

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Presidential Materials Division

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. Email	Richard Socarides to Thomas M. Rosshirt (2 pages)	06/17/99	(b)(6)
002. Email	Thomas M. Rosshirt to Sandra Thurman (2 pages)	06/17/99	(b)(6)
003. Email	Richard Socarides to Elizabeth J. Potter, et al. (2 pages)	06/17/99	(b)(6)

COLLECTION:

Gore Vice Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]

OA/Box Number: 700000

FOLDER TITLE:

[AIDS, Africa, Drugs] [06/16/1999-06/30/1999]

2006-0003-F

SDB2

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).

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]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 12:06:53.00

SUBJECT:

TO: ziegler_jay@ustr.gov@INET@VAXGTWY (ziegler_jay@ustr.gov@INET@VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Guidance on AIDS/Drugs/South Africa

We respect the good intentions of those concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki -- inaugurated today as President of South Africa -- to combat the scourge of AIDS in Africa.

In the context of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission which they co-chair, Vice President Gore and President Mbeki have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of our knowledge and efforts on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.

The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them. That's why he has been encouraging the efforts of the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government, and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to the dispute over patent rights.

We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner, from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our research -- so that 20th century treatment can be replaced by a 21st century cure.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

14256981

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKN

34

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 12:56:55.00

SUBJECT: guidance on AIDS/Drugs/South Africa

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Guidance on AIDS/Drugs/South Africa

We respect the good intentions of those concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki -- inaugurated today as President of South Africa -- to combat the scourge of AIDS in Africa.

In the context of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission which they co-chair, Vice President Gore and President Mbeki have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of our knowledge and efforts on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.

The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them. That's why he has been encouraging the efforts of the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government, and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to the dispute over patent rights.

We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner, from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our research -- so that 20th century treatment can be replaced by a 21st century cure.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 16:01:30.00

SUBJECT: Re: no email

TO: Erica J. Barks-Ruggles (CN=Erica J. Barks-Ruggles/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Guidance on AIDS/Drugs/South Africa

We respect the good intentions of those concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki -- inaugurated today as President of South Africa -- to combat the scourge of AIDS in Africa.

In the context of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission which they co-chair, Vice President Gore and President Mbeki have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of our knowledge and efforts on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.

The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them. That's why he has been encouraging the efforts of the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government, and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to the dispute over patent rights.

We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner, from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our research -- so that 20th century treatment can be replaced by a 21st century cure.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 11:36:20.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We share the aims of those who are concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa, and in particular the availability of medicine. But they have more emotion than information. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki, inaugurated today as President of South Africa, to address the problem of AIDS in Africa.

They have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of its knowledge on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.

The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them.) all available means short of undercutting the patent system that leads to the development of those drugs in the first place. To abrogate patent rights that have led to treatment could undercut the funding that will help find a cure.

We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner) from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our search for a cure. So that the treatments of today will be replaced by the cure of tomorrow.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 12:06:18.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Laura M. Quinn (CN=Laura M. Quinn/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa B. Ratcliff (CN=Melissa B. Ratcliff/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher S. Lehane (CN=Christopher S. Lehane/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Guidance on AIDS/Drugs/South Africa

We respect the good intentions of those concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki -- inaugurated today as President of South Africa -- to combat the scourge of AIDS in Africa.

In the context of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission which they co-chair, Vice President Gore and President Mbeki have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of our knowledge and efforts on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.

The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them. That's why he has been encouraging the efforts of the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government, and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to the dispute over patent rights.

We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner, from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our research -- so that 20th century treatment can be replaced by a 21st century cure.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 19:12:14.00

SUBJECT: Re: samples

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hey there. Here is a draft of the questions. I am working on the answers. The Interviewer is Chris Bull. The Editor is Judy Weider. We confirmed the interview with her. Chris is the WDC correspondent. I will get you his # tomorrow.

DRAFT QUESTIONS: ADVOCATE INTERVIEW: July 24, 1999

1.) You announced your candidacy last week for President. How will Gore the Candidate be different on G/L Issues?

2.) What is your message to the Gay and Lesbian Community?

3.) What do you think are the important issues facing the G/L Community?

4.) Last year the President announced a policy on needle exchange that the Community strongly objected to. Do you agree with this position?

5.) You were heckled last week in Tennessee because of your position on AIDS Drugs in South Africa. Can you address this?

6.) What are your thoughts on Gay Marriage? Here in California?

7.) What is your position on Gay Adoptions?

There are too many children in the world that do not have a safe and secure place to call home. We must not let discrimination, bias or intolerance stand in the way of a child having the opportunity to be raised in a loving caring and stable home. All decisions regarding adoption, foster care, and placement of children should be decided by local officials in consultation with family members ---- not by legislative policy.

8.) The Administration has not implemented the DA/DT/ DP policy. What would you do to ensure service members right to privacy?

9.) What about service members who are HIV +?

10.) What is the outlook for Hate Crimes Legislation passing this session?

11.) What is the legislative outlook for ENDA?

11.) Congressman Barney Frank has introduced Federal Employee Partnership Benefits Legislation. Do you support this?

12.) What Domestic Partnership benefits do you support?

13.) Our community has seen a lot of difficulties with youth violence and teen suicide. What will your Administration offer Gay Youth ?

14.)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 14:15:40.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Erica J. Barks-Ruggles (CN=Erica J. Barks-Ruggles/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Guidance on AIDS/Drugs/South Africa

We respect the good intentions of those concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki -- inaugurated today as President of South Africa -- to combat the scourge of AIDS in Africa.

In the context of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission which they co-chair, Vice President Gore and President Mbeki have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of our knowledge and efforts on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.

The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them. That's why he has been encouraging the efforts of the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government, and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to the dispute over patent rights.

We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner, from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our research -- so that 20th century treatment can be replaced by a 21st century cure.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1999 16:01:09.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Erica J. Barks-Ruggles (CN=Erica J. Barks-Ruggles/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Guidance on AIDS/Drugs/South Africa

We respect the good intentions of those concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki -- inaugurated today as President of South Africa -- to combat the scourge of AIDS in Africa.

In the context of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission which they co-chair, Vice President Gore and President Mbeki have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of our knowledge and efforts on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.

The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them. That's why he has been encouraging the efforts of the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government, and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to the dispute over patent rights.

We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner, from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our research -- so that 20th century treatment can be replaced by a 21st century cure.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: JWright@osophs.dhhs.gov (Jason Wright) (JWright@osophs.dhhs.gov (Jason Wright) [OA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1999 12:44:15.00

SUBJECT: Vice President Gore and AIDS Drugs for Africa

TO: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: montoya_dc@al.eop.gov (montoya_dc@al.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (OPD)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thomas_m._rosshirt@ovp.eop.gov (thomas_m._rosshirt@ovp.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release

Contact:

Asia Russell: 215-426-0141 (before noon EST), 215-731-1844 x8,
215-838-2355 (pager)
Eric Sawyer: 212-864-5672

AIDS ACTIVISTS DISRUPT AL GORE'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDACY: PROTESTORS FROM "AIDS DRUGS FOR AFRICA" DEMAND GLOBAL
ACCESS TO ANTI-HIV DRUGS AND AN END TO VICE-PRESIDENT'S BULLYING OF
SOUTH AFRICA

Carthage, TN--Wednesday, June 16--AIDS activists disrupted Vice
President Al Gore's announcement of his presidential candidacy today
on the steps of the Smith County Courthouse. 15 protestors blew air
horns and chanted "Gore is killing Africans-AIDS drugs now" at the
moment of Gore's announcement, calling attention to the pivotal role
the Vice President has played in preventing HIV positive South
Africans from obtaining the drugs they need to survive.

Gore has been widely criticized for his central role in promoting
controversial US trade policy on South African and other developing
nations. AIDS activists and trade experts charge Gore with
prioritizing the profit motives of the pharmaceutical industry above
the needs of 22.5 million people living with AIDS in Africa, virtually
all of whom have no access to affordable medications.

"Al Gore's devout loyalty to the drug industry is literally costing
millions of lives," said Emily Winkelstein from AIDS Drugs for Africa,
the grassroots activist group that organized today's event.

Most people with AIDS in developing nations die of treatable,
preventable infections such as tuberculosis and pneumonia, because
medications are priced out of their reach, and out of the reach of
their domestic governments. The average annual income in South
African is US \$2600, while an estimated cost of one month's supply of
AIDS drugs is US \$1000.

South Africa and other developing countries have sought tools to
respond to the crisis in medication access, including "compulsory
licensing"--the granting of local licenses to produce generic
equivalents of patented medications when the public health is
threatened by lack of medication access. This practice could lower
drug prices as much as 90%. Compulsory licensing is legal under the
terms and conditions of current international trade agreements, and
includes provisions for royalties for the patent holder.

Gore has publicly threatened severe trade sanctions against South
Africa in response to the governments' efforts to enact a domestic law
to allow production of essential AIDS drugs through compulsory

licensing.

"At the expense of human life, Gore is protecting the multi-billion dollar drug industry he and his presidential campaign hope to benefit from. His actions against South Africa are morally reprehensible," said SharonAnn Lynch, an activist who confronted Gore today. "I am outraged that Gore is siding with the drug companies on an issue, where the moral imperative is clear: South Africans must be allowed to take the necessary steps to address the AIDS crisis in their nation."

20-26% of young adults are infected with HIV in most of southern Africa. In the South African military, 45% of ranks are living with HIV or AIDS.

"Gore has said that the international AIDS pandemic must be a top priority for developing nations as the Chair of the South African Bi-national Commission," said Anna Kramarsky, also of AIDS Drugs for Africa." And all the while he has been using his position to bully South African Deputy President Thabo Mbeki, threatening trade sanctions if the South African government dares respond to the needs of its millions of dying citizens."

"Developing nations are being faced with an unprecedented health emergency, and they must be allowed to use the range of tools available to them, including compulsory licensing of necessary drugs," said Mark Milano from AIDS Drugs for Africa.

"I am outraged that Gore is using his clout as the Vice President to squelch the life-saving efforts of the South African government," said Mel Stevens. "We will follow Gore every step of his campaign, until he stops doing the dirty work of the drug companies for them."

---END---

For more details, call 212-870-3303, or Eric Sawyer 212-864-5672
esawyer@igc.org and they'll talk to you and send you more
information.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Presidential Materials Division

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. Email	Richard Socarides to Thomas M. Rosshirt (2 pages)	06/17/99	(b)(6)

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Gore Vice Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]

OA/Box Number: 700000

FOLDER TITLE:

[AIDS, Africa, Drugs] [06/16/1999-06/30/1999]

2006-0003-F
SDB2

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 advise 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).

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]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1999 03:33:15.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hi. I'm in Paris w/ POTUS.
What is going on here. Is no one paying attention. This will get worse
for you guys.

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 06/17/99
03:30 AM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com
06/16/99 12:44:00 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides
cc:
Subject: NC10383: Bulletin

Rex comments: Excellent! The refusal to either sell these drugs cheap in
the Third World or to let Third World countries make them generically is
completely unconscionable. (b)(6)

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 12:03:12 -0400
From: Ann Northrop <annnorth@earthlink.net>
To: rwockner@netcom.com
Subject: bulletin!

Rex!

I'm dashing off to do my cable show, but you should know that seven AIDS
activists just interrupted Gore's presidential announcement speech in
Carthage TN. The 7, plus 2 doing support, went down there from New York.
They blew air horns, yelled "Gore kills Africans--AIDS drugs now" and held
up signs (bright yellow with black letters pasted over blue Gore signs)
saying AIDS Drugs for Africa and Gore's Greed Kills.

All this is because Gore went to South Africa and, in closed meetings,
threatened them with severe trade sanctions if they went ahead with their
legal plan to manufacture their own versions of AIDS drugs at cheap
prices. Gore and Clinton are propping up drug company profits so Gore can
get campaign contributions. It's ugly.

For more details, call 212-870-3303 and they'll talk to you and send you a
press release.

xxann

Ann Northrop <annnorth@earthlink.net>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1999 09:34:14.00

SUBJECT: call me!

TO: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

All this is because Gore went to South Africa and, in closed meetings, threatened them with severe trade sanctions if they went ahead with their legal plan to manufacture their own versions of AIDS drugs at cheap prices. Gore and Clinton are propping up drug company profits so Gore can get campaign contributions. It's ugly.

The above excerpt from an email -- which you sent me -- is typical of the prevailing view "out there."

These are the most reckless, irresponsible characterizations of Gore's actions and positions

I have heard since I arrived two years ago. Even the most hostile Republicans have more respect for the facts.

I have been working all week with the Washington Post and TIME Magazine to get an accurate story on this -- and spent much of yesterday giving a point by point rebuttal to the reporters who called.

I have also been working on a broad plan with Sandy to get the facts out -- but it's astonishing how easily and unquestioningly people accept this. (You could see it in the e-mail exchange you just sent me.)

We need your help. When are you back here?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Erica S. Lepping (CN=Erica S. Lepping/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1999 12:14:37.00

SUBJECT: today's press guidance

TO: Cathy R. Mays (CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Clay Reed (CN=Clay Reed/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mindy E. Myers (CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dominique L. Cano (CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy (CN=Ann C. Hertelendy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aprill N. Springfield (CN=Aprill N. Springfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger (CN=Jim Kohlenberger/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lynn G. Cutler (CN=Lynn G. Cutler/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda B. Costello (CN=Brenda B. Costello/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Courtney M. Manning (CN=Courtney M. Manning/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joel Johnson (CN=Joel Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark C. Sheppard (CN=Mark C. Sheppard/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Erica S. Lepping (CN=Erica S. Lepping/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@VAXGTWY (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD@VAXGTWY @ VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (CN=Patrick E. Briggs/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BERNSTEIN_MJ@A1@CD@VAXGTWY (BERNSTEIN_MJ@A1@CD@VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie B. Goldberg (CN=Julie B. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Teague (CN=James M. Teague/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis (CN=Mark D. Neschis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (CN=Julianne B. Corbett/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Denver R. Peacock (CN=Denver R. Peacock/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Vandivier (CN=David Vandivier/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David W. Beier (CN=David W. Beier/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jocelyn A. Bucaro (CN=Jocelyn A. Bucaro/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto (CN=Maria E. Soto/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mckenzie K. Davis (CN=Mckenzie K. Davis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry (CN=Marsha E. Berry/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neal Lane (CN=Neal Lane/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Fred DuVal (CN=Fred DuVal/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adriene K. Elrod (CN=Adriene K. Elrod/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP@EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: OLCOTT_E@A1 (OLCOTT_E@A1 @ CD @ VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LEAVY_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP (LEAVY_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nathan B. Naylor (CN=Nathan B. Naylor/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CROWLEY_P@A1 (CROWLEY_P@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK_N@A1 (WOZNIAK_N@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa B. Ratcliff (CN=Melissa B. Ratcliff/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen C. Burchard (CN=Karen C. Burchard/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Press Guidance

Thursday, June 17, 1999, A.M. edition, EDT, P.M. edition, Local Time

Domestic/Economic

1. Guns
2. Lamb Imports
3. Lockbox
4. Medicare
5. Nominations -- and see POTUS letter to Lott
6. Steel
7. VP

Foreign

Kosovo

1. Kosovo (updated)
2. Russia / Kosovo (updated)
3. Humanitarian

**Guns/Juvenile Crime
Questions and Answers
June 17, 1999**

Q: Yesterday, the House passed some tough measures to crack down on juvenile crime, including a McCollum amendment to prosecute 14 year-olds as adults, and increase penalties for kids who bring guns to school. Do you support the bill so far?

A: Since the House is continuing to vote on a wide range of amendments today on the juvenile crime bill, it's a bit premature to say where we are on the whole bill at this time. As you know, the Administration supports a comprehensive approach to addressing the problem of youth crime and violence. Which is why the President has taken the lead in addressing youth violence on all fronts – from the media to the gun industry to parental responsibility.

We support the base juvenile crime bill (H.R. 1501), a bipartisan bill that promotes graduated sanctions for youthful offenders and provides needed resources to states to combat and prevent juvenile crime. We also support the Conyers substitute, which reauthorizes our COPS program and gives communities additional tools they need to take a comprehensive approach to keep kids and neighborhoods safe. However, we do have some concerns with particular provisions of the McCollum amendment that would treat certain juveniles prosecuted in the federal system too harshly by failing to provide needed safeguards for younger juveniles, and juveniles who are charged with less serious crimes. We will work with the Congress to address on these concerns as the bill proceeds.

Q: Two of the gun amendments the House will consider would repeal longstanding D.C. law banning handgun possession. Do you have a position on these amendments?

A: As Chief Ramsey stated yesterday, these amendments would present serious safety problems not only for District residents, but for police officers as well. As crime trends are finally beginning to reverse in the District, it would be ill-advised to make it easier – not harder -- for violent people to gain access to guns, and put citizens at greater risk. We hope the amendments will be defeated in the House, and there appears to be some bipartisan agreement to do so.

Q: What do expect will happen on today's gun show votes?

A: We believe it will be a close vote. As you know, the President strongly supports the McCarthy/Roukema amendment – the only amendment that will actually close the gun show loophole once and for all. The President and the Administration are working very

closely with the backers of the bipartisan McCarthy amendment to help secure the votes necessary to pass this measure which we believe will help save lives. The other two gun show amendments fall short of closing the loophole, and in some instances, open up dangerous new loopholes. Just to give you one example, the FBI estimates that the time limits on background checks contained in the other two sham gun show amendments would have resulted in between 9,000 and 17,000 criminals or other prohibited purchasers getting guns if the same time limits were applied to current background checks conducted by the NICS. Allowing more criminals to get guns defies common sense. The House should put the public safety interest of the American people over the clout of the gun lobby and pass the McCarthy-Roukema amendment.

Q: The NRA and certain Republicans charge that under the your Administration, federal gun prosecutions are significantly down, and almost no cases have been brought against students for bringing a gun to school. They believe that more enforcement of existing laws is needed instead of new gun control laws. What is your response?

A: Although Republicans and the NRA like to say that so-called "Triggerlock" prosecutions are down, and my administration has failed to prosecute kids for bringing guns to school, that's simply not the real story on federal firearms prosecutions. The truth is that:

(1) The laws have succeeded in deterring gun crime. The federal laws cited by the NRA have relatively small penalties and were enacted primarily for their deterrent effect on crime and weapons-carrying by criminals and young people. Put simply, they are intended to stop guns from getting into the hands of criminals and juveniles, and the evidence shows they are doing so. Crime rates are down nationwide, and gun-related crime -- particularly by youth -- is down dramatically: homicides, robberies, and aggravated assaults committed with gun are down by an average of 27 percent. This is in part because these laws have stopped over a quarter million felons, fugitives, and prohibited users from buying guns in the first place.

(2) Federal prosecutions of serious gun crimes have gone up. At the federal level, we have focused on the most serious gun crimes, and prosecution of these crimes is up during this Administration. Prosecutions of gun criminals serving sentences of five years or more have increased by fully 30 percent.

(3) Overall firearms prosecutions of serious gun criminals are up. Combined state and federal prosecution of gun offenses is up during this Administration, in large part because of improved coordination and sensible allocation of resources. About 25 percent more criminals currently are sent to prison for state and federal weapons offenses than in 1992. In many cases, state prosecutions make more sense because criminals may be subject to longer sentences in the state court system.

(4) Tough talk is cheap. Despite its rhetoric, time and again, the gun lobby has opposed efforts to provide real money to state, local, and federal law enforcement agencies to investigate, arrest, and prosecute gun criminals and illegal gun traffickers. Over the past two years, we have called for more resources to enforce our gun laws on every front -- requesting tens of millions of dollars

to hire over 280 new ATF agents and over 40 new federal prosecutors, as well as more than a billion dollars to hire more local police and prosecutors.

(5) Enforcement alone is not enough. While we support increased resources for federal enforcement and prosecutions, enforcement alone is simply not enough. It is essential to prevent criminals and kids from getting guns in the first place. The Brady Law has stopped over a quarter of a million felons, fugitives, and stalkers from getting handguns, preventing countless crimes. That is why I am urging the Congress to enact my proposals to prevent guns from falling into the hands of children and felons.

Q: Recently on *Good Morning America*, the President said he would support requiring gun owners to register their guns. Why didn't the President propose this earlier? Is this something you are going to push for as the Congress considers gun legislation?

A: Last April, the President proposed the most comprehensive gun legislation put forward by any Administration in 30 years. We are pleased that the Senate passed a number of the President's proposals, including requiring background checks at gun shows and mandating safety locks for handguns. But we will push the House to move still further forward on gun legislation by passing additional measures proposed by the President, such as raising the handgun age from 18 to 21 and requiring background checks for explosives purchases.

As the President indicated this morning, we do not intend to pursue gun registration in the context of the legislation currently under consideration by the Congress, and we will not introduce such legislation. The President made very clear that we are focused on the common sense steps we can take now to keep guns out of the hands of kids and criminals. We cannot allow the Congress to buckle under NRA pressure and delay or undermine passage of the sensible measures the President has proposed to help save lives. And if the Congress fails to pass the measures contained in President's bill, we will continue to keep the pressure on Congress to do so.

**Lamb Imports
June 14, 1999**

Q: Why is the President's 201 decision on lamb still held up?

A: This is a complex issue. The President and the Administration are continuing to review various options. We will announce a decision when that decision has been made. [We expect to make an announcement soon/tomorrow.]

Q: Isn't there a statutory deadline with regard to this decision?

A: There is a statutory period in which we do try to make these decisions. However, going a day or two beyond that won't have any impact on the President's authority to go forward with whatever relief he decides is appropriate.

Q: So, you're saying you don't expect any legal consequences associated with the delay in making this decision?

A: We don't expect any.

Lockbox
June 17, 1999

Question: Speaker Hastert has criticized Senate Democrats for blocking the Republican Social Security Lockbox bill. What is the Administration's position on the Senate Republican Lock Box plan?

Answer: We support Senate Democrats in their efforts to improve the bill. It's our understanding that the Senate Republican leadership has refused to allow amendments that will help protect and preserve Medicare. We hope that the Senate will allow those amendments to be considered.

The President is committed to protecting Social Security and Medicare. In his State of the Union address, the President framed the national debate with a budget proposal based on core principles. He called for dedicating the new surplus to a lock box that would lower the nation's debt and extend the solvency of both Social Security and Medicare.

The House-passed proposal was a positive step because it adopted the President's call to dedicate the surplus to debt reduction. But it fell short of the President's overall framework because it does not adopt his other core principles -- it does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security or Medicare, and in fact would permit much of the surplus to be used first for a tax cut rather than Social Security or Medicare first.

The current design of the proposal risks the possibility of exacerbating an economic downturn and needs to be changed. The proposal must also do more ensure that the money it sets aside for debt reduction today will actually be used for this purpose tomorrow. While the proposal is consistent with paying down the debt held by the public, it does nothing to ensure that the benefits of this debt reduction go to the Social Security and Medicare programs.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON MEDICARE REFORM

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Q: Now that you can get to 2020 solvency without using all of the 15 percent of the surplus, are you now going to use some of the surplus for prescription drugs?

A: I have proposed to dedicate 15 percent of the surplus to strengthen the Medicare program. I believe a new prescription drug benefit should be included as part of, not independent from, a broader set of reforms for the Medicare program. We will announce the details of the financing when I unveil my proposal sometime this month.

FOLLOW-UP

Q: Are you denying that some of the surplus will be used for prescription drugs in the President's proposal?

A: I am not going to go into any details about Medicare reform until I make my own decisions, which will be after I return from my trip.

Q: Can you confirm that your prescription drug benefit will be between \$10 and \$25 , as reported in today's *New York Times*?

A: I am not going to discuss details on this or any other aspect of my Medicare reform proposal other than to say that this story is wrong. It would be impossible to provide for a meaningful benefit for a \$10 premium without a fiscally imprudent expenditure of Federal dollars. As has been indicated by members of my staff previously, we are designing the Medicare prescription drug benefit to be significantly less costly than what is available in the Medigap market – about \$90 per month.

Q: What will the design of the drug benefit be? How will it be financed and administered?

A: We are not releasing any information on the design of the drug benefit or any other aspect of our Medicare reform proposal. There are still final policy decisions that need to be made, and no one in the Administration will release this or any aspect of the reform proposal until I make my announcement, which will be the end of this month.

Q: Is anyone in the Administration attempting to pressure the Medicare actuary to produce savings projections?

A: Such a suggestion is ridiculous. No one in this Administration has or would pressure the Medicare actuary to do anything. Rick Foster is respected throughout the Administration, the Congress, and the health policy and academic community.

Q: What are the secret documents mentioned in the *New York Times* story today, and do they outline the design of your drug benefit?

A: The documents that appear to have been cited in this story are materials that have been produced as background information on the need for a prescription drug benefit and recent trends in coverage. They have been available to the media, the Congress, and throughout the Administration for a number of weeks. They are not secret, and they do not provide any information about the design or cost or administration of the drug benefit.

Q: The Breaux-Thomas proposal did not provide a prescription drug benefit to all beneficiaries because over 60 percent of beneficiaries already have some form of coverage. Won't your proposal replace private sector dollars with a large government subsidy?

A: No. We know that today, over 15 million Medicare beneficiaries do not have prescription drug coverage at all, and we know that millions more will lose their coverage as private insurance becomes more expensive and less accessible. This comes at a time when prescription drugs have never been more important to basic health care. For this reason, my drug proposal will be available and affordable to all Medicare beneficiaries.

Q: How do you reconcile a brand new entitlement with the need to constrain the growth of the Medicare program?

A: It's widely acknowledged by conservatives and progressives alike that you cannot modernize the Medicare program without including a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Prescription drugs today are as important as hospital care was when Medicare was created. This can be done in a way so that both the government and beneficiaries share the cost. It also would take advantage of private sector management approaches that can constrain the cost of purchasing these needed medication without the use of price controls. This benefit will be fully financed in my overall Medicare reform plan.

PLAN CONTENT

Q: You've indicated that you want to modernize the program and make it more competitive. Does that mean that your proposal will include a premium support mechanism (or a similar provision) ?

A: We need to inject more competition into the Medicare program, for both the traditional fee-for-service program as well as the managed care plans serve beneficiaries. As we have mentioned, we believe that the premium support proposal advocated by Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas suffers from serious flaws, including consequence of higher premiums for the traditional program. We support competition based on choice, not based on the financial coercion that results from these higher traditional program premiums. We do need to inject more market oriented approaches into the Medicare

program, and we are reviewing the best options to achieve that goal while still protecting beneficiaries from excessive increases in out-of-pocket costs.

Q: How do you respond to the GAO and CBO's contention that your proposal to dedicate some of the surplus to Medicare does not represent real reform?

A: I believe that preparing the Medicare program for the next century will require both additional revenue and reforms to make the program more competitive. In the State of the Union, I set out a plan to provide the program with the necessary new funds and proposed working on a bipartisan basis to develop appropriate reforms. I believed that it was appropriate to await the recommendations of the Commission before proposing specific reforms. Now that the Commission has reported its recommendations, it is incumbent on me to submit my own proposal to modernize and strengthen the program, and as I have previously indicated, I plan on doing that in short order.

Q: Doesn't the recent Trustees Report eliminate the pressure to reform Medicare?

A: Absolutely not. Medicare reform is both about solvency and about making Medicare more efficient, equitable, and adequate in terms of benefits. Our successful stewardship of Medicare does not diminish the future challenges facing the program. Under any scenario, enrollment in Medicare will climb from 39 million to 47 million in 2010, and to 80 million by 2035. We must modernize and strengthen the Medicare program by making it more competitive and instituting the best market-oriented practices of the private sector, and as we have previously indicated, my plan will do just that.

PROVIDER CUTS IN REIMBURSEMENT

Q: Providers have been stating that the cuts in provider reimbursement in the Balanced Budget Act went too far and undermine their ability to provide quality care. Are you going to address this issue in your Medicare reform package?

A: We have consistently said if there is evidence that the Balanced Budget Act Medicare provider payment reductions threaten quality, access, and the ability of providers to deliver needed services, we would be open to considering changes to smooth out this legislation. We are currently evaluating all available evidence on this matter. If we determine there are problems, we will seriously consider administrative and/or legislative options to address these problems.

Q: Will your Medicare proposal include an income related premium?

A: No final decisions about this or any other aspect of the Medicare reform package has been made. Having said this, I have historically indicated an openness to considering this structural reform (in 1992, during the campaign; in 1993, during the Health Security Act; and in 1997, in discussions with Congress on the BBA). But, like any other provision of the Medicare reform package, I will view this in the context of the broader set of reforms before making any final decision.

GUIDANCE ON HORMEL/RECESS APPTS
JUNE 16, 1999

Q: What is the Administration's reaction to Inhofe lifting his holds on administration nominations?

A: We are glad that the Senate will now responsibly move on to the important business of confirming Administration appointments. We continue to emphasize that appointees should not be held hostage because one Senator is unhappy with one appointment.

Q: Why did the President take the step of recess appointing James Hormel?

A: The President believes that Mr. Hormel is uniquely qualified to serve in this position.

He has the strong support of Secretary Albright and former Republican Secretary of State George Schultz. He was supported by an overwhelming majority of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and his nomination was favorably voted out of that committee. An overwhelming majority of Senators have supported his nomination -- more than 60 -- and had the Senate provided him a vote, he would have been confirmed. The Government of Luxembourg "welcomed" his nomination.

The only reason he has been denied an up or down vote in the Senate is because a few senators objected to his nomination because he is gay. The President thinks that this is wrong and discriminatory.

It is not too late for the Senate to give Mr. Hormel the up-or-down vote he deserves, and we think they ought to do it, as a matter of basic fairness.

Q: But didn't Senator Byrd do the same thing when he was Minority Leader in 1985 and the President was Reagan?

A: No. First, there is absolutely no comparison between President Reagan's, and for that matter, President Bush's use of the recess appointment authority and that of President Clinton. Mr. Hormel was President Clinton's 58th recess appointment. President Reagan made 239 recess appointments. And President Bush in only four years made 78, substantially more than President Clinton.

Second, Senator Byrd did not hold appointments hostage. He did not hold up appointments. He was dealing with a President who made wholesale use of recess appointments and was not consulting or notifying the Senate before he did so. So Senator Byrd made a complaint and worked out an agreement under which he would be notified of recess appointments before they took place.

The fact is, we already do that. We notify the Majority Leader before we make a recess appointment, and we did so in the case of Mr. Hormel.

Finally, Senator Byrd's complaint was that President Reagan was routinely circumventing the Senate's confirmation role. We're not doing that. We want the Senate to act. We want them to vote up or down. If we don't have a majority in support of a nominee, the Senate has a right to vote him down. But they are obliged to vote.

The fact is, the Foreign Relations Committee acted on this nomination nearly two years ago. We did not circumvent the process, they did.

Q: Did you notify any other Republicans?

A: We notified the appropriate leaders, and that included Senator Lott.

Lepping/Johnson, etc.

Steel
June 17, 1999

Q: What is Admin position of Roth steel legislation approved by Finance Committee yesterday?

A: Generally constructive approach. Strong enforcement of trade laws, and strong WTO consistent trade laws, best way to address steel import surge.

Admin strategy of vigorous trade law enforcement has been effective. Steel surge has been turned back. Overall steel imports below pre-crisis levels in first four months of this year.

Surge has shown room for strengthening of our section 201 import safeguard law in WTO consistent manner. We are prepared to work with Congress on legislation we can recommend the President sign.

FYI: Final April steel numbers to be released today by Commerce. Will need to update numbers. Had only April prelim's till today. First four-month import statement above still holds.

Deputy USTR Richard Fisher and Commerce Assistant Secretary LaRussa will represent the Administration at the Finance Committee mark up Wednesday morning at 10:00.

Proposed Talking Points

The Administration firmly opposes steel quota legislation, and believes vigorous enforcement of our trade laws is the best way to address the steel surge and unfair trade practices affecting our steel industry.

Through the Administration's strategy of vigorous trade law enforcement, overall steel imports are in the first four months of this year now below pre-crisis levels. The surge has been eliminated. We will remain vigilant against unfair trade practices.

The crisis has shown, however, that there is room for strengthening of our trade laws. The Administration believes that the Levin-Houghton, Roth and Baucus-Levin steel proposals are generally constructive, and we are prepared to work with Congress on legislation we can recommend that the President sign.

Specifically, we are supportive of Section 201 law reform that is W TO consistent, and have provided specific ideas in this regard. We would be concerned about changes that would limit the President's discretion to act in the overall national interest.

We have some concerns about the Section 301 provisions of the Roth proposal, but again, are prepared to work with Congress on this.

We strongly oppose measures that would limit the Commerce Department and Administration's discretion to enter into suspension agreements in the context of antidumping or countervailing duty trade cases.

**Vice President
June 17, 1999**

Language from Lockhart 6-16 briefing:

Q Do you have any information on what the President's thoughts are as Al Gore declares for president?

MR. LOCKHART: I think, very obviously and clearly, the President values the relationship and the incredible work that the Vice President has done over the last seven years as his partner. He has been at the forefront of the economic recovery, of the reinventing government, our commitment to education, our foreign policy and our commitment to the environment. These are all areas that the Vice President has played an enormous role in, and I think will stand to his credit as he stands up today.

I think, also, the President believes that it's time for the President to get out and make the case, let the country know who he is, where he wants to take the country. And he takes an important first step on that journey today.

Q Does that mean even if Gore wants to separate himself from the President's agenda?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the President's agenda on things like the economy, education, the environment will prove to be a very successful platform for the Vice President to run from.

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

June 17, 1999 Local Evening Edition / June 17, 1999 EDT Morning Edition

EUROPE/RUSSIA

Kosovo (updated)

Russia / Kosovo (updated)

Kosovo / Humanitarian

Kosovo / China (updated)

G-8 Summit

France / Religious Sects

NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA

India – Pakistan / Kashmir Fighting

India – Pakistan / Sanctions

Iraq / Security Council Resolutions

Iraq / Car Bombing (new)

Iran / Arrest of Jews

Usama Bin Ladin

ASIA

Korea / Naval incident (updated)

AFRICA

AIDS/Drugs / South Africa

INTELLIGENCE

PFIAB Report

How is Serb compliance?

- Serb pullout is substantial. Above 35000 VJ and MUP are out of Kosovo, along with 110 tanks, 210 APCs, and 151 artillery and mortar pieces.
- This leaves about 11000 in Kosovo.
- Zone 1 in the south is almost entirely evacuated. Zone 2
- While Serb forces have made a sincere effort to comply with the MTA timetable, a few forces do remain in Zone 1 because of logistic problems and congestion on the roads. Consequently, some units in Zone one were given an extra 24 hours to withdraw.
- This should not delay compliance for much more than a day and did not otherwise affect the agreed timetable.

What is the status of KFOR's deployment?

- KFOR deployment is on schedule. About 15000 Allied troops have entered, including 3800 Americans.
- KFOR Forward HQ is now fully established in an ex-factory site in the western part of Pristina. Gen. Jackson chose it because it is reasonably central and has good facilities.
- American forces have moved into their sector and are setting up their command force. They have relieved the French who have moved north into their sector.

What is going on with the Russian force in Kosovo?

- President Clinton had good conversations with President Yeltsin Sunday and Monday on Russian participation in implementing the Kosovo peace settlement. Agreed on a process to address issues.
- As part of that process, Secretary of Defense Cohen is meeting Russian Defense Minister Sergeyev in Helsinki now to discuss longer-term issues of Russian participation in implementing the Kosovo peace settlement. Focus is on finding a formula for Russian participation in KFOR that preserves unity of command and effectiveness of the mission.
- Have made progress in these talks, which are continuing. Cohen and Sergeyev are to meet again Thursday.

- Secretary of State Albright is going tonight to Helsinki to meet with Foreign Minister Ivanov to reinforce those discussions.
- “Long-term” discussions are addressing principles, such as unity of command under KFOR commander, that will facilitate discussions on short-term issues.
- General Jackson and General Zavarzin focused on short-term issues in Pristina. Had constructive talks yesterday, but still more to be done.
- Confident that we have established the right communications channels. Will keep working.
- There is an understanding that we need to continue to move forward with finalizing arrangements for Russian participation in KFOR and that it is in the best interest of implementation to have Russia and other non-NATO countries participate in KFOR.

What about a Russian Sector?

- We have spoken clearly on this issue, we will not accept an arrangement that would amount to the de facto partition of Kosovo. That is not to say that Russian will not play a meaningful role or will not have a zone or area of operation.
- Have made clear that Russian participation is welcome. Russia can play an important role in creating a safe and secure environment on the ground. Early agreement on terms for Russian participation important for building confidence.

Is the President seeking further clarification on the premature deployment of Russian troops into Kosovo?

- Our main concern is that we continue to work towards an agreement on Russian participation that is consistent with NATO’s efforts, sanctioned by the U.N., to fully implement the basic conditions: complete withdrawal of Serb forces; deployment of KFOR; the return of refugees; and a level of self-government and autonomy for the Kosovars.
- Clearly, we would also want to avoid further mistakes or misunderstandings. However, it is important to note that the Russian troop presence did not disrupt KFOR’s deployment nor affect the Serbs’ withdrawal.

What do you mean, weren’t you planning to use the airfield as the headquarters for KFOR?

- As General Clark has said, Pristina airfield was not meant to be used in the early stages of KFOR’s deployment. It is not a strategically important site. That said, of course, we want to work out suitable arrangements with the Russian presence there.

What is your reaction to the Russian deception of promising not to send troops into Kosovo, and then sending them anyway?

- Clearly, this miscommunication is unfortunate.
- Our understanding is that President Yeltsin gave the general orders to participate in KFOR and left the implementation up to the military to decide. The small advance party that was sent into Kosovo is not militarily significant.
- We have had numerous discussions with Russian officials on this. The bottom line remains that the Russians' arrival in Pristina in no way interfered with KFOR's deployment or Serb withdrawal.
- Meanwhile, talks are proceeding to develop workable arrangements for Russian participation in KFOR.

What about the KLA, will they demilitarize?

- We are in contact with the KLA and they remain committed to live by their agreement and to demilitarize consistent with Rambo.

What is the Status of Assistance Efforts?

- UN reports that over 50 trucks with food and other humanitarian goods arrived in Pristina yesterday.
- Additional convoys today.
- These goods will be distributed to outlying areas as KFOR establishes presence in those areas.

Background: President Clinton said in Paris today that he “hope[s] and believe[s] they will reach a successful conclusion” to the talks on Russian participation in KFOR. Yeltsin announced on TV that he had instructed Sergeyev to insist on a Russian sector. Secretary of Defense Cohen continues to meet with his counterpart, Defense Minister Sergeyev, to discuss the issue; Secretary Albright and Foreign Minister Ivanov also arrived to participate in talks.

What is the situation with Kosovo and the Russian troops?

- Secretary of Defense Cohen and Minister of Defense Sergeyev continuing discussions in Helsinki to work out a formula for Russian participation in KFOR. Secretary of State Albright and Foreign Minister Ivanov have joined them in Helsinki.
- As President Clinton said in Paris, hope and believe these talks will reach a successful conclusion. Atmosphere positive.
- Confident that we have established the right communications channels. Will keep working.

What about Yeltsin’s TV statement that Russia insists on its own sector in Kosovo? Since Albright said US will not give the Russians a zone, doesn’t that mean the talks are at a stalemate?

- Aware of Russian position. This is a key issue under discussion.
- As President Clinton said, all peacekeeping forces in Kosovo must operate under a single, unified command. Have also said we will not accept de facto partition of Kosovo. That is not to say that Russian will not play a meaningful role or will not have a zone or area of operation.
- Discussions continuing on this issue. Again, atmosphere has been positive.

Is it true the Russians are reinforcing their troops in Kosovo? Have planes landed in Kosovo? Has another convoy reached them from Bosnia?

- Russians in Pristina received a supply convoy Tuesday. NATO indicated that this was just a resupply effort and that it had no difficulty allowing Russian forces to get food and water.
- There was no second convoy yesterday. There have been no flights into Kosovo.

Doesn't the surprise Russian move prove that your idea of "partnership" with Russia is dead?

- Serves U.S. interests and Russia's to work together to achieve a peaceful settlement in Kosovo.
- Special Envoy Chernomyrdin played a key role in persuading Milosevic to accept the peace agreement which he is now implementing. Yugoslav campaign of violence and repression against Kosovars has stopped, Serbian troops are leaving Kosovo, NATO security force is entering, refugees already starting to return.
- Russia can play an important role in creating a safe and secure environment on the ground. We have made clear Russian participation is welcome. Formula for that participation remains to be worked out, but Secretaries Cohen and Albright meeting with counterparts in Helsinki to continue working on a solution.
- Cooperation with Russia also continues on other issues: nonproliferation, fighting terrorism, civil aviation, strategic arms elimination, protection of fissile materials, support for small business and civil society. Achieved in March important breakthrough on principles to adapt the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty.

Does the surprise Russian move prove that the Russian military, and potentially the Russian nuclear force, is out of control?

- No evidence whatsoever that President Yeltsin is not in charge of Russia's nuclear forces.
- Specifically on the Russian deployment to Kosovo, Russians have told us that President Yeltsin authorized the deployment and left implementation up to the military leaders.

Is the President seeking further clarification on the premature deployment of Russian troops into Kosovo?

- Continue to work towards an agreement on Russian participation that is consistent with NATO's efforts, sanctioned by the UN, to fully implement the basic conditions: complete withdrawal of Serb forces; deployment of KFOR; the return of refugees; and a level of self-government and autonomy for the Kosovars.
- Clearly, we would also want to avoid further misunderstandings. However, it is important to note that the Russian troop presence did not disrupt KFOR's deployment nor affect the Serbs' withdrawal.

KOSOVO: HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE EFFORTS

June 16, 1999

Status of Assistance Efforts

- UNHCR has organized three multi-agency convoys to deliver food and relief supplies from Skopje, Macedonia to Pristina. Convoys then move from Pristina to other major villages. Yesterday, assistance was delivered to 20,000 displaced people in the Glogovac area. Today, assistance moved to Urosevac and Prizren.
- The IRC air drop operation continues to drop almost 10,000 HDRs a day. The U.S. is financing this operation, which will continue until convoys and/or helicopter deliveries are able to reach all populations.

Returns and Demining

- Almost 8000 refugees returned to Kosovo from Macedonia and Albania on June 15, despite warnings by aid agencies that mines and withdrawing Serb forces posed significant dangers. Tragically, two people were killed and one seriously injured by a land mine, while crossing the border at an unofficial point.
- UNICEF is working to raise mine awareness among refugees and returnees. The U.S. is supporting its efforts by providing technical expertise and materials.
- As part of its humanitarian mine awareness strategy for Kosovo, the Department of State just awarded a 1.6 million dollar contract to RONCO Consulting Corporation to begin humanitarian demining as soon as KFOR completes its initial mine assessment and countermine measures. RONCO will deploy six fully trained and equipped demining teams with dogs to Kosovo shortly. These teams will be ready to commence mine clearance operations as soon as KFOR authorizes them to do so. The Department of State is also deploying staff to Kosovo to monitor and oversee these operations and to coordinate all U.S. funded mine clearance with the UN.

UN/NATO coordination

- Civilian/military coordination is a critical component of effort. The British KFOR contingent has established a Civil-Military Coordination Center (CIMIC) at the UNHCR warehouse compound in Pristina. All relief agencies, donors and international organizations are co-located there, enabling close coordination.

CONTEXT: *U/S Pickering led a delegation to China to present the findings of a US investigation of the causes of the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in early May. The delegation includes members from CIA, DIA, DoD, and NSC, along with the Department of State.*

Whom did the delegation meet with in Beijing?

- The delegation had working meetings with both Foreign Minister TANG Jiaxuan and Vice Foreign Minister YANG Jiechi.

What did Pickering say? Did he apologize yet again?

- Undersecretary Pickering traveled to Beijing at the President's request to present our explanation of the causes of the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade. He was fulfilling the President's promise to President Jiang that a full investigation into this incident would be conducted and that the results would be presented to Beijing.

Is the U.S. paying compensation?

- We have offered to provide humanitarian payment to the injured and the families of those killed, with the details to be worked out diplomatically very soon.

Will the U.S. be paying for property damage?

- We are willing to discuss the issue of damage done to China's Embassy in Belgrade. We understand the Chinese will discuss with us the issue of damage to U.S. property in China as well.

Did the Chinese accept the report as adequate?

- We look forward to hearing Undersecretary Pickering's full report upon his return.

**SOUTHEAST EUROPE INITIATIVE, THE STABILITY PACT, AND
RECONSTRUCTION**

What are the G-8 leaders prepared to do about the long-term instability in the Balkans?

- Leaders will review a variety of efforts to stabilize and advance the economic recovery of Kosovo and the frontline states of Southeast Europe (*comment: Russians don't agree to integration*) including: the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe, proposed by Germany as current President of the European Union, which establishes a useful set of principles to guide future cooperation and some mechanisms to facilitate coordination of action; as well as the work of a High-Level Steering Group, coordinated by the World Bank and the European Commission and involving other major donors, which is developing an overall strategy and action plan for recovery, reform and reconstruction and coordination of future assistance.

What will SEI cost and who will pay?

- The President's Southeast Europe Initiative seeks to strengthen ongoing efforts, working with NATO, the EU and the other multilateral institutions to stabilize, transform and eventually integrate this region into the European and transatlantic mainstream. Our goal is to ensure that even as the Kosovo settlement goes forward, that we work to prevent further crises elsewhere in the Balkans. As the President has said, it is cheaper to invest in peace than war.
- We expect the EU to take the lead role on reconstruction and to remain the largest donor of development assistance to the region. However, we are willing to continue to do our fair share and our significant development assistance under the SEED program is already focused on this region.

What are your current cost estimates associated with reconstruction in Kosovo?

- In March, before the most recent Milosevic offensive, best estimates put total costs -- for infrastructure reconstruction and implementation of civilian components of interim peace agreement -- at around \$750 million, with over half of this sum for housing repair.
- At present, there is no way to assess damage done to hundreds of villages shelled and burned by the VJ and the MUP since the beginning of the current offensive. That damage is continuing.

FINANCIAL ARCHITECTURE

Do the measures proposed and implemented by the G-7 really represent a significant improvement to the international financial architecture that will make future crises less likely?

- We have made improvements to the Bretton Woods institutions, particularly in the area of transparency and decision-making.
- We have made advances in the promotion of standards and codes of financial conduct, particularly in the public sector.
- We have established a framework for addressing private sector involvement in the response to any future crises so that private investment decisions will take proper account of the risks involved.
- We have created new institutions, such as the Financial Stability Forum, which will continue to study these types of issues. These steps will not necessarily prevent any future crises, but these and other measures we are undertaking will both make such crises less likely and make the international financial system, and its component parts, more resilient in the face of pressures.

KOLN DEBT INITIATIVE

Jubilee 2000 has called for massive debt relief for poor countries. Since the establishment of the HIPC program in 1996, only three countries have actually received debt relief under the program. What are you going to do to improve the program?

- The changes we will announce in Cologne will provide faster and deeper debt relief to more countries while maintaining incentives for economic reforms and providing a framework for channeling freed up resources into poverty reduction programs. In broad terms, it will more than triple the amount of debt relief anticipated, to approximately \$73 billion in nominal terms (or \$40 billion in constant 1998 dollars).
- As the President announced in March, “Our goal is to ensure that no country committed to fundamental reform is left with a debt burden that keeps it from meeting its people’s basic human needs and spurring growth.”

JORDAN DEBT

King Abdullah of Jordan has asked for debt forgiveness from Jordan's major creditors. Does the United States favor debt forgiveness for Jordan?

- The United States strongly supports debt forgiveness for Jordan. We have already forgiven almost \$700 million in Jordanian debt to the U.S. We have urged other creditors to do the same. Jordan owes over \$7 billion dollars and its debt service payments consume over 20 percent of its budget. King Abdullah knows that reviving economic growth will require economic reforms, and he has made very clear that he is prepared to take the necessary steps, but he has asked Jordan's creditors to give him the breathing room he needs. All G-8 countries have a strong interest in helping King Abdullah succeed in building a brighter economic future for the people of Jordan. We are urging our G-8 partners to join us in doing all that we can to support Jordan's economy during this critical period. We all recognize that reducing Jordan's debt burden -- coupled with economic reforms in Jordan -- would be a powerful catalyst for private investment and economic growth.

UKRAINE NUCLEAR SAFETY

Will Ukraine close Chernobyl in 2000?

- In the 1995, Ukraine committed to close the remaining operational unit at Chernobyl in 2000. We expect Ukraine to meet its commitment, just as the G-7 have been meeting ours.

MIDDLE EAST

Prime Minister-elect Barak has promised to withdraw Israeli forces from southern Lebanon within a year. What is the U.S position on this issue?

- It's important to give Prime Minister-elect Barak time to get settled and form his government. When he is ready, we will consult to elicit his thinking about how he sees the period ahead.
- On the specific point regarding southern Lebanon, we've made it clear that we support UNSC resolution 425 and we want to see it implemented. It has been our consistent position that all foreign troops should withdraw from Lebanon.
- We continue to believe that negotiations between Israel and Lebanon would provide a way to resolve the issues that divide them and to advance Lebanese sovereignty and territorial integrity and the security of both countries.

What is the U.S. position on UN resolution 181? Is it relevant to the peace process? Is 181 irrelevant?

- We have been very clear that the terms of reference for the peace process were defined by Madrid and Oslo. These are U.N. Resolutions 242, 338, and land for peace. Resolution 181 is not one of the terms of reference as defined by Madrid and Oslo.

The PA has asked the UN Security Council to act to stop Israeli settlement activity. What's our response to this request? Will we oppose it?

- On the general subject of settlements, we have made clear our position that continued settlement activity is destructive to the peace process. We've also made clear our view that the parties need to engage directly on issues such as this. We've called on the parties to engage in permanent status negotiations on an accelerated basis in order to deal with these issues.

EXPANDED THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

What is the rationale behind the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative?

- The economic crisis that affected Russia and the NIS over the past year has increased the risk of weapons of mass destruction proliferation and made it harder to fulfill arms control treaty obligations. President Clinton views this situation as one of the most significant national security challenges facing us today. The G8 is endorsing an effort to intensify the broad international partnerships -- among Russia, the other NIS and other nations and international organizations -- to address the security implications of the economic situation.
- Over the next five years, the US will seek over \$4.5 billion from Congress to expand and accelerate our programs for Russia and the other NIS to help address high priority security, arms control and nonproliferation requirements. But the \$4.5 billion in U.S. programs is not enough -- we estimate there is another, roughly equal amount in unmet critical needs for threat reduction and nonproliferation cooperation with Russia and the other Newly Independent States. We envision that the international effort will be made up of direct assistance commitments from individual countries and other multilateral bodies for specific programs and projects based on their own interests and expertise.
- We have identified needs in four areas: nuclear security; non-nuclear weapons of mass destruction; nonproliferation of weapons expertise; and military relocation, stabilization and other security cooperation efforts. Many countries beyond the G-8 have also been involved in such assistance in the past and some have ongoing programs. We are pleased that the G-8 is supporting these efforts to stabilize arms control and achieve nonproliferation objectives -- these efforts are essential to all our security. We look for the G-8 and other concerned countries to increase their activities in this area.

CORE LABOR STANDARDS

What will the G-8 do to promote greater respect for core labor standards?

- We in the G-8 believe that respect for core labor standards is indispensable to social stability and can serve to promote economic growth.
- We are also urging the international financial institutions to incorporate improved implementation of these standards into their policies and to increase cooperative efforts with the ILO. Similarly we are encouraging more effective cooperation between the WTO and ILO.

CYPRUS

Is the Foreign Ministers' G-8 statement on Cyprus an effort to reduce the UN role on the Cyprus issue?

- No. We view the G-8 Foreign Ministers' statement, which calls on leaders to urge Secretary General Annan to invite the parties to talks, as a vehicle to support UN efforts on Cyprus.

The statement refers to negotiations without preconditions. Does this mean the U.S. is abandoning its support for a bizonal, bicomunal federation?

- No. The U.S. continues to support a Cyprus solution based on a bizonal, bicomunal federation.

What role will the U.S., UK, Russian, EU, and others play in the negotiations?

- It is premature to get into such questions at this juncture.

KASHMIR

What can you tell us about the situation in Kashmir?

- Kashmir is an issue that cries out for a bilateral solution, arrived at through direct talks, and with respect for the sanctity of the line of control, agreed by both sides in 1972.
- The G-8 ministerial last week stated that we were deeply concerned about the continuing confrontation following the infiltration of militants across the line of control.
- We have urged other countries, including China, to play an active role in urging restraint on both sides

- We were disappointed at the apparent lack of progress at the talks between the two foreign ministers last Saturday.
- The President called Prime Ministers Vajpayee and Sharif on June 14 and 15, respectively. He expressed our serious concerns about the dangers of the present situation, the need for restraint, and the importance of a bilateral solution. He told Prime Minister Sharif that a peaceful resolution of the problem required the withdrawal of forces supported by Pakistan from the Indian side of the line of control.
- We are confident neither leader wants a wider war, but we should not be complacent about the potential danger of an accident or miscalculation that could lead to dangerous escalation.
- Prime Ministers Sharif and Vajpayee made a fine beginning toward Indo-Pakistan reconciliation at the Lahore Summit in February . That should be the future of the subcontinent, not continued hostilities over a 50-year old dispute.

FRANCE - RELIGIOUS SECTS

June 16, 1999

What do you think about French government endorsement of an Interministerial Mission to Battle Against Sects that casts religious minorities including evangelical groups, Mormons and Jehovah's witnesses in an unfavorable light?

- The US and France share long traditions of tolerance toward religious minorities. The international commitments we have both made to protect the rights of religion and belief (ICCPR, UDHR, others) are very important.
- The US understands and respects the French government's interest in monitoring the activities of dangerous groups and we understand that some dangerous groups hide behind the label of "religion" in order to shield themselves from scrutiny.
- It is most important that this Interministerial Mission carefully verifies its facts about members of religious minorities and does not premise its work on questionable statements about these individuals and their religious practices.
- We hope that the Interministerial Mission will include redress for unfairly targeted religious groups.

Why did the US insist on sending to France a delegation consisting of members of dangerous sects, who proceeded to lecture the French government on how France should deal with it's own religious minorities?

- The US delegation consisted of distinguished scholars and professionals who work in the area of religious freedom. All of the members of the delegation are responsible professionals and respected members of the American religious community.

INDIA-PAKISTAN: KASHMIR FIGHTING
June 16, 1999

- We do not intend to play a mediating role. This is an issue that needs to be resolved bilaterally.

(If asked: U/S Pickering has no current plans to visit South Asia)

INDIA – PAKISTAN: SANCTIONS

June 16, 1999

BACKGROUND: *The Senate and the House passed differing legislation addressing Glenn Amendment sanctions. The Senate June 8 passed an amendment proposed by Senator Roberts and further amended by Senator Brownback that mandates a 5-year suspension of certain economic sanctions against India and Pakistan imposed for actions taken by those countries prior to the date of enactment of the amendment. The amendment also permits the President to issue a national security interest waiver for prohibitions on military sales, export licenses for items on the Munitions List, foreign military financing, and exports of certain goods and technologies to both countries. The House on June 15 passed an extension of the Brownback waiver authority of last year. It would permit presidential waiver authority for economic sanctions and IMET until September 30, 2000.*

- We appreciate Congressional attention to the issue of our nonproliferation interests in South Asia.
- We prefer the flexibility that would come from comprehensive and permanent authority to waive Glenn and related sanctions against India and Pakistan.
- We would not expect to use any additional waiver authority until there is significant action by India/Pakistan on our nonproliferation goals.
- (If asked) This action should not be seen as related to the current fighting in Kashmir. Legislation waiving Glenn sanctions is not a “reward” for either country but would promote our nonproliferation goals in the region.

IRAQ: SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

June 16, 1999

Are you content with stalemate in the Security Council? Do you really want to rebuild a consensus on Iraq?

- Consensus in the Security Council is the best way to handle Iraq. Nine years of experience has shown that we are most successful in compelling Saddam Hussein to live up to his commitments to the international community when the Security Council is united.
- However, we are not seeking consensus at any price. Saddam Hussein must comply with the will of the international community and we will not reduce our standard for compliance.

Are you going to accept the draft British-Dutch Security Council Resolution?

- We are studying the British-Dutch draft very carefully. We think it is probably in the right ballpark, but we're not there yet.

Does that mean that you are willing to accept a suspension of sanctions in return for Iraqi compliance with a new disarmament program?

- As I said, we're looking at it closely, but we still have problems with it.

What about the proposed French draft on Iraq? Would you be willing to accept that?

- We think that the British-Dutch draft is the right starting point to rebuild Council consensus on Iraq.

What about your undeclared "war" in the No-Fly Zones against Iraq?

- American and British planes patrol the two No-Fly Zones over Iraq every day to prevent Saddam Hussein from using airpower to repress his people, as he did so horribly in 1991.
- Our airstrikes are purely defensive. We only strike when our planes are attacked, and when we do so, we take great care to avoid damage to civilian areas.
- If Saddam Hussein wants to stop our airstrikes he only has to stop shooting at our planes.

IRAQ: CAR BOMBING
June 17, 1999

What do you know about the recent car bombing in Iraq? Was this an internal attack against the regime or part of Iran's campaign against Iraqi-supported guerrilla movements?

- We've seen reports of a car bomb explosion in a residential suburb of Baghdad.
- I don't have anything for you regarding casualties or who was responsible.

This is the second car bombing in one week. Is this an indication of an escalation of unrest against the regime?

- We've been seeing an intensification of acts against the regime for some time now, but it's premature to say whether these car bombings are part of this pattern of unrest.

What is your position on reprisals by Iran against MEK targets in Iraq? Do you condemn them or do you prefer to just look the other way?

- We've made it clear that we consider the MEK a terrorist organization responsible for a worldwide campaign of bombings and assassinations.
- The MEK was designated a foreign terrorist organization in 1997 and their assets in the United States blocked. We have called on other states to take similar steps.
- While Iraq and the MEK have blamed the Iranian government for previous car bombings against MEK targets in Iraq, Iran has denied responsibility for these incidents.

But what about last week's scud attack? Does Iran have the right to launch scuds into Iraq in retaliation against the MEK?

- The MEK is a terrorist organization. It has claimed responsibility for, among other acts of terror, the assassination in April of Iranian armed forces Deputy Chief of Staff Lt. Gen. Ali Sayyad Shirazi.
- We have made our position clear that as a terrorist organization, the MEK should not enjoy the support of any state and that the international community should work to prevent it from engaging in further acts of terror.

IRAN: ARREST OF JEWS
June 16, 1999

What do you think of the arrest of the 13 Jews in Iran on espionage charges?

- As my Administration has stated publicly, I am deeply troubled by these arrests. The charges have no foundation and they constitute a serious breach of the rule of law.
- I believe the government of Iran must uphold its stated commitment to protect the rights of all religious and ethnic minorities by releasing these individuals and ensuring that no harm comes to them.

Will the US take action against Iran on this issue?

- We are pursuing this matter vigorously with our European allies, with our friends in the region, and with others we believe could lend useful support on this issue.
- I will not comment on further actions we might take, but certainly events such as this can only increase tensions between the United States and the government of Iran.

BACKGROUND: ABC ran a piece by McWethy saying that, according to intelligence sources, Bin Ladin appears to be "in the advanced stages of operational planning" for another attack against a U.S. facility.

Is Bin Ladin in fact on the verge of another attack on a U.S. facility? Do you have, as ABC reports, phone intercepts and other intelligence demonstrating that bombs and bomb experts are being moved into position?

- We have said all along that we believe UBL will seek to attack American interests again. He has declared his determination to strike at America in his fatwa, and we continue to believe he intends to do so if he can. However, I don't want to characterize how far along he is in his preparations and I'm not going to go into the sources of our information. This is an intelligence matter, and as you know, we don't discuss intelligence issues.
- I want to reiterate, however, that we take Bin Ladin and all Bin Ladin-related threats with the greatest seriousness. We have taken numerous precautions -- and on a number of occasions since the bombings last summer -- and we will continue to take every appropriate measure to protect American lives.

ABC mentions that African posts are thought to be at particular risk, and McWethy specifically mentioned that there had been surveillance of the U.S. embassies in Mozambique, Ghana and Senegal. Is this true? The Middle East and Persian Gulf were also mentioned as potential targets.

- Clearly, the bombings in Dar and Nairobi show that UBL can launch operations in Africa, and obviously we need to take all necessary precautions to ensure that he does not succeed again. We also know that he has operatives in many countries in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf region. But I'm not going to comment on events at particular embassies, which again are intelligence matters. I do want to underscore that we have made a broad range of security upgrades at diplomatic posts around the world since the bombings. We have stepped up intelligence gathering, and we continue to work with nations around the world to deter attacks. We're taking every piece of threat information seriously.

Has Bin Ladin acquired ingredients for chemical or biological weapons from countries that were part of the Soviet Union? And do you know that, as reported, he has weapons labs in particular cities in Afghanistan?

- We have said for almost a year now that Bin Ladin is eagerly seeking to build weapons of mass destruction. There are a number of possible sources of materials for materials for such weapons, but I'm not going to speculate on what he might have procured or where. Suffice it to say that we view Bin Ladin's efforts in this area with the gravest concern, and we are pursuing all possible leads on this issue. Bin Ladin continues to use Afghanistan as his base of operations, but I'm not going to discuss what might be going on at particular installations.

ABC says that U.S. intelligence believes that Bin Ladin has Marfan's Syndrome. Can you confirm?

- No. I have no information on that at all.

KOREA: NAVAL INCIDENT UPDATE

June 17, 1999

CONTEXT: *After Tuesday's bloodshed, the tense sea standoff at the Northern Limit Line (NLL) has abated – for now. No DPRK naval craft have crossed the NLL since the incident. The UN Command invited the DPRK for a second round of General Officers talks, after an inconclusive opening meeting June 15. The DPRK has yet to reply to the UN Command invitation.*

There is no evidence yet to gauge the broader impact of Tuesday's fire fight: there are no indications of DPRK intentions concerning the bilateral vice-ministerial meeting scheduled for June 21 with the ROK in Beijing, although a ROK government spokesman is quoted in the press as saying the ROK will attend. (U.S. Special Envoy Ambassador Charles Kartman is also planning to meet with DPRK Vice Foreign Minister Kim Gye Gwan next week in Beijing as a follow-up to the Kumchang-ni site visit. There are no indications concerning DPRK changes in plans to attend.)

Note: the DoD spokesman yesterday stated that new US forces are being moved into the region. In so doing, he read from the wrong (background) part of his sheet. DoD is now trying to walk this back – the statement is likely to escalate tensions in the area, whereas we are trying in fact to de-escalate them. If reporters ask about “new” US forces, we should stick to the line that: 1. We have not raised the alert status of US forces in the area; 2. We regularly move some types of forces/equipment into and out of this area and are continuing to do so; and 3. There is nothing unusual about these movements.

Are you worried about tensions flaring on the Korean Peninsula and what are you doing about it? What about reports of more U.S. forces moving to the area?

- Given the many security, economic and non-proliferation issues we must confront on the Korean Peninsula, it remains at the forefront of our security concerns in Asia.
- We are in close contact with the South Korean Government and are working closely to defuse the situation and reduce tensions.
- It is clear that the North Koreans have moved their ships back and currently there is clear separation between the boats of both sides. This is a welcome development. Reducing tensions by avoiding another confrontation is in everyone's best interest.
- Our forces remain in their normal state of readiness. We have not raised the alert status of US forces in the area.
- We regularly move some types of forces/equipment into and out of this area and are continuing to do so.

- There is nothing unusual about these movements

Will this terminate Kim Dae Jung's "sunshine policy"?

- No. That policy has combined efforts to build bridges to the North with firmness in dealing with provocative acts by Pyongyang. The South will continue to pursue both strands of this policy.

What has happened in the waters off Korea overnight?

- The North Koreans have moved their ships back above the NLL, and currently there is clear separation between the boats of both sides.

Why did the North commit these provocations?

- We can only speculate as to their motives of the North. Whatever their rationale, however, at this point it appears that they are choosing not to escalate this incident.

Is this over?

- We hope so, but we cannot be sure.

What is the situation at the Northern Limit Line?

- There have been no further incidents since the June 15 confrontation between ROK and DPRK naval vessels. No crossings of the Northern Limit Line by DPRK warships have been noted in the last 24 hours. ROK Navy ships remain in the area, but well away from the Northern Limit Line.

What is the U.S. doing diplomatically? What is the status of UN Command General Officer talks?

- We remain in close contact with the ROK Government throughout the process and are continuing to monitor the situation carefully. We are working closely with the ROK to try to defuse the situation and reduce tensions.
- We contacted the DPRK through the New York channel to urge strongly that they remain north of the Northern Limit Line. We note that DPRK Naval forces are currently staying north of the NLL. Reducing tensions by avoiding another confrontation is in everyone's best interest.

- We welcomed the DPRK decision to attend the UN Command General Officers' talks June 15 in Panmunjom. Unfortunately, those talks recessed without result. A UN Command invitation to the DPRK for a second round is pending a reply from the North.
- We urge the DPRK to continue participating in the discussions so that a way to resolve the situation peacefully can be found and recurrences prevented. I'd refer you to the UN Command in Seoul for details on the talks.

What is the Northern Limit Line (NLL)?

- I'd refer you to the UN Command in Seoul, which is charged with monitoring the Korean War Armistice, for authoritative information about the NLL.
- The NLL has served as an effective means of preventing military tension between North and South Korean military forces for 46 years. It serves as a practical demarcation line which has contributed to the separation of forces.
- We continue to urge the DPRK to recognize this practicality by keeping its craft north of the line.

What about casualties?

- The ROK Ministry of National Defense reported that seven of its sailors were injured. There have been various reports of DPRK casualties, but I cannot confirm these. It is always regrettable whenever conflicts like the one Tuesday result in casualties. We are working hard to urge the DPRK to avoid further confrontations by keeping its craft north of the NLL.

What has the VP done on AIDS in Africa?

- We respect the good intentions of those concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki -- inaugurated today as President of South Africa -- to combat the scourge of AIDS in Africa.
- In the context of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission which they co-chair, Vice President Gore and President Mbeki have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of our knowledge and efforts on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.
- The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them. That's why he has been encouraging the efforts of the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government, and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to the dispute over intellectual property rights.
- We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner, from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our research -- so that 20th century treatment can be replaced by a 21st century cure.

What is your reaction to this report? It's pretty hard-hitting.

- We appreciate the work of the PFIAB and its staff in undertaking this review. The Board did a commendable job in a short time. The report chronicles the longstanding problems at DOE labs, as noted in previous Congressional, internal and GAO reports

But what do you think about the Report's conclusions that you essentially have a bureaucracy out of control?

- We recognize, as did the PFIAB, that the work at the labs represents America's most brilliant scientific achievements on a sustained basis. We also recognize that there are some systemic problems that could potentially make our nuclear weapons secrets vulnerable to foreign intelligence gathering efforts.
- It was the Administration's concerns about these counterintelligence vulnerabilities that prompted the President to issue PDD-61 over a year ago. As the report says, "in the past two years the Clinton Administration has proposed and begun to implement some of the most far-reaching reforms in DOE history."

Yes, but you still have a problem.

- We have in place the mechanisms now to implement the provisions of the PDD. However, as the PFIAB report points out, the implementation cannot be accomplished overnight. It will take constant vigilance and attention, by the national security leadership, by the Secretary of Energy in particular and by the counterintelligence community.

So, what do you think about the proposal that DOE's nuclear programs be placed under a semi-autonomous or independent agency?

- We will carefully review the recommendations.

How about the allegation in the report that the Administration moved too slowly in addressing the problem at the Labs?

- We took what we considered at the time to be far-reaching and unprecedented action. The Administration had long been concerned about counterintelligence issues in the post-Cold War world.

- Accordingly, in the wake of the Ames case we organized the government to work together to improve or counterintelligence capability.
- In 1994, the President had issued an earlier Directive establishing the National Counterintell policy bd.
- Then in 1997, when the problems at the labs became apparent, the Policy Board, composed of counterintelligence professionals, was able to examine the problem and come back in very short order to recommend that the President issue a Directive, which later became PDD-61.

Does the President agree with Secretary Richardson that our nuclear weapons secrets are safe today?

- The important thing is that the Secretary has moved quickly and forcefully to put in place the reforms necessary to reduce the vulnerabilities to our nuclear weapons secrets. But when it comes to security, the job is never done.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

June 15, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

On March 18, 1999, I asked the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, the PFIAB, to undertake a review of the security threat at the Department of Energy's weapons labs and the measures that have been taken to address it. PFIAB Chairman Warren B. Rudman presented the Board's findings to me today. I have asked the PFIAB to make the report available to Congress and to the public.

I would like to thank Senator Rudman and the Board members who undertook this important study over a 90-day period, reviewing hundreds of documents and conducting dozens of interviews. As the report recognizes, the Department of Energy represents the best of America's scientific talent and expertise. The value of their contributions makes it imperative that we place a premium on ensuring that we have instituted the best possible measures for the protection of our nation's most valuable secrets at Department facilities.

This Administration already has taken unprecedented steps to reduce the vulnerability of our secrets at the labs. Over a year ago I issued a sweeping Directive to strengthen counterintelligence across the board at the Department of Energy, and Secretary Richardson has aggressively instituted new rules and procedures for counterintelligence and security at DOE facilities. The PFIAB has made a number of proposals which we will carefully review. We remain committed to taking the necessary steps to safeguard our nation's secrets.

As these vital national security issues are addressed, we will be most successful if we continue our efforts in a bipartisan manner with close cooperation between the Executive and Legislative branches of Government.

#

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Erica S. Lepping@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1999 12:17:00.00

SUBJECT: today's press guidance

TO: WOZNIAK_N (WOZNIAK_N@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:17-JUN-1999 17:49:40.66

TO: CROWLEY_P (CROWLEY_P@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: BERNSTEIN_MJ (BERNSTEIN_MJ@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: OLCOTT_E (OLCOTT_E@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: LEAVY_D (LEAVY_D@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen C. Burchard (Karen C. Burchard@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David W. Beier (David W. Beier@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Marsha E. Berry (Marsha E. Berry@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David Vandivier (David Vandivier@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa B. Ratcliff (Melissa B. Ratcliff@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Denver R. Peacock (Denver R. Peacock@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (Jenni R. Engebretsen@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (Lindsey E. Huff@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (Jennifer M. Palmieri@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry J. Toiv (Barry J. Toiv@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dag Vega (Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne M. Edwards (Anne M. Edwards@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brenda M. Anders (Brenda M. Anders@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan C. Moloney READ:NOT READ	(Megan C. Moloney@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Elizabeth R. Newman READ:NOT READ	(Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Julia M. Payne READ:NOT READ	(Julia M. Payne@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Julianne B. Corbett READ:NOT READ	(Julianne B. Corbett@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Mark D. Neschis READ:NOT READ	(Mark D. Neschis@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Nanda Chitre READ:NOT READ	(Nanda Chitre@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: James M. Teague READ:NOT READ	(James M. Teague@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Beverly J. Barnes READ:NOT READ	(Beverly J. Barnes@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Mark A. Kitchens READ:NOT READ	(Mark A. Kitchens@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jason H. Schechter READ:NOT READ	(Jason H. Schechter@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Dorinda A. Salcido READ:NOT READ	(Dorinda A. Salcido@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer READ:NOT READ	(Sarah E. Gegenheimer@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Julie B. Goldberg READ:NOT READ	(Julie B. Goldberg@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Julie E. Mason READ:NOT READ	(Julie E. Mason@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Nathan B. Naylor READ:NOT READ	(Nathan B. Naylor@OVP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Patrick E. Briggs READ:NOT READ	(Patrick E. Briggs@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: LEAVY_D READ:NOT READ	(LEAVY_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX) (NSC)
TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer READ:NOT READ	(Joshua S. Gottheimer@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Toby C. Graff READ:NOT READ	(Toby C. Graff@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Heather M. Riley READ:NOT READ	(Heather M. Riley@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Richard L. Siewert READ:NOT READ	(Richard L. Siewert@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Michael A. Hammer READ:NOT READ	(Michael A. Hammer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Victoria L. Valentine READ:NOT READ	(Victoria L. Valentine@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Erica S. Lepping READ:NOT READ	(Erica S. Lepping@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Linda Ricci READ:NOT READ	(Linda Ricci@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Mark C. Sheppard READ:NOT READ	(Mark C. Sheppard@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Adriene K. Elrod READ:NOT READ	(Adriene K. Elrod@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Michele Ballantyne READ:NOT READ	(Michele Ballantyne@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Justin L. Coleman READ:NOT READ	(Justin L. Coleman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Joel Johnson READ:NOT READ	(Joel Johnson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr READ:NOT READ	(Thurgood Marshall Jr@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Courtney M. Manning READ:NOT READ	(Courtney M. Manning@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Audrey Choi READ:NOT READ	(Audrey Choi@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Melissa M. Murray READ:NOT READ	(Melissa M. Murray@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Sara M. Latham READ:NOT READ	(Sara M. Latham@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Brenda B. Costello READ:NOT READ	(Brenda B. Costello@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Thomas D. Janenda READ:NOT READ	(Thomas D. Janenda@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Lynn G. Cutler READ:NOT READ	(Lynn G. Cutler@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Fred DuVal READ:NOT READ	(Fred DuVal@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Jim Kohlenberger READ:NOT READ	(Jim Kohlenberger@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Neal Lane READ:NOT READ	(Neal Lane@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Aprill N. Springfield READ:NOT READ	(Aprill N. Springfield@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
TO: Mckenzie K. Davis	(Mckenzie K. Davis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy (Ann C. Hertelendy@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (Rebecca L. Walldorff@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dominique L. Cano (Dominique L. Cano@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Leslie Bernstein (Leslie Bernstein@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mindy E. Myers (Mindy E. Myers@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Maria E. Soto (Maria E. Soto@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Clay Reed (Clay Reed@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jocelyn A. Bucaro (Jocelyn A. Bucaro@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cathy R. Mays (Cathy R. Mays@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa G. Green (Melissa G. Green@EOP@LNCTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 17-JUN-1999 12:14:00

Press Guidance
Thursday, June 17, 1999, A.M. edition, EDT, P.M. edition, Local Time

Domestic/Economic

1. Guns
2. Lamb Imports
3. Lockbox
4. Medicare
5. Nominations -- and see POTUS letter to Lott
6. Steel
7. VP

Foreign

Kosovo

1. Kosovo (updated)
2. Russia / Kosovo (updated)
3. Humanitarian
4. China (updated)

5. G-8 Summit

6. France / Religious Sects

7. India ☐) Pakistan / Kashmir Fighting
8. India ☐) Pakistan / Sanctions

- ===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:17-JUN-1999 12:18:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:
The following attachments were included with this message:

```
===== ATTACHMENT      2 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:17-JUN-1999 12:18:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT SUBJECT:  guns.0617
```

[illegible]

**Guns/Juvenile Crime
Questions and Answers
June 17, 1999**

Q: Yesterday, the House passed some tough measures to crack down on juvenile crime, including a McCollum amendment to prosecute 14 year-olds as adults, and increase penalties for kids who bring guns to school. Do you support the bill so far?

A: Since the House is continuing to vote on a wide range of amendments today on the juvenile crime bill, it's a bit premature to say where we are on the whole bill at this time. As you know, the Administration supports a comprehensive approach to addressing the problem of youth crime and violence. Which is why the President has taken the lead in addressing youth violence on all fronts – from the media to the gun industry to parental responsibility.

We support the base juvenile crime bill (H.R. 1501), a bipartisan bill that promotes graduated sanctions for youthful offenders and provides needed resources to states to combat and prevent juvenile crime. We also support the Conyers substitute, which reauthorizes our COPS program and gives communities additional tools they need to take a comprehensive approach to keep kids and neighborhoods safe. However, we do have some concerns with particular provisions of the McCollum amendment that would treat certain juveniles prosecuted in the federal system too harshly by failing to provide needed safeguards for younger juveniles, and juveniles who are charged with less serious crimes. We will work with the Congress to address on these concerns as the bill proceeds.

Q: Two of the gun amendments the House will consider would repeal longstanding D.C. law banning handgun possession. Do you have a position on these amendments?

A: As Chief Ramsey stated yesterday, these amendments would present serious safety problems not only for District residents, but for police officers as well. As crime trends are finally beginning to reverse in the District, it would be ill-advised to make it easier – not harder -- for violent people to gain access to guns, and put citizens at greater risk. We hope the amendments will be defeated in the House, and there appears to be some bipartisan agreement to do so.

Q: What do expect will happen on today's gun show votes?

A: We believe it will be a close vote. As you know, the President strongly supports the McCarthy/Roukema amendment – the only amendment that will actually close the gun show loophole once and for all. The President and the Administration are working very

closely with the backers of the bipartisan McCarthy amendment to help secure the votes necessary to pass this measure which we believe will help save lives. The other two gun show amendments fall short of closing the loophole, and in some instances, open up dangerous new loopholes. Just to give you one example, the FBI estimates that the time limits on background checks contained in the other two sham gun show amendments would have resulted in between 9,000 and 17,000 criminals or other prohibited purchasers getting guns if the same time limits were applied to current background checks conducted by the NICS. Allowing more criminals to get guns defies common sense. The House should put the public safety interest of the American people over the clout of the gun lobby and pass the McCarthy-Roukema amendment.

Q: The NRA and certain Republicans charge that under the your Administration, federal gun prosecutions are significantly down, and almost no cases have been brought against students for bringing a gun to school. They believe that more enforcement of existing laws is needed instead of new gun control laws. What is your response?

A: Although Republicans and the NRA like to say that so-called "Triggerlock" prosecutions are down, and my administration has failed to prosecute kids for bringing guns to school, that's simply not the real story on federal firearms prosecutions. The truth is that:

(1) The laws have succeeded in deterring gun crime. The federal laws cited by the NRA have relatively small penalties and were enacted primarily for their deterrent effect on crime and weapons-carrying by criminals and young people. Put simply, they are intended to stop guns from getting into the hands of criminals and juveniles, and the evidence shows they are doing so. Crime rates are down nationwide, and gun-related crime -- particularly by youth -- is down dramatically: homicides, robberies, and aggravated assaults committed with gun are down by an average of 27 percent. This is in part because these laws have stopped over a quarter million felons, fugitives, and prohibited users from buying guns in the first place.

(2) Federal prosecutions of serious gun crimes have gone up. At the federal level, we have focused on the most serious gun crimes, and prosecution of these crimes is up during this Administration. Prosecutions of gun criminals serving sentences of five years or more have increased by fully 30 percent.

(3) Overall firearms prosecutions of serious gun criminals are up. Combined state and federal prosecution of gun offenses is up during this Administration, in large part because of improved coordination and sensible allocation of resources. About 25 percent more criminals currently are sent to prison for state and federal weapons offenses than in 1992. In many cases, state prosecutions make more sense because criminals may be subject to longer sentences in the state court system.

(4) Tough talk is cheap. Despite its rhetoric, time and again, the gun lobby has opposed efforts to provide real money to state, local, and federal law enforcement agencies to investigate, arrest, and prosecute gun criminals and illegal gun traffickers. Over the past two years, we have called for more resources to enforce our gun laws on every front -- requesting tens of millions of dollars

to hire over 280 new ATF agents and over 40 new federal prosecutors, as well as more than a billion dollars to hire more local police and prosecutors.

(5) Enforcement alone is not enough. While we support increased resources for federal enforcement and prosecutions, enforcement alone is simply not enough. It is essential to prevent criminals and kids from getting guns in the first place. The Brady Law has stopped over a quarter of a million felons, fugitives, and stalkers from getting handguns, preventing countless crimes. That is why I am urging the Congress to enact my proposals to prevent guns from falling into the hands of children and felons.

Q: Recently on *Good Morning America*, the President said he would support requiring gun owners to register their guns. Why didn't the President propose this earlier? Is this something you are going to push for as the Congress considers gun legislation?

A: Last April, the President proposed the most comprehensive gun legislation put forward by any Administration in 30 years. We are pleased that the Senate passed a number of the President's proposals, including requiring background checks at gun shows and mandating safety locks for handguns. But we will push the House to move still further forward on gun legislation by passing additional measures proposed by the President, such as raising the handgun age from 18 to 21 and requiring background checks for explosives purchases.

As the President indicated this morning, we do not intend to pursue gun registration in the context of the legislation currently under consideration by the Congress, and we will not introduce such legislation. The President made very clear that we are focused on the common sense steps we can take now to keep guns out of the hands of kids and criminals. We cannot allow the Congress to buckle under NRA pressure and delay or undermine passage of the sensible measures the President has proposed to help save lives. And if the Congress fails to pass the measures contained in President's bill, we will continue to keep the pressure on Congress to do so.

Lamb Imports
June 14, 1999

Q: Why is the President's 201 decision on lamb still held up?

A: This is a complex issue. The President and the Administration are continuing to review various options. We will announce a decision when that decision has been made. [We expect to make an announcement soon/tomorrow.]

Q: Isn't there a statutory deadline with regard to this decision?

A: There is a statutory period in which we do try to make these decisions. However, going a day or two beyond that won't have any impact on the President's authority to go forward with whatever relief he decides is appropriate.

Q: So, you're saying you don't expect any legal consequences associated with the delay in making this decision?

A: We don't expect any.

Lockbox
June 17, 1999

Question: **Speaker Hastert has criticized Senate Democrats for blocking the Republican Social Security Lockbox bill. What is the Administration's position on the Senate Republican Lock Box plan?**

Answer: We support Senate Democrats in their efforts to improve the bill. It's our understanding that the Senate Republican leadership has refused to allow amendments that will help protect and preserve Medicare. We hope that the Senate will allow those amendments to be considered.

The President is committed to protecting Social Security and Medicare. In his State of the Union address, the President framed the national debate with a budget proposal based on core principles. He called for dedicating the new surplus to a lock box that would lower the nation's debt and extend the solvency of both Social Security and Medicare.

The House-passed proposal was a positive step because it adopted the President's call to dedicate the surplus to debt reduction. But it fell short of the President's overall framework because it does not adopt his other core principles -- it does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security or Medicare, and in fact would permit much of the surplus to be used first for a tax cut rather than Social Security or Medicare first.

The current design of the proposal risks the possibility of exacerbating an economic downturn and needs to be changed. The proposal must also do more ensure that the money it sets aside for debt reduction today will actually be used for this purpose tomorrow. While the proposal is consistent with paying down the debt held by the public, it does nothing to ensure that the benefits of this debt reduction go to the Social Security and Medicare programs.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON MEDICARE REFORM

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Q: Now that you can get to 2020 solvency without using all of the 15 percent of the surplus, are you now going to use some of the surplus for prescription drugs?

A: I have proposed to dedicate 15 percent of the surplus to strengthen the Medicare program. I believe a new prescription drug benefit should be included as part of, not independent from, a broader set of reforms for the Medicare program. We will announce the details of the financing when I unveil my proposal sometime this month.

FOLLOW-UP

Q: Are you denying that some of the surplus will be used for prescription drugs in the President's proposal?

A: I am not going to go into any details about Medicare reform until I make my own decisions, which will be after I return from my trip.

Q: Can you confirm that your prescription drug benefit will be between \$10 and \$25 , as reported in today's *New York Times*?

A: I am not going to discuss details on this or any other aspect of my Medicare reform proposal other than to say that this story is wrong. It would be impossible to provide for a meaningful benefit for a \$10 premium without a fiscally imprudent expenditure of Federal dollars. As has been indicated by members of my staff previously, we are designing the Medicare prescription drug benefit to be significantly less costly than what is available in the Medigap market – about \$90 per month.

Q: What will the design of the drug benefit be? How will it be financed and administered?

A: We are not releasing any information on the design of the drug benefit or any other aspect of our Medicare reform proposal. There are still final policy decisions that need to be made, and no one in the Administration will release this or any aspect of the reform proposal until I make my announcement, which will be the end of this month.

Q: Is anyone in the Administration attempting to pressure the Medicare actuary to produce savings projections?

A: Such a suggestion is ridiculous. No one in this Administration has or would pressure the Medicare actuary to do anything. Rick Foster is respected throughout the Administration, the Congress, and the health policy and academic community.

Q: What are the secret documents mentioned in the *New York Times* story today, and do they outline the design of your drug benefit?

A: The documents that appear to have been cited in this story are materials that have been produced as background information on the need for a prescription drug benefit and recent trends in coverage. They have been available to the media, the Congress, and throughout the Administration for a number of weeks. They are not secret, and they do not provide any information about the design or cost or administration of the drug benefit.

Q: The Breaux-Thomas proposal did not provide a prescription drug benefit to all beneficiaries because over 60 percent of beneficiaries already have some form of coverage. Won't your proposal replace private sector dollars with a large government subsidy?

A: No. We know that today, over 15 million Medicare beneficiaries do not have prescription drug coverage at all, and we know that millions more will lose their coverage as private insurance becomes more expensive and less accessible. This comes at a time when prescription drugs have never been more important to basic health care. For this reason, my drug proposal will be available and affordable to all Medicare beneficiaries.

Q: How do you reconcile a brand new entitlement with the need to constrain the growth of the Medicare program?

A: It's widely acknowledged by conservatives and progressives alike that you cannot modernize the Medicare program without including a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Prescription drugs today are as important as hospital care was when Medicare was created. This can be done in a way so that both the government and beneficiaries share the cost. It also would take advantage of private sector management approaches that can constrain the cost of purchasing these needed medication without the use of price controls. This benefit will be fully financed in my overall Medicare reform plan.

PLAN CONTENT

Q: You've indicated that you want to modernize the program and make it more competitive. Does that mean that your proposal will include a premium support mechanism (or a similar provision) ?

A: We need to inject more competition into the Medicare program, for both the traditional fee-for-service program as well as the managed care plans serve beneficiaries. As we have mentioned, we believe that the premium support proposal advocated by Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas suffers from serious flaws, including consequence of higher premiums for the traditional program. We support competition based on choice, not based on the financial coercion that results from these higher traditional program premiums. We do need to inject more market oriented approaches into the Medicare

program, and we are reviewing the best options to achieve that goal while still protecting beneficiaries from excessive increases in out-of-pocket costs.

Q: How do you respond to the GAO and CBO's contention that your proposal to dedicate some of the surplus to Medicare does not represent real reform?

A: I believe that preparing the Medicare program for the next century will require both additional revenue and reforms to make the program more competitive. In the State of the Union, I set out a plan to provide the program with the necessary new funds and proposed working on a bipartisan basis to develop appropriate reforms. I believed that it was appropriate to await the recommendations of the Commission before proposing specific reforms. Now that the Commission has reported its recommendations, it is incumbent on me to submit my own proposal to modernize and strengthen the program, and as I have previously indicated, I plan on doing that in short order.

Q: Doesn't the recent Trustees Report eliminate the pressure to reform Medicare?

A: Absolutely not. Medicare reform is both about solvency and about making Medicare more efficient, equitable, and adequate in terms of benefits. Our successful stewardship of Medicare does not diminish the future challenges facing the program. Under any scenario, enrollment in Medicare will climb from 39 million to 47 million in 2010, and to 80 million by 2035. We must modernize and strengthen the Medicare program by making it more competitive and instituting the best market-oriented practices of the private sector, and as we have previously indicated, my plan will do just that.

PROVIDER CUTS IN REIMBURSEMENT

Q: Providers have been stating that the cuts in provider reimbursement in the Balanced Budget Act went too far and undermine their ability to provide quality care. Are you going to address this issue in your Medicare reform package?

A: We have consistently said if there is evidence that the Balanced Budget Act Medicare provider payment reductions threaten quality, access, and the ability of providers to deliver needed services, we would be open to considering changes to smooth out this legislation. We are currently evaluating all available evidence on this matter. If we determine there are problems, we will seriously consider administrative and/or legislative options to address these problems.

Q: Will your Medicare proposal include an income related premium?

A: No final decisions about this or any other aspect of the Medicare reform package has been made. Having said this, I have historically indicated an openness to considering this structural reform (in 1992, during the campaign; in 1993, during the Health Security Act; and in 1997, in discussions with Congress on the BBA). But, like any other provision of the Medicare reform package, I will view this in the context of the broader set of reforms before making any final decision.

GUIDANCE ON HORMEL/RECESS APPTS
JUNE 16, 1999

Q: What is the Administration's reaction to Inhofe lifting his holds on administration nominations?

A: We are glad that the Senate will now responsibly move on to the important business of confirming Administration appointments. We continue to emphasize that appointees should not be held hostage because one Senator is unhappy with one appointment.

Q: Why did the President take the step of recess appointing James Hormel?

A: The President believes that Mr. Hormel is uniquely qualified to serve in this position.

He has the strong support of Secretary Albright and former Republican Secretary of State George Schultz. He was supported by an overwhelming majority of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and his nomination was favorably voted out of that committee. An overwhelming majority of Senators have supported his nomination -- more than 60 -- and had the Senate provided him a vote, he would have been confirmed. The Government of Luxembourg "welcomed" his nomination.

The only reason he has been denied an up or down vote in the Senate is because a few senators objected to his nomination because he is gay. The President thinks that this is wrong and discriminatory.

It is not too late for the Senate to give Mr. Hormel the up-or-down vote he deserves, and we think they ought to do it, as a matter of basic fairness.

Q: But didn't Senator Byrd do the same thing when he was Minority Leader in 1985 and the President was Reagan?

A: No. First, there is absolutely no comparison between President Reagan's, and for that matter, President Bush's use of the recess appointment authority and that of President Clinton. Mr. Hormel was President Clinton's 58th recess appointment. President Reagan made 239 recess appointments. And President Bush in only four years made 78, substantially more than President Clinton.

Second, Senator Byrd did not hold appointments hostage. He did not hold up appointments. He was dealing with a President who made wholesale use of recess appointments and was not consulting or notifying the Senate before he did so. So Senator Byrd made a complaint and worked out an agreement under which he would be notified of recess appointments before they took place.

The fact is, we already do that. We notify the Majority Leader before we make a recess appointment, and we did so in the case of Mr. Hormel.

Finally, Senator Byrd's complaint was that President Reagan was routinely circumventing the Senate's confirmation role. We're not doing that. We want the Senate to act. We want them to vote up or down. If we don't have a majority in support of a nominee, the Senate has a right to vote him down. But they are obliged to vote.

The fact is, the Foreign Relations Committee acted on this nomination nearly two years ago. We did not circumvent the process, they did.

Q: Did you notify any other Republicans?

A: We notified the appropriate leaders, and that included Senator Lott.

Lepping/Johnson, etc.

Steel
June 17, 1999

Q: What is Admin position of Roth steel legislation approved by Finance Committee yesterday?

A: Generally constructive approach. Strong enforcement of trade laws, and strong WTO consistent trade laws, best way to address steel import surge.

Admin strategy of vigorous trade law enforcement has been effective. Steel surge has been turned back. Overall steel imports below pre-crisis levels in first four months of this year.

Surge has shown room for strengthening of our section 201 import safeguard law in WTO consistent manner. We are prepared to work with Congress on legislation we can recommend the President sign.

FYI: Final April steel numbers to be released today by Commerce. Will need to update numbers. Had only April prelim's till today. First four-month import statement above still holds.

Deputy USTR Richard Fisher and Commerce Assistant Secretary LaRussa will represent the Administration at the Finance Committee mark up Wednesday morning at 10:00.

Proposed Talking Points

The Administration firmly opposes steel quota legislation, and believes vigorous enforcement of our trade laws is the best way to address the steel surge and unfair trade practices affecting our steel industry.

Through the Administration's strategy of vigorous trade law enforcement, overall steel imports are in the first four months of this year now below pre-crisis levels. The surge has been eliminated. We will remain vigilant against unfair trade practices.

The crisis has shown, however, that there is room for strengthening of our trade laws. The Administration believes that the Levin-Houghton, Roth and Baucus-Levin steel proposals are generally constructive, and we are prepared to work with Congress on legislation we can recommend that the President sign.

Specifically, we are supportive of Section 201 law reform that is W TO consistent, and have provided specific ideas in this regard. We would be concerned about changes that would limit the President's discretion to act in the overall national interest.

We have some concerns about the Section 301 provisions of the Roth proposal, but again, are prepared to work with Congress on this.

We strongly oppose measures that would limit the Commerce Department and Administration's discretion to enter into suspension agreements in the context of antidumping or countervailing duty trade cases.

**Vice President
June 17, 1999**

Language from Lockhart 6-16 briefing:

Q Do you have any information on what the President's thoughts are as Al Gore declares for president?

MR. LOCKHART: I think, very obviously and clearly, the President values the relationship and the incredible work that the Vice President has done over the last seven years as his partner. He has been at the forefront of the economic recovery, of the reinventing government, our commitment to education, our foreign policy and our commitment to the environment. These are all areas that the Vice President has played an enormous role in, and I think will stand to his credit as he stands up today.

I think, also, the President believes that it's time for the President to get out and make the case, let the country know who he is, where he wants to take the country. And he takes an important first step on that journey today.

Q Does that mean even if Gore wants to separate himself from the President's agenda?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the President's agenda on things like the economy, education, the environment will prove to be a very successful platform for the Vice President to run from.

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

June 17, 1999 Local Evening Edition / June 17, 1999 EDT Morning Edition

EUROPE/RUSSIA

Kosovo (updated)

Russia / Kosovo (updated)

Kosovo / Humanitarian

Kosovo / China (updated)

G-8 Summit

France / Religious Sects

NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA

India – Pakistan / Kashmir Fighting

India – Pakistan / Sanctions

Iraq / Security Council Resolutions

Iraq / Car Bombing (new)

Iran / Arrest of Jews

Usama Bin Ladin

ASIA

Korea / Naval incident (updated)

AFRICA

AIDS/Drugs / South Africa

INTELLIGENCE

PFIAB Report

How is Serb compliance?

- Serb pullout is substantial. Above 35000 VJ and MUP are out of Kosovo, along with 110 tanks, 210 APCs, and 151 artillery and mortar pieces.
- This leaves about 11000 in Kosovo.
- Zone 1 in the south is almost entirely evacuated. Zone 2
- While Serb forces have made a sincere effort to comply with the MTA timetable, a few forces do remain in Zone 1 because of logistic problems and congestion on the roads. Consequently, some units in Zone one were given an extra 24 hours to withdraw.
- This should not delay compliance for much more than a day and did not otherwise affect the agreed timetable.

What is the status of KFOR's deployment?

- KFOR deployment is on schedule. About 15000 Allied troops have entered, including 3800 Americans.
- KFOR Forward HQ is now fully established in an ex-factory site in the western part of Pristina. Gen. Jackson chose it because it is reasonably central and has good facilities.
- American forces have moved into their sector and are setting up their command force. They have relieved the French who have moved north into their sector.

What is going on with the Russian force in Kosovo?

- President Clinton had good conversations with President Yeltsin Sunday and Monday on Russian participation in implementing the Kosovo peace settlement. Agreed on a process to address issues.
- As part of that process, Secretary of Defense Cohen is meeting Russian Defense Minister Sergeyev in Helsinki now to discuss longer-term issues of Russian participation in implementing the Kosovo peace settlement. Focus is on finding a formula for Russian participation in KFOR that preserves unity of command and effectiveness of the mission.
- Have made progress in these talks, which are continuing. Cohen and Sergeyev are to meet again Thursday.

- Secretary of State Albright is going tonight to Helsinki to meet with Foreign Minister Ivanov to reinforce those discussions.
- “Long-term” discussions are addressing principles, such as unity of command under KFOR commander, that will facilitate discussions on short-term issues.
- General Jackson and General Zavarzin focused on short-term issues in Pristina. Had constructive talks yesterday, but still more to be done.
- Confident that we have established the right communications channels. Will keep working.
- There is an understanding that we need to continue to move forward with finalizing arrangements for Russian participation in KFOR and that it is in the best interest of implementation to have Russia and other non-NATO countries participate in KFOR.

What about a Russian Sector?

- We have spoken clearly on this issue, we will not accept an arrangement that would amount to the de facto partition of Kosovo. That is not to say that Russian will not play a meaningful role or will not have a zone or area of operation.
- Have made clear that Russian participation is welcome. Russia can play an important role in creating a safe and secure environment on the ground. Early agreement on terms for Russian participation important for building confidence.

Is the President seeking further clarification on the premature deployment of Russian troops into Kosovo?

- Our main concern is that we continue to work towards an agreement on Russian participation that is consistent with NATO’s efforts, sanctioned by the U.N., to fully implement the basic conditions: complete withdrawal of Serb forces; deployment of KFOR; the return of refugees; and a level of self-government and autonomy for the Kosovars.
- Clearly, we would also want to avoid further mistakes or misunderstandings. However, it is important to note that the Russian troop presence did not disrupt KFOR’s deployment nor affect the Serbs’ withdrawal.

What do you mean, weren’t you planning to use the airfield as the headquarters for KFOR?

- As General Clark has said, Pristina airfield was not meant to be used in the early stages of KFOR’s deployment. It is not a strategically important site. That said, of course, we want to work out suitable arrangements with the Russian presence there.

What is your reaction to the Russian deception of promising not to send troops into Kosovo, and then sending them anyway?

- Clearly, this miscommunication is unfortunate.
- Our understanding is that President Yeltsin gave the general orders to participate in KFOR and left the implementation up to the military to decide. The small advance party that was sent into Kosovo is not militarily significant.
- We have had numerous discussions with Russian officials on this. The bottom line remains that the Russians' arrival in Pristina in no way interfered with KFOR's deployment or Serb withdrawal.
- Meanwhile, talks are proceeding to develop workable arrangements for Russian participation in KFOR.

What about the KLA, will they demilitarize?

- We are in contact with the KLA and they remain committed to live by their agreement and to demilitarize consistent with Rambo.

What is the Status of Assistance Efforts?

- UN reports that over 50 trucks with food and other humanitarian goods arrived in Pristina yesterday.
- Additional convoys today.
- These goods will be distributed to outlying areas as KFOR establishes presence in those areas.

Background: President Clinton said in Paris today that he “hope[s] and believe[s] they will reach a successful conclusion” to the talks on Russian participation in KFOR. Yeltsin announced on TV that he had instructed Sergeyev to insist on a Russian sector. Secretary of Defense Cohen continues to meet with his counterpart, Defense Minister Sergeyev, to discuss the issue; Secretary Albright and Foreign Minister Ivanov also arrived to participate in talks.

What is the situation with Kosovo and the Russian troops?

- Secretary of Defense Cohen and Minister of Defense Sergeyev continuing discussions in Helsinki to work out a formula for Russian participation in KFOR. Secretary of State Albright and Foreign Minister Ivanov have joined them in Helsinki.
- As President Clinton said in Paris, hope and believe these talks will reach a successful conclusion. Atmosphere positive.
- Confident that we have established the right communications channels. Will keep working.

What about Yeltsin’s TV statement that Russia insists on its own sector in Kosovo? Since Albright said US will not give the Russians a zone, doesn’t that mean the talks are at a stalemate?

- Aware of Russian position. This is a key issue under discussion.
- As President Clinton said, all peacekeeping forces in Kosovo must operate under a single, unified command. Have also said we will not accept de facto partition of Kosovo. That is not to say that Russian will not play a meaningful role or will not have a zone or area of operation.
- Discussions continuing on this issue. Again, atmosphere has been positive.

Is it true the Russians are reinforcing their troops in Kosovo? Have planes landed in Kosovo? Has another convoy reached them from Bosnia?

- Russians in Pristina received a supply convoy Tuesday. NATO indicated that this was just a resupply effort and that it had no difficulty allowing Russian forces to get food and water.
- There was no second convoy yesterday. There have been no flights into Kosovo.

Doesn't the surprise Russian move prove that your idea of "partnership" with Russia is dead?

- Serves U.S. interests and Russia's to work together to achieve a peaceful settlement in Kosovo.
- Special Envoy Chernomyrdin played a key role in persuading Milosevic to accept the peace agreement which he is now implementing. Yugoslav campaign of violence and repression against Kosovars has stopped, Serbian troops are leaving Kosovo, NATO security force is entering, refugees already starting to return.
- Russia can play an important role in creating a safe and secure environment on the ground. We have made clear Russian participation is welcome. Formula for that participation remains to be worked out, but Secretaries Cohen and Albright meeting with counterparts in Helsinki to continue working on a solution.
- Cooperation with Russia also continues on other issues: nonproliferation, fighting terrorism, civil aviation, strategic arms elimination, protection of fissile materials, support for small business and civil society. Achieved in March important breakthrough on principles to adapt the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty.

Does the surprise Russian move prove that the Russian military, and potentially the Russian nuclear force, is out of control?

- No evidence whatsoever that President Yeltsin is not in charge of Russia's nuclear forces.
- Specifically on the Russian deployment to Kosovo, Russians have told us that President Yeltsin authorized the deployment and left implementation up to the military leaders.

Is the President seeking further clarification on the premature deployment of Russian troops into Kosovo?

- Continue to work towards an agreement on Russian participation that is consistent with NATO's efforts, sanctioned by the UN, to fully implement the basic conditions: complete withdrawal of Serb forces; deployment of KFOR; the return of refugees; and a level of self-government and autonomy for the Kosovars.
- Clearly, we would also want to avoid further misunderstandings. However, it is important to note that the Russian troop presence did not disrupt KFOR's deployment nor affect the Serbs' withdrawal.

KOSOVO: HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE EFFORTS

June 16, 1999

Status of Assistance Efforts

- UNHCR has organized three multi-agency convoys to deliver food and relief supplies from Skopje, Macedonia to Pristina. Convoys then move from Pristina to other major villages. Yesterday, assistance was delivered to 20,000 displaced people in the Glogovac area. Today, assistance moved to Urosevac and Prizren.
- The IRC air drop operation continues to drop almost 10,000 HDRs a day. The U.S. is financing this operation, which will continue until convoys and/or helicopter deliveries are able to reach all populations.

Returns and Demining

- Almost 8000 refugees returned to Kosovo from Macedonia and Albania on June 15, despite warnings by aid agencies that mines and withdrawing Serb forces posed significant dangers. Tragically, two people were killed and one seriously injured by a land mine, while crossing the border at an unofficial point.
- UNICEF is working to raise mine awareness among refugees and returnees. The U.S. is supporting its efforts by providing technical expertise and materials.
- As part of its humanitarian mine awareness strategy for Kosovo, the Department of State just awarded a 1.6 million dollar contract to RONCO Consulting Corporation to begin humanitarian demining as soon as KFOR completes its initial mine assessment and countermine measures. RONCO will deploy six fully trained and equipped demining teams with dogs to Kosovo shortly. These teams will be ready to commence mine clearance operations as soon as KFOR authorizes them to do so. The Department of State is also deploying staff to Kosovo to monitor and oversee these operations and to coordinate all U.S. funded mine clearance with the UN.

UN/NATO coordination

- Civilian/military coordination is a critical component of effort. The British KFOR contingent has established a Civil-Military Coordination Center (CIMIC) at the UNHCR warehouse compound in Pristina. All relief agencies, donors and international organizations are co-located there, enabling close coordination.

CONTEXT: *U/S Pickering led a delegation to China to present the findings of a US investigation of the causes of the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in early May. The delegation includes members from CIA, DIA, DoD, and NSC, along with the Department of State.*

Whom did the delegation meet with in Beijing?

- The delegation had working meetings with both Foreign Minister TANG Jiaxuan and Vice Foreign Minister YANG Jiechi.

What did Pickering say? Did he apologize yet again?

- Undersecretary Pickering traveled to Beijing at the President's request to present our explanation of the causes of the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade. He was fulfilling the President's promise to President Jiang that a full investigation into this incident would be conducted and that the results would be presented to Beijing.

Is the U.S. paying compensation?

- We have offered to provide humanitarian payment to the injured and the families of those killed, with the details to be worked out diplomatically very soon.

Will the U.S. be paying for property damage?

- We are willing to discuss the issue of damage done to China's Embassy in Belgrade. We understand the Chinese will discuss with us the issue of damage to U.S. property in China as well.

Did the Chinese accept the report as adequate?

- We look forward to hearing Undersecretary Pickering's full report upon his return.

SOUTHEAST EUROPE INITIATIVE, THE STABILITY PACT, AND RECONSTRUCTION

What are the G-8 leaders prepared to do about the long-term instability in the Balkans?

- Leaders will review a variety of efforts to stabilize and advance the economic recovery of Kosovo and the frontline states of Southeast Europe (*comment: Russians don't agree to integration*) including: the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe, proposed by Germany as current President of the European Union, which establishes a useful set of principles to guide future cooperation and some mechanisms to facilitate coordination of action; as well as the work of a High-Level Steering Group, coordinated by the World Bank and the European Commission and involving other major donors, which is developing an overall strategy and action plan for recovery, reform and reconstruction and coordination of future assistance.

What will SEI cost and who will pay?

- The President's Southeast Europe Initiative seeks to strengthen ongoing efforts, working with NATO, the EU and the other multilateral institutions to stabilize, transform and eventually integrate this region into the European and transatlantic mainstream. Our goal is to ensure that even as the Kosovo settlement goes forward, that we work to prevent further crises elsewhere in the Balkans. As the President has said, it is cheaper to invest in peace than war.
- We expect the EU to take the lead role on reconstruction and to remain the largest donor of development assistance to the region. However, we are willing to continue to do our fair share and our significant development assistance under the SEED program is already focused on this region.

What are your current cost estimates associated with reconstruction in Kosovo?

- In March, before the most recent Milosevic offensive, best estimates put total costs -- for infrastructure reconstruction and implementation of civilian components of interim peace agreement -- at around \$750 million, with over half of this sum for housing repair.
- At present, there is no way to assess damage done to hundreds of villages shelled and burned by the VJ and the MUP since the beginning of the current offensive. That damage is continuing.

FINANCIAL ARCHITECTURE

Do the measures proposed and implemented by the G-7 really represent a significant improvement to the international financial architecture that will make future crises less likely?

- We have made improvements to the Bretton Woods institutions, particularly in the area of transparency and decision-making.
- We have made advances in the promotion of standards and codes of financial conduct, particularly in the public sector.
- We have established a framework for addressing private sector involvement in the response to any future crises so that private investment decisions will take proper account of the risks involved.
- We have created new institutions, such as the Financial Stability Forum, which will continue to study these types of issues. These steps will not necessarily prevent any future crises, but these and other measures we are undertaking will both make such crises less likely and make the international financial system, and its component parts, more resilient in the face of pressures.

KOLN DEBT INITIATIVE

Jubilee 2000 has called for massive debt relief for poor countries. Since the establishment of the HIPC program in 1996, only three countries have actually received debt relief under the program. What are you going to do to improve the program?

- The changes we will announce in Cologne will provide faster and deeper debt relief to more countries while maintaining incentives for economic reforms and providing a framework for channeling freed up resources into poverty reduction programs. In broad terms, it will more than triple the amount of debt relief anticipated, to approximately \$73 billion in nominal terms (or \$40 billion in constant 1998 dollars).
- As the President announced in March, “Our goal is to ensure that no country committed to fundamental reform is left with a debt burden that keeps it from meeting its people’s basic human needs and spurring growth.”

JORDAN DEBT

King Abdullah of Jordan has asked for debt forgiveness from Jordan's major creditors. Does the United States favor debt forgiveness for Jordan?

- The United States strongly supports debt forgiveness for Jordan. We have already forgiven almost \$700 million in Jordanian debt to the U.S. We have urged other creditors to do the same. Jordan owes over \$7 billion dollars and its debt service payments consume over 20 percent of its budget. King Abdullah knows that reviving economic growth will require economic reforms, and he has made very clear that he is prepared to take the necessary steps, but he has asked Jordan's creditors to give him the breathing room he needs. All G-8 countries have a strong interest in helping King Abdullah succeed in building a brighter economic future for the people of Jordan. We are urging our G-8 partners to join us in doing all that we can to support Jordan's economy during this critical period. We all recognize that reducing Jordan's debt burden -- coupled with economic reforms in Jordan -- would be a powerful catalyst for private investment and economic growth.

UKRAINE NUCLEAR SAFETY

Will Ukraine close Chernobyl in 2000?

- In the 1995, Ukraine committed to close the remaining operational unit at Chernobyl in 2000. We expect Ukraine to meet its commitment, just as the G-7 have been meeting ours.

MIDDLE EAST

Prime Minister-elect Barak has promised to withdraw Israeli forces from southern Lebanon within a year. What is the U.S position on this issue?

- It's important to give Prime Minister-elect Barak time to get settled and form his government. When he is ready, we will consult to elicit his thinking about how he sees the period ahead.
- On the specific point regarding southern Lebanon, we've made it clear that we support UNSC resolution 425 and we want to see it implemented. It has been our consistent position that all foreign troops should withdraw from Lebanon.
- We continue to believe that negotiations between Israel and Lebanon would provide a way to resolve the issues that divide them and to advance Lebanese sovereignty and territorial integrity and the security of both countries.

What is the U.S. position on UN resolution 181? Is it relevant to the peace process? Is 181 irrelevant?

- We have been very clear that the terms of reference for the peace process were defined by Madrid and Oslo. These are U.N. Resolutions 242, 338, and land for peace. Resolution 181 is not one of the terms of reference as defined by Madrid and Oslo.

The PA has asked the UN Security Council to act to stop Israeli settlement activity. What's our response to this request? Will we oppose it?

- On the general subject of settlements, we have made clear our position that continued settlement activity is destructive to the peace process. We've also made clear our view that the parties need to engage directly on issues such as this. We've called on the parties to engage in permanent status negotiations on an accelerated basis in order to deal with these issues.

EXPANDED THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

What is the rationale behind the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative?

- The economic crisis that affected Russia and the NIS over the past year has increased the risk of weapons of mass destruction proliferation and made it harder to fulfill arms control treaty obligations. President Clinton views this situation as one of the most significant national security challenges facing us today. The G8 is endorsing an effort to intensify the broad international partnerships -- among Russia, the other NIS and other nations and international organizations -- to address the security implications of the economic situation.
- Over the next five years, the US will seek over \$4.5 billion from Congress to expand and accelerate our programs for Russia and the other NIS to help address high priority security, arms control and nonproliferation requirements. But the \$4.5 billion in U.S. programs is not enough -- we estimate there is another, roughly equal amount in unmet critical needs for threat reduction and nonproliferation cooperation with Russia and the other Newly Independent States. We envision that the international effort will be made up of direct assistance commitments from individual countries and other multilateral bodies for specific programs and projects based on their own interests and expertise.
- We have identified needs in four areas: nuclear security; non-nuclear weapons of mass destruction; nonproliferation of weapons expertise; and military relocation, stabilization and other security cooperation efforts. Many countries beyond the G-8 have also been involved in such assistance in the past and some have ongoing programs. We are pleased that the G-8 is supporting these efforts to stabilize arms control and achieve nonproliferation objectives -- these efforts are essential to all our security. We look for the G-8 and other concerned countries to increase their activities in this area.

CORE LABOR STANDARDS

What will the G-8 do to promote greater respect for core labor standards?

- We in the G-8 believe that respect for core labor standards is indispensable to social stability and can serve to promote economic growth.
- We are also urging the international financial institutions to incorporate improved implementation of these standards into their policies and to increase cooperative efforts with the ILO. Similarly we are encouraging more effective cooperation between the WTO and ILO.

CYPRUS

Is the Foreign Ministers' G-8 statement on Cyprus an effort to reduce the UN role on the Cyprus issue?

- No. We view the G-8 Foreign Ministers' statement, which calls on leaders to urge Secretary General Annan to invite the parties to talks, as a vehicle to support UN efforts on Cyprus.

The statement refers to negotiations without preconditions. Does this mean the U.S. is abandoning its support for a bizonal, bicomunal federation?

- No. The U.S. continues to support a Cyprus solution based on a bizonal, bicomunal federation.

What role will the U.S., UK, Russian, EU, and others play in the negotiations?

- It is premature to get into such questions at this juncture.

KASHMIR

What can you tell us about the situation in Kashmir?

- Kashmir is an issue that cries out for a bilateral solution, arrived at through direct talks, and with respect for the sanctity of the line of control, agreed by both sides in 1972.
- The G-8 ministerial last week stated that we were deeply concerned about the continuing confrontation following the infiltration of militants across the line of control.
- We have urged other countries, including China, to play an active role in urging restraint on both sides

- We were disappointed at the apparent lack of progress at the talks between the two foreign ministers last Saturday.
- The President called Prime Ministers Vajpayee and Sharif on June 14 and 15, respectively. He expressed our serious concerns about the dangers of the present situation, the need for restraint, and the importance of a bilateral solution. He told Prime Minister Sharif that a peaceful resolution of the problem required the withdrawal of forces supported by Pakistan from the Indian side of the line of control.
- We are confident neither leader wants a wider war, but we should not be complacent about the potential danger of an accident or miscalculation that could lead to dangerous escalation.
- Prime Ministers Sharif and Vajpayee made a fine beginning toward Indo-Pakistan reconciliation at the Lahore Summit in February . That should be the future of the subcontinent, not continued hostilities over a 50-year old dispute.

FRANCE - RELIGIOUS SECTS

June 16, 1999

What do you think about French government endorsement of an Interministerial Mission to Battle Against Sects that casts religious minorities including evangelical groups, Mormons and Jehovah's witnesses in an unfavorable light?

- The US and France share long traditions of tolerance toward religious minorities. The international commitments we have both made to protect the rights of religion and belief (ICCPR, UDHR, others) are very important.
- The US understands and respects the French government's interest in monitoring the activities of dangerous groups and we understand that some dangerous groups hide behind the label of "religion" in order to shield themselves from scrutiny.
- It is most important that this Interministerial Mission carefully verifies its facts about members of religious minorities and does not premise its work on questionable statements about these individuals and their religious practices.
- We hope that the Interministerial Mission will include redress for unfairly targeted religious groups.

Why did the US insist on sending to France a delegation consisting of members of dangerous sects, who proceeded to lecture the French government on how France should deal with it's own religious minorities?

- The US delegation consisted of distinguished scholars and professionals who work in the area of religious freedom. All of the members of the delegation are responsible professionals and respected members of the American religious community.

INDIA-PAKISTAN: KASHMIR FIGHTING
June 16, 1999

- We do not intend to play a mediating role. This is an issue that needs to be resolved bilaterally.

(If asked: U/S Pickering has no current plans to visit South Asia)

INDIA – PAKISTAN: SANCTIONS

June 16, 1999

BACKGROUND: The Senate and the House passed differing legislation addressing Glenn Amendment sanctions. The Senate June 8 passed an amendment proposed by Senator Roberts and further amended by Senator Brownback that mandates a 5-year suspension of certain economic sanctions against India and Pakistan imposed for actions taken by those countries prior to the date of enactment of the amendment. The amendment also permits the President to issue a national security interest waiver for prohibitions on military sales, export licenses for items on the Munitions List, foreign military financing, and exports of certain goods and technologies to both countries. The House on June 15 passed an extension of the Brownback waiver authority of last year. It would permit presidential waiver authority for economic sanctions and IMET until September 30, 2000.

- We appreciate Congressional attention to the issue of our nonproliferation interests in South Asia.
- We prefer the flexibility that would come from comprehensive and permanent authority to waive Glenn and related sanctions against India and Pakistan.
- We would not expect to use any additional waiver authority until there is significant action by India/Pakistan on our nonproliferation goals.
- (If asked) This action should not be seen as related to the current fighting in Kashmir. Legislation waiving Glenn sanctions is not a “reward” for either country but would promote our nonproliferation goals in the region.

IRAQ: SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

June 16, 1999

Are you content with stalemate in the Security Council? Do you really want to rebuild a consensus on Iraq?

- Consensus in the Security Council is the best way to handle Iraq. Nine years of experience has shown that we are most successful in compelling Saddam Hussein to live up to his commitments to the international community when the Security Council is united.
- However, we are not seeking consensus at any price. Saddam Hussein must comply with the will of the international community and we will not reduce our standard for compliance.

Are you going to accept the draft British-Dutch Security Council Resolution?

- We are studying the British-Dutch draft very carefully. We think it is probably in the right ballpark, but we're not there yet.

Does that mean that you are willing to accept a suspension of sanctions in return for Iraqi compliance with a new disarmament program?

- As I said, we're looking at it closely, but we still have problems with it.

What about the proposed French draft on Iraq? Would you be willing to accept that?

- We think that the British-Dutch draft is the right starting point to rebuild Council consensus on Iraq.

What about your undeclared "war" in the No-Fly Zones against Iraq?

- American and British planes patrol the two No-Fly Zones over Iraq every day to prevent Saddam Hussein from using airpower to repress his people, as he did so horribly in 1991.
- Our airstrikes are purely defensive. We only strike when our planes are attacked, and when we do so, we take great care to avoid damage to civilian areas.
- If Saddam Hussein wants to stop our airstrikes he only has to stop shooting at our planes.

IRAQ: CAR BOMBING
June 17, 1999

What do you know about the recent car bombing in Iraq? Was this an internal attack against the regime or part of Iran's campaign against Iraqi-supported guerrilla movements?

- We've see reports of a car bomb explosion in a residential suburb of Baghdad.
- I don't have anything for you regarding casualties or who was responsible.

This is the second car bombing in one week. Is this an indication of an escalation of unrest against the regime?

- We've been seeing an intensification of acts against the regime for some time now, but it's premature to say whether these car bombings are part of this pattern of unrest.

What is your position on reprisals by Iran against MEK targets in Iraq? Do you condemn them or do you prefer to just look the other way?

- We've made it clear that we consider the MEK a terrorist organization responsible for a worldwide campaign of bombings and assassinations.
- The MEK was designated a foreign terrorist organization in 1997 and their assets in the United States blocked. We have called on other states to take similar steps.
- While Iraq and the MEK have blamed the Iranian government for previous car bombings against MEK targets in Iraq, Iran has denied responsibility for these incidents.

But what about last week's scud attack? Does Iran have the right to launch scuds into Iraq in retaliation against the MEK?

- The MEK is a terrorist organization. It has claimed responsibility for, among other acts of terror, the assassination in April of Iranian armed forces Deputy Chief of Staff Lt. Gen. Ali Sayyad Shirazi.
- We have made our position clear that as a terrorist organization, the MEK should not enjoy the support of any state and that the international community should work to prevent it from engaging in further acts of terror.

IRAN: ARREST OF JEWS
June 16, 1999

What do you think of the arrest of the 13 Jews in Iran on espionage charges?

- As my Administration has stated publicly, I am deeply troubled by these arrests. The charges have no foundation and they constitute a serious breach of the rule of law.
- I believe the government of Iran must uphold its stated commitment to protect the rights of all religious and ethnic minorities by releasing these individuals and ensuring that no harm comes to them.

Will the US take action against Iran on this issue?

- We are pursuing this matter vigorously with our European allies, with our friends in the region, and with others we believe could lend useful support on this issue.
- I will not comment on further actions we might take, but certainly events such as this can only increase tensions between the United States and the government of Iran.

USAMA BIN LADIN
June 16, 1999

BACKGROUND: ABC ran a piece by McWethy saying that, according to intelligence sources, Bin Ladin appears to be "in the advanced stages of operational planning" for another attack against a U.S. facility.

Is Bin Ladin in fact on the verge of another attack on a U.S. facility? Do you have, as ABC reports, phone intercepts and other intelligence demonstrating that bombs and bomb experts are being moved into position?

- We have said all along that we believe UBL will seek to attack American interests again. He has declared his determination to strike at America in his fatwa, and we continue to believe he intends to do so if he can. However, I don't want to characterize how far along he is in his preparations and I'm not going to go into the sources of our information. This is an intelligence matter, and as you know, we don't discuss intelligence issues.
- I want to reiterate, however, that we take Bin Ladin and all Bin Ladin-related threats with the greatest seriousness. We have taken numerous precautions -- and on a number of occasions since the bombings last summer -- and we will continue to take every appropriate measure to protect American lives.

ABC mentions that African posts are thought to be at particular risk, and McWethy specifically mentioned that there had been surveillance of the U.S. embassies in Mozambique, Ghana and Senegal. Is this true? The Middle East and Persian Gulf were also mentioned as potential targets.

- Clearly, the bombings in Dar and Nairobi show that UBL can launch operations in Africa, and obviously we need to take all necessary precautions to ensure that he does not succeed again. We also know that he has operatives in many countries in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf region. But I'm not going to comment on events at particular embassies, which again are intelligence matters. I do want to underscore that we have made a broad range of security upgrades at diplomatic posts around the world since the bombings. We have stepped up intelligence gathering, and we continue to work with nations around the world to deter attacks. We're taking every piece of threat information seriously.

Has Bin Ladin acquired ingredients for chemical or biological weapons from countries that were part of the Soviet Union? And do you know that, as reported, he has weapons labs in particular cities in Afghanistan?

- We have said for almost a year now that Bin Ladin is eagerly seeking to build weapons of mass destruction. There are a number of possible sources of materials for materials for such weapons, but I'm not going to speculate on what he might have procured or where. Suffice it to say that we view Bin Ladin's efforts in this area with the gravest concern, and we are pursuing all possible leads on this issue. Bin Ladin continues to use Afghanistan as his base of operations, but I'm not going to discuss what might be going on at particular installations.

ABC says that U.S. intelligence believes that Bin Ladin has Marfan's Syndrome. Can you confirm?

- No. I have no information on that at all.

KOREA: NAVAL INCIDENT UPDATE
June 17, 1999

CONTEXT: After Tuesday's bloodshed, the tense sea standoff at the Northern Limit Line (NLL) has abated – for now. No DPRK naval craft have crossed the NLL since the incident. The UN Command invited the DPRK for a second round of General Officers talks, after an inconclusive opening meeting June 15. The DPRK has yet to reply to the UN Command invitation.

There is no evidence yet to gauge the broader impact of Tuesday's fire fight: there are no indications of DPRK intentions concerning the bilateral vice-ministerial meeting scheduled for June 21 with the ROK in Beijing, although a ROK government spokesman is quoted in the press as saying the ROK will attend. (U.S. Special Envoy Ambassador Charles Kartman is also planning to meet with DPRK Vice Foreign Minister Kim Gye Gwan next week in Beijing as a follow-up to the Kumchang-ni site visit. There are no indications concerning DPRK changes in plans to attend.)

Note: the DoD spokesman yesterday stated that new US forces are being moved into the region. In so doing, he read from the wrong (background) part of his sheet. DoD is now trying to walk this back – the statement is likely to escalate tensions in the area, whereas we are trying in fact to de-escalate them. If reporters ask about “new” US forces, we should stick to the line that: 1. We have not raised the alert status of US forces in the area; 2. We regularly move some types of forces/equipment into and out of this area and are continuing to do so; and 3. There is nothing unusual about these movements.

Are you worried about tensions flaring on the Korean Peninsula and what are you doing about it? What about reports of more U.S. forces moving to the area?

- Given the many security, economic and non-proliferation issues we must confront on the Korean Peninsula, it remains at the forefront of our security concerns in Asia.
- We are in close contact with the South Korean Government and are working closely to defuse the situation and reduce tensions.
- It is clear that the North Koreans have moved their ships back and currently there is clear separation between the boats of both sides. This is a welcome development. Reducing tensions by avoiding another confrontation is in everyone's best interest.
- Our forces remain in their normal state of readiness. We have not raised the alert status of US forces in the area.
- We regularly move some types of forces/equipment into and out of this area and are continuing to do so.

- There is nothing unusual about these movements

Will this terminate Kim Dae Jung's "sunshine policy"?

- No. That policy has combined efforts to build bridges to the North with firmness in dealing with provocative acts by Pyongyang. The South will continue to pursue both strands of this policy.

What has happened in the waters off Korea overnight?

- The North Koreans have moved their ships back above the NLL, and currently there is clear separation between the boats of both sides.

Why did the North commit these provocations?

- We can only speculate as to their motives of the North. Whatever their rationale, however, at this point it appears that they are choosing not to escalate this incident.

Is this over?

- We hope so, but we cannot be sure.

What is the situation at the Northern Limit Line?

- There have been no further incidents since the June 15 confrontation between ROK and DPRK naval vessels. No crossings of the Northern Limit Line by DPRK warships have been noted in the last 24 hours. ROK Navy ships remain in the area, but well away from the Northern Limit Line.

What is the U.S. doing diplomatically? What is the status of UN Command General Officer talks?

- We remain in close contact with the ROK Government throughout the process and are continuing to monitor the situation carefully. We are working closely with the ROK to try to defuse the situation and reduce tensions.
- We contacted the DPRK through the New York channel to urge strongly that they remain north of the Northern Limit Line. We note that DPRK Naval forces are currently staying north of the NLL. Reducing tensions by avoiding another confrontation is in everyone's best interest.

- We welcomed the DPRK decision to attend the UN Command General Officers' talks June 15 in Panmunjom. Unfortunately, those talks recessed without result. A UN Command invitation to the DPRK for a second round is pending a reply from the North.
- We urge the DPRK to continue participating in the discussions so that a way to resolve the situation peacefully can be found and recurrences prevented. I'd refer you to the UN Command in Seoul for details on the talks.

What is the Northern Limit Line (NLL)?

- I'd refer you to the UN Command in Seoul, which is charged with monitoring the Korean War Armistice, for authoritative information about the NLL.
- The NLL has served as an effective means of preventing military tension between North and South Korean military forces for 46 years. It serves as a practical demarcation line which has contributed to the separation of forces.
- We continue to urge the DPRK to recognize this practicality by keeping its craft north of the line.

What about casualties?

- The ROK Ministry of National Defense reported that seven of its sailors were injured. There have been various reports of DPRK casualties, but I cannot confirm these. It is always regrettable whenever conflicts like the one Tuesday result in casualties. We are working hard to urge the DPRK to avoid further confrontations by keeping its craft north of the NLL.

What has the VP done on AIDS in Africa?

- We respect the good intentions of those concerned about the problems of AIDS in Africa. The Vice President has been working diligently over many years with Thabo Mbeki -- inaugurated today as President of South Africa -- to combat the scourge of AIDS in Africa.
- In the context of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission which they co-chair, Vice President Gore and President Mbeki have worked together to find better ways to track the disease, to promote awareness, and develop better means of prevention. Under Vice President Gore's leadership, the U.S. government has been sharing the best of our knowledge and efforts on AIDS with the Government of South Africa.
- The Vice President also believes we need to use all available means to deliver high-quality, affordable medicines to those who need them. That's why he has been encouraging the efforts of the U.S. Trade Representative, the South African government, and the pharmaceutical industry to explore solutions to the dispute over intellectual property rights.
- We will continue to work with South Africa and other African nations to address the problem of AIDS in a comprehensive manner, from tracking, awareness, prevention, providing treatment, and also continuing our research -- so that 20th century treatment can be replaced by a 21st century cure.

What is your reaction to this report? It's pretty hard-hitting.

- We appreciate the work of the PFIAB and its staff in undertaking this review. The Board did a commendable job in a short time. The report chronicles the longstanding problems at DOE labs, as noted in previous Congressional, internal and GAO reports

But what do you think about the Report's conclusions that you essentially have a bureaucracy out of control?

- We recognize, as did the PFIAB, that the work at the labs represents America's most brilliant scientific achievements on a sustained basis. We also recognize that there are some systemic problems that could potentially make our nuclear weapons secrets vulnerable to foreign intelligence gathering efforts.
- It was the Administration's concerns about these counterintelligence vulnerabilities that prompted the President to issue PDD-61 over a year ago. As the report says, "in the past two years the Clinton Administration has proposed and begun to implement some of the most far-reaching reforms in DOE history."

Yes, but you still have a problem.

- We have in place the mechanisms now to implement the provisions of the PDD. However, as the PFIAB report points out, the implementation cannot be accomplished overnight. It will take constant vigilance and attention, by the national security leadership, by the Secretary of Energy in particular and by the counterintelligence community.

So, what do you think about the proposal that DOE's nuclear programs be placed under a semi-autonomous or independent agency?

- We will carefully review the recommendations.

How about the allegation in the report that the Administration moved too slowly in addressing the problem at the Labs?

- We took what we considered at the time to be far-reaching and unprecedented action. The Administration had long been concerned about counterintelligence issues in the post-Cold War world.

- Accordingly, in the wake of the Ames case we organized the government to work together to improve or counterintelligence capability.
- In 1994, the President had issued an earlier Directive establishing the National Counterintell policy bd.
- Then in 1997, when the problems at the labs became apparent, the Policy Board, composed of counterintelligence professionals, was able to examine the problem and come back in very short order to recommend that the President issue a Directive, which later became PDD-61.

Does the President agree with Secretary Richardson that our nuclear weapons secrets are safe today?

- The important thing is that the Secretary has moved quickly and forcefully to put in place the reforms necessary to reduce the vulnerabilities to our nuclear weapons secrets. But when it comes to security, the job is never done.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

June 15, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

On March 18, 1999, I asked the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, the PFIAB, to undertake a review of the security threat at the Department of Energy's weapons labs and the measures that have been taken to address it. PFIAB Chairman Warren B. Rudman presented the Board's findings to me today. I have asked the PFIAB to make the report available to Congress and to the public.

I would like to thank Senator Rudman and the Board members who undertook this important study over a 90-day period, reviewing hundreds of documents and conducting dozens of interviews. As the report recognizes, the Department of Energy represents the best of America's scientific talent and expertise. The value of their contributions makes it imperative that we place a premium on ensuring that we have instituted the best possible measures for the protection of our nation's most valuable secrets at Department facilities.

This Administration already has taken unprecedented steps to reduce the vulnerability of our secrets at the labs. Over a year ago I issued a sweeping Directive to strengthen counterintelligence across the board at the Department of Energy, and Secretary Richardson has aggressively instituted new rules and procedures for counterintelligence and security at DOE facilities. The PFIAB has made a number of proposals which we will carefully review. We remain committed to taking the necessary steps to safeguard our nation's secrets.

As these vital national security issues are addressed, we will be most successful if we continue our efforts in a bipartisan manner with close cooperation between the Executive and Legislative branches of Government.

#

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Presidential Materials Division

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. Email	Thomas M. Rosshirt to Sandra Thurman (2 pages)	06/17/99	(b)(6)

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Gore Vice Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]

OA/Box Number: 700000

FOLDER TITLE:

[AIDS, Africa, Drugs] [06/16/1999-06/30/1999]

2006-0003-F
SDB2

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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 advise 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).

(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]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1999 09:35:14.00

SUBJECT: what richard sent me

TO: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Thomas M. Rosshirt/OVP on 06/17/99
09:34 AM -----

Richard Socarides @ EOP 06/17/99 03:33:03 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Thomas M. Rosshirt/OVP@OVP

cc:

Subject:

Hi. I'm in Paris w/ POTUS.

What is going on here. Is no one paying attention. This will get worse
for you guys.

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 06/17/99
03:30 AM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com

06/16/99 12:44:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides

cc:

Subject: NC10383: Bulletin

Rex comments: Excellent! The refusal to either sell these drugs cheap in
the Third World or to let Third World countries make them generically is
completely unconscionable. (b)(6)

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 12:03:12 -0400

From: Ann Northrop <annnorth@earthlink.net>

To: rwockner@netcom.com

Subject: bulletin!

Rex!

I'm dashing off to do my cable show, but you should know that seven AIDS
activists just interrupted Gore's presidential announcement speech in
Carthage TN. The 7, plus 2 doing support, went down there from New York.

They blew air horns, yelled "Gore kills Africans--AIDS drugs now" and held up signs (bright yellow with black letters pasted over blue Gore signs) saying AIDS Drugs for Africa and Gore's Greed Kills.

All this is because Gore went to South Africa and, in closed meetings, threatened them with severe trade sanctions if they went ahead with their legal plan to manufacture their own versions of AIDS drugs at cheap prices. Gore and Clinton are propping up drug company profits so Gore can get campaign contributions. It's ugly.

For more details, call 212-870-3303 and they'll talk to you and send you a press release.

xxann

Ann Northrop <annnorth@earthlink.net>

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Presidential Materials Division

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. Email	Richard Socarides to Elizabeth J. Potter, et al. (2 pages)	06/17/99	(b)(6)

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Gore Vice Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]

OA/Box Number: 700000

FOLDER TITLE:

[AIDS, Africa, Drugs] [06/16/1999-06/30/1999]

2006-0003-F
SDB2

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 advise 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).

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]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1999 03:25:12.00

SUBJECT: AIDS protesters

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ron Klain (CN=Ron Klain/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd A. Summers (CN=Todd A. Summers/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip G Dufour (CN=Philip G Dufour/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael B. Feldman (CN=Michael B. Feldman/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Monica M. Dixon (CN=Monica M. Dixon/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leon S. Fuerth (CN=Leon S. Fuerth/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From a internet news service. I suspect this problem will only get bigger.

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 06/17/99
03:23 AM -----

rwockner @ netcom.com

06/16/99 12:44:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides

cc:

Subject: NC10383: Bulletin

Rex comments: Excellent! The refusal to either sell these drugs cheap in the Third World or to let Third World countries make them generically is completely unconscionable.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 12:03:12 -0400
From: Ann Northrop <annnorth@earthlink.net>
To: rwockner@netcom.com
Subject: bulletin!

Rex!

I'm dashing off to do my cable show, but you should know that seven AIDS activists just interrupted Gore's presidential announcement speech in Carthage TN. The 7, plus 2 doing support, went down there from New York. They blew air horns, yelled "Gore kills Africans--AIDS drugs now" and held up signs (bright yellow with black letters pasted over blue Gore signs) saying AIDS Drugs for Africa and Gore's Greed Kills.

All this is because Gore went to South Africa and, in closed meetings, threatened them with severe trade sanctions if they went ahead with their legal plan to manufacture their own versions of AIDS drugs at cheap prices. Gore and Clinton are propping up drug company profits so Gore can get campaign contributions. It's ugly.

For more details, call 212-870-3303 and they'll talk to you and send you a press release.

xxann

Ann Northrop <annnorth@earthlink.net>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-JUN-1999 20:24:23.00

SUBJECT: Compulsory Licensing

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
TALKING POINTS

The Vice President has absolutely no objection to compulsory licensing of pharmaceuticals in South Africa so long as it is consistent with TRIPS (Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property, from the World Trade Organization). We must work toward assuring access to affordable high quality drugs to all who need them.

In 1997, South Africa's General Assembly passed legislation granting broad powers to the Health Minister with respect to pharmaceutical patents. This raised serious concerns regarding whether this new law was consistent with existing World Trade Organization regulations. As a consequence, more than 40 companies from around the world filed suit against the South African government. Unfortunately, the pending law suit slowed negotiations between the United States and South Africa intended to resolve the issue. However, this in no way undermines our position on compulsory licensing or our commitment to working with the South Africans to help provide the most affordable medicines possible.

Access to affordable drugs is just one of many challenges in providing care to people with HIV in Africa. While compulsory licensing is an important issue, it must be considered in the broader context of the development and support of a health care continuum that includes both prevention, social services and treatment. This is the focus of our Administration's work on the global battle against AIDS -- particularly in Africa.

More than any Administration in the past, our Administration has worked diligently to build a new partnership with Africa. A vital part of this new partnership is helping to respond to this serious and growing pandemic.

Through the White House AIDS Office, we have lead several recent fact finding missions to sub-Saharan Africa and are now in the process of finalizing an AIDS Initiative for Africa.

This Administration has been a leader in the battle against AIDS and we will continue to be.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-JUN-1999 19:17:41.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Guidance

AIDS Drugs

for Africa

Context: In 1997 South Africa's National Assembly passed legislation granting the Health Minister sweeping, unspecified powers related to pharmaceutical patents. In response to this legislation, more than 40 companies -- roughly one third from America, one third from Europe, one third from South Africa -- have challenged the law in South African Court, contending that this law violates the constitution of South Africa. Actions under the law cannot be taken until the litigation is resolved.

At the same time, the U.S. Trade Representative was concerned that the ambiguity in the law could allow for actions in violation of the WTO-TRIPS agreement (the agreement reached by the 134-member WTO on protection of intellectual property). As a result, USTR named South Africa to the 301 Special Watch List. The watch list (which does not imply sanctions or even the threat of sanctions) is the lowest level of three designations included in the annual report USTR produces every April. Its purpose is to signal U.S. concern on intellectual property rights protection offered to U.S. goods by U.S. trading partners. The Watch List is not connected to any sanctions, but registers the concern of the U.S. government on intellectual property rights afforded by our trading partners, and signals its desire to watch developments.

The Vice President -- in his meetings with Deputy President Mbeki in August 1998 in Washington and February 1999 in South Africa -- has agreed with the Deputy President (now President) to urge both sides to work toward a resolution of the problem. But progress has been slow because of worries on both sides about prejudicing the outcome of the ongoing litigation.

AIDS activists have charged that the Vice President -- in order to curry favor with drug companies -- has threatened severe trade sanctions against South Africa. These charges have been given credible airing in the media in spite of underlying facts that disprove the points. Namely: Drug company representatives approach the Vice President's staff in mid-April asking the Vice President's office to support raising South Africa's status on the 301 Special Watch List from the lowest level to the highest level. The highest designation -- if imposed -- would require South Africa to resolve the issue to U.S. satisfaction within a set period of time or face trade sanctions and loss of foreign assistance. The Office of the Vice President opposed this recommendation and the April report kept South Africa on the watch list -- exactly where it had been.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Scott R. Hynes (CN=Scott R. Hynes/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-JUN-1999 18:24:47.00

SUBJECT: From Ron

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Please contact Tom Rosshirt about getting David Satcher to do an op-ed piece on Africa/AIDS drugs.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-JUN-1999 17:40:12.00

SUBJECT: From Ron

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

let's be sure and discuss this in the morning =

sb

----- Forwarded by Sarah A. Bianchi/OVP on 06/20/99 05:39
PM -----

Scott R. Hynes

06/18/99 06:25:28 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Sarah A. Bianchi/OVP@OVP

cc: Thomas M. Rosshirt/OVP@OVP

Subject:From Ron

Please contact Tom Rosshirt about getting David Satcher to do an op-ed
piece on Africa/AIDS drugs.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JUN-1999 18:34:15.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Q: Why were there protesters during your campaign announcement?

A: Well, currently there's a terrible crisis in South Africa. AIDS has hit that country with the force of a hurricane and these individuals are upset. I'm upset.

But I think there's more information out there this group needs to know. Some of the large pharmaceutical companies pushed for this Administration to impose sanctions. Now, I was against that and I fought it.

Now I think we're near a solution that will much more aggressively help move inexpensive drugs into the hands of the people who need them without endangering our domestic patent rights.

Q: How long will this take? When can we expect this to be resolved?

A: We're very aggressively working with the new government to resolve this issue.

Q: Why are you in the middle of all this?

A: Because I care and I think this group knows that I care. I've been working very closely with President Mbeki on this issue for some time. In many ways they've come to the right person, just not in the right way.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JUN-1999 09:45:21.00

SUBJECT: FYI--On VP Gore's Response to Global AIDS protests

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI - I thought you might want to see this. Paul and his group are fairly moderate so it gives us some idea what folks on the international AIDS scene are thinking.

----- Forwarded by Sandra Thurman/OPD/EOP on 06/21/99
09:42 AM -----

GlobalAIDS@aol.com

06/19/99 12:25:00 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Sandra Thurman@eop

cc:

Subject: FYI--On VP Gore's Response to Global AIDS protests

To: AIDS Advisors to Vice President Gore

From: Paul Boneberg

Global AIDS Action Network (202-667-6300)

RE: Responding to the Controversy on Global AIDS-Access to Medicines in Africa

Date: June 18, 1999

I am writing to urge the Vice President to articulate a vision on global AIDS

issues that includes addressing the concerns being raised by protestors during his recent campaign events. These protestors raise a legitimate issue

-US trade policy and access to essential medicines--that should be addressed.

But to be effective the Vice President should address both the specific issues raised by the protestors, as well as the broader challenge posed by the global AIDS emergency and the inadequacy of the world's response.

After

all there will be millions of deaths and tens of millions of new infections

from HIV in term of the next President.

1. It is important to recognize that the protests on trade are just one aspect of a much broader discontent around the administration's response to

the global AIDS pandemic. Many AIDS groups have for several years been profoundly frustrated over the administration's inattention to the global AIDS pandemic. For example, dozens of leading AIDS groups have sent annual letters urging increased funding, but the administration has never sought

an
increase. As a result AIDS funding levels have not increased at all since
the
President took office, but the AIDS pandemic has grown 300%.

Protecting the human rights of people with HIV is also a strong concern,
because it is fundamental for AIDS prevention and care programs to
succeed.

However there has been little activity by the administration on this
issue.

When a prominent South African AIDS activist was murdered around last
year's

World AIDS Day many AIDS groups wrote the President urging a strong
response.

Not only was there no response, but in meetings months later the State
Department indicated that they did not know of either the murder or the
letter.

The broader issue of care for people with AIDS also remains un-addressed
in

the US response despite the strong concerns of American AIDS groups. For
example, one pharmaceutical company told activists that its donation of
AZT

for programs to stop mother-to-child AIDS transmission were frustrated by
lack of an AIDS care infrastructure. They said that the donated drugs had
been sitting for months in warehouses in Europe.

The bottom line: the AIDS community has said for years that US global AIDS
programs are inadequate. One leading national AIDS group actually gave the
administration's global AIDS response a "F" in their annual evaluation
last

December. The Vice President should meet with those who have been raising
these broader issues and quickly articulate his own vision of how the US
overall response to the AIDS pandemic can be expanded.

2. Within this context the activists protesting the administrations trade
policy on AIDS medicines in Africa clearly have both substantive arguments
and legitimate reasons to protest to get their point heard. As I
understand

it (I strongly urge a face-to-face meeting with the protestors themselves)
the substance of the disagreement is that US trade policy is grossly
one-sided favoring blindly pharmaceutical profits to the exclusion of all
humanitarian concerns. They want a balanced trade policy as it relates to
medicines, particularly in the face of the AIDS pandemic.

They also have reason to protest as other methods to get a response from
the
administration have been dodged for months. Efforts by activists to secure
a

meeting on trade issues from the Department of States failed with a key
group
(a Ralph Nader affiliate) being deliberately insulted at a public meeting.
Efforts to engage the debate at President Clinton's AIDS Advisory Council
failed when the administration declined to send a representative. In the
absence of any willingness of the administration officials to discuss this
matter over several months protest is understandable.

I strongly urge the Vice President to recognize the need for a trade
policy
that balances US humanitarian and corporate interests. I urge him to meet

with the protesters (as well as others) in articulating how he would improve
US trade policy relative to access to essential medicines.

3. The above points emphasis problems with the administration's AIDS global policies and how they can be approved. However the Vice President can cite numerous example of the administration's commitment on the issue while pledging to improve and expand the American response. For example:

--Activists are on thin ground in accusing the administration of not caring enough about Africa, when Nelson Mandela said in his most recent visit that President Clinton has been a great friend of Africa. The Vice President should remind AIDS activists of its overall efforts to help Africa and how that is seen by Africans themselves.

--Although US funding of global AIDS program is grossly inadequate the US still provides more funding then any other nations-48% of ODA AIDS funding in 1997 according to UNAIDS. We must do more, but other nations must do more as well.

--Most importantly the US has funded huge increases in AIDS research including some \$200,000,000 annually for a vaccine. This research funding is much larger then that of all other nations combined and in the long run may be the most important thing the US can do to stop the pandemic.

Specific Recommendations As to the Vice President's Response

1. Recognizing that the global AIDS emergency is a valid election issue the Vice President should commit himself to a major policy address articulating specific ideas of how the American response can be expanded. (A detailed outline of this is beyond the scope of this memo, but can be provided if helpful.)

2. Prior to this address--and assoon as possible--the Vice President should meet with AIDS activists, both those concerned with the trade issues and with those pursuing a broader global AIDS agenda.

3. In his address the Vice President should not only remind the nation of the administration's strong commitment to AIDS and to Africa, but also acknowledge that our global AIDS response must be vastly expanded.

4. In his address the Vice-President should commit himself to a trade policy that balances America's corporate interest with humanitarian and health concerns. He should clearly indicate a willingness to sacrifice some level of corporate profit to save lives in other nations.

5. On-the-other-hand he should commit himself more broadly to the idea of providing care and access to medicines than the trade issues alone identify.

His goals should be "to get drugs into bodies" by any means necessary and that may include profit as an incentive for the private sector or it may not.

The goal is to save lives, not punish corporations.

In conclusion I urge the Vice President not to avoid this issue, but to confront it head on. In so doing he can provide a vision of an expanded response to the AIDS pandemic that many American would embrace.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JUN-1999 10:08:47.00

SUBJECT: meeting on AIDS/Drugs/Africa

TO: Laura M. Quinn (CN=Laura M. Quinn/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Laura: Can you come to a meeting at 2 pm in Richard Socarides' office with me and Sandy Thurman and probably others? This will be to set up a plan to push the message out into the community. There may be another meeting later this afternoon with Leon to assess the impact of our message on our other constituencies. Would you be free for that one as well? (assuming it is scheduled.)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JUN-1999 12:13:27.00

SUBJECT: From Ron

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
anxious to hear from you on this request from Ron

sb
----- Forwarded by Sarah A. Bianchi/OVP on 06/21/99 12:13
PM -----

Sarah A. Bianchi
06/20/99 05:39:57 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Thomas M. Rosshirt/OVP@OVP
cc:
Subject:From Ron

let's be sure and discuss this in the morning =

sb
----- Forwarded by Sarah A. Bianchi/OVP on 06/20/99 05:39
PM -----

Scott R. Hynes
06/18/99 06:25:28 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Sarah A. Bianchi/OVP@OVP
cc: Thomas M. Rosshirt/OVP@OVP
Subject:From Ron

Please contact Tom Rosshirt about getting David Satcher to do an op-ed
piece on Africa/AIDS drugs.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: David W. Beier (CN=David W. Beier/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JUN-1999 14:58:29.00

SUBJECT: AIDS

TO: Richard M. Saunders (CN=Richard M. Saunders/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I will not be able to join you to discuss this issue. I wanted to offer some thoughts:

* If the press can understand that this is a complex issue that requires more balance than bluster we will be well served. The balance is between the short and long term goals of health improvement. It would be cheaper and easier to give everyone free drugs for all illnesses, but sadly this would mean no new drugs. Similarly, patent protection that is overly broad or long would also prevent other firms from improving on existing drugs. So the extremes will not work.

* Our position has been for at least 15 years to expand the availability of new drugs here and abroad through a balanced approach to incentives, strong regulation and international cooperation. The United States has been joined in this effort within the international community (World Intellectual Property Organization) by measures that require countries to extend patent protections to all inventions. These international rules, however, provide narrow exceptions that recognize the value of patents but which permit each country to protect their health through a narrow compulsory licensing approach.

* We are confident that the combination of efforts (AID, World Bank) in the international community, and by offering drugs that are available and affordable will help stem the tide of AIDS in South Africa.

I hope that these talkers help.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JUN-1999 09:40:15.00

SUBJECT: Re: samples

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

These are great, but I think we're going to need more. Monica and everyone here in press is concerned about this interview -- especially in light of the events on the swing. The more prepared he can be the better! Let me think of a few more and send them your way.

Do you think we can have a draft w/ answers by COB today? I'd like to retool it tomorrow morning and then send it around to folks for additional comments and suggestions.

As for confirmation on this interview, while we're definitely doing it and we consider you an eloquent and powerful force for change, please try to send reporters and editors our way. It makes for less confusion in the long run. Thank you.

Elizabeth J. Potter
06/16/99 07:12:36 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
cc:
Subject: Re: samples

Hey there. Here is a draft of the questions. I am working on the answers. The Interviewer is Chris Bull. The Editor is Judy Weider. We confirmed the interview with her. Chris is the WDC correspondent. I will get you his # tomorrow.

DRAFT QUESTIONS: ADVOCATE INTERVIEW: July 24, 1999

- 1.) You announced your candidacy last week for President. How will Gore the Candidate be different on G/L Issues?
- 2.) What is your message to the Gay and Lesbian Community?
- 3.) What do you think are the important issues facing the G/L Community?
- 4.) Last year the President announced a policy on needle exchange that the Community strongly objected to. Do you agree with this position?

5.) You were heckled last week in Tennessee because of your position on AIDS Drugs in South Africa. Can you address this?

6.) What are your thoughts on Gay Marriage? Here in California?

7.) What is your position on Gay Adoptions?

There are too many children in the world that do not have a safe and secure place to call home. We must not let discrimination, bias or intolerance stand in the way of a child having the opportunity to be raised in a loving caring and stable home. All decisions regarding adoption, foster care, and placement of children should be decided by local officials in consultation with family members ---- not by legislative policy.

8.) The Administration has not implemented the DA/DT/ DP policy. What would you do to ensure service members right to privacy?

9.) What about service members who are HIV +?

10.) What is the outlook for Hate Crimes Legislation passing this session?

11.) What is the legislative outlook for ENDA?

11.) Congressman Barney Frank has introduced Federal Employee Partnership Benefits Legislation. Do you support this?

12.) What Domestic Partnership benefits do you support?

13.) Our community has seen a lot of difficulties with youth violence and teen suicide. What will your Administration offer Gay Youth ?

14.)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JUN-1999 06:36:44.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Ambassador James Joseph
Op-ed

As the United States Ambassador to South Africa, I have watched with admiration over the last four years as Vice President Gore has made unprecedented efforts to reach out to the people and government of South Africa, and in particular to help them confront their AIDS crisis.

That is why I am so astonished to hear claims -- by groups that purport to know and care about this issue -- that the Vice President, at the bidding of the drug companies, has threatened Deputy President Mbeki with trade sanctions against South Africa if they proceed with efforts to offer cheaper AIDS drugs to their people.

This is the most uninformed AIDS-related statement I've heard since "you can get it from toilet seats."

Of course, it takes some background to explain why. In 1997, the South Africa National Assembly passed legislation that gave their Health Minister sweeping and unspecified new powers to abrogate patent rights for pharmaceuticals. Almost immediately, more than 40 countries -- about a third from South Africa, a third from Europe, and a third from the U.S. -- challenged the law in South African courts, claiming it violates the South African Constitution. The litigation is pending.

Meanwhile, the United States Government registered its concern as well -- both to protect the intellectual property of American companies, and to ensure -- through patent protection -- the ongoing search for new and better drugs.

Indeed, everyone accepts the need for patents to protect medical research. That is why the 134 nations of the WTO came to an agreement -- known as TRIPS -- to get a common understanding of intellectual property protection. Our concern was that the South African law -- because it was vague -- might allow the Health Minister to go beyond what was allowed under TRIPS.

To signal its concern, the United States Trade Representative named South Africa to its "watch list" -- the mildest of three designations included in the annual report USTR is mandated by Congress to issue every April. The report monitors the level of intellectual property rights protection given by our major trading partners. The "watch list" is not connected to any trade sanctions or the threat of sanctions.

Meanwhile, negotiations through many channels proceeded with the South African government to resolve the issue, with the U.S. asking South Africa to clarify the law -- stating explicitly that it would be within

the limits established by the TRIPS agreement.

Having followed this issue very closely ever since the National Assembly began drafting the new law, I was amazed to learn -- from groups in the United States -- that the Vice President was threatening severe trade sanctions (something that -- if it were true I would expect first to hear from my government -- not from a group of protestors). Not only that, Gore has been "bullying, badgering, browbeating" Mbeki, they claim. (Do they forget we're dealing with a leader of the African National Congress that triumphed over Apartheid? Nobody bullies Mbeki.)

If you ask these groups for the single most compelling piece of evidence they have for their claim, they point to a State Department Report issued in February of this year. The State Department Report was written because Congress said it would cut off all assistance to the central government of South Africa until it received a report explaining what the U.S. was doing to _____. The report says: "

That's their basis for saying Gore threatened trade sanctions. It's thinner than you think. I was in that meeting. The Vice President suggested a fresh approach for solving the problem. He said the U.S. would be willing to discuss parallel importing if South Africa were willing to do it under conditions stipulated in Article 31 of the TRIPS agreement. He said he knew the drug companies would not like it, but it was the right thing to do -- it was the best way to protect patents and the search for new and better drugs, and also protect the lives of people suffering with AIDS right now.

These groups also charged that the Vice President is working with the drug companies to impose trade sanctions against South Africa. More nonsense. In fact, the Vice President has opposed efforts on the part of the pharmaceutical companies to insist on trade sanctions. The drug companies were very public about lobbying the United States Trade Representative to name South Africa a "Priority Foreign Country" in its annual report -- a step that would lead to trade sanctions. The Vice President believes we can resolve the issue without escalating the trade dispute, and he pushed back -- and in the report issued in April 30, 1999 South Africa was named again to the "watch list."

The AIDS issue in Africa is unlike any epidemics we've ever seen in our lifetime and like few in history. It is understandable that people would protest to bring attention to the issue. And some of what they say is good and necessary, but some of what they say is reckless, and undercuts their cause.

Their claims should be put to some scrutiny. You say Gore is siding with the drug companies against suffering South Africans? What about his pushing back against their efforts to impose trade sanctions in the 301 report put out by USTR? You say Gore threatened trade sanctions against Mbeki; what about people in the room who say otherwise? You say Gore cares nothing about the issue of AIDS in Africa? What about his unprecedented efforts to travel to Africa, his efforts to bring Donna Shalala and David Satcher, and his work personally to advance awareness. This group needs to regroup -- and check its facts. Once they check the facts -- if they're honest -- they will show up at the next Gore event, wait till a strategic moment in the speech, and unfurl a large banner that says: "Oops."

The two of them were a picture of unity and partnership, speaking before a national television audience in February of this year about the raging AIDS epidemic in South Africa. The setting was one of the most beautiful in the world -- Kirstenbosch gardens in Cape Town; but the backdrop was one of the most horrifying: an AIDS infection rate on a rampage -- reaching, by some estimates, nearly a quarter of the population -- threatening not just a health crisis of biblical proportions, but possibly also the future political stability of the country.

Since I presented my diplomatic credentials to President Mandela in January of 1996 and assumed my post as the United States Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, this young democracy has struggled -- on top of all the other obstacles that come with the bitter legacy of apartheid -- to come to terms with the scale of the AIDS epidemic, and to overcome the frightening level of ignorance of how it spreads, to learn techniques of prevention, and to overcome the enormous cultural reluctance to talk about AIDS transmission and prevention openly. In the absence of a cure, the number one weapon is and will remain awareness and prevention.

That was the substance of Vice President Al Gore's talk with Deputy President Mbeki -- now President Mbeki -- the night before as they spoke about the AIDS crisis in their meetings of the sixth U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission. Of all the subjects they planned to talk about in that session, Vice President Gore and his staff had spent more time preparing for the AIDS discussion than for any other -- bringing together the brightest minds of many agencies in Washington so as to bring the best and latest knowledge of America's effort to fight AIDS, and put them at the disposal of the people of South Africa.

The focus was on awareness and prevention -- working first with the military as several other African nations have to turn a corner on the epidemic. The concern was treatment for pregnant mothers with AIDS to reduce the rate of transmission to the newborn child. The focus on awareness and prevention was in line with Mbeki's work as well. He and President Mandela had just appeared for the first time on national Television to talk about it, but he wanted to do more.

The morning following their discussion on AIDS, Deputy President Mbeki presented the Vice President with an AIDS ribbon -- done in African beadwork -- and the two wore them both before the cameras in their joint press conference, and the press took note of them, and the Vice President urged leaders from every sector of South African society to add their voices to the voice of Thabo Mbeki in pleading for more awareness, more prevention.

This was only the latest effort on the part of the Vice President to help South Africa confront the AIDS crisis. Two years before, the Vice President has brought Health and Human Service Secretary Donna Shalala with him to Cape Town to talk to virtually every member of President Mandela's cabinet in what was surely one of the earliest, highest-profile discussions of AIDS in South Africa. I remember the embarrassed silence in the room, and I remember thinking how far we have to go, and how important it was to begin.

Through his personal talks with Thabo Mbeki and through the dialogue he has helped create by the people he has brought together --

Vice President Gore has made an unprecedented effort to address the AIDS crisis in South Africa.

Some who point to that State Department report don't know that it was written to satisfy a Congress that had suspended all U.S. Aid to the Central Government of South Africa, until they received a report from the State Department describing what was being done to resolve the issue with South Africa. The first such report was rejected by Congress -- apparently because it was not tough enough. Naturally, then, the language of the second report was tougher -- to satisfy the friends of pharmaceuticals in Congress. And yet people have seized on that rhetoric as evidence of something sinister.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JUN-1999 15:37:33.00

SUBJECT: NC10432: Wanna zap Al?

TO: Sandra Thurman (CN=Sandra Thurman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip G Dufour (CN=Philip G Dufour/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael B. Feldman (CN=Michael B. Feldman/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Monica M. Dixon (CN=Monica M. Dixon/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ron Klain (CN=Ron Klain/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 06/22/99
03:33 PM -----

rwockner@netcom.com
06/22/99 02:59:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides@EOP
cc:
Subject: NC10432: Wanna zap Al?

Al Gore travel schedule
(for zapping him in re: the Africa AIDS-drugs scandal)

*****June 22	Denver, CO
*****June 23	San Diego, San Francisco, Los Angeles, CA
*****June 24	Los Angeles, CA
*****June 25	Des Moines, IA; Detroit, MI

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JUN-1999 17:56:02.00

SUBJECT: Re: Charlene

TO: Ron Klain (CN=Ron Klain/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I'm working out guidance with them. Likely:

"What the VP said is consistent with U.S. policy."

But they might qualify it by saying it is consistent with U.S. policy regarding AIDS drugs in South Africa.

They might also want to read their turgid prose about "we don't support parallel importing," but

"USTR will not impose sanctions to force countries to forego the use of compulsory pricing or parallel imports."

In the end the Vice President's position is clearly on the outer limit of what USTR will accept, and that will be obvious to any decent reporter.

Anyway, I am working this out with them -- any concerns?

This item is copyrighted. Do not print it without permission from the originating media operation. Do not post this item in a public online forum. Items on this mailing list that are not copyrighted will not contain this message. This free mailing list is open only to people with

supports gay rights, said his organization will aggressively work to bring out support for Gore in the primary next year.

California's primary is scheduled for March 7, on the heels of the weathervane New Hampshire and Iowa primaries. But with 54 electoral votes -- one-fifth of the US electoral votes needed to win the presidency -- California will clearly upstage the two earlier primaries.

It could take very little to tip the scales here.

"The gay vote in California is not huge," said political analyst Allen Lichtmann, "but every vote counts. It is a primary (Gore) absolutely, positively must win."

Between 5.5 and 6.75 percent of last year's California voters identified themselves as gay, according to polls. Yet that number is likely to be higher because of the reluctance of some voters to identify themselves as homosexual, Bauman said.

Bauman believes that Gore's courage to stand up for gays -- a position certain to be attacked by the religious right in the Republican party -- will draw respect and support even from those who may not agree with him on all issues.

"This is a man who believes in inclusion, not exclusion," Bauman said.

"That is essential since we've been through political, hyper-polarizing time in this country," he added.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-JUN-1999 22:30:49.00

SUBJECT: draft statement

TO: Kay Casstevens (CN=Kay Casstevens/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul Thornell (CN=Paul Thornell/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here's what I sent to Mike Elazier -- Clyburn's press guy -- yesterday:

We in the Congressional Black Caucus are deeply concerned about the raging epidemic of AIDS in Africa. We are also concerned that some protestors -- who quite rightly want to bring attention to this issue -- are making statements about Vice President Gore that are totally out of line with what we in the Black Caucus know to be true.

As founding co-chair of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission, Vice President Gore has made a substantial personal investment in building better ties to South Africa.

Through the work of the Commission, he has also made a persistent effort over the last several years to work with South Africa to confront the AIDS crisis.

In his meetings with President Mbeki, he has proposed a framework for resolving our trade differences that is consistent with South Africa's need to provide lower-cost AIDS drugs to its people.

At the same time, the Vice President has stood up to drug company efforts to escalate trade pressure against South Africa for its efforts to provide lower-cost drugs.

The Congressional Black Caucus stands with the protestors on the need to provide lower-cost AIDS drugs in Africa, but we stand apart from them on the Vice President's role. It will be unfortunate for our cause if the protestors manage to convince people that the Vice President is an adversary, when we in the Congressional Black Caucus know him to be a committed ally.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-JUN-1999 22:57:50.00

SUBJECT: draft

TO: Michael.elazier (Michael.elazier @ mail.house.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Michael -- here is a suggested version of a statement that Congressman Clyburn could attach to a release of the two letters. It has some slight changes from what we talked about yesterday.

I will be in touch with you Monday morning, to try to get something out by early afternoon.

Tom

Here's what I sent to Mike Elazier -- Clyburn's press guy -- yesterday:

We in the Congressional Black Caucus are deeply concerned about the raging epidemic of AIDS in Africa. We are also concerned that some protestors -- who quite rightly want to bring attention to this issue -- are making statements about Vice President Gore that are totally out of line with what we in the Black Caucus know to be true.

As founding co-chair of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission, Vice President Gore has made a substantial personal investment in building better ties to South Africa.

Through the work of the Commission, he has also made a persistent effort over the last several years to work with South Africa to confront the AIDS crisis.

In his meetings with President Mbeki, he has proposed a framework for resolving our trade differences that is consistent with South Africa's need to provide lower-cost AIDS drugs to its people.

At the same time, the Vice President has stood up to drug company efforts to escalate trade pressure against South Africa for its efforts to provide lower-cost drugs.

The Congressional Black Caucus stands with the protestors on the need to provide lower-cost AIDS drugs in Africa, but we stand apart from them on the Vice President's role. It will be unfortunate for our cause if the protestors manage to convince people that the Vice President is an adversary, when we in the Congressional Black Caucus know him to be a committed ally.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-JUN-1999 22:30:49.00

SUBJECT: draft statement

TO: Kay Casstevens (CN=Kay Casstevens/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul Thornell (CN=Paul Thornell/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here's what I sent to Mike Elazier -- Clyburn's press guy -- yesterday:

We in the Congressional Black Caucus are deeply concerned about the raging epidemic of AIDS in Africa. We are also concerned that some protestors -- who quite rightly want to bring attention to this issue -- are making statements about Vice President Gore that are totally out of line with what we in the Black Caucus know to be true.

As founding co-chair of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission, Vice President Gore has made a substantial personal investment in building better ties to South Africa.

Through the work of the Commission, he has also made a persistent effort over the last several years to work with South Africa to confront the AIDS crisis.

In his meetings with President Mbeki, he has proposed a framework for resolving our trade differences that is consistent with South Africa's need to provide lower-cost AIDS drugs to its people.

At the same time, the Vice President has stood up to drug company efforts to escalate trade pressure against South Africa for its efforts to provide lower-cost drugs.

The Congressional Black Caucus stands with the protestors on the need to provide lower-cost AIDS drugs in Africa, but we stand apart from them on the Vice President's role. It will be unfortunate for our cause if the protestors manage to convince people that the Vice President is an adversary, when we in the Congressional Black Caucus know him to be a committed ally.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-JUN-1999 22:57:50.00

SUBJECT: draft

TO: Michael.elazier (Michael.elazier @ mail.house.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Michael -- here is a suggested version of a statement that Congressman Clyburn could attach to a release of the two letters. It has some slight changes from what we talked about yesterday.

I will be in touch with you Monday morning, to try to get something out by early afternoon.

Tom

Here's what I sent to Mike Elazier -- Clyburn's press guy -- yesterday:

We in the Congressional Black Caucus are deeply concerned about the raging epidemic of AIDS in Africa. We are also concerned that some protestors -- who quite rightly want to bring attention to this issue -- are making statements about Vice President Gore that are totally out of line with what we in the Black Caucus know to be true.

As founding co-chair of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission, Vice President Gore has made a substantial personal investment in building better ties to South Africa.

Through the work of the Commission, he has also made a persistent effort over the last several years to work with South Africa to confront the AIDS crisis.

In his meetings with President Mbeki, he has proposed a framework for resolving our trade differences that is consistent with South Africa's need to provide lower-cost AIDS drugs to its people.

At the same time, the Vice President has stood up to drug company efforts to escalate trade pressure against South Africa for its efforts to provide lower-cost drugs.

The Congressional Black Caucus stands with the protestors on the need to provide lower-cost AIDS drugs in Africa, but we stand apart from them on the Vice President's role. It will be unfortunate for our cause if the protestors manage to convince people that the Vice President is an adversary, when we in the Congressional Black Caucus know him to be a committed ally.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura M. Quinn (CN=Laura M. Quinn/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-1999 16:06:02.00

SUBJECT: Re: guidance on AIDS/Drugs/Africa

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

hey did sonya move that stuff?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-1999 11:33:52.00

SUBJECT: two sets of talkers

TO: Paul Thornell (CN=Paul Thornell/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

ú The Clinton-Gore Administration has worked hard to build stronger U.S. ties with Africa. The President has taken the longest-ever Presidential trip to Africa. He has also sent a Presidential Mission on AIDS to sub-Saharan Africa to chronicle the scope of the crisis and propose a response. And Vice President Gore has almost certainly invested more time and effort in Africa than any of his predecessors.

ú As co-chair of the U.S.-South Africa Binational Commission, the Vice President has made a tremendous personal investment working with South African leaders to improve health, expand trade, and build the economy of the new South Africa.

ú He has also helped South Africa confront the crisis of AIDS. He has worked to help track the spread of AIDS, expand awareness, and promote prevention. He has taken Secretary Shalala, Surgeon General David Satcher, and AIDS Policy Director Sandy Thurman with him on his trips to Cape Town to help give the South African government the benefit of some of America ,s best knowledge and ideas about fighting AIDS.

ú As you know, some groups have been getting publicity by making statements about the Vice President ,s actions and positions on AIDS and South Africa that are completely different from what we know about him. So we asked the Vice President to give us an update on the issue of the United States trade differences over pharmaceuticals in South Africa.

ú He has never threatened South Africa with trade sanctions. He has been a clear leader in the effort to work out a solution to this trade dispute that takes account the health crisis that is rampaging through South Africa. He told Deputy President Mbeki almost a year ago that he would support South Africa ,s efforts to make medicines more affordable) consistent with international agreements.

ú And the Vice President stood up to drug companies. In fact, the drug companies were pushing USTR to put the most pressure they could on South Africa, and the Vice President pushed back.

ú As Susan Rice, our Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, said in the press this week (Baltimore Sun, Tuesday June 22): the Vice President took the position that the health crisis in South Africa needed to be taken into account, and he led the way led the way in opposing trade sanctions pushed by the pharmaceutical industry.

ú The fact of the matter is) the Vice President is a great friend of Africa and a bitter foe of AIDS, and it is unfortunate these people don , t recognize his leadership and give him the respect he deserves.

I support the efforts of the protestors to call attention to the crisis of

AIDS in Africa, but having seen and studied and participated in more demonstrations than I can count, I take issue with some of their tactics. A successful protest has to have truth on its side, and these protestors are not telling the truth about Vice President Gore.

They say the Vice President) trying to curry favor with the drug companies) threatened sanctions against South Africa unless they give up their legal rights to make or import lower-cost AIDS drugs.

Anybody who knows the Vice President as I do, knows those charges are nonsense. And others who don't yet know it, will soon find out.

The Washington Post has already editorialized that these protestors are & manipulating the facts. 8

The Baltimore Sun has reported that under pressure from the Vice President , s office, the trade representative rejected the drug companies efforts to slap sanctions on South Africa.

Assistant Secretary of State for Africa Susan Rice has said the Vice President led the way in opposing trade sanctions and other drastic actions pushed by the pharmaceutical industry.

And several publications have pointed out that the real villain is a Congressman who) at the behest of the pharmaceutical industry -- wrote into law a provision to cut off all U.S. aid to the Central government of South Africa until the State Department reported on what they were doing to pressure the South Africans to change their law. And he has threatened to put tougher language in next year ,s bill.

It ,s good to get publicity for an issue like AIDS in Africa, but it ,s bad to get it by making charges against your allies, particularly charges you can ,t back up with evidence. When that happens, instead of getting stories about the issue of AIDS in Africa, you ,ll get stories about how you got your facts wrong. And when people begin to learn that the protestors are wrong about the Vice President, they ,ll begin to wonder if they ,re wrong on other issues as well.

During the Civil Rights era, African Americans had to be 100 percent right, and our antagonists one hundred percent wrong, for blacks to win the battle of public opinion and force a change in policy.

These protestors should learn from that, and make sure they are one hundred percent right before they begin to spread false charges about the Vice President. Because there are a lot of us who know South Africa, know the issue of AIDS, and know the Vice President, and we know their charges are simply not true.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-JUN-1999 13:51:23.00

SUBJECT: meeting with AIDS groups

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Leon is meeting tomorrow with HRC, AIDS action, and maybe one more group to talk about the VP's role in AIDS/Drugs/Africa. can you be there. 3 pm. His office.

tom

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jeffrey K. Nussbaum (CN=Jeffrey K. Nussbaum/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-JUN-1999 14:51:11.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

AIDS Activists Return, Gore Responds

About 3000 AIDS activists demonstrated outside the Wyndham Franklin Plaza Hotel

during Gore's \$1K-a-head dinner. Gore responded to the demonstrators, led by ACTUP

and who have been hounding his campaign, in a letter released 6/28: "I support South

Africa's effort to provide AIDS drugs at reduced prices through compulsory licensing

and parallel importing, so long as they are carried out in a way that is consistent with

international agreement." AIDS Action Council dir. Daniel Zingale of the protestors:

"They missed the mark. The true culprit is not Al Gore but the drug companies" (Collins, Philadelphia Inquirer, 6/29)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-JUN-1999 09:11:54.00

SUBJECT: WA Post Article

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

AIDS Activists Dog Gore A 2nd Day

Role in Drug Dispute With S. Africa Is Hit

By Charles R. Babcock and Ceci Connolly
Washington Post Staff Writers
Friday, June 18, 1999; Page A12

NEW YORK, June 17 *For the second day in a row, AIDS
activists disrupted Vice President Gore's presidential campaign
tour today, protesting his behind-the-scenes role in a trade dispute over the
cost of drugs in South Africa.

At two campaign stops today and one yesterday, Gore
raised his voice and fired back at demonstrators as they chanted "Gore's
greed kills." In one brief but tense exchange in New Hampshire, the protesters
stood yelling just a few feet from Gore before being escorted out by police.

Health and AIDS activists accuse Gore of favoring
drugmakers' profits over the lives of millions of South Africans infected with
the human immunodeficiency virus, which causes AIDS. They say
Gore, in talks with South African President Thabo Mbeki, has threatened
trade sanctions if South Africa permits the widespread sale of cheaper,
generic drugs that would cut into U.S. companies' sales.

"Vice President Al Gore is doing drug company dirty
work," the group AIDS Drugs for Africa says in fliers distributed at Gore's
appearances.

Small clutches of demonstrators first appeared Wednesday
at Gore's announcement of his candidacy in Carthage, Tenn. Gore
responded with a quick phrase about free speech. But today he was
prepared with a full-throated response.

"I love this country. I love the First Amendment," Gore boomed in response to fewer than a dozen protesters here. "Let's give a hand to those who are exercising their First Amendment rights." As the audience clapped in approval, Gore's voice grew louder: "Let's give them a hand. Let's give them another hand. Make it louder." New York police removed the demonstrators, as Gore continued: "Now I'd like to have my say."

At the heart of the dispute is a South African law designed to give AIDS patients access to cheaper drugs. U.S. pharmaceutical companies see the law -- which allows South Africa's health minister to bring in less expensive imported AIDS drugs or locally produced generics -- as an infringement on their patent protections. They have pushed aggressively for help in Congress and at the White House, even proposing that foreign aid to South Africa be cut off.

One senior Gore adviser acknowledged the vice president is in a delicate position, balancing the magnitude of the AIDS crisis in South Africa and the needs of U.S. companies. "Obviously the vice president's got to stick up for the commercial interests of U.S. companies," the adviser said. But, he said, Gore realizes the disease "is a major threat to the welfare and even the future stability" of South Africa."

Gore has long had good relations with gay rights groups, an important Democratic Party constituency, and the South Africa issue does not appear to be endangering that relationship. David Smith, spokesman for the Human Rights Campaign, one of the largest gay rights lobbying groups, described the patent matter as a "complicated issue" with "no easy solutions" and added, "To single out the vice president is not fair."

However, AIDS activist Eric Sawyer told the President's Advisory Council on HIV/AIDS last week that it should help change a "misguided government policy" designed "simply to protect the excessive profits of drug companies." Two of the main companies producing the drugs -- Bristol-Myers Squibb and Glaxo Wellcome -- have given the bulk of their corporate contributions to the

Republican Party in recent years.

Gore met with Mbeki, who was then deputy president, last August and again in February as part of regular bilateral talks. A State Department report released earlier this year called the patent dispute "a central focus" of the August talks, part of "an assiduous, concerted campaign" by top U.S. officials to persuade South Africa to change the law. South Africa denies the law would violate international patent rules.

An estimated 6 million South Africans are infected with HIV, compared with about 1 million in the United States. Many patients in this country use a "cocktail" of three AIDS drugs often costing more than \$1,000 a month. South African patients may buy the cocktail for about \$800 a month, but the new law -- which has yet to take effect because of a court challenge -- would pave the way for far lower prices.

During a speech at Hesser College in Manchester, N.H., this morning, Gore turned the protest into an opportunity to talk about AIDS awareness.

"Let me say in response to those who may have chosen an inappropriate way to make their point, that actually the crisis of AIDS in Africa is one that should command the attention of people in the United States and around the world," he said. "This epidemic was ignored for too long in the United States of America and I'm proud our nation is taking the lead to try to do something about it."

His wife, Tipper, snapped photos as the four demonstrators were led out.

Gore is in the middle of a four-day, cross-country announcement swing aimed at pumping some fresh energy into a campaign that has sputtered throughout the spring. As his plane headed to New York today, he said a Senate run by Hillary Rodham Clinton "will generate enthusiasm there and around the country."

The new stump speech, which he has dutifully repeated at every stop, makes clear Gore is ready to begin the shift away from President Clinton on moral

administration's policy issues while still hoping to share in the glories of the
achievements.

day because as a As he told reporters on Air Force Two today: "It's a new
own vision for the candidate for president, I am obviously presenting my
country's future."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-JUN-1999 09:36:28.00

SUBJECT: see the bolded passages from this June 17 W. Post article

TO: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

AIDS Activists Dog Gore A 2nd Day
Role in Drug Dispute With S. Africa Is Hit

By Charles R. Babcock and Ceci Connolly
Washington Post Staff Writers
Friday, June 18, 1999; Page A12

NEW YORK, June 17 *For the second day in a row, AIDS
activists disrupted Vice President Gore's presidential campaign
tour today, protesting his behind-the-scenes role in a trade dispute over the
cost of drugs in South Africa.

At two campaign stops today and one yesterday, Gore
raised his voice and fired back at demonstrators as they chanted "Gore's
greed kills." In one brief but tense exchange in New Hampshire, the protesters
stood yelling just a few feet from Gore before being escorted out by police.

Health and AIDS activists accuse Gore of favoring
drugmakers' profits over the lives of millions of South Africans infected with
the human immunodeficiency virus, which causes AIDS. They say
Gore, in talks with South African President Thabo Mbeki, has threatened
trade sanctions if South Africa permits the widespread sale of cheaper,
generic drugs that would cut into U.S. companies' sales.

"Vice President Al Gore is doing drug company dirty
work," the group AIDS Drugs for Africa says in fliers distributed at Gore's
appearances.

Small clutches of demonstrators first appeared Wednesday
at Gore's announcement of his candidacy in Carthage, Tenn. Gore
responded with a quick phrase about free speech. But today he was
prepared with a full-throated response.

"I love this country. I love the First Amendment," Gore boomed in response to fewer than a dozen protesters here. "Let's give a hand to those who are exercising their First Amendment rights." As the audience clapped in approval, Gore's voice grew louder: "Let's give them a hand. Let's give them another hand. Make it louder." New York police removed the demonstrators, as Gore continued: "Now I'd like to have my say."

At the heart of the dispute is a South African law designed to give AIDS patients access to cheaper drugs. U.S. pharmaceutical companies see the law -- which allows South Africa's health minister to bring in less expensive imported AIDS drugs or locally produced generics -- as an infringement on their patent protections. They have pushed aggressively for help in Congress and at the White House, even proposing that foreign aid to South Africa be cut off.

One senior Gore adviser acknowledged the vice president is in a delicate position, balancing the magnitude of the AIDS crisis in South Africa and the needs of U.S. companies. "Obviously the vice president's got to stick up for the commercial interests of U.S. companies," the adviser said. But, he said, Gore realizes the disease "is a major threat to the welfare and even the future stability" of South Africa."

Gore has long had good relations with gay rights groups, an important Democratic Party constituency, and the South Africa issue does not appear to be endangering that relationship. David Smith, spokesman for the Human Rights Campaign, one of the largest gay rights lobbying groups, described the patent matter as a "complicated issue" with "no easy solutions" and added, "To single out the vice president is not fair."

However, AIDS activist Eric Sawyer told the President's Advisory Council on HIV/AIDS last week that it should help change a "misguided government policy" designed "simply to protect the excessive profits of drug companies." Two of the main companies producing the drugs -- Bristol-Myers Squibb and Glaxo Wellcome -- have given the bulk of their corporate contributions to the

Republican Party in recent years.

Gore met with Mbeki, who was then deputy president, last August and again in February as part of regular bilateral talks. A State Department report released earlier this year called the patent dispute "a central focus" of the August talks, part of "an assiduous, concerted campaign" by top U.S. officials to persuade South Africa to change the law. South Africa denies the law would violate international patent rules.

An estimated 6 million South Africans are infected with HIV, compared with about 1 million in the United States. Many patients in this country use a "cocktail" of three AIDS drugs often costing more than \$1,000 a month. South African patients may buy the cocktail for about \$800 a month, but the new law -- which has yet to take effect because of a court challenge -- would pave the way for far lower prices.

During a speech at Hesser College in Manchester, N.H., this morning, Gore turned the protest into an opportunity to talk about AIDS awareness.

"Let me say in response to those who may have chosen an inappropriate way to make their point, that actually the crisis of AIDS in Africa is one that should command the attention of people in the United States and around the world," he said. "This epidemic was ignored for too long in the United States of America and I'm proud our nation is taking the lead to try to do something about it."

His wife, Tipper, snapped photos as the four demonstrators were led out.

Gore is in the middle of a four-day, cross-country announcement swing aimed at pumping some fresh energy into a campaign that has sputtered throughout the spring. As his plane headed to New York today, he said a Senate run by Hillary Rodham Clinton "will generate enthusiasm there and around the country."

The new stump speech, which he has dutifully repeated at every stop, makes clear Gore is ready to begin the shift away from President Clinton on moral

issues while still hoping to share in the glories of the
administration's policy
achievements.

As he told reporters on Air Force Two today: "It's a new
day because as a
candidate for president, I am obviously presenting my
own vision for the
country's future."