

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	David Sandalow to Theodore Osius. Subject: Slightly Revised Prescott Points. (12 pages)	01/27/1999	P1/b(1)
002. email	Andrew Weiss to Mary Ann Silva. Subject: FW: Agenda for Berger-Fuerth-Talbott Meeting on Nonproliferation. (3 pages)	02/18/1999	P1/b(1)
003. email	Gary Samore to John Caravelli, Andrew Weiss, and Carlos Pascual. Subject: Agenda for Berger-Fuerth-Talbott Meeting on Nonproliferation. (4 pages)	02/18/1999	P1/b(1)
004. email	John Caravelli to Gary Samore, Carlos Pascual, Andrew Weiss, and Steven Black. Subject: Agenda for Berger-Fuerth-Talbott Meeting on Nonproliferation. (5 pages)	02/18/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/27/1999-02/23/1999]

2006-1363-F
vz5663

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	David Sandalow to Theodore Osius. Subject: Slightly Revised Prescott Points. (12 pages)	01/27/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/27/1999-02/23/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5663

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 1/27/99 11:13:51 AM

FROM Bader, Jeffrey A.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT POTUS reply to letter from Senator Helms on Taiwan
[UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Hammonds, D. Holly
Hendricks, Lori A.
Holtzapple, Richard A.
Lee, Malcolm R.
McNamer, Bruce
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Allen, Charles A.
Baker, James E.
DeRosa, Mary B.
Highsmith, Newell L.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Krass, Caroline D.
Baker, James E.
Lee, Malcolm R.

CARBON_COPY Arvizu, Alexander A.
Bader, Jeffrey A.
Heitkotter, Karen R.
Lieberthal, Kenneth C.
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.

TEXT_BODY Jamie, Malcolm,

Appreciate your clearance on a letter from POTUS to Senator Helms on Taiwan's participation in international organizations.
It's been run by State, inc. Legal Advisor's office, and Treasury.
Reply due today, so welcome your looking at it as soon as convenient.

If
you need to see the package, Karen Heitkotter in our office has a copy and can make available.

Thanks,

Jeff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

0231 Helmsltr.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I appreciate your January 8 letter asking for more information on my administration's attitude toward Taiwan membership in international organizations.

In the Taiwan policy review my administration undertook in 1994, we concluded the United States should support Taiwan's participation in international organizations where statehood is not a requirement. We also concluded we would support appropriate ways for Taiwan's voice to be heard in organizations requiring statehood for membership where we could not support actual membership.

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the most important example of an organization that does not require statehood for membership and where we support Taiwan's entry. Last year, we concluded our bilateral market access agreement for Taiwan's WTO accession, and we are actively working with Taiwan to resolve outstanding multilateral issues. We believe Taiwan's accession should be judged on its own merits, without linkage to the PRC's accession. The Semiconductor Council and the Global Governmental Forum, groupings of semiconductor producers, are two other organizations not requiring statehood for membership in which we successfully supported Taiwan's active participation.

Within organizations requiring statehood for membership, we have supported appropriate participation by Taiwan. For example, we believe Taiwan should be allowed to participate as an observer in the OECD's Competition Policy and Law Committee and are working to achieve a consensus toward that end. We have sponsored U.S.-based Taiwan private sector representatives to attend the IMF/World Bank annual meeting in Washington. Members of a Taiwan NGO can

participate on a delegation of an international NGO in activities of the World Health Organization.

We consult frequently with Taiwan about the most effective way to facilitate Taiwan's membership or participation in international organizations and work with Taiwan wherever we can be effective. Changing the charters of organizations to permit Taiwan's membership is not a feasible course where statehood is a prerequisite for membership. I do not foresee the possibility of garnering the necessary international support to effect such changes. We do, however, urge the PRC to be more receptive to Taiwan's participation in international organizations. The state of cross-Strait relations is likely to continue to be a decisive factor in affecting PRC attitudes.

My Administration looks forward to continuing to work with you and with Taiwan to expand its participation in international organizations.

Sincerely,

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 0231 Helmsltrjbsrb.doc

January 27, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL R. BERGER

THROUGH: KENNETH LIEBERTHAL

FROM: JEFFREY A. BADER

SUBJECT: Letter to Senator Helms on Taiwan

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President covering a reply to a letter

from Senator Helms on Taiwan's participation in international organizations.

Concurrence: Jamie Baker, Malcolm Lee

Attachment

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Letter to Senator Helms

Tab B January 8, 1999 Letter from Senator Helms

Tab C September 16, 1998 Letter from the President to Senator Helms

Tab D July 23, 1998 Letter from Senator Helms

1

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 0231 Helmsltrsrpotus.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER

LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Reply to Letter from Senator Helms on Taiwan
Participation in
International Organizations

Purpose

Answer a letter from Senator Helms on Taiwan participation in international organizations.

Background

You wrote a detailed letter to Senator Helms on September 16

answering a number
of questions he had posed to you in a July 23 letter on our Taiwan
policy
(letters attached at Tabs C and D). Now Senator Helms has written
again seeking
greater detail on administration policy toward Taiwan's participation
in
international organizations.

The reply at Tab A describes our support for Taiwan membership in
organizations
like the WTO and Semiconductor Council where the rules of the
organizations
permit membership, and our support for support for Taiwan
participation short of
membership in other organizations like the OECD, IMF/World Bank,
and WHO.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter at Tab A.

Attachment

Tab A Letter to Senator Helms

Tab B January 8, 1999 letter from Senator Helms

Tab C September 16, 1998 letter to Senator Helms

Tab D July 23, 1998 letter from Senator Helms

2

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/9/99 11:52:13 AM
FROM Peterman, David (Brian)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Legislative Priorities Background - Law of the Sea [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreassen, Steven P.
Bell, Robert G.
Bouchard, Joseph F.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Langley, Janice M.
Mulligan, George D.
Peterman, David (Brian)
Pimentel, Betsy J.
vonLipsey, Roderick K.
Wasserman, Elaine P.
Witkowski, Anne A.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Bob- Ed Rice asked for background information on the Leg. Priorities by 1600 today. Attached is a short version reply in the same format as Anne's. Below is a longer version.

NSC
Legislative Priorities - Law of the Sea (LOS)

Priority: In relation
to other treaties; after CTBT, Biological Weapons Protocol, Kyoto
Protocol, and CFE Treaty Adaptation.

Why it is important: The
UN Convention on the Law of the Sea was signed in 1982 but concerns
over deep seabed mining provisions kept several industrialized nations,
including the U.S., from ratifying. In 1994, an Agreement on Implemen
of Part XI was signed that eliminated the objectionable provisions.
On Oct. 7, 1994, President Clinton submitted the LOS to the Senate
for advice and consent to accession to the Convention and for ratificatio
of the agreement on Part XI. PDD-36 set accession and ratification
as the Administration's top ocean policy objective.

From a national

security perspective, the Convention is important because:

* It

codifies critical navigational rights and freedoms that are not otherwise universally accepted by coastal states. These are critical to the mobility of our forces. It sets a worldwide legal standard for the size of nations' maritime zones.

* Because it reflects the U.S.

view of the Law of the Sea, particularly with respect to global freedom of navigation, it is in our interest for all coastal and maritime nations to become a Party. U.S. ratification will encourage the states not party to follow suit. There are currently 127 states that are party to the Convention, including most of our NATO allies, as well as Russia, China and Japan.

* It fully reflects the strong

U.S. view of the sovereign immunity of warships and government ships in non-commercial service.

* The serious flaws in the Convention's

original deep seabed mining provisions were corrected by the 1994 Implementing Agreement. All other industrialized nations who joined us in rejecting the original Convention (e.g. Germany, Japan, U.K.) have become Parties since the 1994 changes.

The Administration

mounted a full court press in 1998 to win the Senate's ratification of the Convention. Despite strong encouragement from Secretaries Cohen, Albright, and Daley; letters from all seven living former CNOs; intervention by industry leaders; and bipartisan support in the Senate, Senator Helms refused to hold hearings on the Convention in the SFRC. Failure to ratify the Convention resulted in the U.S. losing its provisional seat on the Seabed Authority in November 1998. If the Convention is ratified, we expect the U.S. will be able to regain the Seabed Authority seat.

Why it is on the list: This

comes from the President's address at the National Oceans Conference on June 12, 1998. "Fifth, we must join the rest of the world in ratifying, at long last, the Convention on the Law of the Sea. The character of our country, and, frankly, the nature of a lot of the economic and political success we have enjoyed around the world has rested in no small part on our continuous championing of the rule of law at home and abroad. The historic Convention on the Law of the Sea extends the rule of law to the world's oceans." "This year, during this legislative session, the United States Senate should, and must, confirm its leadership role by making America a part of the community of nations already party to the Convention on the Law of the Sea."

Unfortunately, Senator Helms prevented ratification in 1998. The Administration should continue its efforts to win ratification.

in 1999.

Brian Peterman
NSC Defense Directorate
Ext. 69188

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT LOS Priority.doc
Legislative Priorities - Law of the Sea

Priority

Obtain Senate advice and consent to accession to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and ratification of the agreement on Part XI by November 1999. Do not interfere with ratification of CTBT, Biological Weapons Protocol, Kyoto Protocol.

Importance

PDD-36 set ratification as the Administration's top ocean policy priority. In his National Oceans Conference speech on June 12, 1998, POTUS stated that during this legislative session, the United States Senate should, and must confirm its leadership role by making America a part of the community already party to the Convention on the Law of the Sea." Senator Helms will hold SFRC hearings on the Convention and it remains unratified.

Legislative Issues

Despite aggressive encouragement from the Administration and bipartisanship in the Senate, Senator Helms remains the major obstacle to ratification. To achieve the President's objectives, we should continue our carefully managed campaign on the Senate, coordinated by the Sub-Group on Ocean Policy, to ratify the Convention without jeopardizing ratification of higher priority treaties.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/9/99 3:02:20 PM
FROM Peterman, David (Brian)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Leg Priorities Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreasen, Steven P.
Bell, Robert G.
Bouchard, Joseph F.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Langley, Janice M.
Mulligan, George D.
Peterman, David (Brian)
Pimentel, Betsy J.
vonLipsey, Roderick K.
Wasserman, Elaine P.
Witkowski, Anne A.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Sandie- The latest version.

Brian Peterman
NSC Defense
Directorate
Ext. 69188

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

LOS Priority1.doc
Legislative Priorities - Law of the Sea

Priority

Obtain Senate advice and consent to accession to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and ratification of the agreement on Part XI by November 1999, recognizing this is a lower priority item than ratification of CTBT.

Importance

PDD-36 set ratification as the Administration's top ocean policy priority. In

his National Oceans Conference speech on June 12, 1998, POTUS stated, "This year, during this legislative session, the United States Senate should, and must, confirm its leadership role by making America a part of the community of nations already party to the Convention on the Law of the Sea." Senator Helms refused to hold SFRC hearings on the Convention and it remains unratified.

Legislative Issues

Despite aggressive encouragement from the Administration (including a personal plea to Helms from Cohen) and bipartisan support in the Senate (including Thurmond and Stevens), Helms remains intransigent. We will continue our carefully coordinated campaign with the Senate, but should not expect a breakthrough absent an unexpected reversal by Helms or hostage-taking on our part (though that approach could complicate our higher CTB ratification priority).

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/10/99 10:54:33 AM
FROM Rice, Edward A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT EUROPE [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Lackey, Miles M.
Rudman, Mara E.
Tavlarides, Mark J.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY FYI. This is background passed to Don Kerrick.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT Legislative Priorities.doc
LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 1999/2000

EUROPE

NATO: Washington Summit:

Believe you are up to speed on this issue.

Russia: Expanded Threat Reduction (two-thirds expansion of programs over 5 years):

Overview

The international economic crisis that spread to Russia and other NIS in 1998, could hinder efforts to implement key arms control agreements and to reduce the risks of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, weapons delivery systems, technologies and expertise. The Administration is seeking over \$4.5 billion from Congress to expand, increase and accelerate U.S. programs for Russia and the other NIS to address high priority security, arms control and nonproliferation

requirements. We will draw upon the long history of the Cooperative Threat Reduction and other programs sponsored by the Departments of Defense, Energy and State and to focus on areas most affected by recent economic distress. We are also proposing to intensify cooperative efforts by the G-7, EU and others.

Legislative Developments

Senator Lott told Sandy Berger on February 3 that we should not take Republican support for granted. According to Lott, many Republican members are not in the same place as traditional proponents such as Lugar and Domenici. An interagency team led by Carlos Pascual has begun briefing appropriators and committees of jurisdiction. There is significant Congressional interest in reviving the Iran missile sanctions bill in light of continued transfers of sensitive Russian technology.

Pending discussion with Russia, the other NIS and with other international partners, we emphasize the following four priority areas:

1. Nuclear Security Programs: added assistance for strategic nuclear delivery vehicle dismantlement, warhead dismantlement, transport and storage security; fissile material and spent fuel storage; material protection; control and accounting; securing highly enriched uranium (HEU) and cooperation in plutonium disposition; reactor core conversion; and transformation of the nuclear cities.
2. Non-nuclear Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs: increased assistance for Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) implementation; physical security enhancements and related biological weapons (BW) infrastructure elimination; and export control system enhancements.
3. Science and Technology Nonproliferation Programs: increased assistance to

engage weapons scientists and institutes and redirect WMD expertise to civilian research and commercial joint ventures under the multilateral, International Science and Technology Center (ISTC); DOE Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP); Civilian Research and Development Foundation (CRDF) and other science and technology programs.

4. Military Relocation and Other Security Cooperation Programs: ammunition disposal and force relocation assistance to help deal with the cost of military realignment outside of Russia and to facilitate military downsizing. Such assistance, for example, could contribute to the disposition of munitions in Transdnistria and facilitate the withdrawal of Russian troops.

Assistance would go only to entities that do not engage in proliferation activities with countries of concern and thereby increase incentives to uphold strict nonproliferation standards. It is also essential that Russia and the

other NIS not tax our assistance and provide an environment for smooth, effective implementation of our efforts.

Balkans: Peace settlement restoring autonomy to Kosovo; progress toward self-sustaining peace in Bosnia and further U.S./SFOR troop reductions:

The deployment of ground forces is a controversial issue with the Hill and has important resource requirements requiring Hill support. We will likely need to seek a supplemental for Kosovo funding for both military and civilian implementation. Senator Lott's recent letter indicates that the issues of

particular concern to the Hill are chain of command, impact on readiness, and exit strategy.

In Bosnia, we have had particular difficulty getting funding for key civilian implementation tasks. We need to ensure that new funding for Kosovo and

continued funding for Bosnia also covers the civilian accounts that are also vital to success of the mission. For example, funding for training of new Kosovar local police will be crucial to help facilitate draw-down of NATO forces.

On some occasions, the Congress has passed legislation that limits our flexibility to effectively implement our policy -- requiring withdrawal of forces, prohibiting use of funds, requiring extensive Presidential waivers. For example in Bosnia, the Lautenberg Amendment complicated our ability to provide aide to emerging moderate leaders in Republika Srpska. We need to identify these types of initiatives early and seek to resolve the concern directly with the members.

Our four objectives should be:

1. Support/funding for possible U.S. military deployment to Kosovo
2. Support/funding for civil implementation in Kosovo
3. Minimal restrictive or conditional legislation on Bosnia/Kosovo
4. Continued funding for Bosnia activities

Northern Ireland: Support peace process and the International Fund for Ireland:

We have several sets of legislative priorities on Northern Ireland:

* Contribution to International Fund for Ireland was \$19.6 million last year, State had sought \$24.6 for FY99 to cover Springvale commitments. Strong bipartisan support to maintain the \$19.6 number, with some members questioning how much longer this program will run. IFI has made major contribution to economic regeneration and reconciliation with its projects in depressed areas.

* "Walsh" Visa bill. 4,000 work visas for each of next three years for younger people from Northern Ireland and the Irish border counties. State has the lead in putting the framework together for this program that was enacted in November,

striving to start issuing in September-October this year. State must fund the administrative costs.

* Deportees and Extraditees. Broad interest in the status of the dozen-plus Irish nationals facing deportation due to criminal records. Law does not permit them to stay as permanent residents. Attorney General acted to stay proceedings for nine persons. Another five or six are currently fighting deportation. Three escaped IRA prisoners are fighting extradition to the UK in California. Case in currently on appeal and the three persons out on bail.

* Broader peace process issues. Two Irish caucuses actively follow Northern Ireland issues, ranging from policing to marches. Chairman Gilman will hold hearings this spring on policing reform.

ASIA

China: Access to WTO; Normal Trade Relations; Cox Committee:

WTO and Normal Trade Relations. There is a possibility we may reach agreement on China's accession to WTO this year, conceivably by the time of Premier Zhu Rongji's April visit. WTO accessions do not require Congressional approval, though there have been periodic proposals in the past (which we have opposed) to subject China's accession to a Congressional vote.

Nevertheless, there will be a kind of surrogate Congressional vote on the China WTO accession. We have told the Chinese that POTUS would seek permanent Normal Trade Relations (NTR) with China if we negotiated a commercially sound WTO agreement. That would require Congressional action, since the requirement for China's annual renewal is based on the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Therefore, the WTO package will need to pass muster with Congress on key market access issues, such as agriculture, tariff levels, and services.

China's annual certification for continued eligibility for Normal Trade Relations comes up for renewal on June 3. With or without a WTO agreement, this year's debate will inevitably serve as a lightning rod for Congressional concerns on the whole range of issues in U.S.-China relations. This year, human rights (recent arrests and convictions of activists seeking to form a new political party), religious freedom, Tibet, and market access can be expected to get particular attention.

Aside from our normal preparations to counter attacks on particular issues and to round up the necessary votes for renewal, this year we will need to forge a legislative strategy for how to secure permanent NTR if we reach agreement on China's WTO accession. With a good WTO package, the American business community can be expected to launch a major effort. Human rights groups, however, will almost certainly oppose permanent NTR as a loss of leverage. We will need to look at the legislative and legal options closely, e.g., do we seek repeal of Jackson-Vanik or graduation of China from the ranks of those considered annually.

Cox-Dicks Committee Report on Technology Transfer to China. The Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China examined U.S. technology transfer policies toward China. The report recommends Executive Branch and Congressional action, aimed at China, in such areas as protecting U.S. nuclear weapons information against espionage and strengthening U.S. and multilateral export controls.

The Committee was to have expired on December 31, 1998, but the Committee was extended until April 1, 1999 in order to complete a declassified version of the report. The Administration's response to the report was delivered to

the
Committee on February 1. The NSC is coordinating a declassification
review of
the report, which should be completed by the end of February.

While we disagree with much of the report's analysis, we were able to
support
most of the recommendations. Many
of the recommendations call for legislative action in the appropriate
committee
of jurisdiction (which include HIRC, HASC, HPSCI, Senate Banking,
SASC and SSCI.)
In fact, we are already implementing a number of the
recommendations due to
previous Executive Branch action, legislative mandate, or are
pursuing action as
a matter of policy.

Where we disagree with a recommendation, we have explained why
and have told the
Committee what alternative measures the Administration has taken or
will take to
address the thrust of the recommendation. One recommendation, for
example,
suggests that the U.S. should work, particularly within the Wassenaar
Arrangement, to create multilateral export controls that would have a
"COCOM-like" veto process. This is unrealistic, given the positions of
Wassenaar
members (including our major allies). Our response describes how we
have been
seeking to strengthen Wassenaar, including expanding information
sharing on
weapons sales. The Committee recommended mandatory notifications
for foreign
direct investment in the U.S., which we do not support because of the
potential
chilling effect this could have on FDI. We discuss the problems with a
mandatory
process and offer to meet with the appropriate committees to review
the existing
voluntary procedures. Other examples of problematic
recommendations include
requiring unannounced on-site inspections for U.S. high performance
computers
sold to China.

We will need to remain quite vigilant, because it is difficult to
accurately
predict what legislation might be offered as a result of this report.
Isolated

amendments that are attached to major pieces of legislation will be difficult to defeat (witness the 1997 and 1998 NDAA computer and satellite provisions). In the meantime, agencies will meet with the appropriate committees to discuss current policies and procedures, and to correct the inaccuracies and misperceptions in the report. We can expect support from the U.S. business community, which is well aware of the potential for a move towards unilateral export restrictions aimed at China.

N. Korea: Restrain missile development and related technology transfer; maintain Agreed Framework:

The legislative priority regarding North Korea is that no new constraints be placed on U.S. funding of heavy fuel oil shipments under the Agreed Framework and that we need full funding for KEDO for the year 2000. The Congress adopted legislation in 1998 that requires that the Administration make certain certifications regarding North Korean missile and nuclear issues as a condition for release of funds to provide heavy fuel oil during 1999. The heavy fuel oil commitment is an integral part of the 1994 Agreed Framework. That agreement, in turn, is the vehicle through which we prevent North Korea from producing weapons grade fissile materials. Should the U.S. stop providing heavy fuel oil, the North Koreans could well re-start their facility at Yongbyon and, within a short time, produce weapons grade plutonium. That, in turn, would create a crisis with unpredictable outcomes.

MIDDLE EAST/SOUTH ASIA

Wye Accords Supplemental:

* Wye Supplemental reflects commitment President made to the parties and represents our effort to help move the process forward.

* Will help Israel address its security requirements, particularly those

arising
out of its redeployments.

* Will help Palestinians build a stronger economy and meet the people's economic, social and educational needs. This is the best way to reduce the appeal of extremist groups like Hamas that feed on the population's dissatisfaction.

* Will help Jordan strengthen its economy and military. Jordan has been firmest ally of peace in the Middle East and deserves our support. With passing of King, urgency of demonstrating our support for Jordan and of ensuring its stability has only grown.

* While Israelis and Palestinians have yet to implement the Wye agreement, we are confident that they will and want to be in a position to support them as soon as they do.

* As for Jordanian piece, want to move it as soon as possible to demonstrate support to the new King and ensure stability during period of transition.

Iraq: Containment policy/support regime change/humanitarian initiatives:

* In the aftermath of Operation Desert Fox, we are in a situation in which we seek to contain Iraq until Saddam can be replaced. Without cooperation from the Congress, we will find ourselves losing international support for our containment policy, as well as our replacement strategy.

* The designation of Iraqi opposition groups eligible to receive U.S. assistance under the Iraq Liberation Act marks a turning point in U.S. policy. International support will be critical to success.

* Although many governments in the region agree that Saddam must go, they universally question the strength of our commitment to provide the necessary support to opposition groups inside and outside Iraq. They also face

pressure
from their publics, who blame sanctions for the suffering of the Iraqi
people.

* In this regard, we must shift the burden of blame for the suffering of
the
Iraqi people to Saddam's shoulders. This will require us to take
measures in
lifting the ceiling on oil-for-food sales. This step is important, and is
designed to strengthen, not undermine, the sanctions regime. We will
have to
work hard to prevent knee-jerk reactions from some on the Hill who
may
unwittingly play into Saddam's hands by portraying this initiative in a
negative
light.

* Congress has offered a gesture of support in allocating \$97M in
military
drawdown authority to support the external opposition. Unfortunately,
attempting
to equip a military force from the ground up using drawdown
authority with no
accompanying hard funding is a losing venture. This fact plays into
the hands of
those who wish to undermine the Administration's commitment to
replacing Saddam.

* If we are to succeed, we must work closely with the Congress to
develop a
sensible plan that addresses support for overt and covert programs,
including
funding, as well as the tough issue of potential U.S. military support
in the
event of a move against Saddam.

* Without strong congressional support in the areas of containment,
humanitarian
programs and replacement plan, our entire strategy for Iraq will be in
serious
jeopardy.

India/Pakistan: Sanctions; POTUS possible Fall 99 trip:

* With over a billion people between them, growing economies -- and
now tested
nuclear weapons, India and Pakistan are two countries that require
increased U.S.
attention.

* Given the many difficult issues we have with them -- narcotics, terrorism, the environment, health care (particularly AIDS), trade and investment -- not to mention nuclear and missile proliferation, the President has already invested more time and attention to these two than any of his predecessors and would like to do even more by visiting them later this year.

* At the President's direction, Strobe Talbott has engaged representatives of both countries for the last nine months in an effort to resolve the nonproliferation issues that have become more dangerous in the wake of their May nuclear tests.

* Strobe has made some progress though not as much as we would like. Both have promised to sign the CTBT this year and will inaugurate unprecedented direct bus travel later this month.

* As he continues his dialogue with the Indians and Pakistanis, an increasingly important factor is our willingness to lift the sanctions imposed after their tests in response to their agreeing to various elements of our nonproliferation agenda.

* Last October, Congress passed the India Pakistan Relief Act (aka the Brownback Amendment) which gave the President authority to waive non-military sanctions in the national interest for up to 12 months.

* The President exercised a portion of that authority on December 1 in an effort to encourage the India and Pakistan to take further nonproliferation steps. This waiver will expire in October unless extended by Congress.

* In order to advance our nonproliferation agenda -- and to broaden and deepen our relationships with these increasingly important countries, it is essential that the President's authority to waive sanctions be extended and expanded to include authority to waive all sanctions.

* Without the leverage such authority would provide, we will never be able to move our relationships with these two to the level they warrant and the President wants.

LATIN AMERICA

Mexico: Certification:

Essential to smooth bilateral relations, encouraging further CN cooperation.

Necessary to counter Congressional efforts to reverse Presidential decision on certification.

Central America: Mitch supplemental:

Essential to USG response to Hurricane Mitch and to successful POTUS trip to

region. Need funding legislation.

Haiti: Maintaining funding and softening Dole conditionality:

Needed to counter Congressional initiatives to cut funding and place onerous

conditions on aid. Cutbacks would have strong adverse effect on hemisphere's

poorest economy, fragile democracy. APNSA and POTUS interest high.

Among other things, the "Dole Amendment" requires "substantial progress" in

investigations into political murders that took place in 1991-1995, complete

privatization of three major public entities, and removal from GOH positions of

individuals "credibly alleged" to have engaged in human rights violations. These

conditions are difficult to meet in the current (20-month) political impasse and

in the absence of an effective judiciary, investigative mechanisms, etc. Some

important aid categories are excepted from Dole prohibitions, but others are not.

The Dole Amendment is currently blocking us from providing assistance (in the

form of salaries to participants from U.S. law enforcement) to the UN police

mission in Haiti (MIPONUH) because the program is considered "assistance to the

Central Government of Haiti."

Peru-Ecuador: Binational Peace Fund:

Needed for border integration project to bolster Ecuador-Peru peace settlement
that the USG helped broker as one of the "guarantors" to the 1942 Rio Protocol.
Need Congressional support for the three-year, \$40 million support for border integration that the President pledged on February 5.

WORLD ECONOMICS

Fast Track Authority [now called "traditional trade negotiating authority"]:

* In the State of the Union speech, POTUS called for a "new consensus" granting him fast track authority to expand America's opportunities in the global economy while ensuring that expanded trade benefits all citizens, including by protecting worker's rights and the environment.

* While POTUS can negotiate without such "authority", "fast track" allows a negotiated package to pass Congress on an up or down vote. This authority is now called "traditional" to emphasize that every President since 1974 has been granted such authority. Securing fast track is very important to our ability to lead in the WTO, in hemispheric negotiations, and in other contexts, and is virtually essential to concluding any major trade agreement. (Note, however, that Chile and several Asian countries have indicated a possible willingness to proceed with free trade agreements without fast track).

* Key issues: How to build a consensus with diverse groups on the hill, with labor, with environmental groups and with business.

FTAA:

* The President is committed to the launch of the Free Trade Agreement of the

Americas. The FTAA would be comprehensive, covering all areas of trade; and would be a single agreement that all countries would have to sign on to.

* An agreement to establish an FTAA would allow U.S. service suppliers and consumers to benefit from a competitive and open framework in the region. The goal would be to eliminate impediments to market access for goods and services among our countries to foster economic growth.

* The US would like to establish a hemispheric free trade area that is GATT-consistent, especially in the areas of market access and agriculture. The agreement would apply to all service sectors; promote transparency and ensure that small economies are integrated into the process.

* At this time, legislation is not needed to negotiate a free trade agreement. However, at the end of the negotiations (approximately five-years), implementation legislation would be necessary.

* Key Issues: The passage of trade negotiating authority is essential to the viability of the FTAA. Without fast track, legislative amendments could be attached to the FTAA that could further complicate trade negotiations with other countries.

CBI:

Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement

* The President will work with Congress toward swift passage of legislation expanding the Caribbean Basin Initiative trade ties with the Caribbean and Central American countries. This trade legislation will create opportunities for American businesses and workers as it provides enhanced market access and economic stimulus to countries devastated by hurricanes.

* The Administration has requested funding for CBI enhancement in the past two

years of budget proposals and intends to request funding for FY'2000.

* Key political issues: The Administration will carefully examine the options for providing enhanced CBI to avoid creating problems for labor and progressive Democrats. At a time when we are trying to build consensus with these groups for fast track and Africa trade enhancement.

* Key Issues: To work with both Houses to build consensus on proposals already put forth for CBI enhancement and Hurricane Mitch. At the same time, we will work with key textiles and labor groups build support for CBI enhancement.

Africa Trade Bill:

This act encourages and supports economic reforms already underway in Africa by offering additional benefits to the continent's most aggressive reformers. In so doing, it shifts U.S.-African economic relations from a singular aid focus to a partnership rooted in aid and trade benefiting both Africans and Americans. The bill expands GSP benefits to Africa's strongest reforming countries, extends GSP for Africa to 10 years (instead of the normal year-by-year renewal) and eliminates textile quotas and tariffs for those same countries. These provisions will allow Africa to develop manufacturing capacity before the GATT expires in 2005, and provide incentives to further open African markets (still some of the world's most protected markets) to American goods and services. The bill also reinforces actions already undertaken by the Administration under the President's Partnership for Economic Growth and Opportunity in Africa.

Legislative Issues

Because the bill would (according to the ITC) result in the loss of about 700 textile sector jobs in the U.S., the trade benefits have attracted the negative attention of unions and textile manufacturers. The bill is also

criticized by
 some of Congress' traditional supporters of Africa as being too weak
 on debt
 forgiveness. These issues have triggered a split in the CBC and among
 Democrats
 which we are addressing, and must continue to address. The
 Republicans and
 free-trade Democrats are strong supporters of this bill. It passed the
 House
 with strong bipartisan support last year and passed the Senate Finance
 Committee
 with similar support. It did not, however, have enough momentum to
 get to the
 Senate floor. We will have to work closely with the Hill to ensure that
 there
 are champions in the Senate who will move this bill.

Importance

This bill is very important, both substantively and symbolically, as a
 first step
 towards building real trade relations with Africa. It can help stabilize
 and
 support Africa's reformers while helping to create a more predictable
 and
 attractive climate for investment and trade. The bill is seen by many
 Africans
 and supporters of the Administration's Africa policy as the litmus test
 of the
 President's commitment to building partnerships and relationships
 with African
 nations that resemble those we have with the rest of the world.

Trade Ministerial Millennium Round:

* In the State of the Union speech, POTUS called for an ambitious
 new WTO Round
 to be launched when world trade ministers meet in Seattle in late
 November 99 -
 "to shape the world trading system in the 21st century." The United
 States wants
 the Round to significantly reduce market barriers to agriculture and
 services,
 eliminate industrial tariffs, further open procurement markets, enhance
 protection of intellectual property, and ensure that labor and
 environmental
 standards are protected.

* We do not need new legislative authority to open a Round; but the

case we make
for the Round on the hill and with interest groups will be very
important in
selling fast track.

* Key political issues: all of the above, but especially labor,
environment,
agriculture.

MILITARY READINESS

Defense spending increase:

Importance

The President's FY2000 budget submitted to Congress provides an
increase of over
\$12 billion for defense readiness and modernization through a
combination of new
spending and budgetary savings and represents the start of a six-year
effort that
will represent the first long-term sustained increase in defense
spending in a
decade.

Legislative Issues

It is clear that Republican defense hawks" on the Hill will seek to "up
the ante"
by proposing even higher defense spending levels (e.g., \$20 billion in
topline
relief for FY2000 vice our proposal for \$4 billion in new money).
However, it is
not at all clear whether these members have the votes - many "deficit
hawks"
(such as Kasich) will prefer tax cuts. Our challenge is to "force
accountability" in this debate by insisting that those promoting higher
defense
spending show where the money will come from and what the
opportunity costs
really are. We must also continue to press the Congress to limit
unnecessary
procurement add-ons and approve additional rounds of Base Closure
for 2001 and
2005.

Development of Missile Defense Systems:

Importance

The Administration's FY 2000-2005 budget requests \$21.4 billion for both theater and strategic missile defense. The issue of National Missile Defense (NMD) may be the most visible and contentious defense policy issue during this legislative session.

Legislative Issues

Congressional Republicans in both the Senate and House may attempt to accelerate funding to allow NMD deployment sooner than we think prudent (i.e., 2003 v. 2005) or may try to enact legislation that would effectively make the deployment decision now v. 2000 as we plan. Congress may also attempt to "reprioritize" funding within both theater and national missile defense programs in ways we would find objectionable.

Improve pay and benefits for military personnel:

Importance

The President's FY2000 Budget Proposal includes a military pay raise of 4.4 percent, the largest since 1982; a major proposal for restructuring the pay system to reward performance; and the reinstatement of military retirement benefits that were taken away over a decade ago. This package equates to an additional \$20 billion in personnel compensation initiatives compared to the original FY2000 budget planning guidance.

Legislative Issues

The Senate has proposed a competing plan in S. 4, "The Soldiers, Sailors and Airman Bill of Rights Act of 1999." However, S. 4 would spend \$10.8 billion over the next 6 years in excess of the Balanced Budget Agreement caps and the President's Budget proposal. This constitutes a potential drain on other defense programs, by undermining the Administration budget proposal's

balance of critical readiness needs, weapons modernization and a military compensation plan that is generous, appropriate and provides the right balance of improvements and enhancements.

Two additional BRAC rounds:

Importance

The April 1998 "Report of the Department of Defense on Base Realignment and Closure" states that BRAC savings are critical to meeting the DOD's Quadrennial Defense Review strategy. The first four BRAC rounds will save the Defense Department approximately \$25 billion dollars by the year 2003, with an annual recurring savings of over \$5 billion every year thereafter. Two additional rounds of BRAC could save the Defense Department more than \$20 billion between the years 2008 and 2015 and \$3 Billion per year thereafter. Each year delay, then, costs the U.S. taxpayer billions of dollars in support of unnecessary and expensive base infrastructure.

The BRAC process is a proven, effective and fair tool for reducing excess capacity and making the difficult decisions that impact the Congress and local communities. In fact, both the Defense Department and the General Accounting Office have shown that the impact of base closure on local communities is far less disruptive - and the economic recovery much better - than even the BRAC commission's projections during base closure testimony.

Legislative Issues

We should seek to develop Senate support for two additional rounds of BRAC.

ARMS CONTROL/TREATY PROTOCOLS

Advice and Consent for CTB:

Importance

On January 11, the President approved a Berger-Stein recommendation to make "an all-out effort to achieve advice and consent to CTBT in 1999," and in the SOU, asked the Senate to approve the Treaty now. The CTBT is a cornerstone of the global nonproliferation regime and underpins our efforts to reduce tensions in South Asia following last year's nuclear tests by India and Pakistan; it is also a legacy achievement of this President.

Legislative Issues

Helms has indicated he will not hold hearings on CTBT until the Administration submits and the Senate has acted on the 1997 ABM agreements (which we will not do unless the Duma ratifies START II), while Biden has said CTBT is his highest legislative priority. Intensive Administration effort required to move Treaty before September, including the need to identify possible "trades" or "hostages" involving CTBT with a Republican legislative priority.

Complete Biological Weapons Protocol:

Importance

Under the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), some 140 countries have committed not to develop, produce or possess biological and toxin weapons. However, the BWC lacks provisions for enforcing these commitments through mandatory declarations and on-site inspections. This lack of verification provisions has enabled a number of BWC State Parties to continue to pursue biological weapons (BW) programs. Indeed, of the dozen or so countries seeking to acquire BW, some three-quarters are parties to the Convention.

Since 1995, negotiations have been underway in Geneva on a protocol to strengthen

compliance with the BWC. In last year's State of the Union message, the President called upon the international community to act to prevent the use of disease as a weapon of war and terror by concluding a new international system to detect and deter cheating under the Convention. We are seeking to complete substantive work on the protocol by the end of this year.

Legislative Developments

As with the Chemical Weapons Convention, Congressional support for the protocol will be essential. Continuing U.S. leadership in the fight against BW proliferation will require Senate ratification of the protocol and prompt Congressional approval of the companion legislation necessary for its implementation.

Conclude negotiations on CFE Treaty Adaptation:

Priority

Conclude Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty adaptation by the November, 1999 OSCE summit.

Importance

Signature of a successfully adapted CFE treaty would be a centerpiece of the 1999 OSCE summit and fulfill goal POTUS established last fall.

Legislative Issues

Need to develop Senate support for the adapted treaty as it nears completion in 1999, so that we have a foundation for successful ratification in the year 2000. This should be manageable by Albright and her team at State, with support from NSC and DOD.

Ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty:

Priority

Obtain Senate advice and consent to accession to the UN Convention on the Law of

the Sea and ratification of the agreement on Part XI by November 1999, recognizing this is a lower priority item than ratification of CTBT.

Importance

PDD-36 set ratification as the Administration's top ocean policy priority. In his National Oceans Conference speech on June 12, 1998, POTUS stated, "This year, during this legislative session, the United States Senate should, and must, confirm its leadership role by making America a part of the community of nations already party to the Convention on the Law of the Sea." Senator Helms refused to hold SFRC hearings on the Convention and it remains unratified.

Legislative Issues

Despite aggressive encouragement from the Administration (including a personal plea to Helms from Cohen) and bipartisan support in the Senate (including Thurmond and Stevens), Helms remains intransigent. We will continue our carefully coordinated campaign with the Senate, but should not expect a breakthrough absent an unexpected reversal by Helms or hostage-taking on our part (though that approach could complicate our higher CTB ratification priority).

UNITED NATIONS

Pay UN Arrears:

TRANSNATIONAL THREATS

Pass the International Crime Control Act:

The ICCA would provide law enforcement authorities with significant new tools in the fight against international organized crime, including the ability to: prosecute violent acts of organized crime committed against Americans overseas;

deny visas to suspected drug and alien smugglers and their family members based on reasonable cause to believe their involvement in those crimes; freeze criminals' assets in the United States when criminals are arrested abroad; and extradite suspected criminals to other nations when the offense falls outside the offenses listed in an existing treaty, or even in certain cases when there is no treaty. All of the new tools in the bill are needed for our law enforcement arsenal, and the AG is fully on board -- her senior staff has played the leading role in crafting the entire package.

Legislative Issues

The Administration bill submitted to the Hill last year, which had virtually unanimous interagency support, did not make much progress for at least three reasons: (1) tough competition for scarce time on the legislative agenda; (2) broad recognition of the difficulty of the moving crime bills through Congress (i.e., while the "anti-crime stance" sells politically at the conceptual level, achieving a common denominator of non-objectionable specifics in a crime bill is often surprisingly difficult); and (3) after POTUS rolled out the ICCS and sent the ICCA to the Hill, we didn't push hard enough -- here again, time constraints were a big factor. All that said, various of our DOJ and other departmental legislative experts did feel that the Administration package -- either in total or substantial part -- was sellable, provided that we started early enough in the session and persuaded Administration principals to engage.

FY00 CBW and cyber terrorism initiatives:

Importance

The cyber funding will help to defend the nation's computer systems and critical infrastructure from cyber-terrorism. The most critical sectors of our economy --

power-generation, telecommunications, banking, transportation and emergency

services -- are potentially vulnerable to disruptions from computer attack.

President Clinton proposed in the Fiscal Year 2000 budget spending \$1.46 billion to defend against this emerging threat. This represents an increase of \$400 million from the FY 1999 budget proposal.

The President's FY 2000 funding request for countering the threat of terrorist

use of weapons of mass destruction continues and expands the program to \$1.385

billion. The FY 2000 request would include increases of \$30 million above the

previous level for research into new vaccines and medicines, an additional \$15

million to fund Public Health Surveillance to detect an attack, and an additional

\$13 million to create new metropolitan medical response teams.

Legislative Issues

The FY 2000 Budget contains numerous interagency budget items.

The Cyber budget

proposal is based in 14 agencies, which are themselves in 6 or 7 appropriations

committees. The WMD submission cuts across multiple agencies as well. The

failure to deliver on any one agency proposal can create a systematic failure in

our defense against the threat as a whole. Although much of the money is in DOD

and Justice, this is not a pure DOD/Law Enforcement issue. More than anything,

this requires COORDINATION of efforts.

The FY2000 Budget includes funding for the following new initiatives, which will require special attention:

* Critical Infrastructure Applied Research Initiative: The President's budget

proposal includes \$500 million for research and development efforts. A portion

of these funds will be spent on new initiatives to improve information assurance

by safeguarding networks. Funds will also be dedicated to developing tools that

can identify anomalous activities and "Trojan Horses" (malicious codes installed by unauthorized users).

Cyber:

* **Computer Intrusion Detection Networks:** The Defense Department has already begun to install intrusion detection systems and create a network to warn key computers of an attack. Under the President's initiative, a similar system for other Federal agencies will be evaluated and designed. These networks will ensure that when one computer system is attacked, others in the network will be instantly warned of the intrusion, informed of the mode of attack used, and provided with methods to stop it.

* **Information Sharing and Analysis Centers (ISACs):** As part of the public-private partnership, we will support the initial establishment of ISACs to foster private sector development of best practices and standards for computer security, to encourage the sharing of vulnerability analysis, and to provide outreach and training programs. These ISACs will enable the Federal government to provide private industry with threat information without compromising privacy, civil liberties or proprietary data.

* **Cyber Corps:** This program will address the shortage of highly skilled computer science expertise in the government and enable agencies to recruit a cadre of experts to respond to attacks on computer networks. It will use existing personnel flexibilities, scholarship and financial assistance programs, and examine new scholarship programs to retrain, retain and recruit computer science students.

WMD:

* \$52 million to continue procurement of a national stockpile of specialized

medicines to protect the civilian population.

- * \$611 million for training and equipping emergency personnel in U.S. cities, planning and exercising for weapons of mass destruction contingencies and strengthening public health infrastructure.

- * \$206 million to protect U.S. government facilities.

- * \$381 for research and development, including pathogen genome sequencing, vaccines, new therapies, detection and diagnosis, decontamination, and disposition of nuclear material.

Improve Embassy Security:

ENCRYPTION

Clarify and update legal procedures to ensure law enforcement access to decryption information; provide appropriate protections for third party assistance to law enforcement:

Background:

In updating the Administration's Encryption Policy last summer, the Encryption Deputies agreed to consider legislation proposed by Justice and FBI to update their legal tools to track with modern technology, especially as the use of encryption becomes more common. While the law enforcement community does not seek to expand its current authorities to gain access to communicated data, it does propose to fine-tune the procedures to gain access. This legislation is particularly important to the AG and Director Freeh.

Justice has only recently provided its proposed draft for interagency review and coordination. While many of Justice's proposals actually improve privacy protections, a few provisions push up against the Constitution and will raise

alarms with the privacy community and some of the IT industry. The IWG is seeking to resolve areas of disagreement and identify hot-button provisions for Deputies' consideration. Further, the IWG will need to recommend a legislative strategy.

The draft legislation is very complex. Even assuming that the Deputies/agencies reach agreement on the details and agree to support it to the Hill, it is unlikely to pass this year. While Justice/FBI may take the lead in selling the details of the legislation, the exercise will still consume NSC resources since certain provisions will be controversial and, importantly, some Members may seek to add amendments to the legislation that modify controversial export controls on encryption.

Based on the above background, the following responds to your specific questions:

Priority

Given the AG and Director Freeh's commitment to this initiative, we believe this legislation must be an NSC priority, pending Deputies agreement to move forward. However, since the proposed legislation is complex at best and may be a hard sell this year, recommend that it be given a moderate priority (for now), albeit recognizing that it may consume NSC resources.

Legislative Issues

Given that the IWG and Deputies are not yet fully aware of the details of this legislation, recommend that this issue remain on the back burner with regard to consulting the Hill for now. Assuming we eventually gain interagency support for a draft bill and submit to the Hill, we expect progress this year to be difficult given the bill's complexity and the continued debate over export controls (note: while export controls are not part of this draft, we expect them

to be raised and proposed for barter).

Importance

The draft Justice legislation would provide law enforcement agencies with updated legal access tools to gain access and/or recover encryption data. Further, some provisions improve privacy in that they clarify the legal access procedures where they are now ambiguous at best. Finally, the draft bill includes liability protections to third parties (e.g., companies, ISPs) that comply with law enforcement requests for assistance pursuant to legal authorities. All of the updated tools in the bill either improve our law enforcement arsenal or improve privacy protections. The AG and Freeh are on board.

EXPORT CONTROL

Export Control Act; HPC's:

ENVIRONMENT

Ratify the Sea Turtle Convention:

Hemispheric agreement to protect sea turtles. WTO decision striking down U.S. law to protect sea turtles called for treaties like this as an alternative. Environmental groups are calling for WH visibility in ratification effort as a condition for support on fast track.

Ratify the Desertification Convention:

POTUS highlighted this treaty on Africa trip and helped shape bipartisan coalition for ratification. No known opposition in Senate. More than 100 countries have ratified. Promotes long-term conflict avoidance, mostly in Africa.

23

23

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/11/99 6:15:14 PM
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT February 11 Lockhart Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bobbitt, Philip C.
Crowley, Philip J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Hammer, Michael A.
Hurwitz, Marc I.
Leavy, David C.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
Malinowski, Tomasz P.
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Press Briefing
February 11 Lockhart Press Briefing

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT joe0211.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release February 11, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING BY
JOE LOCKHART

The Briefing Room

1:07 P.M. EST

MR. LOCKHART: Questions.

Q Yes. I want to address the business we were talking about this mornin

that is stories that say that there is going to be revenge visited upon Republicans and other people who have been the President's critics in the whole business.

MR. LOCKHART: Well, first off, the only person who is quoted in that by name is Mr. Sosnik, and I think his quote made a lot of sense. There have been a series of stories over the last couple of weeks which very loosely talk about White House advisors, and as I told you this morning, I don't know who these guys are, where they live, or who they work for. I'll just leave it to

Q Would you address the subject?

MR. LOCKHART: Sure, absolutely. The President --

Q Is revenge one of the things the President is interested in?

MR. LOCKHART: The President is very committed to working hard over the next year and a half to help Democrats retake the House and the Senate. The margin in particular is very close. It's a very small margin and we think, with the President helping to raise resources and articulating a very positive and forward-looking message, that we can retake the House.

I have to tell you there are people in the Democratic Party, people who are here at the White House who I think are pretty good at developing a political strategy and I can't think of a worse, more dumb, strategy than going after people based on whether they were a House manager or not. You look at the House managers and the vast majority are in safe seats or unopposed seats. We are going to go out, do the best we can at articulating a message, and do it based on where we think we can win seats, in cooperation with the Democrats on the Hill.

Q The answer is no?

MR. LOCKHART: The answer is, I think we're a little bit smarter than that.

Q Joe, are there any decisions on whether or how the President would address the nation after a vote?

MR. LOCKHART: No. I expect from what I hear from the Hill that we're looking

at tomorrow. And I have no insight yet into how or when that will happen.

Q Do you, by any chance, regret this gloat-free zone issue, especially since

Senate Chaplain took that issue in his prayer today, praying that the President would not gloat over victories?

MR. LOCKHART: I actually am very pleased that I said it because it has come down

on the number of times you all have asked me that question, so I believe it served its purpose. And I always appreciate prayers. They're very helpful, particularly in the case of me.

Q Joe, is there a difference between a gloat-free zone and criticizing what the White House did and the House procedure and the fact that you believe that the President should have never been impeached in the first place?

MR. LOCKHART: Sure. But I think we've been pretty clear on what we're talking about

the House. And our efforts are to move this debate into the areas that the American people care about, Social Security, education, health care. So

we don't see any reason to come back to the discussions we were having in November and December.

Q So you're saying the White House does not intend after this vote to try to make it as having been nothing more than a partisan venture?

MR. LOCKHART: I think we've made our point. I think the American people in

large degree agrees with that point, and I don't see any -- it's not my intention to revisit past history ad nauseam.

Q What is the President planning on doing, Joe, to reconcile these parties after the vote to bring the Congress back together in a way that he can work with

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think if you look at the State of the Union address, you

see a road map for doing that. He laid out a very positive agenda on issues ranging from

Social Security, education, health care. But he also -- and I think it's important to look at the first thing he did, which was to turn around and shake hands with the new Speaker of the House. That is the spirit by which we will go forward, and it's the spirit in which we think we can get things done this year.

I think, if you look back over the administration, we have, in times -- in

most political times -- 1996, when the President was running for reelection we actually got a lot of things done on a bipartisan basis very late in the session -- whether it was welfare reform; minimum wage; the Kassebaum-Kennedy health care legislation. So we think we can do what's best for the American public, things through Congress, and also delineate where the parties are different to give the voters a choice for when they go to the polls, which is the end of the year.

Q Do you look forward to cooperation?

MR. LOCKHART: Absolutely.

Q Joe, if what the House did was partisan and unfair, would senators who were convicted also be acting in a partisan and unfair manner?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think the process in the Senate has been quite different than the process in the House. If you look at what the House did, it was much passing on and providing some validation to the referral they got. The Senate had a process -- the trial -- where both sides were given an opportunity to make their case. And I think senators are making up their mind based on that case.

Q So you're saying now that the Senate proceeding has been fair?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm saying -- as I think I said yesterday -- that both sides were able to make their case. I think there have been days in this process where we've had some grievance with a turn in events one way or the other. But I think, to differentiate what happened in the Senate to the House, we were able to make our case. There was no limiting us to a day or limiting us to, after a number of hearings, saying you can come in and present your case, and then in the middle of that presentation releasing the articles or the actual charges. So I think there has been a vast difference.

Q So you think it has been fair? Generally it has been fair?

MR. LOCKHART: Ask me again tomorrow. (Laughter.)

Q By extension, Joe, would you say that a vote in favor of the articles by an individual senator is a matter of conscience and a vote worthy of credit?

MR. LOCKHART: We would certainly hope that the senators would vote based on the case that was presented to them by both sides and vote on the conscience -- and vote in a way that's devoid or separates whatever political considerations may exist.

Q How would it change the dynamic of this story and the public viewing if, in fact, there is no censure, no formal proclamation by the Senate? The President has said repeatedly that he is open to consideration of that. Even one time he suggested that he thought he might deserve something like that.

MR. LOCKHART: It's impossible for me to predict how it will change if it is a decision for the Senate to make and for the Senate to articulate why they made whatever decision it is they end up making.

Q Does it really help the President in dealing with Congress if some people say, well, he got off scott free -- is that a good thing?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the American people have a somewhat deeper understanding of these issues than whatever slogan is coming out of one side or the other any given day. So I'm not sure what the -- if there is any profound meaning to them. But I think it's for the Senate to decide what they want to do, and leave it to them.

Q Joe, if the Senate, as it now seems likely, the Senate fails to muster a majority on either or even both of the impeachment articles, can the President take at least some comfort from that?

MR. LOCKHART: I think that he believes strongly in what Mr. Ruff presented, which is the House managers have not made their case and that he's not on the charges they've brought forward. And that's -- I think that's pretty straightforward.

Q So he would feel some comfort from that level of support?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the Senate agreeing with the case the defense made is a positive.

Q Joe, the reason -- a lot of these questions try to get at this same basic notion, which is, does the White House regard what has happened to the

President

in this whole inquiry as nothing more than a political vendetta, or rather legitimate search for the truth about what the President did and whether it was illegal?

MR. LOCKHART: Again, I think we have been very clear over the last particularly as we talked about the House proceedings, the President accepted responsibility for what he did. But we have serious concerns about how House

proceeded to do their business. It seemed at times more based on a partisan agenda than a search for what happened here and a search for the truth. We

are well passed that, and if that's what the issue de jour is I'll stand here and continue to repeat what we've said over and over again. But as far as the President is concerned, he's looking forward to the future and that's what he's concentrating on.

Q But isn't the President ultimately responsible for his own impeachment?

MR. LOCKHART: The President is responsible for his actions. Others have

to decide whether the House in how they approached this process acted in a way that demonstrated their search for the truth or in a way that demonstrated a need to gain partisan advantage. Our views are I think pretty well known.

Q Getting back to the congressional campaign of 2000, if, as you say, the President is not going to pursue revenge or a vendetta against the House managers, does he take the notion of taking back the House personally?

important to him as far as his redemption and his legacy is concerned?

MR. LOCKHART: I think he's got a more practical view of that, which we

believe that -- for instance, if we had managed to win a few more seats this time, pushing forward the agenda of saving Social Security, investing in people,

investing in education, health care, would be easier. It would be easier. You'll remember a theme of the last campaign was putting progress ahead of partisanship. We think that it will be demonstrably easier to promote the agenda

of the President, and the Democrat who will succeed the President in 2001 with a Democratic Congress.

Q Are you concerned about the impact that advisors would have on the vote, of coming out and saying the President is taking this personally and want --

MR. LOCKHART: You know, I think senators have spent the last five very involved in this -- on the evidence, on the case that has been made before them -- or not made, as the case may be. I doubt that there are people sitting, making up their mind based on what an unnamed person who says they the President says.

I think they have their own people. Maybe they live out at the swamp in Capitol; ours live in Lafayette Park, I don't know. But they have their own unnamed advisors they've got to deal with. I'm sure they've got a vast reservoir of information to base their decision on, and they're all doing that.

Q Joe, you say the President now makes an aggressive effort to help the Democrats win back the House. Will he or will he not brand the Republican Party as the party of impeachment?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think again -- I don't know how the year 2000 campaign will play out, but I think the President, as he goes out and talks to Democrats around the country and, in a more overtly political way as we do at fundraisers and political events, he'll talk about the idea that you've heard before, which is putting progress over partisanship. That it's the people's business that we have here in Washington need to focus on, and that's Social Security, health care, education those issues that the President has stayed focused on. And we to continue to try to make progress and we can do that in a bipartisan way. We can do that with Republicans as we move forward.

Q As a tactical matter, since House managers and senators alike are reaching to a strategy that you've already denounced as dumb are you going to make an explicit effort to reach out to these House members and senators and say no, this is not what we said?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think on political matters we're best talking to Democrats and they can make their own judgments.

Q You're not suggesting, Joe, that the New York Times made up this White House advisors?

MR. LOCKHART: Absolutely not. I'm suggesting there is a vast reserve of people here who advise the President. There are thousands of them and they show up in the paper every day.

Q Joe, we understand the President is going to make some statement of contrition after this process --

MR. LOCKHART: Well, you understand more than I do. I don't know what he's going to do.

Q If you could just clarify for us -- where he's made statements of contrition in the past, and perhaps he'll make another one -- this article says that he's furious at the people that impeached him. How can he be contrite and furious at the same time?

MR. LOCKHART: You're asking me to talk about something I don't know about, which is what he's going to say or not say, so I don't have an answer.

Q In past when he's made statements of contrition, Joe, is his emotion one of contrition or one of being furious at the people who impeached him?

MR. LOCKHART: His emotion, as I know it, is he accepts responsibility for what he's done and he's determined to do the best job he can as President, move forward doing the best job for the American people and, in a political sense, he's determined to help the Democratic Party prevail in the next election.

Q Joe, just to be clear about it, are you saying that the President's anger at House Republicans will not, in any way, animate his efforts on behalf of Democrats in the 2000 election?

MR. LOCKHART: What I'm saying is we are within a handful of seats of regaining the House. That's enough incentive to go out and work hard for Democrats around this country. And that's what he's going to do.

Q That's enough, but you're not denying that his anger could be part of that effort?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm affirmatively telling you that that is the motivation and that's enough.

Q Joe, is there any comment from the White House on the report that China is stepping up construction of a military base in the South China Sea, on Vietnam?

Island and --

MR. LOCKHART: I'm sorry, say the second part again?

Q There was a report yesterday -- well, in today's Washington Times, the China is stepping up construction of a military base in the South China Sea, on Woody Island and the Paracels Islands chain?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, I think we're aware of that. It's something of concern, and, as we've urged before, we urge them to work in dialogue with all of the concerned in the area there.

Q On China, are you also concerned about the buildup of missiles on the mainland aimed at Taiwan?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, the administration is aware of the growing deployment in China, in recent years, of missiles capable of striking Taiwan. This is not particularly new. It's been something that we've been aware of has been on. You'll remember the testing of these missiles in 1996 precipitated the deploying the Area II carrier groups to the Straits.

We have a strong interest in maintaining peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait. We have supplied, for this reason, defensive arms to Taiwan consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act. We plan to continue to monitor the military balance in the Taiwan Strait closely, and meet our obligation to provide Taiwan the arms it needs for adequate defense.

Q But couldn't the buildup of these missiles endanger regional security?

MR. LOCKHART: Certainly. And that's why I've so stated the preceding points.

Q The report seemed to indicate that the number of missiles that we now believe are there have tripled. Is that, in fact, the case?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not going to get into the detail except to acknowledge that we have been aware for some time of an increase and, again, this is not a story, but it is something of concern.

Q So the current status -- the current number of missiles you now believe

there, you have known about for some time?

MR. LOCKHART: I believe that the buildup has gone over some time, we are aware.

Q One more follow-up on that. There's talk about a U.S. missile defense umbrella. How seriously is the U.S. committed to defending Taiwan?

MR. LOCKHART: You know, theater missile defense technology is in development stage and is some years away, and we'll make a decision in the future in area, based on the development of the technologies, Taiwan's defense needs and how we perceive the best way to maintain peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait.

Q Joe, now that you've finally sent forth the nomination of Richard Holbrooke, did the White House pass it by the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Helms?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes. Yesterday.

Q They have it?

MR. LOCKHART: News to some of us. I knew that.

Q The White House passed it by Senator Helms? It's usually traditional, you send up a major appointment on foreign affairs --

MR. LOCKHART: Well, it was sent up to the Senate --

Q Have you had a previous private conversation with Senator Helms?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, we certainly had discussions with -- I'm not sure if it was with Senator Helms or with his staff, over sending up the nomination, so I think he was aware of what our plans were.

Q How does he feel about it, do you know?

MR. LOCKHART: I think his able spokesman was quoted in the paper saying that they're going to do their own due diligence, as they always do for any appointment like this, and they look forward to getting on with it quickly.

Q Joe, the President of Iran has been invited to Paris, I believe, for a state visit or an official visit of some kind. Is that the type of relations that we

encourage our allies to engage in with Iran, or do we discourage them because we feel they are such --

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not aware of the invitation, so I'd have to look into that to see if the U.S. government had a view on that.

Q Joe, has the President read letters from 200,000 steelworkers which were brought here yesterday?

MR. LOCKHART: Has he seen them? No. I understand they came --

Q Why not?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, because they came in 23 boxes and I'm not sure they'd fit in the Oval Office. But he's --

Q But you counted the number of boxes.

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, we did, because they came in one by one. But he's certainly aware of the concerns that have been raised by the steel industry steel workers. And the President, with his economic team, and the Secretary of Commerce, have worked very hard to make sure that those concerns are addressed. And we have worked again very hard with some of our trading partners to express in very explicit terms our concerns about some of the activities, particularly concerning the hot-rolled steel.

Q Does the White House have any position on the work-fair bill --

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not sure we've seen -- I would have to check on

Q Joe, speaking of concerns, is the President concerned about the American Airlines problem with passengers --

MR. LOCKHART: I think the President is always -- has some concern about a major disruption of the kind we saw this week with American Airlines. But it's a matter that was in the courts and has been litigated in a court, so I don't think it would be appropriate to make any other comment.

Q Joe, to quickly revisit something from earlier -- how quickly after the crash can we expect to see Speaker Hastert here to be talking with the President

the good old days?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't have any particular dates or announcements to make, but I expect that when Congress gets back, the President looks forward to working with them quickly and in a bipartisan way. And I fully expect the President to meet both with Democratic and Republican leaders sometime after they get back.

Q How quickly after the Senate finishes its business can we expect to see a general news conference?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think you'll see the President in several situations -- we have a flurry of foreign leaders coming here over the next two or three weeks. You'll see him, and I'm working hard to secure a date sometime in the middle of March.

Q Well, that's why I said "general" -- you say secure a date -- you're talking about a general news conference?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, yes.

Q Would there be a news conference in Mexico?

MR. LOCKHART: No, there will be a chance to go in and do a pool session during the bilateral meeting. You'll probably get a chance to ask a couple of questions, but there is no --

Q How about in Central America?

MR. LOCKHART: That's a ways down the road, I don't know.

Q Joe, can you tell us why there is not a press availability today with Schroeder and not a press conference in Mexico, since the last time we were in Mexico there was a bilateral press conference that went on for quite a while?

MR. LOCKHART: It is just based on decisions we make here. On Mexico, I think it was -- Mexico I think has something to do with the timing. This is not an extended trip.

Q Mexican officials have said that the U.S. government specifically requested that there not be one.

MR. LOCKHART: Then it's because we decided not to do one.

Q Because?

Q You just went out of your way to mention that there are a number of foreign leaders coming here. Are you suggesting that you will go back to allow pool sprays here instead of stills only after this is over?

MR. LOCKHART: That's what I'm suggesting.

Q But then why specifically did you decide the Mexico trip wasn't --

MR. LOCKHART: Because the Mexico trip has been planned over the last three or four weeks. We all know what we're talking about here -- the sort of loose ends there like, gee, what's he talking about. (Laughter.)

Q -- you're going to go back to pool sprays with foreign leaders instead of stills?

MR. LOCKHART: Pardon?

Q In answer to Bill's question you just said you're going to go back to have pool sprays when foreign leaders visit instead of stills, but what about the notion of having press conferences with foreign leaders?

MR. LOCKHART: I think I just addressed that. Somebody asked --

Q But we were talking about pool sprays.

MR. LOCKHART: Okay. Next.

Q Joe, congressional Republicans want to get fast track moving and they complained that the White House has not been as interested as previously in doing this, even though I believe the President mentioned it in the State of the Union. How interested is the White House in getting fast track as a priority?

MR. LOCKHART: The White House is interested in fast track, but as the President said, he believes he has to build -- we have to build a new consensus for getting it forward. We can't move forward with this unless we get a bipartisan cooperation from both Democrats and Republicans. And the President believes we need to work on working through some of those issues, whether it's question of

labor or environment, because we don't want to get to the end of the pro and come up short like we did the last time we went through this.

Q Then you won't move forward with this unless you have a majority of Democrats for it?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I'm saying we need to build a new consensus that believe will get the bill passed. I'm not getting into numbers.

Q What's he doing to build the consensus among Democrats?

MR. LOCKHART: I think there's work being done by the President's economic and trade team to try to build that consensus, and when we think that that's done we'll move forward.

Q Did he speak with Gephardt when the Congressman was up here recently about fast track?

MR. LOCKHART: Oh, I'm sorry, about fast track. I don't know if it can I think when he was here it was more of a conversation -- the Minority Leader came down in large part to talk about what his plans were and some of the things that he planned to talk about in announcing that he was going to stay and not another office.

Q Are you working on this with labor unions and ecological groups?

MR. LOCKHART: I think they certainly have an interest in this and we have an inclusive group here.

Q Does the White House have a view for Senator Thompson's committee when it begins hearings later this month on whether to renew the Independent C Act?

MR. LOCKHART: I haven't heard anything explicit, so I would have to go back and check. There's been a lot of talk among senators about trying to reform the statute, but I just haven't heard -- I haven't been party to any explicit discussions here about whether or when we'll develop an official administration view.

Q Is it fair to say people who believe the President would not sign a bill would simply renew it -- is that a fair assumption?

MR. LOCKHART: I think there has been serious issues raised with several the investigations, so it's probably quite useful that Senator Thompson is going to launch a review of this and we look forward to seeing what he comes up with.

Q Would you count the White House as skeptical about renewing it as it exists?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't think we would counter the conventional wisdom that says that -- that treats this with some skepticism.

Q Is the United States government paying for the President's defense in trial in the Senate?

MR. LOCKHART: Certainly the United States government employs the White House Counsel's Office, which you well know, and the President pays for his personal attorneys.

Q So Mr. Kendall and Ms. Seligman, for example, would be paid for by the President and not the government?

MR. LOCKHART: That's correct.

Q You can obviously foresee a situation whereby the President's interest in trying to forge bipartisan legislation with the President leadership perhaps could collide with the President's interest in getting Democrats elected in the House of Representatives and becoming the majority. Which would take priority?"

MR. LOCKHART: Oh, I can equally see a scenario where Democratic issues and agenda items will get support from Republicans who feel that they need something before they go back to the voters. So I think there is a scenario where we push forward with the President's agenda, with Democratic issues that does well for the Democratic Party and we get things done. I don't think there is a false choice implicit in your question.

Q Republicans appear to be focusing more on targeted tax cuts such as marriage penalty or estate taxes. Would that be a better approach than the across-the-board tax cut that they're also considering? Would it make it to get a deal on taxes?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think the best way to approach this is the way the President has laid out, which is -- and some of this involves the sequence we need to save Social Security and Medicare first. We need to reserve bulk of the surplus for the next 15 years to ensure the long-term viability of Social Security and Medicare. And after that, we have an aggressive program to promote savings and wealth accumulation, with our USA accounts, which is a half-trillion dollar tax cut, in effect.

As far as trying to compare the various ideas that are coming out of the Republican Party, the ideas put out recently are certainly more progressive than the across-the-board tax cut, but I think it skirts the more important issue of doing what we need to do first on Social Security and Medicare.

Q Joe, does the White House or the President have any view on the controversy over whether one of the Teletubbies is gay? (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: No, but we understand Congressman Burton is going to launch an investigation into why Bert and Ernie share a bedroom. (Laughter.)

Q Oooh.

MR. LOCKHART: No, we have no --

Q -- watch Sesame Street.

MR. LOCKHART: They watch Teletubbies, too.

Q Are you going to regret that you said that?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I hope not. (Laughter.) Children's Workshop, come to see me next week. No. We have an ever-expanding scale of ridiculous, and it pushes the envelope a little further.

Q Did you see Reverend Falwell on television, all over the television this morning?

MR. LOCKHART: I didn't. What did he say?

Q I don't remember. (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: Wait, that's my answer.

Q No, I don't mean to be demeaning --

MR. LOCKHART: Sam has no recollection.

Q He didn't seem to know how to pronounce -- it's Twinky or Tinky?

Q Tinky-Winky.

Q Tinky-Winky -- he was never able to get it right.

MR. LOCKHART: Tinky-Winky. Bye, Scott. (Laughter.) At least there person here who's --

Q Thank you.

MR. LOCKHART: No, no. Everybody sit down. April?

Q Thank you. Joe, this is -- we're coming down to the wire with tomorrow. Granted, you're not going to be partying, but is there a sense of relief that this is almost over after over a year?

MR. LOCKHART: Sure. I think I've said that in the past and I think it will only be overtaken by relief when it actually is over.

Q What's next? (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: What's next? What's next is we go to Mexico. And starting next

--

Q Well, who could have imagined this story -- what I'm asking, anything coming up? (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: A major effort to reform and ensure Social Security the next 75 years; investing in education; investing in health care with the patient bill of rights -- it's a big story, I know you'll all be covering it.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

1:39 P.M. EST

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Andrew Weiss to Mary Ann Silva. Subject: FW: Agenda for Berger-Fuerth-Talbott Meeting on Nonproliferation. (3 pages)	02/18/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/27/1999-02/23/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5663

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	Gary Samore to John Caravelli, Andrew Weiss, and Carlos Pascual. Subject: Agenda for Berger-Fuerth-Talbott Meeting on Nonproliferation. (4 pages)	02/18/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/27/1999-02/23/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5663

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
004. email	John Caravelli to Gary Samore, Carlos Pascual, Andrew Weiss, and Steven Black. Subject: Agenda for Berger-Fuerth-Talbott Meeting on Nonproliferation. (5 pages)	02/18/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/27/1999-02/23/1999]

2006-1363-F
vz5663

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 2/19/99 10:59:45 AM
FROM Weiss, Andrew S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Response to Senator Helms -- [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Kaufman, Stuart J.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

thanks. will turn to shortly.

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

From: Kaufman,
Stuart J.
Sent: Friday, February 19, 1999 10:59 AM
To: Weiss,
Andrew S.
Cc: @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine
Subject: FW: Response to
Senator Helms -- [UNCLASSIFIED]

Andrew, looks good to me. On
to you for clearance.

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

From: Witkowsky,
Anne A.
Sent: Friday, February 19, 1999 10:46 AM
To: Witkowsky,
Anne A.; Weiss, Andrew S.; McEldowney, Nancy E.; Flanagan, Stephen
J.; Baker, James E.; Lackey, Miles M.
Cc: @CEE - Central/Eastern
Europe; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
@RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine
Subject: RE: Response to Senator Helms
-- [UNCLASSIFIED]

My apologies to all. Sent you wrong version.
Attached (version #2) is for your clearance.

<< File: 0957ltr2.doc
>>

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

From: Witkowsky, Anne A.
Sent: Friday,
February 19, 1999 10:10 AM
To: Weiss, Andrew S.; McEldowney, Nancy
E.; Flanagan, Stephen J.; Baker, James E.; Lackey, Miles M.
Cc: @CEE
- Central/Eastern Europe; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative

Affairs; @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine
Subject: Response to Senator Helms
-- [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

FOR ACTION

Andrew, Nancy,
Steve, Jamie, Miles:

Attached is a response to Senator Helms'
letter on CFE and ABM (as it relates to the flank agreement). Need
to get this up to the hill before Albright testifies before SFRC
next Tuesday, so need clearance by 1:00 today. Sorry for short suspense.
Cover memos to follow.

<< File: 0957ltr.doc >>

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/19/99 12:01:04 PM
FROM Witkowski, Anne A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Response to Senator Helms -- [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Krass, Caroline D.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

agree. thks.

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

From: Krass, Caroline
D.

Sent: Friday, February 19, 1999 11:57 AM

To: Witkowski, Anne
A.

Subject: FW: Response to Senator Helms -- [UNCLASSIFIED]

Forgot

to add one more minor edit -- I think it should be Resolution of
Ratification "of", not "to." I've made the change on this version.

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

From: Krass, Caroline D.

Sent: Friday, February 19,
1999 11:49 AM

To: Witkowski, Anne A.

Cc: @LEGAL - Legal Advisor

Subject: FW:

Response to Senator Helms -- [UNCLASSIFIED]

Legal clears with
the attached minor edits.

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

From: Witkowski,
Anne A.

Sent: Friday, February 19, 1999 10:46 AM

To: Witkowski,

Anne A.; Weiss, Andrew S.; McElDowney, Nancy E.; Flanagan, Stephen
J.; Baker, James E.; Lackey, Miles M.

Cc: @CEE - Central/Eastern

Europe; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
@RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine
Subject: RE: Response to Senator Helms
-- [UNCLASSIFIED]

My apologies to all. Sent you wrong version.
Attached (version #2) is for your clearance.

<< File: 0957ltr2.doc
>>

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

From: Witkowski, Anne A.
Sent: Friday,
February 19, 1999 10:10 AM
To: Weiss, Andrew S.; McEldowney, Nancy
E.; Flanagan, Stephen J.; Baker, James E.; Lackey, Miles M.
Cc: @CEE
- Central/Eastern Europe; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative

Affairs; @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine
Subject: Response to Senator Helms
-- [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

FOR ACTION

Andrew, Nancy,
Steve, Jamie, Miles:

Attached is a response to Senator Helms'
letter on CFE and ABM (as it relates to the flank agreement). Need
to get this up to the hill before Albright testifies before SFRC
next Tuesday, so need clearance by 1:00 today. Sorry for short suspense.
Cover memos to follow.

<< File: 0957ltr.doc >>

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/19/99 1:19:08 PM
FROM Weiss, Andrew S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Response to Senator Helms -- [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Witkowsky, Anne A.

CARBON_COPY Bandler, Donald K.
Braden, Susan R.
Brown, Keim C.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Allen, Charles A.
Baker, James E.
DeRosa, Mary B.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Krass, Caroline D.
Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Lackey, Miles M.
Rudman, Mara E.
Tavlarides, Mark J.
Barnett, Cheryl E.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Kaufman, Stuart J.
Pascual, Carlos E.
Segal, Jack D.
Silva, Mary Ann T.
Weiss, Andrew S.

TEXT_BODY Clear

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

From: Witkowsky, Anne A.

Sent: Friday,

February 19, 1999 1:05 PM

To: Witkowsky, Anne A.; Weiss, Andrew

S.; McEldowney, Nancy E.; Flanagan, Stephen J.; Baker, James E.;

Lackey, Miles M.; Andreasen, Steven P.

Cc: @CEE - Central/Eastern

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

@RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine

Subject: RE: Response to Senator Helms
-- [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Thanks for quick turn around
on letter. Here are cover memos for clearance asap.

<< File:
0957prs.doc >> << File: 0957srb.doc >>
-----Original Message-----
From: Witkowski,
Anne A.
Sent: Friday, February 19, 1999 10:46 AM
To: Witkowski,
Anne A.; Weiss, Andrew S.; McEldowney, Nancy E.; Flanagan, Stephen
J.; Baker, James E.; Lackey, Miles M.
Cc: @CEE - Central/Eastern
Europe; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
@RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine
Subject: RE: Response to Senator Helms
-- [UNCLASSIFIED]

My apologies to all. Sent you wrong version.
Attached (version #2) is for your clearance.

<< File: 0957ltr2.doc
>>

-----Original Message-----
From: Witkowski, Anne A.
Sent: Friday,
February 19, 1999 10:10 AM
To: Weiss, Andrew S.; McEldowney, Nancy
E.; Flanagan, Stephen J.; Baker, James E.; Lackey, Miles M.
Cc: @CEE
- Central/Eastern Europe; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs; @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine
Subject: Response to Senator Helms
-- [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

FOR ACTION

Andrew, Nancy,
Steve, Jamie, Miles:

Attached is a response to Senator Helms'
letter on CFE and ABM (as it relates to the flank agreement). Need
to get this up to the hill before Albright testifies before SFRC

next Tuesday, so need clearance by 1:00 today. Sorry for short suspense.
Cover memos to follow.

<< File: 0957ltr.doc >>

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/23/99 8:56:43 AM
FROM Andreasen, Steven P.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Package 0957 - Letter to Senator Helms re CFE / ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Witkowsky, Anne A.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Have you alerted State that Helms will have the POTUS letter, hot off the press?

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

From: Kaplan, Dean
M.

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 1999 7:27 AM

To: Hasman, Thomas

M.; Rice, Edward A.

Cc: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary; @WWD - West

Wing Desk; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy;

Bellamy, Ralph C.; George, Christopher L.

Subject: RE: Package 0957

- Letter to Senator Helms re CFE / ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

We (RMO)

will hand-carry to Helms this morning, per Col. Rice.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Hasman, Thomas M.

Sent: Monday, February 22,
1999 11:16 PM

To: Rice, Edward A.

Cc: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary;

@WWD - West Wing Desk; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @DEFENSE
- Defense Policy; Bellamy, Ralph C.; George, Christopher L.

Subject: Package

0957 - Letter to Senator Helms re CFE / ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

This

package is at WWD awaiting dispatch instructions. Anne Witkowsky would like the letter to reach Sen. Helms before Albright gives testimony before SFRC. Would faxing the letter be appropriate, or should we

arrange courier delivery w/ Records Management?

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/23/99 7:39:20 AM

FROM Kaplan, Dean M.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT RE: Package 0957 - Letter to Senator Helms re CFE / ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Tavlarides, Mark J.
 Hasman, Thomas M.
 Rice, Edward A.
 Porter, Pete
 Porter, Pete

CARBON_COPY Bartlett, L. June
 Cosgriff, Kevin J.
 Davies, Glyn T.
 Dejban, Donna D.
 Elkon, Nicole L.
 Hasman, Thomas M.
 Hilliard, Brenda I.
 Jacobson, Tracey A.
 Joshi, M. Kay
 Kerrick, Donald L.
 Millison, Cathy L.
 Rice, Edward A.
 Darnes, Victoria J.
 Ficklin, John W.
 Kaplan, Dean M.
 Marsh, Thomas S
 Porter, Pete
 Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
 Starks, Tali T.
 Burrell, Christina L.
 Lackey, Miles M.
 Tavlarides, Mark J.
 Andreasen, Steven P.
 Bell, Robert G.
 Bouchard, Joseph F.
 Kelly, Sandra L.
 Langley, Janice M.
 Mulligan, George D.
 Peterman, David (Brian)
 Pimentel, Betsy J.
 vonLipsey, Roderick K.
 Wasserman, Elaine P.
 Witkowsky, Anne A.

Bellamy, Ralph C.
George, Christopher L.

TEXT_BODY

Sure. Just went to 379 for dispatch processing. I'll ask Pete to make you a copy that you can fax.

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

From: Tavlarides,
Mark J.
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 1999 7:36 AM
To: Kaplan, Dean
M.; Hasman, Thomas M.; Rice, Edward A.
Cc: @EXECSEC - Executive
Secretary; @WWD - West Wing Desk; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
@DEFENSE - Defense Policy; Bellamy, Ralph C.; George, Christopher
L.
Subject: RE: Package 0957 - Letter to Senator Helms re CFE /
ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Both. Could we have a copy as well. Thanks.

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

From: Kaplan, Dean M.
Sent: Tuesday, February 23,
1999 7:27 AM
To: Hasman, Thomas M.; Rice, Edward A.
Cc: @EXECSEC
- Executive Secretary; @WWD - West Wing Desk; @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; Bellamy, Ralph C.; George, Christopher
L.
Subject: RE: Package 0957 - Letter to Senator Helms re CFE /
ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

We (RMO) will hand-carry to Helms this morning,
per Col. Rice.

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

From: Hasman, Thomas
M.
Sent: Monday, February 22, 1999 11:16 PM
To: Rice, Edward A.
Cc: @EXECSEC
- Executive Secretary; @WWD - West Wing Desk; @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; Bellamy, Ralph C.; George, Christopher
L.
Subject: Package 0957 - Letter to Senator Helms re CFE / ABM
[UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

This package is at WWD awaiting dispatch instructions. Anne Witkowsky would like the letter to reach Sen. Helms before Albright gives testimony before SFRC. Would faxing the letter be appropriate, or should we arrange courier delivery w/ Records Management?