to our ambassadorial post.

Q When is the announcement? Tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: We are a long ways from an announcement related to the Ambassador to Ireland.

Q After we talked this morning, Speaker Gingrich came to a stakeout and repeated much of what he had to say, including the following quote: "This is not about sex, this is about law breaking," and he's referring to the President.

MR. MCCURRY: This is about politics. And it's about things other than the work that the American people expect to see their leaders doing here. And the President is going to stay concentrated on the matters he's been working on: education funding, child care, the work we're doing right now on a major foreign policy issue with respect to the expansion of our NATO alliance. There's a lot of work to be done and we'll leave the politics to the Speaker.

Q But a lot of that work can't be done without the cooperation to some large extent of Republicans on the Hill, including the Speaker.

MR. MCCURRY: We do have a Constitution that has three branches of government: the legislative branch, the executive branch, the judicial branch. And the executive branch here, the White House, the President does need to work with the legislative branch, and there are 535 good people there and we will work with all of them.

Q But if the hip bone is connected to the thigh bone, and the thigh bone is

connected --

MR. MCCURRY: The thigh bone is connected to -- right.

Q Did you get any feedback on your remarks this morning?

MR. MCCURRY: Feedback on which remarks?

Q That he should come to his senses.

MR. MCCURRY: It doesn't appear that he did, according to Sam. (Laughter.)

Q This morning he was saying as soon as he comes to his senses we can get on with the work -- meaning? Could you clarify that? Did you mean that you're not going to work with him until he comes to his senses?

MR. MCCURRY: No, of course not. I mean, we'll work with him. To the degree he's willing to work with us, we will work with him. He's the Speaker. We have to -- we don't have any choice but to work with him to the degree that the legislative branch and the executive branch are going to work together to do the business of the people. We're going to do the business of the people. We think there's probably a strong majority of members of the House of Representatives who want to get on with business and leave the politics to other times and more appropriate venues.

Q But, Mike, he was just talking about authorization of IMF funding and linking it to the fact that how can the Congress approve IMF funding when there's so many questions concerning the Riadys and campaign finance. Are the Democrats legitimately working to solve those question when they're opposing --

MR. MCCURRY: In all of the countless billions of words that have been spewed and uttered and written about campaign finance, I've never seen anything that connects any issue with respect to the Riadys to the question of IMF funding. That is way out of left field. I don't know what that is about.

Q He's talking about the funding and helping in Indonesia and saying that Congress shouldn't act until a lot of the questions about -- that the Democrats

refuse to answer are answered. Okay, what about this. Why --

MR. MCCURRY: That's got nothing to do with IMF funding. I mean, it's crazy.

Q Why are the Democrats opposing immunity for --

MR. MCCURRY: I have no idea. That is an issue that arose in the course of the House committee hearings. I think they all spoke to it. Representative Waxman was very clear. They object to the conduct of that hearing by Chairman Burton and they had a number of issues and they were all very public about it. That was their food fight, not ours.

Q Well, part of what the Speaker is saying is that the White House and the Democratic Party are delaying on these investigations and that's also delaying the business at hand.

MR. MCCURRY: I personally don't know a thing about -- I don't even know who they were trying to immunize, but I'll check with Mr. Kennedy here and see. To my knowledge we had absolutely no role in that whatsoever. That was a procedural dispute about the way in which that ill-begotten investigation has been conducted by the chairman.

Q This isn't going to stop. The Speaker said today, I will never again, as long as I am Speaker, make a speech without commenting on this topic.

MR. MCCURRY: They have precious little else by way of valuable ideas on how to move the country's business forward to contribute, so they do resort to other issues from time to time.

Q But if this continues day after day, aren't you worried that at some point --

MR. MCCURRY: If the Speaker continues to make attacks like this each and every day, the American people will either see those as being valued commentary on the condition of life in Washington or they won't. My guess is the American people will say, knock it off, at some point to him, and then he'll get back to doing business.

Q Mike, speaking of Newt Gingrich, tomorrow he's supposed to come out with his Republican anti-drug control policy. He's going to attack General Barry McCaffrey. McCaffrey is under attack at the CDC and now Newt is expected to come out and throw something at him as well. What's the President's response?

MR. MCCURRY: You've heard me before on this subject. General McCaffrey has done a very good job of leading our comprehensive approach to fighting drugs. He can point to the work that we've done with Congress to achieve a number of things. We've put in place an anti-drug campaign that will help discourage drug use by young people, secured funding for it. We've established the Drug-Free Communities program, which is empowering anti-drug groups in countless towns and cities. We've mobilized millions of Americans to fight drug use through the Prevention Through Service Alliance.

We've been taking -- working with the help of Congress to further all of our goals, that are quite ambitious with respect to discouraging drug use by young people. And we've got a comprehensive drug strategy pending in our budget proposals before the Congress that we hope they will take up and pass, because that's the way to make progress on what is a very important administration priority, which is being led very ably and successfully by General McCaffrey.

Q So it's safe to say the President isn't really looking at any of these darts that are being thrown --

MR. MCCURRY: It's safe to say that, as in a number of things, he is looking to see less politics and more progress.

Q There was a press conference this morning by some of the conservative opponents of affirmative action that met with the President some months ago. They said that while they were charmed by that meeting, they are now convinced that the President isn't serious about including them in the dialogue. Any reaction?

MR. MCCURRY: It's the first I've heard of that and I'm surprised to hear that, because we did value their contribution and their ongoing contribution. And I'll check and see what efforts the race initiative staff has been making to continue what the President thought was a very valuable contribution they made to his race.

dialogue.

Q Mike, have you said in the past few days whether the President supports the actions that Congressman Waxman and the others on the Government Reform Committee have taken?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know that we have taken any position on it one way or another. I'd check with Mr. Kennedy on that; he may have been addressing the issue.

Q Are you in coordination with Mr. Waxman here at the White House?

MR. MCCURRY: We talk to him from time to time about all sorts of issues because he plays the leadership role on a variety of subjects. But I do not know the degree to which we've had any contact with him on this.

Q Is he doing your bidding?

MR. MCCURRY: Look, our bidding has got to do with all the things I'm telling you about -- the work the President discusses and does every single day. We are less interested in political theatre and more interested in doing the business that the President talks to you about each and every day. Our work has been on those things -- getting a tobacco agreement, moving ahead on some of these critical funding priorities that we have for investments that will help continue the economic performance we've seen, helping improve educational standards, health care quality. That's the business the President is working on.

Q What's the outlook on tobacco now?

MR. MCCURRY: We had a good meeting with the groups that were represented here today and walked through what we see as the outlook for passage of comprehensive legislation and the degree it's going to take working together and getting people with different viewpoints to come together in order to pass legislation. A very good meeting.

Q And ultimately opposed to what Mr. Gingrich is saying, which is, I'll help him raise the tax if all the money goes right back to the American people.

MR. MCCURRY: We are unalterably opposed to what is being referred to in the debate as a skinny bill. We think the comprehensive approach that's been developed through the Senate Commerce Committee with the hard work of Senator McCain and others represents the right direction to go with the kinds of improvements and modifications we've been discussing with the sponsors.

And there is, to our assessment, a strong bipartisan coalition ready to pass that legislation if we can get the leadership moving in that direction.

Q Mike, your reaction to the death sentence handed down to the nine accused coup plotters in Nigeria?

MR. MCCURRY: I didn't see -- you got something on that? Why don't you take -- I'll answer your question and then come back.

Q Back to Gingrich, do you have a view on what his -- why Gingrich is coming out with this? Just a month ago he said -- he was telling Republicans, you shouldn't focus on the problems and scandals of the White House and the like because it's not going to help you in your re-election?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. I do not know. He needs more junk food in his diet, maybe. I just don't know. (Laughter.)

Let me do Nigeria. The verdicts and death sentences were the product of a closed military proceeding, which in its totality failed to achieve the minimum standards of due process. And because the proceedings took place beyond the scrutiny of the public and press, it's unknown if defendants had access to counsel of their own choice and the opportunity to confront their accusers or the right to present and contest evidence, all hallmarks of civil procedures in legal settings that governments around the world respect.

Obviously, the United States government believes that this is demonstration that the government of Nigeria does not take seriously its obligations, and its respect for international norms of legal procedures seriously are in question.

Q Do you call on Nigeria to reverse?

MR. MCCURRY: We call on the due process and respect for law and the role of law to apply. And we believe that the matter should be reviewed urgently by the appropriate authorities.

Q On the State Department authorization bill, given that you object to the Mexico City language inserted there, do you have any concerns about the uses to which USAID money is put in international family planning programs?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we don't have any concerns that they are somehow or other being directed to prohibited activities like abortions. But we do know that groups that operate in the field -- nongovernment organizations that receive the kind of assistance we're talking about -- are exactly the people that some of you saw at work during our trip to Africa, who are helping with maternal health care, who are helping children who need immunizations from diseases, who are dealing with all the consequences that those programs are designed to address.

In many cases, clinics that provide a range of services to women provide a variety of medical services. And it seems to us very shortsighted to cut off the kind of funding that can help deal with a range of health-related issues that do not go directly for the performance of abortions because that is against our law and there's been no suggestion that that law ought to change. And it also goes to organizations that have played a very valuable role in the international debate with respect to population control.

So it's very shortsighted if your concern is the health and welfare of populations that really need this kind of care.

Q To follow that, Senator Helms says they're going to sit on the bill for a couple of days to see if the President changes his mind.

MR. MCCURRY: It's not likely to happen; in fact, it will not happen. And it's better that they send the bill here so we can quickly veto it, so we can get on to addressing all those things that are not tied up in funding that we need to address.

Q Mike, why is it important that these family planning organizations be able to

lobby for abortion, since they're already prohibited from performing them?

MR. MCCURRY: It's not that -- it's not necessarily important that they do; it's that many of those groups, because they feel strongly about the issue, that is one aspect of the work that they do. But I'm talking of -- I've just described to you what we think is important is the work that they do in the field in health care delivery affecting the populations that need that kind of assistance. And it would be, in effect, a violation of their freedom of expression to say they couldn't participate in any of these other debates or that they somehow or other would lose this valuable funding that they need just because they do raise a voice in that other debate.

Q Well, if you could just describe the distinction. I mean, you obviously don't have any compunctions about preventing them from performing abortions, but for some reason you've drawn the line at lobbying for abortion. Why is that a more kind of sacred right to protect than the ability to perform them?

MR. MCCURRY: Because it's a right to freely express their views in the context of an international debate, and in some countries, domestically in that debate. That's a right that we happen to cherish -- the right to freedom of expression, freedom to debate.

Q Mike, do you have any indication -- early indication -- from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on how it will view Davidow's nomination?

MR. MCCURRY: Only the comments that I've seen expressed on behalf of the chairman by his spokesman, which said that they would promptly and thoroughly review the nomination. We believe it has been a well-received nomination. Ambassador Davidow is highly respected. His work as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs was exemplary, helping to lead to the success of the President's recent participation in the second Summit of the Americas. He's widely known throughout the region and within Mexico as someone who has provided extraordinary leadership to that part of our government dealing with relations in the Americas. And I think for all those reasons and many more, his nomination will be well received in the Senate.

Q What are the prospects that the Vice President's trip to the Middle East will get the peace process back on track?

MR. MCCURRY: The Vice President's trip is primarily for the purpose of celebrating the 50th anniversary of Israel's independence, but as with any high-ranking travel by senior officials in our government, our meetings with the parties can help encourage them to make those difficult decisions that are necessary if we're going to move the process forward. The Vice President fully intended to engage both the Palestinian leadership and the Israeli leadership on that point, but that would be preparatory to the meetings that we foresee in London May 4th and, no doubt, additional work in the process itself.

Q So your expectations are pretty low for this thing?

MR. MCCURRY: My expectations were never that this would be a critical moment for decision making in the process. But it will lend, we hope, some momentum to the thinking of those that believe now is the time for these parties to be very serious about bridging the gaps in their positions that exist, and to recognize that this is a moment that needs to be seized because there may not be all that many moments in the future.

Q Mike, will the President, when he's in California at the end of this week, take the opportunity to make his position on Proposition 227 public?

MR. MCCURRY: I have not heard whether he will address the Unz amendment or not. I'm not aware that there's anything that would suggest itself as a forum for that, but I don't rule out that the issue might arise -- the Unz initiative in California.

Q Ward Connerly, Abigail Thernstrom, and a number of other people who met with the President last December on the race initiative --

MR. MCCURRY: Been there, done that.

Q -- launched their own today. And among other things said that they felt they'd been had by the President.

MR. MCCURRY: Been there, done that question already.

Q Maybe you talked about this -- Netanyahu's coming here in about two weeks. Do you expect the President to see him at that --

MR. MCCURRY: It is a wonderful answer, Karen. It didn't tell you a whole lot, but -- (laughter.)

Q Is the President favorably disposed to seeing Netanyahu when he comes here for the AIPAC conference?

MR. MCCURRY: He is always very favorably disposed to receive the Prime Minister of Israel under any circumstances. He would love an opportunity to receive the Prime Minister after there has been significant progress in the Middle East peace process.

Q Will he break bread with him this time?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't -- that's the first I've heard that there's any certainty to the Prime Minister's schedule. The last I'd heard was it was not entirely clear that that was going to happen. If it is, that's a new development and the NSC can maybe help you out on whether we've heard anything about plans.

Q It was reported that -- President Clinton is going to talk directly -- Cyprus. Could you please comment or is there some way --

MR. MCCURRY: I have not heard anything that suggests to me that the President would be speaking directly either to President Clerides or to Mr. Denktash. I do know that Ambassador Holbrooke intends to see them when he arrives in Cyprus, I believe Friday -- correct? And obviously he will convey the strong sentiments of the President that it is important for the parties now to take an opportunity to set aside the differences that have divided the island for the last 20-plus years. And we will raise other issues that have also been a source of concern to us, particularly the reported acceptance of a proposed shipment of SA-300 missiles.

Q -- today give a strong warning to Cyprus for a new Turkish invasion on the

excuse of the Russian missiles, as you mentioned. May we have your reaction, since the White House is directly involved for a solution?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we certainly would like to see a solution that would prevent the introduction to the island of missile technology that we think would be destabilizing. We've made that quite clear. We've raised our concerns with the Russian Federation. We have raised our concerns directly with the Greek Cypriot leadership and with others. And we acknowledge that those arms transfers can have a potentially destabilizing affect, could lead other to take measures in reaction. And for all those reasons, we think it's important to set aside that sale and that proposed transfer.

Q The status of the threats of an invasion from Turkey? How do you comment?

MR. MCCURRY: I know that there have been threats made. I would not cite any specific threats as being any more or less alarming than simply the fact that the introduction of technologies that are potentially destabilizing represents the wrong direction at a time when we are trying to promote reconciliation and dialogue that could lead to a peaceful settlement of the issues that have divided the Turkish community and the Greek community on Cyprus.

Q Mike, you spoke earlier about the concerns the White House has about the supplemental spending bill. Which items are likely to attract a line item veto from the President if it arrives in the White House?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I would not, at this point, want to identify our specific concerns in connection with a question on the line item veto or the use of the line item veto. I can tell you that we have been very explicit in identifying our specific concerns and you can take them exactly for what they are -- a strong express to the Congress of what needs to change in those -- in the supplemental language and what -- I guess a better way to say it would be what we're trying to prevent from happening during the conference that would make it more possible for the President to sign a bill rather than have to consider a veto -- any kind of veto.

OMB Director Franklin Raines has written to the conference chairs today and I believe that letter we can make available that has some specific provisions

cited, not the least of which is the decision -- or a proposal being considered by the conference to allow 600,000 Uzis and AK-47s to come back in the country so they can show up on our streets, which seems like a particularly wrong-headed idea.

Q Does the President have any plans to talk to Mr. Lott about Mr. Gingrich's statements?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know whether he has any plans. It's principally a session that would talk primarily about the NATO debate that's now underway and how we can bring that to successful conclusion with a vote of ratification, but I don't rule out that other subjects might arise. That's not the President's primary purpose.

He clearly wants to focus on the bipartisanship in foreign policy that's being demonstrated in a very good Senate debate on the future of NATO and talk about what we think would be a very historic decision by the Senate to move forward and accelerate the modernization and redefinition of one of the important institutions of Euro-Atlantic cooperation.

Q You had also -- the other day, you know, Mr. Gingrich made some statements in support of Mr. Starr and against White House aides. And you said that it was unfortunate that he was hanging on politics, that it was getting in the way of the business. Do you think that the investigation is dragging on and getting in the way of the business at hand?

MR. MCCURRY: Which one? There are quite a few.

Q The Grand Jury, either.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know -- one of them I think is coming to some kind of conclusion and another one keeps going on. We continue to -- you know, irrespective of that, continue to work on the things that we talk about here every day and I haven't detected that it's interfered with the President's ability to continue addressing those things that he wakes up and thinks about every day when he comes to work.

Q Do you think Mr. Starr's private work is dragging this on?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't addressed that subject. I don't know the degree to which it does interfere with his work. I'm not in a position to evaluate that.

Q You can't tell us anything more about those one or two questions that Mrs. Clinton declined to --

MR. MCCURRY: I can't. I'm not familiar with what they are and only familiar with the statement that Mr. Kendall has issued that you've now received.

Q Is that the first time that a First Lady has invoked that spousal privilege?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not enough of a historian to know.

Q Can you say whether the President thinks he's well served by the First Lady declining to answer a couple of questions?

Q It's a trap.

Q Don't give it away.

MR. MCCURRY: Mr. Kendall indicated that it was perfectly appropriate for the First Lady to, in a five-hour interview session, fail to answer two questions on the grounds that she didn't want to repeat conversations she'd had with her husband. And I don't know any reason why the President would dispute Mr. Kendall's judgment that it was appropriate.

Q Well, was it in the spirit of cooperation, I guess is what I was asking.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know what the questions were and I don't know whether Mr. Starr or his representatives have any objection to the fact that she didn't answer those two questions. I don't know.

Q Mike, doesn't that leave the impression, though, that there's something to hide in refusing to answer a couple of questions?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think so. It's a common law application and I think most Americans are familiar that wives are not required to testify about certain things involving husbands. I don't know that that gives any appearance other than that.

Q Secretary Shalala today said that the White House still needs to see some improvements on the McCain tobacco bill. Can you elaborate a little bit more about how close the White House is to supporting a version of that bill?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, a version of the bill -- I mean, we have recognized that the passage of the McCain bill, 19 to 1 in the Commerce Committee, is a very significant step forward in this whole debate. And our concerns on the specific provisions that we have are -- you know, compared to the comprehensive nature of the bill, are at the edge of fine-tuning the legislation, although there are some important concerns that we've expressed. But they are not designed to make it impossible to move forward with that legislation. That's the vehicle, that's the one that's moving, that's the one that clearly has the best prospect in this session of Congress to gain passage and to make history, and we're very encouraged by the prospects for passage.

Q So what elements need to be --

MR. MCCURRY: Have we identified those specific things?

MR. TOIV: Particularly the look-back.

MR. MCCURRY: It's the look-back provision. Wait a minute, I'll tell you.

Well, it's that and it's the overall cap. It's the \$3.5 billion cap and making it company specific. And there are a number of other concerns. We can get you some more. Bruce Reed can help you on some of the specific things.

But we are at the point now where we're working with various people on the Hill to identify very specifically those things that we would like to fine-tune with respect to the legislation. And I think Senator McCain, himself, has indicated that some of our concerns seem to him things that certainly can at least be thought about and talked about.

Q She spent a lot of time speaking about the price per pack of a \$1.10. Would you like to see the price of cigarettes rise higher as a way to discourage --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've projected a price impact of \$1.50 per pack over 10 years. And most experts say that that would translate to roughly \$1.10 over five years. There have been different estimates about that, but that certainly not -- most experts think that that's within the right range; that by no means, way, shape, or form are the exaggerated claims of the industry, accurate according to any of the experts who have assessed what the impact of the legislation would be.

Q This reported scientific cooperation with China, is there any concern by the White House that this would enable China to penetrate into America's computer system?

MR. MCCURRY: No. We would clearly have taken into account any national security concerns prior to finishing the work that was launched by the two Presidents at the state visit and culminating in the memorandum signed by the Secretary of State and the new Chinese Foreign Minister today.

Q If the President isn't going to raise Gingrich in his -- you know, the regular phone calls that he holds with Lott, should we just assume it's not being taken very seriously?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. It's -- yes. Yes. Take it that we don't take entirely seriously a lot of the political bravado, because at the end of the day there's work to do and we'll get on with doing the work one way or the other and we'll see where the Speaker ends up.

Q But in that connection, Mike, seeing that the Speaker's attack follows those by Mr. DeLay and Mr. Arme, don't you see a concerted, calculated Republican policy developing here?

MR. MCCURRY: I just saw someone on television reading a six-page memo that instructs people to do exactly that. So I assume that it is, of course. What else would it be?

Q Well, is this war?

MR. MCCURRY: No, it's a P.R., political strategy on behalf of the Republican leadership for reasons that mystify us. We can't figure out what they think they're doing.

Q What do you think?

MR. MCCURRY: I think they're making a serious mistake. I think they ought to be working on the things the American people want Congress and the President to work on, which is why we are sitting here talking ourselves blue in the face about all the things the President is working on every day and trying to get done. There's not that much time left in Congress to get these things done and we need to get back on to it.

Q How many days --

MR. MCCURRY: It's a dwindling number, Sam, a dwindling number.

Q The President doesn't seem to be on the phone much these days with, you know, lobbying his --

MR. MCCURRY: We've had a lot of members of Congress down here, and he has phone or office time every afternoon, and I think talks to a lot of members of Congress daily.

Q Will he be talking to the Speaker today?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know if he plans to talk to the Speaker. I think we bit off plenty today by dealing with the Majority Leader of the Senate.

Q Mike, a group of conservatives, the Conservative Action Team, is proposing a \$150 billion in net tax cuts. Do you have anything new on an overall tax cut level that might be acceptable to the White House?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, we have a great tax cut package that we've identified that's

pending in our FY '99 budget proposals, and they're targeted and they go to the heart of what we think smart tax policy ought to be about: helping families rise kids, moving forward with the kind of energy conservation and measures that will help us deal with the issue of climate change -- back in the news today because countries are beginning to sign the Kyoto protocol. Yes, we've got a good, smart approach to tax cut that doesn't do any damage to our goal of continuing to balance the budget and maybe even produce surpluses, and that's the way to go.

Q Mike, there seems to be a bit of ambiguity in the Kendall statement. Should we take it to mean there were only two questions that the First Lady didn't answer and that spousal privilege is the only privilege that was invoked?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't heard anything contrary to that, but you may want to pursue that with Mr. Kennedy.

Q Mike, any reaction on Paula Jones formally filing notice of appeal today?

MR. MCCURRY: No.

Q Mike, just one last question. Has the President yet made a decision on the possibility of reducing troops in the Gulf? And if not, during what timeframe do you expect him to make that call?

MR. MCCURRY: As I told some of you earlier, the President and the administration constantly assess our force posture in the Persian Gulf. It's extensive. It's there to back up the work we're doing diplomatically to achieve compliance by the government of Iraq with relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. The President would seriously consider recommendations from his national security advisers and from the Secretary of Defense related to our deployments in the Gulf.

But, that said, that deployment has certainly proved its usefulness in achieving the agreement that the U.N. Secretary General was able to arrive at with the government of Iraq and with the continuation of inspections necessary for the work of the U.N. Special Commission.

Now, inspections are not the same thing as full compliance, and for that reason

we are not rushing to make any decisions about force posture in the region. We'll look at it very carefully, as we look at it every day, and assess what are the best interests of the United States and the international community as we continue our work.

Q What's going on tomorrow at 10:45 a.m.? There's TBA on the schedule, some announcement the President makes.

Q The Rose Garden.

MR. MCCURRY: We'll be talking about the national economy and ways that we can continue its stunningly fine performance.

Q Any closer to a press conference?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know. Maybe, maybe not. Who knows?

Q Well, who does know? Do you know?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know, and I don't know that anyone knows.

Q Why doesn't he hold a press conference and answer the question that he promised once he would answer for the American people.

MR. MCCURRY: Which one?

Q About the scandal. These are legitimate questions, and the American people have a right to the answer. At an appropriate time I will give them.

MR. MCCURRY: I've forgotten what the questions are by now.

Q What was his relationship with Monica Lewinsky?

Q We can remind him.

MR. MCCURRY: I'm sure that if you want to ask that, that you will receive the answer that he's already given you. He's told you what the relationship was not.

Q What was it, though?

MR. MCCURRY: And he's answered the question as to what he's asked people to say about it, and I don't know that he intends to say anything more beyond that about it.

Q Mike, seriously, does the President not want to hold a news conference? Is that --

MR. MCCURRY: The President, just about every day this week, has been taking questions from you. I think he -- he had what amounted to a mini-press conference yesterday.

Q It's not a formal news conference, and you know it.

MR. MCCURRY: You like the East -- you like being in the East Room where you guys all get to stand up and be on TV --

Q No, but we'd like a forum in which a lot of questions and a lot of subjects can get answered.

MR. MCCURRY: Okay. Well, we certainly -- I certainly like those, too, as you know.

Q Remember how he went on and on at that news conference over at the State Department, an hour and half, wouldn't quit -- oh, I'm having fun, let's do some more.

Q That was last February.

MR. MCCURRY: Good, we'll go back over to the State Department and do one with them again. That's good.

All right, we're done. Thanks.

• •
END

1:40 P.M. EDT

19

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 4/29/98 7:19:57 PM
FROM Schwartz, Eric P.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Information Memorandum for NSC [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Kyle, Robert D.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

2280 Berger Memo (Nickles).doc

April 10, 1998

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: ERIC SCHWARTZ/MARA RUDMAN/BOB KYLE

FROM: STEVE NAPLAN/GINA ABERCROMBIE-WINSTANLEY
MALCOLM LEE

SUBJECT: International Religious Freedom Act of 1998

This memorandum describes the state of play on religious freedom legislation, and offers recommendations on how we should proceed.

Background to the Legislation: On March 26, Senator Nickles, along with six cosponsors (notably including Senator Lieberman), introduced the International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) of 1998. Senator Helms is also a cosponsor. IRFA is an alternative to the Wolf-Specter bill, which is expected on House floor during the week of May 11. Wolf-Specter continues to contain a number of troubling provisions, most notably broad automatic economic sanctions.

Politics of the Legislation: While our tough stand toward Wolf-Specter (including a veto threat) led to some modifications and slowed movement on the bill, we believe that the Congress will adopt some legislation on religious freedom overwhelmingly in this session. The Nickles legislation reflects an effort by a number of Senators to come up with legislation that permits the Administration greater flexibility than does Wolf-Specter, while still credibly addressing the religious persecution issue. Senator Helms has indicated his desire to move Nickles quickly, so that it - rather than Wolf-Specter - becomes the focus of attention on the Hill.

KEY ELEMENTS OF THE NICKLES LEGISLATION

New Positions: The IRFA establishes an Ambassador-at-Large for Religious Liberty under the Secretary of State as well as a seven member, bipartisan Commission on International Religious Liberty that would investigate problems and make policy recommendations. Additionally, the IRFA urges (but does not mandate) the establishment at NSC of a Special Advisor on Religious Persecution. (Sponsors have indicated flexibility in how such provisions would be interpreted and implemented.)

Training and Contacts: The legislation requires training for foreign service officers to aid them in recognizing religious persecution, and high-level Embassy contacts with imprisoned religious leaders abroad. The bill grants to U.S. citizens abroad equal access to U.S. embassies for religious activities and directs the State Department to maintain country-specific lists of religious prisoners.

Reporting and Sanctions: These are the critical sections of the legislation. They are problematic, but better than Wolf-Specter, as they permit

greater
Administration flexibility.

Reporting: The IRFA mandates an annual report to Congress on Religious Persecution, and requires that the Administration make two sets of findings: first, that we identify in the annual report those governments that "engage in or tolerate acts of religious persecution"; and second, that we subsequently identify (through a Presidential determination issued after publication of the annual report) those governments that engage in "gross violations of the right to freedom of religion," including torture, prolonged detention without charge, disappearances, or other flagrant denial of the right to liberty or security of the person.

Sanctions: For those governments that engage in any religious persecution, the President is required to implement one of sixteen possible "executive measures and sanctions" of his choosing that are specified in the legislation, including "a private demarche", "a public demarche," "a public condemnation," "cancellation of scientific exchanges," "cancellation of cultural exchanges," "denial of state visits," and eight forms of economic sanctions (described below). He must also report to the Congress on his actions.

For those governments that engage in "gross violations of the right to freedom of religion," the President is required to choose one of the eight economic sanctions among the sixteen listed measures. The eight economic sanctions include withdrawals, limitations, or suspensions on development assistance, OPIC and EXIM, security assistance, GSP, IFI loans, export licenses, and USG loans.

Flexibility: Beyond the ability of the President to pick and choose among listed measures and sanctions, additional provisions provide the Administration with

flexibility in implementation. First, the President could waive any of the executive measures and sanctions if he determined that such a waiver served the purposes of the Act or was necessary for national security reasons, or if he determined the government in question had ceased violations or had taken substantial steps to end them. Second, in lieu of the sixteen measures and sanctions, the Administration could negotiate "binding agreements" with a foreign government that obligated such government to take measures to cease, or take substantial steps to address and phase out the act, policy, or practice constituting the religious persecution. And finally, with respect to "gross violators", the President could substitute any action authorized by law for any of the eight economic sanctions listed in the legislation, so long as he makes the case that such actions are commensurate in effect to a substituted sanction and would serve the purposes of the Act.

COMMENT AND EVALUATION

Nickles is far from ideal and we would prefer no legislation in this area. But we believe some version of a religious freedom bill will be adopted with veto override numbers and sent to the President this year. It is our view that our best hope is to work cooperatively with Members, indicating that while we are not prepared to endorse the Nickles bill in its current form, we would like to discuss changes that would enable us ultimately to support (or at least not oppose) the bill. Moreover, we do not recommend a veto threat, as this would not create leverage for us and could buy a great deal of ill will - from the Hill as well as religious groups. We also note that Stu Eizenstat, who met with House Members opposing Wolf-Specter and testified before HIRC in the course of the markup, believes that for tactical reasons, the Administration should be as supportive as possible of the Nickles bill.

Fixes: There is a great deal we should (and will) try to change in this bill, from the requirement of an Ambassador-at-Large for Religious Freedom Issues, to the sense of the Congress provision on a Special Advisor at the NSC, to detailed mandates on training and reporting.

However, the more problematic portions of the legislation relate to the annual reporting requirement and the "executive measures and sanctions" -- notwithstanding the flexibility that the legislation provides.

We would first try to convince members to eliminate the requirement that we specifically designate countries as either "violators" or "gross violators." We would emphasize that information on the nature of abuses would emerge in any event in the annual reports on religious freedom required by the legislation.

Moreover, we could try to convince Members to modify the list of sixteen measures and sanctions to make those illustrative, while retaining the requirement that we document our efforts to promote religious freedom in the annual report required by the bill.

However, these efforts are likely to fail, as many Members believe that sanctions are at the heart of the legislation.

Alternatively, we could request that the legislation eliminate the requirement that the President make a separate determination on "gross violators." Even if we could not strip the special "gross violator" designation, we could at least seek to ensure that such designation not be made separate from the annual report required by the legislation. Furthermore, we would seek to obtain an understanding that we could liberally interpret the term "commensurate measures," so that we were not locked into economic sanctions in the case of a "gross violator."

RECOMMENDATION

That, subject to your review of specific changes we will recommend to the Hill,
you approve the general course of action outlined above, in particular,
that we

-

-- express willingness to work with Members to fashion workable compromises;

-- withhold support for now, but do not threaten veto;

-- focus our efforts on obtaining changes in the reporting and sanctions provisions;

-- reassess position after discussions with Members.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

3

4

2280

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 4/30/98 10:23:55 AM
FROM Sandalow, David B.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT NATO accession/Inhofe Kyoto amendment [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Rudman, Mara E.
Braden, Susan R.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Quinn, Mary E.

CARBON_COPY Bartlett, L. June
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Millison, Cathy L.
Poole, Jennifer C.
Rice, Edward A.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

TEXT_BODY Mara: Sen. Inhofe reportedly plans to introduce an amendment to the NATO accession bill today requiring the President to submit the Kyoto Protocol to the Senate for advice and consent.

Following fyi
is language we used in a February POTUS letter to Sen. Helms, responding to an attempt to link CTBT to Kyoto:

"You also raise the Kyoto Protocol. This treaty will require the advice and consent of the Senate. However, I do not believe that the United States should assume binding obligations under the climate treaty unless key developing countries meaningfully participate in meeting the challenge of climate

change. It is clear that the Senate shares my concerns. Although the Kyoto Protocol was an historic step forward, more progress is necessary with respect to the participation of key developing countries. It would be premature to submit the treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification at this time."

Any questions,
pls let me know.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Lawrence Butler to Robert Kyle. Subject: RE: U.S.-EU Trade Issues. (3 pages)	04/30/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/28/1998-05/19/1998]

2006-1363-F
vz5654

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 4/30/98 7:35:37 PM
FROM Allen, Charles A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT LOS Treaty - long version [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bouchard, Joseph F.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

Joe, here is additional material, including my attempt to develop the point Jamie made to Chuck Ruff about the lasting effects of this treaty.

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	Robert Kyle to Lawrence Butler. Subject: RE: U.S.-EU Trade Issues. (4 pages)	05/01/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/28/1998-05/19/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5654

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	Lawrence Butler to Donald Bandler. Subject: RE: U.S.-EU Trade Issues. (4 pages)	05/01/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/28/1998-05/19/1998]

2006-1363-F
vz5654

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 5/15/98 10:39:26 AM
FROM DeLaurentis, Jeffrey J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT CUBA: Guidance on Helms bill [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY Crowley, Philip J.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
DeLaurentis, Jeffrey J.
DeSouza, Patrick J.
Dobbins, James F.
Hofmann, Karl W.
Kinser-Kidane, Brenda J.
Lawson, Chappell H.
Piccone, Theodore J.

TEXT_BODY as promised.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT cuba guidance may 15.doc
CUBA
May 15, 1998

Helms' bill on humanitarian assistance to Cuba

Background (for briefer only): Senator Helms introduced legislation yesterday to provide \$25 million a year in U.S. government humanitarian assistance to the people of Cuba. The aid would be channeled to NGOs, in particular the Catholic Church. The bill would authorize direct flights to carry such assistance but would ban direct charter passenger flights (which the President recently reinstated). It imposes other restrictions on the executive branch, requires the President to take steps to bolster U.S. support for opponents of the Castro regime, including introducing a UN Security Council resolution, and to submit periodic reports on human rights, worker rights, etc. It would also

mandate

Radio and TV Marti be broadcast from the U.S. Naval base at Guantanamo or other suitable sites in proximity to Cuba.

Is the White House supporting the Helms' bill on increased humanitarian assistance to Cuba? Doesn't it increase support to the Cuban people like the President wants?

* When the President announced his measures in support of the Cuban people (March 20), he noted that he had been following the various proposals put forward by Members of Congress for expanding humanitarian assistance to the people of Cuba, including food. He asked Secretary Albright to work with the Congress to seek a bipartisan approach to the transfer of food to Cuba.

* The starting point are the pending bills before Congress, including the one just introduced by Senator Helms.

* We want to work with the sponsors of these various initiatives to see whether bipartisan legislation can be achieved. Discussions are now underway.

What about the provision in Helms' bill to broadcast Radio and TV Marti from the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay. Isn't that illegal?

* We prefer not to comment on the specifics of the bill until we have had a chance to study it.

(Note to the briefer: This provision of the bill could be problematic. Preliminary read from the lawyers is that such broadcasts would violate the 1903 Lease Agreement (Article II) for Guantanamo, which provides that the premises are for "use as coaling or naval stations only, and for no other purpose." Radio and TV Marti broadcasts could not be justified as falling within the scope of military communications of U.S. armed forces permissible under Article 38 of the ITU Convention.)

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. email	William Wechsler to Eric Schwartz. Subject: RE: ICC Papers. (3 pages)	05/15/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/28/1998-05/19/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5654

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
005. email	Mary McCarthy to Eric Schwartz. Subject: RE: ICC Papers. (4 pages)	05/16/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/28/1998-05/19/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5654

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
006. email	Eric Schwartz to Joseph Bouchard, Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley, Christina Burrell et al. Subject: ICC Papers. (12 pages)	05/19/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/28/1998-05/19/1998]

2006-1363-F
vz5654

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]