

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Andrew Weiss to Carlos Pascual. Subject: FW: Strategy in Lott-Leiberman. (4 pages)	09/21/1999	P1/b(1)
002. email	Jendayi Frazer to Gayle Smith. Subject: Summary Points from deliverables meeting. (4 pages)	10/05/1999	P1/b(1)
003. email	Andrew Weiss to Anne Witkowsky. Subject: [Helms Letter] (3 pages)	11/05/1999	P1/b(1)
004. email	Anthony Blinken to Anne Witkowsky. Subject: RE: CFE Endgame Update. (3 pages)	11/05/1999	P1/b(1)
005. email	Kenneth Pollack to Christina Burrell, Miles Lackey, Daniel Shapiro, and Mark Tavlarides. Subject: POTUS Iraq Meeting. (15 pages)	11/11/1999	P1/b(1)
006. email	Kenneth Pollack to Miles Lackey. Subject: FW: POTUS Iraq Meeting. (15 pages)	11/11/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/20/1999-11/11/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5672

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 9/20/99 10:00:25 AM
FROM Keith, James R. (ASIA)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Response to Helms on POTUS Meeting with Jiang in Auckland
[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Matthews, Sonyia (ADMIN)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Lackey has cleared. Would you please put this package in final?
I'll sign for JP, who is in New York for most of the day today.
Thanks, Jim

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

From: Keith, James R.
(ASIA)
Sent: Friday, September 17, 1999 5:06 PM
To: Lackey, Miles
M. (LEGIS); @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Subject: Response to
Helms on POTUS Meeting with Jiang in Auckland
[UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

for
your review and comment:

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 6702 jk~srb.doc

September 20, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: JACK PRITCHARD, ACTING

FROM: JAMES KEITH

SUBJECT: Response to Senator Helms Concerning POTUS' Meeting

with Chinese
President Jiang Zemin

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President covering a response to Senator Helms regarding the President's meeting with Chinese President Jiang Zemin in Auckland.

The NSC received the incoming correspondence on 10 September 1999.

Concurrence by: Miles Lackey

RECOMMENDATION

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

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Response to Senator Helms

Tab B Incoming Correspondence

1

6702

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 6702 srb~potus.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Response to Senator Helms Concerning Your Meeting
with Chinese President
Jiang Zemin

Purpose

Respond to Helms' letter urging you to avoid tilting toward Beijing during your meeting with Jiang in Auckland.

Background

Senator Helms wrote to you to caution against advancing U.S.-China relations at the expense of Taiwan. Helms alleges that the Administration is already tilting toward Beijing and advocates a reversal of that alleged position by warning Jiang that any PRC use of force in the dispute with Taiwan will trigger U.S. intervention; that the Administration refrain from pressuring Taiwan to enter into negotiation with Beijing; that you avoid any kind of joint statement with Jiang in Auckland; and that you say nothing to Jiang on arms sales to Taiwan other than to restate the obligations of the Taiwan Relations Act.

Your response underlines broad agreement with Helm's main points; reiterates our commitment to "one China," and indicates that your discussion with Jiang was entirely consistent with the fundamental principles that guide our relations with the PRC and Taiwan.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter to Helms at Tab A.

Attachments

Tab A Letter to Senator Helms
Tab B Incoming Correspondence

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 6702 potus~helms.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter concerning my meeting with Chinese President Jiang in Auckland. You should rest assured that we are in broad agreement:

- * Advances in U.S.-PRC relations will not come at Taiwan's expense.
- * The United States must refrain from mediating issues that should be addressed directly by Taiwan and the People's Republic of China (PRC).
- * There must be absolute clarity regarding the U.S. position that differences between Chinese on both sides of the Strait must be resolved peacefully and without outside pressure.
- * Our legal obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act must be clearly and consistently implemented.

I am determined uphold these principles and to maintain our longstanding "one China" policy because it remains the best means to advance the interests of the American people in regional peace, stability, and increasing prosperity. I can assure you that everything I said to President Jiang in Auckland was consistent with the foregoing and with the additional fundamental principles that guide our ties with the PRC and Taiwan.

As always, I am grateful to you for your forthright insight and advice.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse A. Helms
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Andrew Weiss to Carlos Pascual. Subject: FW: Strategy in Lott-Leiberman. (4 pages)	09/21/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/20/1999-11/11/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5672

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
002. email	Jendayi Frazer to Gayle Smith. Subject: Summary Points from deliverables meeting. (4 pages)	10/05/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/20/1999-11/11/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5672

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 10/8/99 1:50:21 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT October 8 Press Availability by the President and Prime Minister Chretien of Canada [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Fallin, James (PRESS)
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)
Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS)
Leavy, David C. (PRESS)
Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)
Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)
Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)
Orzulak, Paul K. (SPCHW)
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)
Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)
Matthews, Sonyia (ADMIN)
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)
Rudman, Mara E. (NSA)
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY POTUS Press Conference
October 8 Press Availability by the President
and Prime Minister Chretien of Canada

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Canada - Press Availability.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Ottawa, Canada)

For Immediate Release October 8, 1999

PRESS AVAILABILITY BY THE PRESIDENT
AND PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN

Parliament
Ottawa, Canada

12:05 P.M. EDT

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Madames et monsieurs, ladies and gentlemen, it's a great pleasure for me to receive the President of the United States in Canada for this occasion of opening the new embassy, and for the President to come and make a speech in Mont Tremblant on federalism.

As you know, the relations between Canada and the U.S. are excellent, and the President is here for his fifth visit to Canada since he started in office. And when I asked him to come to the conference at Mont Tremblant I had to call upon our longstanding friendship. And everyone is very pleased that you, the leader of the greatest democracy and the greatest federation, should come to give your point of view.

-- the President of the United States to come and make this statement, the speech in Mont Tremblant, because he has been -- he is in a very privileged position. He has been the governor of a state, of Arkansas, and he has been the President of the Conference of the Governors, and he has been, on the other side,

the President of the United States. So he knows the functioning of a federal system inside out.

And I'm sure that the people coming from around the world will benefit very strongly from his experience. And I want to say thank you very much. And I take it as a great sign of friendship for Canada and for myself that you have accepted to be with us today.

If you want to say a few words.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. First of all, Prime Minister, thank you for welcoming me back for my fifth trip to Canada since I've been President.

I would like to be very brief, and then we'll open it to questions. I'm here today to dedicate our embassy, to speak at the Prime Minister's federalism conference, and to have the chance to meet with Prime Minister Chretien. I want to just mention two or three issues.

First of all, I'm profoundly grateful for the leadership shown by Canada in our common efforts to promote world peace: the work we've done together in Haiti, the work we've did together in Bosnia, the work we did together in Kosovo with NATO, and the efforts that we're all making in East Timor -- which is still a difficult situation, where we've got to get all the refugees home and safe and where we strongly support Secretary General Annan's efforts to establish a United Nations program there.

One of the things that we have worked on together is our efforts in nonproliferation. And Canada and the United States agree with all of our NATO allies that the comprehensive test ban treaty is the right thing to do, it's the interest of the United States.

There has been far more controversy about it in our country than in other countries, including other nuclear powers who are our allies. And I was -- we've been trying to have a debate on this for two years, but it is clear now that the level of opposition to the treaty and the time it would take to craft the necessary safeguards to get the necessary votes are simply not there.

So I hope that the Senate will reach an agreement to delay the vote and to establish an orderly process, a non-political orderly process, to systematically deal with all the issues that are out there and to take whatever time is necessary to do it.

With this treaty other nations will find it harder to acquire or to modernize nuclear weapons, and we will gain the means to detect and deter. If we don't have the treaty, the United States will continue to refrain from testing, and we'll give a green light to every other country in the world to test, to develop, to modernize nuclear weapons.

I think it's clear what we ought to do, but it's also clear that we ought not to rush this vote until there has been an appropriate process in the Senate.

So those are the major foreign policy issues I wanted to mention. The other thing I wanted to say is, I think Canada and the United States will be working very closely to try to reinvigorate the movement to expanded trade around the world. If we're going to really see the rest of the world's economy pick up, and enjoy the kind of prosperity we have enjoyed in the last few years, we've got to make the most of this WTO ministerial. We've got to make the most of Canada's hosting the Free Trade Area of the Americas ministerial. And I think that's important.

Now, as to our bilateral relations, I wanted to mention one thing that we talked about in our meeting. We have agreed to have a more intensive dialogue on border issues, through a new forum we creatively called the Canada-United States Partnership, or CUSP. This will enable us to have local businesses, local communities, talk about managing border issues, and figure out how we can resolve some of the hassles people have with the vast volume of goods that go back and forth across the border, and the vast number of people.

So, I thank you. And you've already said why you invited me to the federalism conference. And I can tell you, I was a governor for 12 years, and no matter how hard you try, you will never solve all the problems of federalism. So the best thing you can do is to paraphrase Winston Churchill and say it is the worst form of government, except for all the others.

Thank you very much.

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Thank you, sir. Now, we'll take questions. Sir?

Q Mr. President, the Senate Majority Leader has stated that he would consider taking the test ban treaty off the table, withdrawing it from consideration under the caveat that it would not be reintroduced in the 106th Congress. Would you, sir, in order to preserve this treaty, be willing to give up ownership of it to the next Congress and the next administration?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I don't own it. And insofar as I do, we always will, since we negotiated it and the United States was the first to sign it. But it isn't mine, it belongs to the world. And I think the whole nature of your question shows what's wrong with the way the Senate has treated this.

They've treated this like a political document. They've treated this whole issue like a political issue. They went out and got people committed to vote against the treaty before they knew the first thing about it. And what I have said is -- I don't understand what he's worried about. This thing could never have come up in the first place if he hadn't agreed to it. And I wouldn't bring it up unless I thought we could ratify it, because I won't treat it politically.

So this whole thing is about politics. It's about burn us in 1999, because we're against the treaty that 80 percent of the American people support; but please don't burn us again in 2000. It's political. This treaty is not going to come up until we think we can pass it. And it won't come up until they treat it seriously.

Every serious American treaty, for example, has the legislative language attached as safeguards, just like we did in the Chemical Weapons Treaty, so that everyone understands exactly what it means. In this treaty they actually went out of their way to try to keep safeguards from being attached to it so that they could have the maximum number of votes against it.

So I will give you a nonpolitical answer. I will say again, they should put it off and then they should agree to a legitimate process where Republicans and Democratic senators think about the national interest. They have total control

over when it comes up, not me. If it had been up to me we would have started on this two years ago. We would have had six months of hearings, two weeks of debate, lots of negotiations and this whole thing would have been out of the way a year and a half ago.

It was not out of the way because that's the decision they made not to bring it up. They control when it comes up. So you're asking the wrong person whether it would come up next year. You should turn around and ask Senator Lott whether it would come up next year.

What I want to do -- I don't care when it comes up, except when it comes up, I want it to come up as soon as we can, pass it, with a legitimate process. As messy as this has been, this has illustrated to the American people, beyond any question, that this whole deal has been about politics so far.

Now, there are some people who are honestly against this treaty. But we haven't been able to hear from them for two years, and we haven't been able to answer them, and we haven't been able to work on it. So I think it's been a very healthy thing to bring it up. But now we ought to do what's right for America, take it out of politics -- this is not going to be a huge issue next year in the election, one way or the other. We should deal with this on the merits. They should agree to a process -- then they control when it comes up.

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: And I would like to add that we all have an interest in that, and all your allies to America, we will want this process to be terminated as quickly as possible, because there's a lot of other nations that have to live with the consequences of what the American Congress will do. And peace in the world is extremely important for our neighbors, too.

Q Prime Minister, did you discuss the concerns that Canada's defense industries have had with having to get licenses? And did you get any answer from the President?

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Yes, we discussed and we have found an agreement. And the agreement will be in details made public by Madam Albright and Mr. Axworthy

--

Q Was it important to get an agreement? Why?

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: But, yes. It's always important when you have a problem to find a solution. And we found a solution. That's all. (Laughter.)

Next. Next.

Q Mr. President, today a London magistrate ruled that former Chilean dictator Pinochet be extradited for trial in Spain. The CIA has been accused of withholding documents that are said to show that the United States encouraged the coup which installed Pinochet in power, and that the CIA maintained close ties to Pinochet's repressive security forces. Will you order that the release of those documents be sped up?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I believe we've released some documents, and my understanding -- before I came out here, I was told that we're about to release some more. So I think we ought to just keep releasing documents until we -- I think you're entitled to know what happened back then, and how it happened.

And obviously, the governments of Spain and the United Kingdom are following their own legal systems. I would point out, in defense of the people of Chile, is that they actually succeeded in moving away from the Pinochet dictatorship, and solving the problem they had in a way that allowed them to make a transition to parliamentary democracy. And I think that even the people that spent their whole lives opposed to Pinochet, they have some -- they're trying to figure out, now, what the impact on their democracy will be of all these actions.

But the United States has supported the legal process, and we continue to do so. And we support releasing documents in an appropriate fashion. And we support the democracy which now exists in Chile.

Paul?

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Okay, en Francais --

THE PRESIDENT: I've got to take a couple of the Americans -- go ahead. France, yes, go ahead.

Q Monsieur Clinton --

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Oh, the question is for Clinton -- (laughter.)

Q Mr. Clinton, I want to know if your meeting with Mr. Bouchard today is an indication of any change in U.S. policy towards Quebec sovereignty? And secondly, if Mr. Chretien asked you anything about that meeting today?

THE PRESIDENT: No, and, no. That's the short answer. PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Thank you. Next. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: The short answer, no and no. I did meet with him when he was in opposition about four years ago. He is the premier of the province. We're going there; he's the host; it's a courtesy and I think I should do it. But there has been no change in our policy, whatsoever.

Q First of all, Mr. President, are you going to meet Senator Helms' demand that you actually submit what you announced here today in writing? How badly has this hurt the United States --

THE PRESIDENT: I'm sorry, what --

Q Senator Helms' demand that you submit it in writing to him.

THE PRESIDENT: Submit what?

Q The CTBT -- I'm sorry -- the CTBT, the withdrawal of it in writing. He's asked for that. How badly has that hurt a U.S. leadership role in arms control? And what's the message from India where the world's largest democracy just overwhelmingly reelected the government that you criticized heavily for conducting nuclear tests?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think, first of all, if you look at India, you have to see the people voted for that government for all kinds of reasons. And what I believe is -- look, France conducted a nuclear test before they signed the treaty. What I believe is that the United States does not sign the treaty and

show a little leadership here, why should the Pakistanis and the Indians do it?

Ever since the end of World War II, and beginning with the election of Dwight Eisenhower, we have had a bipartisan commitment to leading the world away from proliferation. It has never been called into question until the present day. Never.

Now, we had to work for a very long time to get the Chemical Weapons Convention passed, which is very important. But Senator Helms and the others followed a legitimate process. I never had a doubt that the objections that they raised and the safeguards they wanted were absolutely heartfelt and serious. This treaty was never treated seriously. They took two years, had no time for hearings, said I'll give you eight days, and later we discovered -- after they said that, that that was offered only after they had 43 commitments on a party-line vote to vote against the treaty from people who hadn't heard a hearing and hadn't even thought about it -- most of them.

So they want me to give them a letter to cover the political decision they have made that does severe damage to the interest of the United States and the interest of nonproliferation in the world? I don't think so. That's not what this is about. They have to take responsibility for whether they want to reverse 50 years of American leadership in nonproliferation that the Republicans have been just as involved in as the Democrats, to their everlasting credit.

Now, they have to make that decision. I cannot bring this treaty up again unless they want to. I have asked them to put it off because we don't have the votes. I have talked to enough Republicans to know that some of them have honest, genuine reservations about this treaty, and they ought to have the opportunity to have them resolved, instead of being told that they owe it to their party to vote against the treaty and that the leadership of their party will do everything they can to keep us from writing safeguards into the treaty which answer their reservations, which is what we do on every other thing.

So I don't want to get into making this political. But they shouldn't tie the Senate up or themselves up in knots thinking that some letter from me will somehow obscure from the American people next year the reality that they have run the risk of putting America on the wrong side of the proliferation issue for the

first time in 50 years. And they want to do it and then they don't want to get up and defend it before the American people in an election year. That's what this whole thing is about. That is the wrong thing to do.

We don't have the votes. I'm not going to try to bring it up without the votes. Let them take it down, but also agree on a legitimate process to take this out of politics. I will not criticize them as long as they are genuinely working through the issues, the way we did in the Chemical Weapons Treaty.

They're entitled to advise and consent. They're entitled to take all the time they want. But nobody hit a lick at this for two years. And then they tried to get it up and down on grounds that were other than substantive, and that's wrong. And it's bad for America. It has nothing to do with me and my administration. I wouldn't care who got the thing ratified, as long as we did it in the right way.

Q On your throne speech next week, sir -- on your throne speech next week, do you see it as charting some kind of grand new course for the millennium? Or is it just more of the same? (Laughter.)

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Yes, it will be -- if Canada is considered as the best country in the world. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Are you sure he's not one of ours? (Laughter.)

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: You know, they're complaining because I keep telling them that Canada's been considered, Mr. President, as the best country in the world to live in. I'm sorry to tell you to that. (Laughter.) And I want to carry on in the 21st century with the same thing, and they say I have no vision. Imagine if I had a vision. (Laughter.) So you will see.

Q Mr. Chretien? Mr. Chretien?

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead. (Laughter.) I'm sorry. That was great.

Q You've been asked to sell oil from the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve to fight rising heating oil prices as the winter comes. Do you think this is a good

idea, and do you agree with Senator Schumer that OPEC has been engaged in price gouging, to raise the prices?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we should look at the reserve, and the question of whether, if we released some oil from it for sales, we could moderate the price some.

I think that the states in the Northeast, as you know, are unusually dependent upon home heating oil and, therefore, are the most sensitive to oil prices. But it's also true that the price of oil was historically low for a good long time. And it's made a modest rebound, now.

I'm grateful that it hasn't put any inflation in our economy and so far we can manage it. But we have to be sensitive to the people who are disproportionately affected by it. And I have not reached a decision yet, because I haven't been given a recommendation yet, about whether we could have any appreciable impact on the Americans that are most disproportionately affected.

One of the reasons we always fight hard for the LIHEAP program, apart from what the summertime can do to people all over America, is that we know these people in the Northeast have a problem that no other Americans have, with the impact of the oil prices. It hits them much, much harder. So we're looking at it.

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Thank you. Madame?

Q This morning you talked about rule of law, respect for rule of law being one of the fundamental principles Canada and the U.S. share. I am wondering, in that context, if the President could tell us what he thinks of Mr. Bouchard saying that Quebec could secede without regard to the Canadian Constitution, or the Supreme Court ruling last year, which said they must have a clear majority vote yes and a clear question. Would the U.S. ever recognize a sovereign Quebec under those circumstances?

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: I think that it's for me to reply. I think that the rule of law will apply to Canada. We have a judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, which said very clearly that the question has to be clear and the majority has to be clear. And if there is a clear will expressed, then only

after that, that negotiations could start.

So the rule of law will be applied. The question will have to be clear, and the majority will have to be clear. And I know that if they have a clear question, the President of the United States will never have to make a decision on that.

Q Excuse me. I would like to say something. You've had a lot of disasters lately, and so has the world. And I'm with Christian News, and I would like to ask you, have you thought that possibly this is a message from above that there is moral decay, that there is abortion, that there is violence? I was wondering if you had given it some thought.

THE PRESIDENT: Actually, I have. You know, we -- particularly because of all the millennial predictions. But I think the fact is that some of these natural disasters are part of predictable weather patterns, and the others have been predicted for more than a decade now by people who tell us that the climate is warming up. And I think that the real moral message here is that as we all get richer and use more of the resources God has given us, we're being called upon to take greater care of them. And I think that we have to deal seriously with the impact of the changing climate.

I was just in New Zealand at the jumping-off place for 70 percent of our operations in Antarctica, the South Pole, talking about the thinning of the polar ice cap there and the consequences it could bring to the whole world.

So I believe that insofar as these natural disasters are greater in intensity or number than previous ones, the primary warning we're getting from on high is that we have to keep -- to use the phrase of a person I know reasonably well -- we have to keep Earth in the balance. We have to respond to this in an appropriate way.

Yes.

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Okay. And that will be the last one.

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead.

Q Sir, you talked about the Republicans playing politics with this arms band treaty, or weapons testing ban treaty. Are you talking about normal partisan politics, just Republicans versus Democrats? Are you talking about the kind of politics where some Republicans -- maybe not a lot of them, but some will say, I'm sorry, Bill Clinton is for it, I feel so viscerally that I despise Bill Clinton, I'm not going to go along with something that he wants that much and I'm not going to give him a victory during his administration on something this important?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think that's what's going on. I mean, it might be, but I don't think so. That sounds like Wile E. Coyote and the Roadrunner, you know? (Laughter.) But I don't think that's what's going on.

I think you have the following things. I think you have -- I will say again -- you have some Republicans who have thought about this and listened to people who aren't for it and really believe it's not the right thing to do. I hate it when we have fights; we're always questioning other people's motives. There are people who genuinely aren't for this. I think they're dead wrong and I think it would be a disaster if their view prevailed, but I believe that's what they think.

Now, in addition to that, however, this process -- the Democrats were frustrated because for two years -- that's why I don't think the second part of your thing is right -- for two years they've been trying to bring this treaty up for a hearing, during which time we did ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention. And they could never even get hearings. So there was something about this thing that they didn't want to give hearings on.

So then the Democrats agreed to what they knew was a truncated hearing schedule -- almost no hearings -- and debate schedule, only to find that basically a sufficient number of votes in the Republican caucus had been locked down for reasons of party loyalty, whatever their motives were, from people who couldn't possibly know enough about the treaty right now to know they were against it on the merits.

Now, maybe it's they don't want some alleged victory to come to the administration during the pendency of the political season. Maybe that's it,

maybe not. My point is, I don't care about that. I don't care who gets credit for it. If they adopted it I'd be glad to say it was Trent Lott's triumph. It's six and one-half dozen of the other to me. What I want to do is to leave this country with a framework -- my country -- with a framework for dealing with the major security problems of the 21st century.

I believe that there will still be rogue states that want nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. I, furthermore, believe that there will be enemies of all nation states -- terrorist groups, organized criminals, drug runners -- who will be increasingly likely to have access to miniaturized, but powerful weapons of mass destruction. And what I would like to leave office doing is not getting credit for anything -- I don't give a rip who gets the credit for it. What I want is the Chemical Weapons Convention to be enforced, the Biological Weapons Convention to have teeth added to it so it actually means something, and this Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to be in place so at least we have a shot to reduce the number of nuclear states and the sophistication of their weapons and their ability to use them. That's the whole deal with me.

Because I think that our successors are going to have a whole lot of headaches from all these groups, and we need to minimize risk because as societies grow more open they'll be more vulnerable to being terrorized by people who have access to this. That's the whole deal with me. I don't care who gets credit for it, I just want there to be a framework for dealing with it.

So if they take more than a year to deal with this, if there is a legitimate process of working through, that's okay with me. If there is an emergency in the world where the rest of the world -- it looks like we're going to have 10 other people try to become nuclear powers, and they've had two months of hearings or three months of hearings, and I think there's some reason we ought to vote -- that goes back to your question -- I don't want to say on the front end, yes, I'll play the same political game, and no matter what, we won't vote next year, no matter what other developments we see on the Indian Subcontinent or in other places.

But this thing can't come up for a vote if they don't bring it up. And I'm not going to willfully try to get it up if I think it's going to get beat. That's the only thing I want to -- I'm sorry to bore our Canadian friends with a

discourse to American politics. And the other thing, the United States cannot afford to relinquish the leadership of the world in the cause of nonproliferation.

So if they want to strengthen the treaty, there are all kinds of vehicles through which we can do it. We do it on every other treaty. And if they want to take months, if they want to take a year -- whatever they need to take. Just play this straight. I'm not going to be out there -- there's no down side for them to playing it straight.

But I will not say in advance, no matter what -- no matter what happens in the world, no matter what unforeseeable development there is, no matter what other countries are about to do -- no matter what, I would not ask you to deal with this next year, because on the merits there might be a reason. If it's just politics, we won't, because I'm not going to bring it up if we can't win.

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Perhaps, Mr. President, I would like to add that when we were at the summit in Birmingham, and it was at the moment that India was about to do the experiment, and Pakistan was to follow, we were all extremely preoccupied about it. And it is a problem that concerns the world. And it's not only the United States -- everybody around the globe has a stake into that.

And, for me, I cannot agree more than the President that the leadership of the United States for the allies is extremely important. And keep up the good fight.

And, unfortunately, we have to go. Merci beaucoup. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

END

12:35 P.M. EDT

• •

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 9/24/99 6:46:16 PM

FROM Wasserman, Elaine P. (EXSEC)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Package 6702 - Response to Sen. Helms concerning POTUS' Meeting w/Chinese President Jiang Zemin [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Keith, James R. (ASIA)

CARBON_COPY Huso, Ravic R. (ASIA)
Keith, James R. (ASIA)
Lieberthal, Kenneth G. (ASIA)
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L. (ASIA)
Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)
Bartlett, L. June (EXSEC)
Bradtke, Robert A. (EXSEC)
Dejban, Donna D. (NSA)
Gire, Cynthia L. (EXSEC)
Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)
Hilliard, Brenda I. (EXSEC)
Jacobson, Tracey A. (ADMIN)
Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)
Matthews, Sonyia (ADMIN)
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)
Powell, Elliott (WHSR/EXSEC)
Sargeant, Stephen T. (EXSEC)
Wasserman, Elaine P. (EXSEC)

TEXT_BODY Hi Jim - Package 6702 was returned from upstairs with following notes from Jim Steinberg: Redo format; rebut "hastily arranged" charge, rebut "tilt."

Package with diskette being returned to you for redo.

Thanks, Elaine

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/5/99 9:44:02 PM
FROM Wasserman, Elaine P. (EXSEC)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Package 6702 - Letter to Senator Helms [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Keith, James R. (ASIA)

CARBON_COPY Huso, Ravic R. (ASIA)
Keith, James R. (ASIA)
Lieberthal, Kenneth G. (ASIA)
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L. (ASIA)
Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)
Bartlett, L. June (EXSEC)
Bradtke, Robert A. (EXSEC)
Dejban, Donna D. (NSA)
Gire, Cynthia L. (EXSEC)
Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)
Hilliard, Brenda I. (EXSEC)
Jacobson, Tracey A. (ADMIN)
Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)
Matthews, Sonyia (ADMIN)
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)
Powell, Elliott (WHSR/EXSEC)
Sargeant, Stephen T. (EXSEC)
Wasserman, Elaine P. (EXSEC)

TEXT_BODY Hi Jim - Subject package returned from upstairs with the following note: Back to Ken L. -- Needs to be redone. JS wants to discuss.

Package
with diskette being returned to you first A.M.

Thanks, Elaine

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/29/99 2:43:24 PM
FROM Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION BTW US &
IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF
DOUBLE TAXATION & PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC
[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)
Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)

CARBON_COPY Darnes, Victoria J. (RECORDS)
Ficklin, John W. (RECORDS)
Good, Travis C. (RECORDS)
Kaplan, Dean M. (RECORDS)
Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)
Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)
Porter, Pete (RECORDS)
Sanborn, Daniel R. K. (Records)
Starks, Tali T. (RECORDS)
Bartlett, L. June (EXSEC)
Bradtke, Robert A. (EXSEC)
Dejban, Donna D. (NSA)
Gire, Cynthia L. (EXSEC)
Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)
Hilliard, Brenda I. (EXSEC)
Jacobson, Tracey A. (ADMIN)
Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)
Matthews, Sonyia (ADMIN)
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)
Powell, Elliott (WHSR/EXSEC)
Sargeant, Stephen T. (EXSEC)
Wasserman, Elaine P. (EXSEC)

TEXT_BODY

Many thanks.

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

From: Marsh, Thomas S
(RECORDS)

Sent: Friday, October 29, 1999 2:33 PM

To: Shapiro,

Daniel B. (LEGIS); Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)

Cc: @WWD - West

Wing Desk; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
Subject: RE: Pkg 7519
- CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION BTW US & IRELAND FOR
AVOIDANCE OF
DOUBLE TAXATION & PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Sir

--

Treaty w/ transmittal letter has been faxed.

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

From: Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Sent: Friday, October
29, 1999 1:58 PM
To: Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS); Konrad, Elizabeth
M. (RECORDS)
Cc: @WWD - West Wing Desk
Subject: RE: Pkg 7519 -
CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION BTW US & IRELAND FOR
AVOIDANCE OF
DOUBLE TAXATION & PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC
[UNCLASSIFIED]

I

assume they will. Thanks.

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

From: Marsh,
Thomas S (RECORDS)
Sent: Friday, October 29, 1999 1:57 PM
To: Shapiro,
Daniel B. (LEGIS); Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)
Cc: @WWD - West
Wing Desk
Subject: RE: Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION
BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION &
PREVENTION OF
FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Sir --

This is the transmittal
letter for the treaty. They may want the treaty as well. I'll have
a copy on the next run.

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

From: Shapiro,

Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Sent: Friday, October 29, 1999 1:07 PM
To: Konrad,
Elizabeth M. (RECORDS); Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)
Cc: Shapiro,
Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Subject: RE: Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION
BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION &
PREVENTION OF
FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Tom -- Thanks for helping
me on this. Attached is what I got from Ed. Is there any other
part of this package? -- Dan

<< File: THE WHITE HOUSE.doc >>

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

From: Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)

Sent: Friday, October 29, 1999 12:51 PM
To: Shapiro, Daniel B.
(LEGIS)
Subject: RE: Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION
BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION &
PREVENTION OF
FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Dan-

I am leaving the West

Wing post at 1pm (for the day). Tom Marsh will be here to assist
you with that fax. Therefore, when Ed Exec Clerk forwards the package
to you, can you send it to Tom please? He will then fax it per your
request.

Also, since it will be coming in to you on an unclass system,
can you please send it to Tom via the Classified system as we do
not have unclass capability.

Thanks much,
Betsy

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

From: Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Sent: Friday, October
29, 1999 12:14 PM
To: Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS); @EUROPE -
European Affairs
Cc: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary; @LEGAL - Legal

Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @PRESS - Public Affairs;
@WWD - West Wing Desk
Subject: RE: Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING
CONVENTION BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE
TAXATION & PREVENTION
OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thank you for the good
news.

Sen. Helms' staff has requested that we fax them the transmittal
package today so they can get started working on it for their Committee
meeting next week. I would like to accommodate them. The fax would
go to Patti McNerney at 224-0836. Is this doable?

-----Original

Message-----

From: Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)

Sent: Friday,

October 29, 1999 11:17 AM

To: @EUROPE - European Affairs

Cc: @EXECSEC

- Executive Secretary; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @WWD - West Wing Desk

Subject: Pkg

7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION BTW US & IRELAND
FOR AVOIDANCE
OF DOUBLE TAXATION & PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Per

White House Exec Clerk's office, Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING
CONVENTION
BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION &
PREVENTION OF
FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME & CAPITAL
GAINS, was
signed by POTUS, dated & to be transmitted on Oct 29.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/29/99 1:57:25 PM

FROM Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT RE: Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION & PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)

CARBON_COPY Darnes, Victoria J. (RECORDS)
Ficklin, John W. (RECORDS)
Good, Travis C. (RECORDS)
Kaplan, Dean M. (RECORDS)
Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)
Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)
Porter, Pete (RECORDS)
Sanborn, Daniel R. K. (Records)
Starks, Tali T. (RECORDS)

TEXT_BODY Sir --

This is the transmittal letter for the treaty. They may want the treaty as well. I'll have a copy on the next run.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)

Sent: Friday, October

29, 1999 1:07 PM

To: Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS); Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)

Cc: Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)

Subject: RE: Pkg 7519

- CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION & PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Tom

-- Thanks for helping me on this. Attached is what I got from Ed.

Is there any other part of this package? -- Dan

<< File: THE
WHITE HOUSE.doc >>

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

From: Konrad,
Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)
Sent: Friday, October 29, 1999 12:51 PM
To: Shapiro,
Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Subject: RE: Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION
BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION &
PREVENTION OF
FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Dan-

I am leaving the West

Wing post at 1pm (for the day). Tom Marsh will be here to assist
you with that fax. Therefore, when Ed Exec Clerk forwards the package
to you, can you send it to Tom please? He will then fax it per your
request.

Also, since it will be coming in to you on an unclass system,
can you please send it to Tom via the Classified system as we do
not have unclass capability.

Thanks much,
Betsy

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

From: Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Sent: Friday, October
29, 1999 12:14 PM
To: Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS); @EUROPE -
European Affairs
Cc: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary; @LEGAL - Legal
Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @PRESS - Public Affairs;
@WWD - West Wing Desk
Subject: RE: Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING
CONVENTION BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE
TAXATION & PREVENTION
OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thank you for the good
news.

Sen. Helms' staff has requested that we fax them the transmittal
package today so they can get started working on it for their Committee
meeting next week. I would like to accommodate them. The fax would
go to Patti McNerney at 224-0836. Is this doable?

-----Original

Message-----

From: Konrad, Elizabeth M. (RECORDS)

Sent: Friday,

October 29, 1999 11:17 AM

To: @EUROPE - European Affairs

Cc: @EXECSEC

- Executive Secretary; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @WWD - West Wing Desk

Subject: Pkg

7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING CONVENTION BTW US & IRELAND
FOR AVOIDANCE

OF DOUBLE TAXATION & PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION ETC ETC
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Per

White House Exec Clerk's office, Pkg 7519 - CONVENTION AMENDING
CONVENTION

BTW US & IRELAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION &
PREVENTION OF

FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME & CAPITAL
GAINS, was

signed by POTUS, dated & to be transmitted on Oct 29.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 11/3/99 5:06:27 PM
FROM Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: POTUS Ltr to Lott re Holum [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)

CARBON_COPY DeRosa, Mary B. (LEGAL)
Allen, Charles A. (LEGAL)

TEXT_BODY Just added one comma to the letter.

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

From: Andreasen,
Steven P. (DEFENSE)
Sent: Wednesday, November 03, 1999 4:45 PM
To: @DEFENSE
- Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL -
Legal
Advisor
Subject: POTUS Ltr to Lott re Holum [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Please
clear asap ... want to move tonight. thanks. Steve.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Lott Holum mtb.doc

November 3, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL R. BERGER

THROUGH: HANS A. BINNENDIJK

FROM: STEVEN P. ANDREASEN

SUBJECT: Response to Lott on Holum

Attached is a response from the President to Senator Lott regarding John Holum's August trip to Moscow, received in final from State today, and cleared with Justice/OLC.

The NSC received the incoming correspondence on October 3.

Concurrence by: Lackey Krass

RECOMMENDATION

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

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Letter to Senator Lott

Tab B Letter from Senator Lott

1

7004

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT Lott Holum mtp.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Response to Senator Lott Regarding John Holum

Purpose

To respond to a letter from Senator Lott regarding John Holum.

Background

Senator Lott has written you raising concerns regarding John Holum's leading a delegation in Moscow in August to discuss START and ABM issues. The response from you notes that John's activities while pending confirmation have been conducted in close consultation with Department attorneys as to what activities are and are not permissible; were conducted pursuant to specific instructions from the Department's leadership; and do not depart from established practice. You conclude by encouraging prompt Senate action on John's nomination.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter to Senator Lott at Tab A.

Attachments

Tab A Letter to Senator Lott

Tab B Letter from Senator Lott

1

7004

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT Lott Holum Ltr.doc

Dear Mr. Leader:

Thank you for your letter regarding John Holum's meetings in Moscow in August to discuss the START and ABM Treaties.

The Administration shares your sensitivity to ensuring that the activities of persons awaiting confirmation are appropriate from both a legal and policy perspective, and Mr. Holum has gone to great lengths to do so. Mr. Holum has consulted closely with Department attorneys as to what activities are and are not permissible and has followed that advice scrupulously. In this case, the discussions in Moscow to which your letter refers were in fact quite limited. Their purpose was to clarify the positions of the two governments on the issues involved, and they were not considered by either side themselves to constitute negotiations between the two governments. All aspects of Mr. Holum's work in Moscow were undertaken in his role as Senior Adviser, and not in his capacity as Under Secretary-designate, and he undertook the discussions pursuant to specific instructions from the Department's leadership.

It is neither established practice nor a legal requirement that a person must be serving in an advice and consent position in order to lead a delegation meeting with representatives of a foreign government, whether to lead preliminary discussions - as in this case - or to actually conduct negotiations. Whether at the direct request of the Secretary of State or in the ordinary course of the Department's activities, individuals who are not confirmed regularly represent the United States by participating in or leading discussions in which they have a particular expertise.

I would be remiss not to take this opportunity to underscore the importance of the Senate's completing action on Mr. Holum's nomination at the earliest possible time. As your letter reflects, the Government deserves to have Senate-confirmed senior leadership on the job and available to provide politically-accountable answers. Congress and the Administration share an interest in having

the
consolidation of the foreign affairs agencies under the Foreign Affairs
Reform
and Restructuring Act begin on the strongest possible footing.

Until earlier this year, Mr. Holum served the country with distinction
in the
Senate-confirmed position of Director of the Arms Control and
Disarmament Agency
(ACDA). His circumstances thus differ significantly from those
typical of
persons nominated for new positions. The responsibilities of the
position to
which Mr. Holum has been nominated substantially overlap those of
his former
position. He no longer holds that position only due to its elimination
as part
of the consolidation in April of ACDA and the State Department
under the Foreign
Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act. The ACDA functions were
transferred under
that Act to the Secretary of State and, by subsequent delegation, to the
position
to which he has been nominated. Following hearings, Mr. Holum's
nomination was
favorably reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on
June 30, and has
awaited a floor vote since that time. The Senate Foreign Relations
Committee has
been informed in advance of Mr. Holum's travel.

Confirmation of this nominee will make a critical contribution to
ensuring the
success of the restructuring efforts on which Senator Helms and so
many in
Congress, as well as so many in my Administration, have worked so
hard. For all
the reasons stated above, I urge that the Senate move as quickly as
possible to
confirm my nomination of John Holum as Under Secretary of State
for Arms Control
and International Security.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Trent Lott
Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

2

2

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

003. email	Andrew Weiss to Anne Witkowsky. Subject: [Helms Letter] (3 pages)	11/05/1999	P1/b(1)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/20/1999-11/11/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5672

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	Anthony Blinken to Anne Witkowsky. Subject: RE: CFE Endgame Update. (3 pages)	11/05/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/20/1999-11/11/1999]

2006-1363-F
vz5672

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 11/8/99 11:51:01 AM
FROM Sutphen, Mona K. (NSA)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: BWC Allegation [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Harris, Elisa D. (NONPRO)
Storey, Sharon V. (NSA)

CARBON_COPY Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO)

TEXT_BODY

Elisa -

Sandy read this and writes: "I would like you to draft a strong letter of protest from me to the Secretary (copy to Holum). Their answer was non-responsive and evasive. They rejected our protest w/out even notice (on a matter directly affecting the NSC/WH). I would like to know (1) what, if any information they have which would preclude a straightforward "no" answer; (2) why they dismissed our objection w/out notice; (3) if your friend there, who as JH knows, has personally clashed w/a member of my staff was involved in preparing the response and (4) if there is any substantial reason I should not refer this matter to State IG."

He also cc'd Holum on this comment above, but I leave it to you and Gary to decide whether/how to communicate this to him. Call w/questions.

Mona

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

From: Harris,
Elisa D. (NONPRO)
Sent: Friday, November 05, 1999 5:47 PM
To: Storey,
Sharon V. (NSA); Sutphen, Mona K. (NSA)
Cc: Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO);
Harris, Elisa D. (NONPRO)
Subject: BWC Allegation [UNCLASSIFIED]

PLEASE
PASS TO SANDY ONLY:

We wanted to bring to your attention a very serious charge that has been leveled by the SFRC and how the State Department has responded to that charge.

Among the various questions for the record submitted by Senator Helms to Assistant Secretary Designate Avis Bohlen was the following:

"Is the Department aware of any actions by a White House or NSC official which are equivalent to conspiracy with a foreign nation, NATO ally or otherwise, to alter the interagency-coordinated position of the United States government on BWC matters? Please provide detail."

State's draft response, sent to our office for clearance on Monday, was:

"While on occasion there has been a lively debate within the Administration on the best way to proceed, I am confident that all participants in the process support the decisions that have been reached."

Gary and I believed that State's draft response was inadequate, in that it left the central and very serious charge of conspiracy by the NSC staff unanswered. We requested that State preface their response with a clear "no". Mark Tavlarides in NSC/Leg agreed with us, and spoke with State/H Monday evening about the importance of setting the record straight. On Tuesday morning, State sent the response forward unchanged.

In her confirmation hearing on Tuesday, Bohlen was asked about this issue again. We have received conflicting reports from State/H on her response, with some indicating that she stated that this was a "misrepresentation" and others saying that she expressed a lack of familiarity with the issue. We have asked State to send us the transcript as soon as it becomes available, but are told this could take several months. In the interim, because State rejected our proposed addition to their answer for the record, very serious charges against the NSC have been left standing.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 11/8/99 3:09:57 PM
FROM Harris, Elisa D. (NONPRO)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT berger bwc letter [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY gary: here is a draft for you to look at. we need to talk further about certain aspects of this before we send to sandy. tx!!

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT srbmkall-8.doc

Dear Madeleine:

I am writing to express my deep concern over the Department's recent handling of a question for the record submitted by Senator Helms to Assistant Secretary Designate Avis Bohlen. The question concerned the conduct of the NSC staff on Biological Weapons Convention Protocol matters. I believe that the Department's answer was non-responsive and evasive. Moreover, Department officials rejected NSC efforts to set the record straight without ever talking to the NSC staff concerned.

The specific question asked by Senator Helms, was: "Is the Department aware of

any actions by a White House or NSC official which are equivalent to conspiracy with a foreign nation, NATO ally or otherwise, to alter the interagency coordinated position of the United States government on BWC matters? Please provide detail."

State's draft response was: "While on occasion there has been a lively debate within the Administration on the best way to proceed, I am confident that all participants in the process support the decisions that have been reached."

My staff believed, and I agree, that this answer was inadequate, in that it left the central and very serious charge of conspiracy by the NSC staff unanswered. Both the relevant NSC policy office and the NSC legislative affairs office asked that State preface their answer with a clear and unequivocal "no". This was not done.

I would like to know the following:

1. What, if any, information State has that would preclude a straightforward "no" answer?
2. Why State officials dismissed the NSC's proposed addition without discussing the matter with the NSC staff concerned?
3. Whether Donald Mahley, the chief U.S. BWC negotiator, discussed this issue with anyone on the SFRC staff at any time and, if so, what specifically was discussed?
4. Whether Donald Mahley was involved in preparing or clearing the draft answer?
5. Whether there is any substantial reason why I should not refer this matter to the State Department Inspector General?

I would appreciate your prompt and personal attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Madeleine Albright
Secretary of State
Washington, DC

cc: John Holum
2

2

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
005. email	Kenneth Pollack to Christina Burrell, Miles Lackey, Daniel Shapiro, and Mark Tavlarides. Subject: POTUS Iraq Meeting. (15 pages)	11/11/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/20/1999-11/11/1999]

2006-1363-F
vz5672

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
006. email	Kenneth Pollack to Miles Lackey. Subject: FW: POTUS Iraq Meeting. (15 pages)	11/11/1999	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/20/1999-11/11/1999]

2006-1363-F
vz5672

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]