

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Beth Sanner to Jane Holl, Barry Lowenkron, and Susan Rice at 11:09. Subject: Meeting. [CIA Act] (2 pages)	05/19/1993	P1/b(1), P3/b(3)
002. email	Barry Lowenkron to M. Brooke Darby at 8:55. Subject: Bruce Morrison: Adams (2 pages)	06/30/1993	P1/b(1)
003. email	Jane Holl to Mary Emery, Wilma Hall, Kristen Cicio, et al at 19:22. Subject: Hurd's Visit (2 pages)	09/21/1993	P1/b(1)
004. email	Betsy Marshall to James Reed at 14:14. Subject: Kohl Talkers (2 pages)	11/24/1993	P1/b(1)
005. email	Jane Holl to Nancy Soderberg at 16:20. Subject: Reynolds-Major Talks (2 pages)	12/03/1993	P1/b(1)
006. email	Julien LeBourgeois to Jenonne Walker at 12:07. Subject: Flynn on Northern Ireland (1 page)	12/07/1993	P1/b(1)
007. email	Julien LeBourgeois to M. Brook Darby at 12:41. Subject: Ireland (1 page)	12/07/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
A1-Record (Jan 93- Sept 94) ([Peace Process, Irish, Ireland])
OA/Box Number: 570000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1993-12/03/1993]

2006-1990-F

vz1660

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

14-May-1993 13:48 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE BELOW

FROM: Natalie S. Wozniak
(WOZNIAK)

SUBJECT: May 14 Press Conference Qs and As

May 14, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE NSC STAFF

FROM: DON STEINBERG/PAUL CLARKE

SUBJECT: MAY 14 PRESS CONFERENCE

Following are the final approved versions of the Qs and As prepared for the President's Press Conference today.

Please retain them for future reference.

Thanks for all your help in putting this package together.

□

FOREIGN POLICY Qs and As FOR MAY 14 PRESS CONFERENCE

AFRICA

- SOMALIA
- SUDAN

ASIA

- CAMBODIA
- CHINA: MFN
- CHINA: MISSILE PROLIFERATION
- NORTH KOREA
- VIETNAM

CIS

- ARMENIA AND AZERBAIJAN
- RUSSIA: ASSISTANCE
- RUSSIA: CONSTITUTIONAL DEBATE
- RUSSIA: MISSILE-RELATED EXPORTS
- RUSSIA: SATELLITE LAUNCH
- RUSSIA/UNITED STATES: PEACEKEEPING
- RUSSIA/UNITED STATES: SPACE STATION
- RUSSIA/UNITED STATES: URANIUM PURCHASE
- UNITED STATES/UKRAINIAN RELATIONS

EUROPE

BOSNIA/MACEDONIA
NORTHERN IRELAND: SPECIAL ENVOY
NORTHERN IRELAND: VISA TO GERRY ADAMS

LATIN AMERICA

HAITI
HAITIANS AT GUANTANAMO BAY

MIDDLE EAST

IRAN
IRAQ
IRAQ: UN GUARDS
MIDDLE EAST: AMERICAN DRAFT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN
JOINT STATEMENT
MIDDLE EAST PEACE TALKS

ARMS CONTROL ISSUES

ACDA STATUS
COCOM
UNITED STATES NUCLEAR TESTING PROGRAM

DEFENSE ISSUES

HOMOSEXUALS IN THE MILITARY
TAILHOOK
WOMEN IN COMBAT

ENVIRONMENT

BIODIVERSITY

INTELLIGENCE

BUDGET
ENCRYPTION

□

TRADE ISSUES: GENERAL

CHILE
EC PROCUREMENT DISPUTE
NAFTA
SUPER 301
URUGUAY ROUND

TRADE ISSUES: UNITED STATES/JAPAN

JAPAN ACCUSES UNITED STATES OF UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES
MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLES/AUTOS AND AUTO PARTS
NEGOTIATING FRAMEWORK WITH JAPAN
TONE OF UNITED STATES-JAPAN RELATIONS
TRADE RESULTS VS. MANAGED TRADE

□

Somalia

Q: When will the last U.S. troops be out of Somalia?

A: The transition from UNITAF to UNOSOM II was
successfully completed May 4.

The number of U.S. troops in Somalia was over 24,000 when I took office, and now we have less than 4,000.

I am proud that the remaining U.S. soldiers are playing an important support role in UNOSOM II.

Their withdrawal will be worked out with the UN and with other nations that are contributors to UNOSOM.

I cannot give you a precise date at this point, but I can assure you that I will not keep American soldiers there any longer than necessary.

Q: Are those 4,000 combat troops?

A: No, 2,700 are logistics support troops. The remainder are part of a Quick Reaction Force that will be stationed off-shore beginning in the summer.

Q: How would you characterize the U.S. role in Somalia?

A: The U.S.-led coalition was a great success. We eliminated the risk of mass starvation and greatly alleviated the humanitarian crisis we found when we arrived.

The transition from UNITAF to UNOSOM II has taken place smoothly, and we are confident of the continued success of the UN in Somalia.

11

Sudan

Q: What is being done about the tragic situation in Sudan?

A: I am deeply concerned about the crisis in Sudan, where as many as a million people could be at risk of starvation.

We have taken a number of practical steps to relieve the suffering. We have provided two C-130s and several smaller aircraft to fly food into areas of critical need. We are also moving food by barge up the Nile.

The parties to the conflict must stop using food and the misery of their own people as weapons. Fighting, whether it is between the rebel factions or with the government, prevents relief efforts from taking place and the result is that many more people die.

The SPLA and the government must negotiate seriously at the talks now underway in Abuja under Nigerian auspices and reach a settlement that will allow the reconciliation and rehabilitation that Sudan so desperately needs.

We will continue to support strongly the Abuja talks.

Both Ambassador Petterson and Assistant Secretary Moose have recently visited the region to assess the needs of those affected.

We are currently looking at additional steps we can take to alleviate the suffering.

U

Cambodia

Q: Will the Cambodian elections proceed as planned in view of the attacks on UNTAC personnel? What are we doing to improve the security of the UNTAC troops?

A: We are committed to holding the elections as scheduled in late May. We condemn the attacks on UNTAC personnel, but the international community will not be intimidated. The Khmer Rouge will be held fully responsible for its actions.

The U.S., UN and the major troop-contributing countries in Cambodia are taking concrete steps to enhance the security of UN personnel. We have just sent three U.S. transport planes to Phnom Penh filled with urgently needed equipment, like body armor, helmets and medical supplies. In addition, Australia is sending six Black Hawk helicopters and 100 additional support troops, which the U.S. government will lift to Cambodia.

We expect UNTAC troops to take all measures necessary within the scope of their mandate to defend the election process. That mandate allows the UN soldiers to defend themselves and their mission with force when threatened.

LI

China: MFN

Q: During the campaign, you spoke out on your concerns over humans rights abuses and criticized the previous administration for coddling China. China's MFN treatment comes up for renewal in a couple of weeks or so. Will you hold to your campaign position and place conditions on MFN?

A: We have no interest in isolating China. China is changing rapidly and growing quickly. I hope it will be a partner in building a more secure and prosperous world.

But continued progress in our relations must include progress in human rights, trade access and non-proliferation.

As we chart our China policy, I am consulting closely with key members of Congress, including on the issues of MFN.

Our approach to MFN renewal will depend on steps the Chinese government takes to address these important issues.

Q: What is your reaction to the news that the Chinese rebuffed Lord during his recent trip?

A: Ambassador Lord met with senior Chinese officials for two days of frank discussions in Beijing earlier this week.

He pressed for additional progress in the areas of human rights, trade and nonproliferation.

I do not intend to characterize the Chinese response until Ambassador Lord has provided me his full report.

Q: Do you support the China MFN bill introduced in Congress by Pelosi and Mitchell, including the provision on Tibet?

A: I share the concerns of Congress over China's record. I share with a majority in Congress the belief that progress in our relations must include progress in human rights, trade and non-proliferation.

As to the issue of Tibet, we continue to urge Beijing to revive discussions with the Dalai Lama and to address the full range of concerns and issues of the people of Tibet, including human rights abuses.

Q: Will you place conditions on MFN through an Executive Order?

A: I have not made any decisions yet. As I said, our approach to MFN renewal will depend on steps the Chinese government takes to address these important issues.

||

China and Missile Proliferation

Q: Are you going to impose sanctions on China for missile exports to Pakistan?

A: We've made very clear to China our concern about reports that they may have exported missile-related technology to Pakistan.

We expect China to live up to the commitment it has made to observe the guidelines and parameters of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) with respect to its exports.

U.S. law requires us to impose sanctions on countries or individual companies if we determine they have exported missile technology in contravention of the MTCR Guidelines. We will enforce that law.

[IF PRESSED]:

No determination has been made regarding whether new missile technology sanctions must be imposed against China.

11

North Korea Nuclear

Q: Now that the UN Security Council has passed a resolution, what's the next step in dealing with North Korea's nuclear program?

A: North Korea should heed Tuesday's UNSC resolution calling for it to honor its non-proliferation commitments.

The international community has again made clear that non-proliferation is vital to international peace and security and that countries who sign non-proliferation agreements must live up to them.

Q: Will the U.S. meet with North Korea to resolve this issue?

A: We've said that we would be willing to meet with North Korean officials if this would support international efforts to resolve the current situation. Nothing has been scheduled.

11

Vietnam

Q: Can you tell us if you have made any decision to change U.S. policy toward Vietnam? To lift the embargo?

A: Any decision on U.S.-Vietnam relations depends on my evaluation of the effort to achieve the fullest possible accounting of American POW/MIAs.

We are in the process of reviewing the results of General Vessey's visit to Hanoi last month in terms of its contribution to the fullest possible accounting.

I have made no decision at this point.

Q: Can you comment on Senator Kerry's upcoming trip to Vietnam? Is he conveying a message from you to the Vietnamese leaders?

A: Senator Kerry is making a personal trip to Vietnam to press for further progress on the issue of MIA/POW's. I hope his visit will contribute to resolving some of the unanswered questions, and I look forward to

receiving a report when he returns.

Senator Kerry knows well that this Administration places the highest priority on the fullest possible accounting of POW/MIAs, and he will convey that message to the Vietnamese.

(if pressed)

I have sent a letter to the Vietnam President Le Duc Anh.

The letter simply underscores my commitment to the American people to ensure the fullest possible accounting of our MIA/POWs.

It urges the Vietnamese government to accommodate Senator Kerry's request for progress in resolving outstanding questions on this important issue.

||

Armenia and Azerbaijan

Q: Have you given any thought to dealing with the possible consequences of a widened war in the Caucasus, particularly the involvement of regional powers such as Turkey, Russia or Iran in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict?

A: Our negotiator, Ambassador Jack Maresca, has been working tirelessly to bring the parties back to the CSCE-sponsored Minsk Group negotiations in the wake of the recent ethnic Armenian offensive.

We believe this is the best way to avoid a widening of the conflict. We are in almost constant contact with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkey and Russia on these matters.

Ambassador Strobe Talbott, the coordinator for our policy toward the former Soviet Union, visited Armenia and Azerbaijan this week. He stressed the importance of a peaceful resolution of these issues with both parties.

||

Russia: Assistance

Q: How will you fund the \$1.8 billion U.S. assistance program for Russia announced in April? Will you ask for a supplemental?

A: I am consulting with Congress on the best way to fund this program. I was in close touch with Congress before announcing this program. We are now exchanging views on how the money should be allocated and how to fund the program.

We have made no decision on whether that should be through a supplemental.

Q: Can you give us a breakdown of the \$1.8 billion program?

A: This program is designed to build on the \$1.6 billion Vancouver program by expanding our efforts to promote democracy and free markets in Russia.

We hope to direct \$1.3 billion to efforts to promote nuclear power safety, expanded energy production, a safer environment, technical assistance, and vastly increased exchanges.

We also are discussing \$500 million as a "challenge grant" to a multilateral Privatization Fund to be financed with our G-7 partners.

If the other G-7 nations make substantial contributions, then we will together reach our \$2 billion goal.

A matching contribution by EBRD and the World Bank would increase the capital available to \$4 billion.

This program would assist in privatizing the largest enterprises in Russia -- thereby contributing to our goal of helping to build a free market economy in Russia.

Q: How can you justify aid to Russia when your stimulus package has been defeated and times are tough here at home?

A: For America to be strong at home -- to revive opportunity and growth here -- we must be strong and active abroad.

Nowhere is our involvement more important than in our policies toward Russia.

Russia's struggle to build a free and democratic society is a political miracle, historic in its scope and drama.

!]

We must act now and do what we can to support the reform process in Russia -- not out of charity, but because it is a wise investment in our own future.

Our efforts will entail some new costs, but we'll reap even larger dividends for our safety and prosperity if we act now.

America's taxpayers spent trillions of dollars to prosecute the Cold War; a democratizing Russia means we can reduce that pace of spending and move billions into creating new businesses, new jobs and a better future for our children.

But if Russia falls into anarchy or lurches back

to despotism, we would face a renewed nuclear threat, higher defense budgets and a huge setback for democracy for the world.

Thus, our ability to put people first at home requires that we put Russia first on our agenda abroad.

I]

Russia: The Constitutional Debate

Q: Now that President Yeltsin has won the April 25 referendum, he seems to be provoking a new political crisis by calling for a June 5 Constitutional Convention. Does the U.S. support this move which many observers would characterize as extra-constitutional?

A: -- First, as I have noted previously, it would not be appropriate for the U.S. to comment on what is or is not constitutional within the Russian system. That is for the Russian people to decide.

The Russian people gave President Yeltsin and the reform process a great vote of confidence and support in the April 25 referendum. The successful conclusion of a free and fair referendum is in itself a major step in the development of Russian democracy.

Our position is clear: we support the strengthening of Russian democracy and economic reform. We support reformers throughout Russia, and specifically President Yeltsin, who is the leader of the reform movement.

The U.S. has offered significant bilateral economic support to help reform continue. And we are working closely with our allies to provide even greater multilateral support.

I]

Russia: Missile-Related Exports

Q: Are Russian high-technology exports contributing to the proliferation of ballistic missiles?

A: The Russians have said that they believe that the transfer of hardware and technology for "peaceful" space-launch programs is permitted under the international Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR).

We have interpreted the MTCR differently and, in accordance with U.S. law, have imposed sanctions against entities in both Russia and India for their involvement in efforts to transfer MTCR-controlled items.

We will continue to press for universal observance of the MTCR guidelines and to discuss these matters with the Russians in order to resolve our differences.

We need to work with the Russians to find legitimate

avenues for their high-technology exports in this and other areas.

[]

Russia Satellite Launch

Q: Why are we allowing Russia to enter the international commercial satellite launch market when U.S. firms already face stiff competition from Europe and China?

A: Last week in Moscow, the United States and Russia agreed on the main elements of an agreement that will both facilitate Russia's entry into the commercial satellite launch market and, at the same time, safeguard our commercial interests.

The agreement will allow Russia to enter the international launch market in a way that will avoid market disruption and government intervention that could distort competition. This is something our industry expressed strong concern about, and we believe that we have addressed these concerns in the agreement.

The agreement is also important because it will encourage market-oriented reforms in the Russian economy and space-launch sector and demonstrate that we are serious about cooperating with Russia over the long haul on important areas of interest to both sides.

Q: Won't it cost American jobs?

That is always a concern. However, we have taken steps to minimize any such risk. For example, the number of launches available to Russian bid has been limited so as to avoid the displacement of U.S. firms.

In addition, by removing a barrier to the development of the satellite industry as a whole, this agreement could expand market opportunities for existing U.S. firms and thus create jobs.

Q: Can you provide us with any details on the number of launches permitted, the pricing provision and other key elements?

A: Ambassador Kantor's staff at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative can provide you with more information on the agreement.

[]

Russia/United States: Peacekeeping

Q: You have just announced a series of new peacekeeping initiatives with Russia to help resolve international conflicts. Why are you doing this, especially in light of their veto of Cyprus peacekeeping?

A: We are actively examining ways to enhance the U.N.'s peacekeeping capability.

One of the great benefits of our new relationships with Russia is that our two military forces now have an opportunity to work together to help resolve conflicts. This is an historic change.

Peacekeeping and peace enforcement are relatively new roles for the U.S. military. By conducting joint training and exercises with the Russians, we will strengthen our ability to support peacekeeping missions approved by the U.N. Security Council. We plan to work with other countries in challenging, but largely non-combat situations, in the field.

We are also working with the Russians and our other friends on the Security Council to address the institutional, financial and operational challenges the U.N. faces as it tries to support more peacekeepers than ever before.

As for the Russian veto of the Cyprus funding, the Russians used their veto in the Security Council on the question of how to finance the peacekeeping force, not on whether that force should continue to operate. We are confident that they will continue their pattern of constructive consultation and cooperation.

Q: Does all of this mean that we are shifting our focus away from our traditional allies?

A: No, not at all. Peacekeeping is something that can and should be done by as broad a spectrum of countries as possible.

We see this as the beginning of what we hope will be fruitful cooperation with many friendly countries that share our commitment to U.N. peacekeeping.

||

Russia/United States: Participation in Space Station

Q: What is the status of Russia's involvement in the space station redesign?

A: Russian space officials have been in Washington to participate in the redesign effort.

No decisions have been made about the Russian contribution.

Nevertheless, we intend to give full consideration to the use of Russian assets, including hardware that can reduce the station's costs.

||

Uranium Purchase from Russia

Q: What's the status of your plans to buy highly-enriched uranium from Russia?

A: This continues to be a high priority. Buying enriched uranium from dismantled former Soviet weapons will reduce proliferation risks while helping the Russian economy.

Our negotiators are continuing to work out the complex commercial and technical issues needed to conclude this agreement.

We've told the Russians that before this deal goes forward, there will need to be arrangements for equitable sharing of the proceeds with Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus.

!!

U.S./Ukrainian Relations

Q: How were Ambassador Talbott's meetings in Ukraine? Ukrainian officials have complained that we are giving Ukraine short shrift compared to Russia.

A: Ambassador Talbott met with President Kravchuk and other Ukrainian officials. His meetings were very positive.

-- We are seeking to develop our relations with Ukraine on We want a full and productive relationship, and Ambassador Talbott's trip there was a sign of that.

Q: Are we developing a more lenient approach toward Ukraine?

A: Our position that Ukraine should ratify the START I treaty and accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear weapon state remains firm. When Ambassador Talbott met with Ukrainian government officials, they stressed that Ukraine would fulfill these commitments.

Q: Are you proposing a new security initiative with Ukraine?

A: Our proposals for security assurances remain as before, but Ambassador Talbott did have a good discussion of security issues with Ukrainian officials.

Q: Why did you refuse to see Prime Minister Kuchma when he came to the United States?

A: Prime Minister Kuchma was invited here on a private visit, during a busy period for me. I will look forward to meeting him at a time more convenient for both of us.

!!

Bosnia/Macedonia

Q: Are we sending forces to Macedonia as reported in the media?

A: As I said previously, we are considering this among a number of options we are studying in our efforts to deal with the conflict in Yugoslavia.

No final decisions have been made.

Q: Are we sending ground troops to monitor the border between Serbia and Bosnia?

A: I am not contemplating any such steps. As I have said, I do not intend to put ground troops into Bosnia except as part of an effort to implement a settlement.

Q: Why are you back-pedaling on military options for responding to the Bosnian crisis after such intensive rhetoric last week?

A: We remain committed to our approach to the Bosnian crisis. We have always said that all options for dealing with this crisis are on the table, including more forceful measures to help bring a stop to the killing. In fact, the current general cease-fire may have been reached in part because the Serbs know we are serious about more forceful measures.

Q: Why has the air come out of your Bosnian policy? How are you going to recover from the European rejection of your initiatives? Doesn't the current stall put the lie to the U.S. as leader for the post-Cold War world?

A: Not so. Together with our allies and friends, we have made clear that all options are open; we continue to assess the situation.

The conflict in Bosnia is among the most complex anyone has ever faced. Deeply rooted hatreds have been fertilized with the blood of thousands. Bringing peace to this region will require the full effort of the international community. The United States cannot solve this problem on its own.

With the cease-fire generally holding in Bosnia, and Mr. Milosevic on record as disassociating himself from the actions of the Bosnian Serbs, we are at an important phase in the search for peace. It is up to the Bosnians to maintain the cease-fire which has been agreed.

□

The international community is watching developments in the former Yugoslavia very closely. Mr. Milosevic has said that he will sever all but essential humanitarian

goods to the Bosnian Serbs. It is now up to him to deliver on this promise.

In short, in assessing the responsibilities of the international community -- including the United States -- for resolving this conflict, it is also important to keep in mind the responsibilities of the parties, the governments in Belgrade and Zagreb.

We, together with other concerned members of the international community are, as we have been, willing to help bring peace to the region. But others must do their share.

Q: Doesn't the continued warfare between the Croats and Muslims complicate efforts to bring peace to Bosnia?

A: We have condemned those who initiate violence, regardless of their affiliation. We have given strong messages to Zagreb that they must do what they can to prevent violence from breaking out. We have sent similar messages to the Izetbegovic government.

Q: A general cease-fire seems to be holding, but how will the U.S. react if the violence in Eastern Bosnia resumes?

A: I won't address that hypothetical situation, but will stress that we continue to follow events in Bosnia very closely and have not ruled out any options.

Q: What about the upcoming vote of the Bosnian Serb Assembly?

A: The U.S. places no legitimacy in this so-called referendum.

Q: If the U.S. were to take stronger action, do you need additional authorization by the UN?

A: We will ensure that any action we take will be consistent with UN resolutions. We will seek additional action in the UN if it is required.

Q: How about consultations with Congress?

A: My advisers and I have had extensive consultations with Congressional leadership and interested members on the Bosnian situation. Their observations and recommendations have been an important part of our deliberations.

11

Q: What about the Bosnian Foreign Minister's (Haris Siladzic) call for removing UNPROFOR from Bosnia?

A: We understand the frustration of the Bosnians as this conflict has dragged on.

The men and women of UNPROFOR, the UNHCR and ICRC have worked tirelessly under extremely difficult circumstances to relieve the suffering of tens of thousands of Bosnian citizens, as well as the suffering of others.

The United States does not believe that UNPROFOR presents a problem for the international community as it contemplates what further measures may be necessary to help bring peace.

□

Northern Ireland: Special Envoy

Q: Do you plan to appoint a "Special Envoy" on Northern Ireland?

A: As you know, I consulted earlier this year with both Prime Minister Major and Prime Minister Reynolds. My number one priority is to encourage the parties to resume the talks which were recessed last fall.

I told both leaders that our policy toward Northern Ireland would be based on three principles:

First, Northern Ireland will remain an important issue for discussion among the U.S., Great Britain and Ireland.

Second, any proposals we make will be judged against the standard of whether they can contribute to bringing about an end to the tragedy in Northern Ireland. The goal is to promote peace and reconciliation.

Third, we will consult fully with both Britain and Ireland.

If the parties believe that a U.S. representative could help, then I would be prepared to take such a step to advance the cause of peace.

Ultimately, it is up to the people in Northern Ireland themselves to bring about an end to this tragedy. I want them to know that we will stand with them to help in any way we can.

□

Visa to Gerry Adams

Q: During the campaign you called for granting a visa to Gerry Adams, yet your Administration just denied him one. How do you account for this contradiction?

A: Mr. Adams was denied a visa in accordance with U.S. law, specifically, the Immigration and Nationality Act which bars those individuals involved in terrorist

activity from entry into the United States.

The decision to deny Mr. Adams a visa was recommended by the State Department with the full support of the Justice Department, including the FBI. I stand by that decision.

During the campaign, I said I would consider granting a visa to Mr. Adams because he was a member of parliament and as such could be helpful to the process of bringing peace to the area.

However, Mr. Adams is no longer a member of Parliament.

Q: Will you be discussing Northern Ireland with President Robinson?

A: As you know, I will be seeing President Robinson -- who is Ireland's head of state -- later this afternoon, along with Ireland's Foreign Minister Dick Spring.

I anticipate we will touch on Northern Ireland and on other issues affecting Irish society and Ireland's role in the world. In that regard, let me add that all of us, not to mention the Somalis themselves, owe President Robinson a heartfelt thank you for her valiant efforts to highlight the plight of the Somali people.

I understand she will be accepting an award from Care today for her efforts. It is a well deserved honor.

Haiti

Q: What is the status of the Haiti negotiations?

A: I am committed to the restoration of constitutional government and the return of President Aristide to Haiti. We have made that view clear to the current military leaders in Haiti.

I believe that the negotiations will succeed. We will not back off from our commitment to the Haitian people, nor will we accept delaying tactics. All Haitian parties must come together to ensure the restoration of democracy quickly.

We believe UN and OAS Special Representative Dante Caputo is making progress, and we continue to support his efforts.

Secretary Christopher held productive meetings with UN Secretary General Boutros Ghali, Under-Secretary General Goulding and Mr. Caputo two days ago in New York.

Q: Will the UN Security Council consider the issue of Haiti,

especially the idea of international police monitors?

A: A number of UN members, including ourselves, are consulting on ways to strengthen the international presence in Haiti as part of the future political settlement.

One option under discussion is the deployment of international police monitors to professionalize the Haitian police and promote security and confidence.

I support this concept, but a number of details remain to be worked out, including the role of the U.S. in this operation.

[]

Haitians at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

[Background: As a result of a court order mandating "adequate care" for Haitian AIDS victims whose immune systems had seriously deteriorated, some 50 Haitians were recently permitted U.S. entry from Guantanamo. In addition, we have permitted another 50 or so to come into the United States for specified medical and humanitarian reasons. Thus, the population of Haitians at Guantanamo has diminished from about 270 when you took office to about 170 today.]

Q: What do you plan to do with the Haitians at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba?

A: This is a complicated and compelling issue that is under review.

It must be resolved in a manner that meets the humanitarian needs of the Haitians and is sensitive to burdens faced by state and local health care facilities.

[]

Iran

Q: What is your view of the current behavior of Iran?

A: Iran's behavior on a number of important issues shows that it has chosen to remain outside the family of nations.

It sponsors terrorism and assassination; it supports extremist violence in Egypt and elsewhere; it is engaged in an effort to subvert the Middle East peace process; and it is seeking nuclear weapons. We and our allies need to work together to contain the Iranian

threat.

Q: Are you prepared to allow the sale of civilian aircraft to Iran?

A: This is a difficult issue which combines a number of U.S. interests, including economic interests. It has been the subject of an intensive review in the Administration, and a decision has not yet been taken.

Q: How serious is the threat from Iran? What are you doing about it?

A: Iran is building up its conventional military forces, pursuing missile and chemical weapons programs and seeking nuclear weapons. Its sponsorship of terrorism and assassination, its support for extremist violence in Egypt and elsewhere and its violent opposition to the Middle East peace process put it outside the family of nations.

We have pressed our allies and others not to assist Iran's nuclear and other weapons programs. We've told potential exporters that arms sales to Iran would be highly destabilizing, given the Iranian regime's behavior and ambitions.

□

Iraq

Q: What is your reaction to the Kuwaiti claim that Iraq tried to assassinate former President Bush last month in Kuwait city?

A: This is a very serious matter.

We are working closely with the Government of Kuwait to investigate these charges thoroughly and expeditiously. An FBI/Secret Service team is in Kuwait at the moment interrogating the suspects and examining the physical evidence.

Until this investigation is completed, I am not going to speculate about its conclusions or the course of action I will decide upon.

Q: Are you softening the U.S. approach to Iraq?

A: No, we are toughening the U.S. approach, with enforcement of our no-fly zone, continuing pressure on nuclear issues and the growing effect of our embargo.

Senior members of my Administration recently expressed my support to the Iraqi democratic opposition here in Washington.

We are insisting that Iraq comply fully with all the UN resolutions. That applies to the Saddam Hussein regime and any successor regime.

We are also urging the UN to set up a commission to investigate Iraq's war crimes and crimes against humanity.

□

Iraq: UN Guards

[Background: The UN has announced it is withdrawing 50 UN guards from northern Iraq this weekend because it has run out of money for its programs in Iraq, including those that provide relief for the Kurds in the north.]

Q: What is the U.S. reaction to reports the UN is withdrawing guards from northern Iraq which protect relief operations for the Kurds?

A: The UN guards play an important role in the humanitarian relief effort in Iraq. We are working with our allies and other donors to ensure that the UN has the finances needed to get the UN guard force to its full strength.

At the same time, U.S. and coalition aircraft will continue their mission of patrolling the no-fly zone in northern Iraq to protect the Kurds from Iraqi military pressure.

Saddam Hussein should have no doubt that the coalition remains determined to see all the UN resolutions are complied with, including Resolution 688 that demands an end to repression of the Iraqi people.

□

American Draft

of an Israeli-Palestinian Joint Statement

[Background: The U.S. tabled the attached draft on Wednesday evening, May 12. It followed the earlier tabling of Israeli and Palestinian drafts and was designed to codify overlapping areas where they seemed to be close to agreement. The introduction of an American draft was designed to focus their energies, particularly in the closing days of the negotiations and ensure that there would be an ongoing focus of activity during the recess.

Neither side has rejected the draft, contrary to the impression created in the media. The Palestinians see it as an "Israeli draft" and have serious problems with it. The Israelis like it. Both sides are engaged with us in ongoing discussions about it which we intend to continue in the next few weeks. Our objective is to prepare the ground for closure on this agreement when the negotiations resume in early June.]

The Document:

The document is an American draft of an Israeli-Palestinian agreement. It does not represent American positions but rather our version of the common ground between the parties. The elements of the statement include:

Objective: to end the conflict and create a peaceful future of coexistence

Goal of Negotiations: an agreement on self government arrangements for the Palestinians for five years; a second phase of final status negotiations to implement 242 and 338.

Description of Self-Government: the empowerment of the Palestinians through the transfer of the functions of the Israeli Civil Administration, which should give Palestinians greater control over decisions that affect their lives and fate.

Security: the agreement states the opposing views of the Israeli and Palestinian sides. Israel wants to be responsible for overall security and the security of Israelis in the territories during the interim period; the Palestinians object.

Establishment of Working Groups: codifies agreement already reached on the creation of three working groups: concept of interim self-government; land and water and humanitarian affairs and human rights.

Elections: elections for the authority will be free and fair and will include international observers.

Powers: the powers of the elected authority will include executive and judicial powers and legislative powers within the responsibilities transferred to it.

[]

Q: Are you disappointed that the U.S. draft Israeli-Palestinian agreement has been rejected?

A: The draft agreement has not been rejected by either side. Both the Israelis and Palestinians have some problems with it.

But both sides have indicated their willingness to use the American draft as a basis for their negotiations.

We will be having ongoing discussions with the Israelis and Palestinians about this draft over the next few weeks before the formal negotiations reconvene.

[]

[Background: The Middle East peace negotiations adjourned yesterday without any substantive agreement. Nevertheless, all sides in all the tracks have tabled papers and are negotiating their differences. Progress is being made but it is slow and difficult. The U.S., for the first time since Madrid, has introduced an American draft of a joint Israeli-Palestinian agreement. We sought to do this at a trilateral meeting (U.S.-Israel-Palestinians), but the Palestinians did not show up. This was disappointing since they had been demanding trilateral meetings. Nevertheless, both sides are now giving serious consideration to the U.S. draft. We are treating this break in negotiations as a recess. We expect the negotiations to resume, after Jewish and Muslim holidays, in early June.]

Q: The Arab-Israeli negotiators have now left town. Why didn't you meet with them?

A: I was looking forward to meeting with them to hear them report that they had achieved agreement.

Unfortunately, that did not happen in this round. But I remain optimistic that we will be able to meet soon and announce real progress.

As I have often stated, I believe that 1993 can be a year of serious and substantive progress in the Middle East negotiations -- a year of breakthrough. Because of that assessment, I have instructed Secretary of State Christopher and our team to be actively engaged in the negotiations as a "full partner."

The U.S. was fully engaged in this round of the negotiations, working with all the parties. We even introduced an American draft of an Israeli-Palestinian agreement.

There is a lot of hard work to be done. We are ready to do our part. I expect the parties to live up to their responsibilities. We can only be a "full partner" if they are full participants too.

Frankly, I think some opportunities were missed this time. That makes it all the more important that all the parties come back after the recess, as early as June, in a problem-solving mode, ready to do real work.

!!

ACDA

Q: There is continuing uncertainty over your plans for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Is it true that you plan to dissolve the agency and fold it into the State Department?

A: We are now engaged in a review of ACDA's future.

In deciding how best to organize the Government in the areas of arms control and non-proliferation, one of our key considerations will be the high priority that I

place on both these areas.

We expect the review to be completed soon.

Meanwhile, ACDA continues to play an important role in interagency deliberations as we review our policies in these areas.

||

COCOM

Q: You promised Mr. Yeltsin that you would review security-related export controls for Russia. What are the results of that review?

A: As I stated during the campaign and again to Mr. Yeltsin at Vancouver, we need a careful review of our East-West export controls.

We are in the midst of a study of this review, and we will closely coordinate our views with Congress and our allies.

||

U.S. Nuclear Testing Program

Q: Have you decided whether or not to resume U.S. nuclear testing when the moratorium expires on July 1, 1993?

A: I support a phased approach to the implementation of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty but have not made any decisions on actual tests.

Last year's Congressional compromise on this issue allows the U.S. to phase out nuclear testing between 1993 and 1996 as it simultaneously pursues a Comprehensive Test Ban, with the goal of attaining a CTB by 1996.

Our review of these issues is in its final stages and I expect to receive recommendations from the appropriate Departments in the next few weeks.

||

Homosexuals in the Military

Q: The Senate and House Armed Services Committees have recently completed their hearings on the issue of lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military. The testimony during the SASC hearing strongly suggests that the "don't ask/don't tell" formula is gaining momentum as an alternative to lifting the ban completely. Do you view this as a viable option?

A: I remain committed to ensuring that American citizens who want to serve their country should be able to do so unless their conduct disqualifies them from doing so.

I believe that behavior can and should be strictly

regulated. I do not think people should be disqualified merely on the basis of status.

I do not believe individuals should be excluded from military service solely on the basis of their status.

Q: Will you discuss this issue with Congress before acting on the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense?

A: I had extensive discussions in the Congress on this issue earlier in the year.

In the next two months, Secretary Aspin plans to discuss with concerned members of Congress the issues that have been raised both in his investigations and in the Armed Services Committees hearings.

Once I receive Secretary Aspin's recommendation on or before July 15, I will again consult with Congressional leaders.

□

Star Wars Program

Q: Do you agree with Secretary Aspin's decision to kill the Star Wars program?

A: Secretary Aspin has renamed, restructured and reoriented the former Strategic Defense Initiative Office (SDIO); he has not canceled research and development on missile defenses.

Under the new Ballistic Missile Defense Office (BMDO), which will now report to the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition instead of directly to the Secretary, the Defense Department will continue as a first priority to develop and deploy theater missile defenses. The second priority is to develop a limited defense for the Continental United States that would be consistent with the ABM Treaty and which we could consider deploying in about a decade or so.

We have requested \$3.8 billion for work on missile defenses in FY 1994, so it isn't accurate to say we have terminated our efforts in this area.

The decisions announced by Secretary Aspin yesterday are fully consistent with the position on SDI that I took during the campaign and enjoy my full support.

□

Tailhook

Q: The recently released Tailhook report described in vivid detail the sexual misconduct of many junior officers and the failure of several more senior officers to exercise appropriate leadership. What is being done to punish those

responsible?

A: The sexual misconduct that is reported to have occurred at the 1991 Tailhook conference is not in keeping with the high standards that we expect from our military officers. Furthermore, it is an affront to the fair and equal treatment of women that we expect throughout the military -- or anywhere.

I hope that this report will not be used to diminish our respect for the Navy and its extraordinarily devoted and competent personnel.

The Chief of Naval Operations and acting Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Frank Kelso, have established convening authorities that are ready to expedite the individual cases that have arisen from the Tailhook investigation.

We must ensure that the follow-up to the report, including any judicial proceedings, be implemented in a fair and objective manner. As Commander-in-Chief, I am determined that this process be fair both to those making the allegations and to the officers being charged.

I have recently nominated John Dalton to be the next Secretary of the Navy. Upon his confirmation, I expect him to focus on the fair and expeditious resolution of this unfortunate event.

||

Women in Combat

Q: Secretary Aspin recently announced that women will be allowed to serve in combat positions in the Armed Forces. Is this decision consistent with the recommendations of last year's Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces and subsequent Congressional proclamations?

A: In opening combat positions to women, Secretary Aspin was referring specifically to allowing women to serve aboard U.S. Navy combat ships with the exception of amphibious ships and submarines.

The decision to allow women to fly tactical aircraft during combat missions is contrary to the recommendation of the Commission but is consistent with the position taken by the Congressional decision to lift the ban against women serving in combat.

The military services are moving quickly to implement this decision and, as Commander-in-Chief, I am confident that women will be able to make significant contributions to our national security in combat positions.

||

Biodiversity

Q: Have the industry and environmental groups been consulted on your approach to signing the biodiversity treaty?

A: Yes. We have worked with leaders in the pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries and in the environmental community. They have played a vital role in helping us to understand the key concerns of the industry and in helping us find a way to sign the treaty that also protects the patent and other economic rights of our industry.

Q: Can you release the draft interpretative statement?

A: No, we're not releasing it at this time, because it is the subject of discussion with other governments. We will release it as soon as we have completed those discussions.

Q: When will you submit the treaty to the Senate for ratification?

A: We will submit the treaty as soon as we complete the discussions with other governments, so that we have an approach to an interpretative statement that we feel will have broad support.

Q: How long is that going to take? Will it be done in 1993?

A: We have already begun these discussions. We want to complete them soon -- and certainly expect it well before the end of the year.

17

Intelligence Budget

Q: Do you plan to live up to your campaign pledge and cut intelligence spending by \$7.0 billion?

A: Our budget request will reduce the intelligence budget by \$7.0 billion between fiscal years 1993 and 1997 when compared to the Bush administration's proposal for the same period of time.

Jim Woolsey, Les Aspin and I are committed to this course of action. And I believe that we will be able to identify additional savings.

We plan to consolidate costly collection systems, streamline operations and eliminate costly and redundant activities that may exist in military and civilian intelligence programs. This consolidation

will incur some initial expenses.

We inherited the priorities of another era. We have begun a process to identify intelligence priorities that will help us meet the challenges of a new era.

This will not happen overnight. But we are committed to both real reductions and maintaining a well-grounded intelligence capability to help us meet the challenges we face.

U

Encryption

Q: Your Administration has announced a new initiative with regard to encryption products that it claims will improve the privacy of telephone communications while at the same time meeting the needs of law enforcement. Are the privacy rights of Americans going to be jeopardized by this initiative?

A: Absolutely not. First of all, our approach is voluntary. We will give our citizens and business community the opportunity to buy an encryption product that is more secure, more convenient and less expensive than others readily available today.

While encryption technology can help Americans protect business secrets and prevent the unauthorized release of personal information, it can also be used by terrorists, drug dealers, and other criminals.

Our approach is to use the best technology available to strike a good balance among competing needs.

We are providing law enforcement with no new authorities to access the private conversations of Americans.

I am committed to policies that protect the rights of all Americans to privacy while also protecting them from those who break the law.

U

Chile

Q: You have said that you support a free trade agreement with Chile. Ambassador Kantor has said that he wants to build on the NAFTA process with more agreements in Latin America. Why aren't you requesting fast-track authority for any bilateral agreements? Is Chile next in line for a trade agreement after the NAFTA?

A: Chile deserves a lot of credit for taking some extremely significant steps to liberalize its economy. In part because of these steps, U.S. exports to Chile were up 33 percent last year.

I continue to support the negotiation of a free trade

agreement with Chile at the appropriate time. Done properly, such an agreement could be in the interest of both of our nations. Chile is also a praiseworthy model of democratic efficiency and social justice.

While I hope to negotiate bilateral arrangements with other countries after the NAFTA, I want to focus my attention on completing that negotiation and those at the Uruguay Round at this time.

II

EC Procurement Dispute

Q: Last week you held your first U.S.-EC Summit. You settled part of a dispute with the EC over government procurement, yet Ambassador Kantor announced that the United States is still planning to retaliate. Is this half a trade war? Or are you trying to paper over U.S.-EC differences in order to focus on problems with the Japanese?

A: I am pleased with the outcome of U.S.-EC discussions on the procurement issue. Our U.S. manufacturers won access to the EC's \$20 billion market for heavy electrical equipment -- a market that had been closed. The affected U.S. companies believe this is a great opportunity.

At the same time, the U.S. and the EC will continue to work to resolve other outstanding issues. As Ambassador Kantor explained, the U.S. will move ahead with plans for measured retaliation over remaining barriers to U.S. access to the European telecommunications sector.

There is no link between this issue and our trade agenda with Japan. The U.S. will work to reduce trade barriers wherever we find them.

□

NAFTA

Q: The Cabinet met yesterday to discuss NAFTA strategy, reportedly considering whether to seek trade sanctions for violations of environmental and labor standards. Wouldn't this contradict Ambassador Kantor's testimony to Congress that the U.S. would not seek sanctions? Wouldn't trade sanctions require reopening the underlying NAFTA agreement? Are you seeking tougher measures because you agree with Director Panetta -- that the NAFTA would be dead in Congress if the vote were held today?

A: My position on NAFTA is unchanged. I firmly believe that a NAFTA agreement, coupled with strong and effective supplemental agreements, can be an important component of a stronger and more competitive U.S. economy. A good agreement must include tough enforcement provisions with real teeth.

I am committed to negotiating accords that provide

assurances that environmental and labor standards are upheld.

I believe Congress wants the same things from a NAFTA that I do. If we succeed in putting together a strong NAFTA package, I am confident it will win support in Congress.

You can see the potential of the NAFTA by looking at what we've already gained. Since Mexico began to liberalize its economy in 1986, we've gone from a \$6 billion trade deficit with Mexico to a \$5-plus billion trade surplus. That improvement in the U.S. trade balance has created over a quarter of a million new American jobs. The NAFTA can help lock in that change.

Many people may not know that Mexico already is a critical market for U.S. goods. In 1992, Mexico passed Japan as the second largest market for U.S. exports of manufactured goods. Moreover, Mexico has just begun to realize its economic potential.

Super 301

Q: During the campaign, you said that you supported legislation to renew Super 301. Why aren't you including it with your request for fast-track extension?

A: I support extension of Super 301, and I will work with the Congress to find the best opportunity to extend it. But given the importance of jump-starting the Uruguay Round, I want to avoid a protracted Congressional debate over other trade measures at this time.

Super 301 is only one tool in our trade arsenal. I won't wait for new legislation before I place a high priority on expanding export opportunities for U.S. businesses. I'm doing that now.

Uruguay Round

Q: When do you expect to start serious negotiations to complete the Uruguay Round? Hasn't the Round taken a back seat to NAFTA?

A: The completion of a good Uruguay Round agreement remains a high priority of this Administration. A successful conclusion of the Round is essential to strengthen the world trading system and promote global growth. One-third of the world's trade is not currently covered by GATT, including services. For example, U.S. industries lose up to \$60 billion each year due to inadequate intellectual property rights protection. A successful Uruguay Round would help remedy these problems.

That is why I announced on April 9 my intention to seek a short renewal of fast-track authority to complete these talks by December 15. I urge Congress to approve

a clean extension of fast-track authority as soon as possible so that none of our trading partners have any excuse to delay serious negotiations. We are consulting with Congress as to the best way to do this.

Today, in Toronto, Ambassador Kantor is negotiating on market access provisions with the EC, Canada, and Japan. We look forward to making significant progress with our major trading partners so that we can complete a successful Round by December.

□

Japan Accuses U.S. of Unfair Trade Practices

Q: Earlier this week, Japan issued a report accusing the U.S. of being the worst offender of free-trade principles among its major trading partners. In particular, it criticized the U.S. for the use of unilateral sanctions. What is the Administration's response?

A: By all reasonable standards, the U.S. maintains the most open market in the world.

Japan and we can liberalize world trade, by concentrating on the successful completion of the Uruguay Round and the development of the framework for economic negotiations announced last month.

□

Multi-Purpose Vehicles/Autos and Auto Parts

Q: Is the Administration going to increase the tariff on multi-purpose vehicles to 25 percent? When are you going to make a decision?

A: The Department of the Treasury is currently reviewing this matter, and we will wait for that review to be completed before any decision is taken.

Minivan reclassification raises broader questions about trade opportunities for autos and auto parts. Sixty percent of the U.S. trade deficit with Japan consists of autos and auto parts.

We take seriously the pledges that Japanese auto manufacturers made in 1992 to buy more auto parts, increase the local content of cars made in U.S. plants and import more cars into Japan. We will look to them to fulfill their commitments.

Beyond that, I am deeply concerned about the competitiveness of the U.S. auto industry and the openness of foreign markets to our autos and auto parts. It is the responsibility of our companies to produce competitive goods, and they have. It is now the obligation of other countries, including Japan, to open their markets to competitive U.S. goods.

□

Negotiating Framework with Japan

Q: How do you expect to get results from Japan, when previous Administrations have had such difficulty? Your new economic framework negotiations seem identical to the initiatives past Administrations have pursued (e.g. MOSS talks, SII). How is this one different?

A: We view the U.S.-Japan relationship as having three interconnected parts: economic issues, political/security partnership, and cooperation on global problems.

The exact content of our initiative is currently being worked out, but several aspects of our approach are fundamentally different. First, we have zeroed in on the need to advance the economic agenda in our relationship. Second, for the first time in 12 years, the U.S. is honestly addressing its budget deficit -- and that puts us in a stronger position to seek action from Japan. Third, I will remain personally committed to these talks and will stay actively involved.

Q: How and when will the framework discussions proceed?

A: The two sides will meet in the near future to discuss schedule and approach. They will then move quickly to talks over the specific framework.

ii

Tone of U.S.-Japan Relations

Q: Increasingly, Japan seems to be standing up to the United States, both in its tone and its attitude towards U.S. policy. Is this the beginning of a trade war?

A: As I announced after my meeting with Prime Minister Miyazawa, the U.S.-Japan relationship is entering a new phase, one based on equal partnership and mutual respect.

In a bilateral relationship as complex as the U.S.-Japan relationship, it is not surprising that there are differences of opinion, but those differences need not lead to a trade war.

We are developing a new framework through which we can address our concerns about structural and sectoral barriers to trade with Japan. We look forward to resolving our differences and avoiding increased frictions through these negotiations.

ii

Trade Results vs. Managed Trade

Q: You have said that, in our relationship with Japan, you will demand results. The Japanese equate results with managed

trade, which they reject. How can you be for results and for free trade at the same time?

A: I am concerned about Japan's substantial and persistent trade surplus with the U.S. As Prime Minister Miyazawa recognized when he was here last month, we have engaged in many negotiations, some of which have resulted in improved market access, some of which have not. Changes in procedures and superficial barriers are not sufficient if more intractable barriers remain that deny sales to U.S. firms.

It is important that the U.S. insist on measurable progress when it comes to trade agreements with Japan, but that does not mean managed trade. I support free trade. We will be looking for measurable progress to make sure that our agreements with Japan produce competitive opportunities for American business in Japan.

Q: Does this mean every future agreement will be like the semiconductor agreement?

A: Not necessarily. There are many ways to measure progress other than market share (e.g., increased design-in opportunities, number of foreign bids awarded, number of distribution outlets carrying foreign products). In still other cases, specific measurements might not be necessary in the agreement at all. Each case is different. It also is important that U.S. companies pursue the market aggressively. We should not be too simplistic about this, but results do matter.

Distribution:

FOR: Larry Branscum	(BRANSCUM)
FOR: George M. Andricos	(ANDRICOS)
FOR: Christina L. Funches	(FUNCHES)
FOR: Donald G. Gross	(GROSS)
FOR: Jeremy D. Rosner	(ROSNER)
FOR: Norma D. Schillaci	(SCHILLACI)
FOR: Dennis C. Jett	(JETT)
FOR: Martha S. Ramsay	(RAMSAY)
FOR: Eileen B. Claussen	(CLAUSSEN)
FOR: Cheryl C. Washington	(WASHINGTON)
FOR: Debra M. Steen	(STEEN)
FOR: Sandra J. Kristoff	(KRISTOFF)
FOR: Kent M. Wiedemann	(WIEDEMANN)
FOR: Ferial A. Saeed	(SAEED)
FOR: Anne A. Witkowsky	(WITKOWSKY)
FOR: Michael D. Fry	(FRY)
FOR: Sandra L. Kelly	(KELLYS)
FOR: Angelyn D. Moody	(MOODY)
FOR: Rita P. O'Flinn	(OFLINN)
FOR: Steven R. Jones	(JONES)
FOR: Keith D. Hahn	(HAHN)

FOR: Jonathan M. Spalter (SPALTER)
FOR: Robert G. Bell (BELL)
FOR: Steven P. Andreasen (ANDREASEN)
FOR: Richard D. Hooker (HOOKER)
FOR: Barry F. Lowenkron (LOWENKRON)
FOR: Betty A. Marshall (MARSHALL)
FOR: Earl A. Wayne (WAYNE)
FOR: Jane E. Holl (HOLL)
FOR: Jenonne R. Walker (WALKER)
FOR: O. Ruth Stalcup (STALCUP)
FOR: Baerbel K. Houck (HOUCK)
FOR: Charles A. Kupchan (KUPCHAN)
FOR: Nancy Soderberg (SODERBERG)
FOR: M. Brooke Darby (DARBY)
FOR: Wilma G. Hall (HALL)
FOR: Brenda I. Hilliard (HILLIARD)
FOR: Cathy Millison (MILLISON)
FOR: Wendy E. Gray (GRAY)
FOR: Mary C. Emery (EMERY)
!!
FOR: Kristen K. Cicio (CICIO)
FOR: Allison M. Wright (WRIGHT)
FOR: William H. Itoh (ITOH)
FOR: Kristie A. Kenney (KENNEY)
FOR: M. Kay LaPlante (LAPLANTE)
FOR: Katherine M. Veit (VEIT)
FOR: Beverly L. Petchel (PETCHEL)
FOR: Marilyn E. Wilson (WILSONM)
FOR: Nancy V. Menan (MENAN)
FOR: William H. Leary (LEARY)
FOR: Steven D. Tilley (TILLEY)
FOR: Charlene C. Bolinski (BOLINSKI)
FOR: John W. Ficklin (FICKLIN)
FOR: Willie T. Lawson (LAWSON)
FOR: James W. Davis (DAVISJ)
FOR: David S. Van Tassel (VANTASSEL)
FOR: Patricia A. Simmons (SIMMONS)
FOR: Thomas A. Sculimbrene (SCULIMBRENE)
FOR: Marissa Metz (METZ)
FOR: Walter E. Avis (AVIS)
FOR: Ralph C. Bellamy (BELLAMY)
FOR: Christopher George (GEORGE)
FOR: M. Elise Neil (NEIL)
FOR: Lisa Marie Salvetti (SALVETTIL)
FOR: Charlotte P. Seeley (SEELEY)
FOR: Jane E Baker (BAKERJ)
FOR: George Van Eron (VANERON)
FOR: Brian Merchant (MERCHANT)
FOR: Kyle D. Bakke (BAKKE)
FOR: Jocelyn D. Argarin (ARGARIN)
FOR: Andrew S. Kerr (KERR)
FOR: Pat A. Battenfield (BATTENFIELD)
FOR: Patty A. Daniel (DANIEL)
FOR: William E. Primosch (PRIMOSCH)
FOR: Helen C. Walsh (WALSH)
FOR: Peggy Jordan (JORDAN)
FOR: Patricia A. Rawson (RAWSON)
FOR: Michael J. Waguespack (WAGUESPACK)
FOR: David Kelly (KELLYD)
FOR: George J. Tenet (TENET)

FOR: Robert B. Morley (MORLEY)
FOR: Roseanne M. Hill (HILLR)
FOR: Richard E. Feinberg (FEINBERG)
FOR: Barbro A. Owens-Kirkpatrick (OWENS)
FOR: Joan S. Hunerwadel (HUNERWADEL)
FOR: Neal S. Wolin (WOLIN)
FOR: David M. Satterfield (SATTERFIELD)
FOR: Kathy Leahy (LEAHY)
FOR: Bruce O. Riedel (RIEDEL)
FOR: Bettie A. Kuehn (KUEHN)
FOR: Martin S. Indyk (INDYK)
FOR: Edmund J. Hull (HULL)
FOR: Bronya H. Clark (CLARKB)
FOR: Patricia D. Nelson (NELSON)
FOR: Helen Pahlke (PAHLKE)
FOR: Deborah Perroy (PERROY)
FOR: James P. Farrell (FARRELL)
||
FOR: Richard A. Juchnewicz (JUCHNEWICZ)
FOR: Marsha L. Dimel (DIMEL)
FOR: Sean J. Darragh (DARRAGH)
FOR: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK)
FOR: Paul Clarke (CLARKE)
FOR: Donald K. Steinberg (STEINBERG)
FOR: Richard A. Clarke (CLARKER)
FOR: Richard L. Canas (CANAS)
FOR: Wanda D. Lindsey (LINDSEY)
FOR: Michael A. Sheehan (SHEEHAN)
FOR: Rand R. Beers (BEERS)
FOR: Eric P. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ)
FOR: Ernest J. Wilson III (WILSON)
FOR: Susan E. Rice (RICE)
FOR: Marcia G. Norman (NORMAN)
FOR: O. Ruth Stalcup (STALCUP)
FOR: Sean J. Darragh (DARRAGH)
FOR: Mary E. Quinn (QUINN)
FOR: Marion H. Blieberger (BLIEBERGER)
FOR: Daniel B. Poneman (PONEMAN)
FOR: Elisa D. Harris (HARRIS)
FOR: Steven Aoki (AOKI)
FOR: Richard C. Barth (BARTH)
FOR: Toby T. Gati (GATI)
FOR: R. Nicholas Burns (BURNS)
FOR: Rose E. Gottemoeller (GOTTEMOELLER)
FOR: Beth E. Sanner (SANNER)
FOR: Nancy H. Maxfield (MAXFIELD)
FOR: Elaine M. Mitsler (MITSLER)
FOR: Rosemarie C. Forsythe (FORSYTHE)
FOR: Jeff Q. Ragle (RAGLE)
FOR: James M. Waurishuk (WAURISHUK)
FOR: Edward F. Phillips (PHILLIPS)
FOR: Christine L. Potts (POTTS)
FOR: Neil G. Bleicken (BLEICKEN)
FOR: Anne D. Alexander (ALEXANDER)
FOR: Carlos A. Burgos (BURGOS)
FOR: David E. Herrington (HERRINGTON)
FOR: Dan Vaughan (VAUGHAN)
FOR: John Peggins (PEGGINS)
FOR: James M. Johnson (JOHNSONJ)
FOR: Francis J. Huber (HUBER)

FOR: Stephen B. Conley (CONLEY)
 FOR: Diana L. Snow (SNOW)
 FOR: James M. Bieda (BIEDA)
 FOR: Ronald J. Repp (REPP)
 FOR: Gary W. Arnold (ARNOLD)
 FOR: Robert G. Bruton (BRUTON)
 FOR: Valon J. Wadsworth (WADSWORTHV)
 FOR: Gary E. Bresnahan (BRESNAHAN)
 FOR: Deborah Perroy (PERROY)
 FOR: Adrienne M. Marks (MARKS@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Cornelius F. O'Leary (OLEARY@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Timothy J. Perez (PEREZ@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: David Reyes (REYES@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Jennifer E. Shelt (SHELT@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Ralph H. Sigler (SIGLER@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 |
 FOR: Michael J. McEnroe (MCENROE@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Mary M. Wadsworth (WADSWORTH)
 FOR: Bonnie E. Mitchell (MITCHELL@WHSR@CCGATE@OEOb)
 FOR: Roy Hamilton (HAMILTON@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Miles R. Murphy (MURPHY@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Elisabeth A. Healey (HEALEY@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Russell J. Buzalko (BUZALKO@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Katherine E. O'Loughlin (OLOUGHLIN@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Stephen G. Niemerski (NIEMERSKI@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Remote Addressee (MCGEATH@WHSR@CCGATE@OEOb)
 FOR: John K. Naland (NALAND@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Scott Burlingame (BURLINGAME@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Michael Unrue (UNRUE@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: William H. Spencer (SPENCER@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Sandra Smigay (SMIGAY@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Thomas G. Crispell (CRISPELL@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: David R. Bailey (BAILEY@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Michael Laybourne (LAYBOURNE@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: James N. Pitman (PITMAN@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Theodore Sevigny (SEVIGNY@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 FOR: Russell L. Gorrell (GORRELL@WHSR@CCGATE@VAXA)
 CC: Records (RECORDS)

 Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 14-May-1993 13:40
 Deletable Flag: Y
 DOCNUM: 006614
 VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE20:ZURIJKN6J.WPL
 A1 Folder: MAY93
 Message Format:
 Message Status: READ
 Date Modified: 14-May-1993 13:40
 Forward Flag: YES
 Read-Receipt Requested: NO
 Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
 Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Beth Sanner to Jane Holl, Barry Lowenkron, and Susan Rice at 11:09. Subject: Meeting. [CIA Act] (2 pages)	05/19/1993	P1/b(1), P3/b(3)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
A1-Record (Jan 93- Sept 94) ([Peace Process, Irish, Ireland])
OA/Box Number: 570000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1993-12/03/1993]

2006-1990-F
vz1660

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

28-Jul-1993 09:03 EDT

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE BELOW

FROM: Kent M. Wiedemann
(WIEDEMANN)

SUBJECT: Keating Visit

Now that Christopher has announced that PM Keating is invited to Washington in September, Keating pressuring Amb. Cook here to confirm the exact dates. When Cook is pressured, he usually tries to call Tony, and may do so soon. You may refer him to me.

However, we do need to seek to get an answer to Cook on the Keating visit dates. Keating has to fit the Washington visit into a trip to the UK and Ireland, and must confirm his itinerary for those governments. His preferred times here are, in order, Sept. 12, 13, 14, 15. It would be a working visit, i.e. the usual one-hour meeting plus lunch. Can you get me a fix on the date which I can pass on to Amb. Cook? Thanks.

Distribution:

FOR: Mary C. Emery	(EMERY)
FOR: Wilma G. Hall	(HALL)
FOR: Kristen K. Cicio	(CICIO)
FOR: Katherine M. Veit	(VEIT)
FOR: James W. Reed	(REED)
FOR: William H. Itoh	(ITOH)
FOR: Kristie A. Kenney	(KENNEY)
FOR: M. Brooke Darby	(DARBY)
CC: Records	(RECORDS)
CC: Kristie A. Kenney	(KENNEY)
CC: W. Anthony K. Lake	(LAKE)
CC: Nancy Soderberg	(SODERBERG)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 28-Jul-1993 08:58
 Deletable Flag: Y
 DOCNUM: 012266
 VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE29:ZUUFCTT3.WPL
 A1 Folder: JUL93
 Message Format:
 Message Status: READ
 Date Modified: 28-Jul-1993 08:58
 Forward Flag: YES
 Read-Receipt Requested: NO
 Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
 Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

DECLASSIFIED
 E.O. 13526
 White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
 By 12 NARA, Date 10/30/2012
 2006-10950-F

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Barry Lowenkron to M. Brooke Darby at 8:55. Subject: Bruce Morrison: Adams (2 pages)	06/30/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
A1-Record (Jan 93- Sept 94) ([Peace Process, Irish, Ireland])
OA/Box Number: 570000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1993-12/03/1993]

2006-1990-F
vz1660

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

12-Aug-1993 07:31 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Barry F. Lowenkron (LOWENKRON)

FROM:

Cathy Millison (MILLISON)

SUBJECT:

Hale Referral

Good morning, Barry. Log #4218 is a referral from Marcia Hale forwarding a letter from Speaker Foley. The letter asks that the President travel to Northern Ireland in the fall to dedicate a "new chair in conflict resolution" at the United Nations University and the University of Ulster. Can you let me know as soon as possible what our recommendation is. We need to get back to Hale's office as soon as possible. Thanks.

CC: Records

(RECORDS)

CC: Baerbel K. Houck

(HOUCK)

CC: Betty A. Marshall

(MARSHALL)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 12-Aug-1993 07:27

Deletable Flag: Y

DOCNUM: 013224

VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE2:ZUUUAR62P.WPL

A1 Folder: AUG93

Message Format:

Message Status: READ

Date Modified: 12-Aug-1993 07:30

Forward Flag: YES

Read-Receipt Requested: NO

Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO

Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Jane Holl to Mary Emery, Wilma Hall, Kristen Cicio, et al at 19:22. Subject: Hurd's Visit (2 pages)	09/21/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
A1-Record (Jan 93- Sept 94) ([Peace Process, Irish, Ireland])
OA/Box Number: 570000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1993-12/03/1993]

2006-1990-F

vz1660

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

27-Sep-1993 14:26 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Jane E. Holl (HOLL)

FROM:

Cathy Millison (MILLISON)

SUBJECT:

Contributions to Ireland - Package #6873

As discussed, I sent you an example of a package on preparing a Presidential Determination. However, after I sent it I notice that the memo to the President does not have the "THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK" line. All PD's need to go through the Executive Clerk's office. Thanks.

- CC: Records (RECORDS)
- CC: Baerbel K. Houck (HOUCK)
- CC: Betty A. Marshall (MARSHALL)

 Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 27-Sep-1993 14:23
 Deletable Flag: Y
 DOCNUM: 016458
 VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE42:ZUWOKMPOJ.WPL
 A1 Folder: SEP93
 Message Format:
 Message Status: READ
 Date Modified: 27-Sep-1993 14:23
 Forward Flag: YES
 Read-Receipt Requested: NO
 Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
 Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

30-Sep-1993 13:43 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Jane E. Holl (HOLL)

FROM: Cathy Millison (MILLISON)

SUBJECT: #3799 - Ltr from King on Ireland

Hi, Jane. Nancy has asked me to check with the staff to see where we stand on some overdue Congressionals. #3799 is a letter from King dated May 28. Can you tell me where we stand on this. Perhaps we responded to these issues in another letter to him.

CC: Records (RECORDS)
CC: Betty A. Marshall (MARSHALL)
CC: Baerbel K. Houck (HOUCK)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 30-Sep-1993 13:38
Deletable Flag: Y
DOCNUM: 016753
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE36:ZUWRJM3OL.WPL
A1 Folder: SEP93
Message Format:
Message Status: READ
Date Modified: 30-Sep-1993 13:38
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

07-Oct-1993 17:43 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Jane E. Holl (HOLL)
Betty A. Marshall (MARSHALL)

FROM: Wendy E. Gray
(GRAY)

SUBJECT: 5807 for your review

Hi Jane!

Nancy has made the following edits to package 5807 and would like your concurrence. Is the new verbage OK?

Thanks!

||

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE
HOWARD PASTER

SUBJECT: Response to Congressman Manton et al re: Northern Ireland

Purpose

To respond to Congressman Manton and 64 other Representatives.

Background

Congressman Manton and 64 other Representatives have sent a letter requesting that you take action to fulfill your promises to the Irish American community. They also ask that you meet with members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs. They have a series of requests, especially the special envoy, that do not make sense at this time and I therefore suggest that I meet with them to hear their concerns. Secret talks between John Hume of the Social Democratic Labor Party (SDLP) and Kerry Adams of the IRA have sparked new hope for progress. At Tab A is a suggested reply to the Members.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letters to Members at Tab A.

Attachments

Tab A Letters to Members
Tab B Incoming

U

Dear Tom:

Thank you for your letters regarding U.S. policy toward Northern Ireland.

I take seriously the commitment I have made to work aggressively to promote efforts to achieve peace and reconciliation between the factions in Northern Ireland. For this reason, my Administration has stayed in close contact with a number of Irish and British leaders as they have worked to reestablish meaningful talks. I am following closely the recent discussions between the S.D.L.P. and the I.R.A. and hope they will produce progress toward peace.

Your views on how to bring an end to this tragic conflict are important to me. I have asked Anthony Lake, my National Security Adviser, to meet with representatives of the Congressional Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs to discuss how the United States might best use its energies at this stage to promote the renewal of serious talks.

Thank you again for writing and I look forward to staying in touch on this important issue.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Thomas J. Manton

House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

□

CC: Records

(RECORDS)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 07-Oct-1993 17:42
Deletable Flag: Y
DOCNUM: 017380
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE35:ZUWYPBLI2.WPL
A1 Folder: OCT93
Message Format:
Message Status: READ
Date Modified: 07-Oct-1993 17:42
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

07-Oct-1993 19:51 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE BELOW

FROM: Wendy E. Gray
(GRAY)

SUBJECT: New letter for Package 5807

Hi Jane!

This is the new and improved version of the letter for package 5807.

Thanks!

LI

Dear Tom:

Thank you for your letters regarding U.S. policy toward Northern Ireland.

I take seriously the commitment I have made to work aggressively to promote efforts to achieve peace and reconciliation between the factions in Northern Ireland. For this reason, my Administration has stayed in close contact with a number of Irish and British leaders as they have worked to reestablish meaningful talks. It has followed closely the recent discussions between the S.D.L.P. and the I.R.A. and we hope they will produce progress toward peace.

Your views on how to bring an end to this tragic conflict are important to me. I have asked Anthony Lake, my National Security Adviser, to meet with representatives of the Congressional Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs to discuss how the United States might best use its energies at this stage to promote the renewal of serious talks.

Thank you again for writing and I look forward to staying in touch on this important issue.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Thomas J. Manton
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

□

Distribution:

FOR: Jane E. Holl	(HOLL)
FOR: Betty A. Marshall	(MARSHALL)
CC: Records	(RECORDS)
CC: Cathy Millison	(MILLISON)
CC: Brenda I. Hilliard	(HILLIARD)
CC: M. Kay LaPlante	(LAPLANTE)
CC: Michelle M. Bloxton	(BLOXTON)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 07-Oct-1993 19:49
Deletable Flag: Y
DOCNUM: 017408
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE34:ZUWYSDCMA.WPL
A1 Folder: OCT93
Message Format:
Message Status: READ
Date Modified: 07-Oct-1993 19:49
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST__CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

06-Nov-1993 13:39 EDT

or ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Jane E. Holl (HOLL)

FROM: George J. Tenet (TENET)

SUBJECT: RE: State Department's Annual Human Rights Reports f

JANE: CAN WE GET TOGETHER ON MONDAY TO DISCUSS SODERBERG'S TASKING TO US ON NORTHERN IRELAND. GJT

CC: Records (RECORDS)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 06-Nov-1993 13:38
Deletable Flag: Y
DOCNUM: 019859
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE14:ZUYCJIRPX.WPL
A1 Folder: NOV93
Message Format:
Message Status: READ
Date Modified: 06-Nov-1993 13:38
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By RL NARA, Date 10/30/2002
2006-1040 -F

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

12-Nov-1993 09:47 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE BELOW

FROM: Jane E. Holl
(HOLL)

SUBJECT: PG on BC letter to Dinkins on Adams.

Presidential Letter to Dinkins on Gerry Adams as reported in Irish Times

Q: Does the President's letter accurately reflect U.S. policy on this issue?

The substance of the letter speaks for itself.

Q: When the President said that his policy continues "to support the early resumption of political talks as the most promising way to seek peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland," did this mean that he rejects the Hume-Adams initiative?

This statement in no way undermines any serious effort to move the process of reconciliation forward.

Q: Will you release the letter?

No.

Q: The Irish government is disavowing any role in the issue of granting a U.S. visa to Adams, and London says it was not consulted on the matter. Why did the President say what he did about their views?

The substance of the letter speaks for itself.

Q: Will the President see Foreign Minister Spring when he is in town next week?

The President's schedule is not yet fixed.

Distribution:

- FOR: Nancy Soderberg (SODERBERG)
- FOR: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK)
- FOR: Donald K. Steinberg (STEINBERG)
- CC: Records (RECORDS)
- CC: Jenonne R. Walker (WALKER)
- CC: Betty A. Marshall (MARSHALL)
- CC: Dana M. Carrico (CARRICO)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 12-Nov-1993 09:46
Deletable Flag: Y
DOCNUM: 020348
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE44:ZUYIDZGWR.WPL
A1 Folder: NOV93
Message Format:
Message Status: READ
Date Modified: 12-Nov-1993 09:46
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

12-Nov-1993 14:16 EDT

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE BELOW

FROM: Jane E. Holl
(HOLL)

SUBJECT: request for meeting

As I may have mentioned, Sir Robin Renwick would like to come in next week for a brief chat with Tony. He specifically would like to discuss the President's visit to the UK in June, Northern Ireland, and a potential meeting between the President and Major in February when the latter is scheduled to visit Harvard for a lecture.

I asked if Sir Robin could wait until after the APEC Summit, and they indicated that they strongly preferred next week. I suspect 30 minutes would be enough.

Can you let me know?

Distribution:

FOR: Mary C. Emery	(EMERY)
FOR: Wilma G. Hall	(HALL)
FOR: Kristen K. Cicio	(CICIO)
FOR: Katherine M. Veit	(VEIT)
FOR: James W. Reed	(REED)
FOR: William H. Itoh	(ITOH)
FOR: Kristie A. Kenney	(KENNEY)
FOR: M. Brooke Darby	(DARBY)
CC: Records	(RECORDS)
CC: Jenonne R. Walker	(WALKER)
CC: Betty A. Marshall	(MARSHALL)
CC: Dana M. Carrico	(CARRICO)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 12-Nov-1993 14:11
 Deletable Flag: Y
 DOCNUM: 020391
 VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE11:ZUYIKE4IO.WPL
 A1 Folder: NOV93
 Message Format:
 Message Status: READ
 Date Modified: 12-Nov-1993 14:11
 Forward Flag: YES
 Read-Receipt Requested: NO
 Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
 Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

DECLASSIFIED
 E.O. 13526
 White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
 By YL NARA, Date 10/30/2012

2006-1440-7

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

19-Nov-1993 18:44 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Jane E. Holl

(HOLL)

FROM:

Natalie S. Wozniak
(WOZNIAK)

SUBJECT:

BBC-TV

Jane --

Jenonne has asked that she or I touch base with you Monday morning to see if you would be willing and able to handle this BBC interview. Jenonne said you were the real Ireland expert, but she would try to become an expert asap if you were not interested in doing the interview.

Sarah Brown has informed me that BBC will now be in town Monday, possibly, but Tuesday, definitely, and would like to conduct the interview at your convenience at that time. They could do it in your office (with a 30-45 minute pre-set time) or outside on the North triangle in front of the White House (where all press do their standups and no pre-set required other than fitting you with a microphone).

Sarah said they are mainly interested in what the U.S./Clinton Administration policy is on Ireland. No trick questions. They will not try to trip you up (her words). They will even try to get to you an idea of the types of questions they will ask.

Are you interested?

Please advise me and Jenonne of your decision. I will work on the details with Sarah Brown and Betty/Dana.

Thanks,
Natalie

P.S. On Monday, I will also ask Don Steinberg if we want to put you in this situation.

CC: Records (RECORDS)
CC: Jenonne R. Walker (WALKER)
CC: Betty A. Marshall (MARSHALL)
CC: Dana M. Carrico (CARRICO)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 19-Nov-1993 18:36
Deletable Flag: Y
DOCNUM: 021079
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE27:ZUYPQS55Q.WPL
A1 Folder: NOV93
Message Format:
Message Status: READ
Date Modified: 19-Nov-1993 18:36
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

||

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

18-Nov-1993 17:23 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Jenonne R. Walker (WALKER)

FROM: Natalie S. Wozniak
(WOZNIAK)

SUBJECT: Press Request: BBC-TV

CC: Records (RECORDS)
CC: Betty A. Marshall (MARSHALL)
CC: Dana M. Carrico (CARRICO)

BBC-TV in New York would like to interview you on-the-record for sound and camera for "Newsnight" -- their equivalent of our "Nightline." The subjects include the President's position on the Irish peace initiative and other Irish issues, i.e., peace envoys. What came out of the meeting with the Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs. The interview would be for their Monday, November 22 show.

Don Steinberg has approved this request.

Please let me know if you are interested and I will work on the arrangements with Betty.

Thanks,
Natalie
x2947

POC: Sarah Brown (212) 373-4022

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. email	Betsy Marshall to James Reed at 14:14. Subject: Kohl Talkers (2 pages)	11/24/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
A1-Record (Jan 93- Sept 94) ([Peace Process, Irish, Ireland])
OA/Box Number: 570000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1993-12/03/1993]

2006-1990-F
vz1660

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
005. email	Jane Holl to Nancy Soderberg at 16:20. Subject: Reynolds-Major Talks (2 pages)	12/03/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
A1-Record (Jan 93- Sept 94) ([Peace Process, Irish, Ireland])
OA/Box Number: 570000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1993-12/03/1993]

2006-1990-F

vz1660

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
006. email	Julien LeBourgeois to Jenonne Walker at 12:07. Subject: Flynn on Northern Ireland (1 page)	12/07/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
A1-Record (Jan 93- Sept 94) ([Peace Process, Irish, Ireland])
OA/Box Number: 570000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1993-12/03/1993]

2006-1990-F
vz1660

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
007. email	Julien LeBourgeois to M. Brook Darby at 12:41. Subject: Ireland (1 page)	12/07/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
A1-Record (Jan 93- Sept 94) ([Peace Process, Irish, Ireland])
OA/Box Number: 570000

FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1993-12/03/1993]

2006-1990-F
vz1660

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

10-Dec-1993 16:43 EDT

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE BELOW

FROM: Julien D. LeBourgeois
(LEBOURGEOIS)

SUBJECT: Talks on Northern Ireland

State has heard that this morning's (12/10) Reynolds/Major meeting on the margins of the EU summit went well, and that they might move up their next meeting from 12/17 to 12/14 or 12/15.

Distribution:

FOR: Nancy Soderberg	(SODERBERG)
FOR: Jenonne R. Walker	(WALKER)
FOR: Jane E. Holl	(HOLL)
CC: Records	(RECORDS)
CC: William H. Itoh	(ITOH)
CC: Records	(RECORDS)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 10-Dec-1993 16:35
 Deletable Flag: Y
 DOCNUM: 022985
 VMS Filename: OAS\$SHARE11:ZUZKNW9WN.WPL
 A1 Folder: DEC93
 Message Format:
 Message Status: READ
 Date Modified: 10-Dec-1993 16:43
 Forward Flag: YES
 Read-Receipt Requested: NO
 Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
 Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
 White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
 By VL NARA, Date 10/30/2002
 2006-1990-F

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

19-Dec-1993 19:32 EDT

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: Jane E. Holl (HOLL)

FROM: Wendy E. Gray (GRAY)

SUBJECT: A Note from Nancy

Hi Jane!

Chris agreed to 3-4 visits a year by Smith to Ireland. Please have Oxman pass informally to Smith.

Thank you

CC: Records (RECORDS)

CC: Dana M. Carrico (CARRICO)

CC: Cathy Millison (MILLISON)

 Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 19-Dec-1993 19:31
 Deletable Flag: Y
 DOCNUM: 023732
 VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE33:ZUZTRWY7A.WPL
 A1 Folder: DEC93
 Message Format:
 Message Status: READ
 Date Modified: 19-Dec-1993 19:32
 Forward Flag: YES
 Read-Receipt Requested: NO
 Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
 Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
 By VL NARA, Date 10/30/07

2006-140-F