

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Earl Wayne to Barry Lowenson and Jenonne Walker at 12:51. Subject: Call (1 page)	02/17/1993	P1/b(1)
002. email	Barry Lowenson to Wilma Hall and Mary Emery at 13:21. Subject: Northern Ireland (1 page)	02/17/1993	P1/b(1)
003. email	Earl Wayne to Nancy Soderberg at 16:53. Subject: Mayor Flynn's Mandate (1 page)	04/08/1993	P1/b(1), P5
004. email	Earl Wayne to Barry Lowenson at 10:17. Subject: Para on Ireland (2 pages)	05/12/1993	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:

[02/17/1993-05/13/1993]

2006-1990-F

vz1659

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

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

001. email	Earl Wayne to Barry Lowenson and Jenonne Walker at 12:51. Subject: Call (1 page)	02/17/1993	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:

[02/17/1993-05/13/1993]

2006-1990-F
vz1659

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Barry Lowenson to Wilma Hall and Mary Emery at 13:21. Subject: Northern Ireland (1 page)	02/17/1993	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:

[02/17/1993-05/13/1993]

2006-1990-F
vz1659

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

22-Feb-1993 16:12 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Natalie S. Wozniak

(WOZNIAK)

FROM:

Paul Clarke
(CLARKE)

SUBJECT:

Upcoming Events

Memo to Tony, Sandy, Nancy,

Several issues are before us:

The Major visit: Pre-meeting press reports have not been positive so far, dwelling on the North Ireland envoy issue and themes of the demise of the special relationship between our two nations. It may be helpful to have a senior administration official, either from State or NSC, do a backgrounder Tuesday in the Breifing Room to lay out our much more upbeat message. In the same vein, an on-the-record briefing after the event may give us a chance to set the record straight.

Bosnia: We have received a generous number of calls regarding the air drop issue. How do we plan to speak to the press on this issue? Would a backgrounder in the Briefing Room by Mr. Berger or a senior State Department official serve our needs?

Which leads to the corollary issue of Television interviews. We have passed the one month mark without a TV interview from a senior NSC staffer. We do have standing requests from NBC and MacNeil-Lehrer for interviews with Mr. Berger. While we are under no obligation to put anyone forward, the option remains open. It would not damage our credibility to stay from the TV cameras for some additional weeks.

CC: Records

(RECORDS)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 22-Feb-1993 14:52
Deletable Flag: Y
DOCNUM: 001184
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE18:ZUOFN5FMD.WPL
A1 Folder: FEB93
Message Format:

Message Status: READ
Date Modified: 22-Feb-1993 14:52
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

25-Feb-1993 13:17 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Nancy Soderberg (SODERBERG)
M. Brooke Darby (DARBY)

FROM: Natalie S. Wozniak
(WOZNIAK)

SUBJECT: Northern Ireland

US-UK: Special Envoy

Q: Are you going to appoint Thomas Foley as Special Envoy on the Northern Ireland issue?

A: During the campaign, I expressed a willingness to appoint a special envoy if the parties to the conflict in Northern Ireland felt such an action would be helpful.
We are reviewing the issue; no decision has been made.

Q: Will you discuss this issue with Prime Minister Major?

A: Prime Minister Major and I will cover a range of issues.

CC: Records (RECORDS)
CC: Paul Clarke (CLARKE)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 25-Feb-1993 13:16
Deletable Flag: Y
DOCNUM: 001405
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE12:ZUOIIZG06.WPL
A1 Folder: FEB93
Message Format:
Message Status: READ
Date Modified: 25-Feb-1993 13:16
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

16-Mar-1993 14:26 EDT

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: M. Brooke Darby (DARBY)

FROM: Barry F. Lowenkron (LOWENKRON)

SUBJECT: Hume

John Hume (DOB January 1937):

Leader of the Social Democratic & Labor Party in Northern Ireland since November 1979. SDLP is a moderate, nationalist (Catholic) party. Hume was one of its founding members (1970).

- 1979: elected to European Parliament (as one of three representatives from Northern Ireland in the EEP).
- March 1982: guest of Reagan at St. Patrick's day lunch in the White House.
- 1983: elected to British Parliament from Londonderry. First first time a non-unionist won a seat in Londonderry since the establishment of Northern Ireland.

Friend of Speaker Foley & Senator Kennedy.

Takes pragmatic approach to Northern Ireland issue. For example: feels that MacBride principles detract from the main issue of encouraging greater investment in Northern Ireland.

CC: Records (RECORDS)
 CC: Katherine M. Mathis (MATHIS)

 Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 16-Mar-1993 14:26
 Deletable Flag: N
 DOCNUM: 002614
 VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE41:ZUPBKN20A.WPL
 A1 Folder: MAR93
 Message Format:
 Message Status: NOTED
 Date Modified: 16-Mar-1993 14:26
 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 YZ NARA, Date 10/30/2012

2006-1990-F

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

17-Mar-1993 09:00 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE BELOW

FROM: Barry F. Lowenkron
(LOWENKRON)

SUBJECT: Press Statement

Brooke, please pass to Nancy ASAP. Thanks.

New page 6 (ending)

I would like to take the opportunity of Prime Minister Reynold's visit today to announce that I am nominating Jean Kennedy Smith to be our new Ambassador to Ireland. I can think of no name, and no family, who better captures the bonds between Ireland and the United States.

In many ways, Jean has already served as an unofficial international ambassador as founder of Very Special Arts, a charity to coordinate arts education for disabled children throughout the world. Mr. Prime Minister, I think I can speak for Jean, for myself and for all of us gathered here today when I say that the friendship between our two countries means a great deal to the American people. I know these ties will prove of great benefit to both of our countries as we work together to face the challenges ahead.

Distribution:

FOR: M. Brooke Darby	(DARBY)
CC: Records	(RECORDS)
CC: William H. Itoh	(ITOH)
CC: Kristie A. Kenney	(KENNEY)
CC: Brenda I. Hilliard	(HILLIARD)
CC: Cathy Millison	(MILLISON)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 17-Mar-1993 08:59
Deletable Flag: N
DOCNUM: 002666
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE34:ZUPCCUS5A.WPL
A1 Folder: MAR93
Message Format:
Message Status: NOTED
Date Modified: 17-Mar-1993 08:59
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	Earl Wayne to Nancy Soderberg at 16:53. Subject: Mayor Flynn's Mandate (1 page)	04/08/1993	P1/b(1), P5

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/17/1993-05/13/1993]

2006-1990-F
vz1659

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

05-May-1993 09:21 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Mary C. Emery (EMERY)

FROM: Barry F. Lowenkron
(LOWENKRON)

SUBJECT: Lake Meeting with Sir Patrick Mayhew

Mary, The British embassy called again to inquire whether Tony would be willing to meet with UK Minister for Northern Ireland, Sir Patrick Mayhew. Should I assume that a meeting is not possible? The Brits need to know yes or no since this is Mayhew's last day. Thanks.

CC: Records (RECORDS)

CC: Wilma G. Hall (HALL)

CC: Katherine M. Mathis (MATHIS)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 05-May-1993 09:18

Deletable Flag: N

DOCNUM: 005954

VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE44:ZUQZDC7QJ.WPL

A1 Folder: MAY93

Message Format:

Message Status: NOTED

Date Modified: 05-May-1993 09:18

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
004. email	Earl Wayne to Barry Lowenson at 10:17. Subject: Para on Ireland (2 pages)	05/12/1993	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:

[02/17/1993-05/13/1993]

2006-1990-F

vz1659

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-May-1993 14:43 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Paul Clarke (CLARKE)
Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK)

FROM: Paul Clarke
(CLARKE)

SUBJECT: Press Conference

Nat,
Please send the following to the NSC staff -- Do you have any other thoughts?

Subject: Urgent -- Presidential Press Conference

The President will have a Press Conference in the East Room this Friday at 1300; as in the past, the NSC will prepare Qs and As for the President.

Please prepare guidance on the following items:

Africa
Angola
Somalia
South Africa
Sudan

Asia
Cambodia
China: MFN
North Korea: Nuclear Proliferation
Vietnam [include Kerry trip]

CIS
Russia: Political/Economic Reforms
Russia: Status of U.S./G-7 Assistance [include Talbott/Gati trip]
U.S./Ukraine Relations

Europe
Bosnia
Macedonia
U.S./Ireland: Special Envoy, Visa for Gerry Adams/
President Robinson Visit

Latin America
Haiti
Haitians at Guantanamo

Middle East

Iran: Conventional and Nuclear Weapons Programs
Iraq: Possible Bush Assassination Plot
Middle East Peace Talks

Arms Control
ACDA
Nuclear Testing
START/NPT

Defense
Gays in the Military
Tailhook
Women in Combat

Environment
Biodiversity

Trade

LI

NAFTA
Super 301
Uruguay Round
U.S./Japan issues

Please feel free to contribute additional items if you think they warrant Presidential attention. A copy of the Qs and As for the April 23 Press Conference is attached for use in updating your items. Please remember to be concise in your responses. E-mail your responses to @Press No Later Than 11:00 a.m. Thursday.

CC: Records

(RECORDS)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 12-May-1993 14:42
Deletable Flag: N
DOCNUM: 006438
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE13:ZURGL1MD4.WPL
A1 Folder: MAY93
Message Format:
Message Status: NOTED
Date Modified: 12-May-1993 14:42
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

13-May-1993 16:40 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK)
Paul Clarke (CLARKE)
Donald K. Steinberg (STEINBERG)

FROM: Barry F. Lowenkron
(LOWENKRON)

SUBJECT: IRELAND: Qs & As

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 between 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 US 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.

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: I have insisted, and will continue to insist, that decisions

to grant such visas must be based solely on U.S. law so that our principles of free speech and political debate remain protected.

-- 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.

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.

ll

-- 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. In my view, it is a well deserved honor.

CC: Records

(RECORDS)

Additional Header Information Follows

Date Created: 13-May-1993 16:40
Deletable Flag: N
DOCNUM: 006550
VMS Filename: OA\$SHARE10:ZURHNU13N.WPL
A1 Folder: MAY93
Message Format:
Message Status: NOTED
Date Modified: 13-May-1993 16:40
Forward Flag: YES
Read-Receipt Requested: NO
Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

13-May-1993 10:49 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE BELOW

FROM: Paul Clarke
(CLARKE)

SUBJECT: Presidential Press Conference

May 13, 1993

TO: NSC SENIOR DIRECTORS/DIRECTORS

FROM: DON STEINBERG/PAUL CLARKE

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL PRESS CONFERENCE

Please remember to submit your Qs and As for tomorrow's President's Press Conference. Guidance should be E-mailed (no paper or disc copy is needed) to @Press by 11:00 a.m. today.

Please prepare guidance on the following items:

Africa
Angola
Somalia
South Africa
Sudan

Asia
Cambodia
China: MFN
North Korea: Nuclear Proliferation
Vietnam (received)*

CIS
Russia: Political/Economic Reforms
Russia: Status of U.S./G-7 Assistance [include Talbott/Gati trip]
U.S./Ukraine Relations

Europe
Bosnia
Macedonia
U.S./Ireland: Special Envoy, Visa for Gerry Adams/
President Robinson Visit

Latin America
Haiti
Haitians at Guantanamo (received)*

Middle East
Iran: Conventional and Nuclear Weapons Programs

Iraq: Possible Bush Assassination Plot
Middle East Peace Talks

Arms Control
ACDA
Nuclear Testing
START/NPT

□

Defense
Gays in the Military
Tailhook
Women in Combat

Environment
Biodiversity

Trade
NAFTA
Super 301
Uruguay Round
U.S./Japan issues

Please feel free to contribute additional items if you think they warrant Presidential attention. A copy of the Qs and As for the April 23 Press Conference is attached for use in updating your items. Please remember to be concise in your responses. E-mail your responses to @Press No Later Than 11:00 a.m. Thursday.

□

FOREIGN POLICY Qs and As FOR APRIL 23 PRESS CONFERENCE

AFRICA

ANGOLA
SOMALIA
SOUTH AFRICA
SUDAN
ZAIRE

ASIA

CAMBODIA
CHINA: MFN
CHINA: MILITARY BUILD-UP
NORTH KOREA
VIETNAM: VESSEY MISSION

CIS

ARMENIA AND AZERBAIJAN
RUSSIA: APRIL 25 REFERENDUM
RUSSIA: ASSISTANCE
RUSSIA/U.S.: HEU SALES
RUSSIA: MISSILE-RELATED EXPORTS
RUSSIA/U.S.: PEACEKEEPING
RUSSIA/U.S.: SPACE STATION
U.S. POLICY TOWARD UKRAINE

EUROPE

BOSNIA

BOSNIA: FIGHTING BETWEEN CROATS AND MUSLIMS
CROATIA: TUDJMAN VISIT

LATIN AMERICA

CUBA
HAITI
HAITIANS AT GUANTANAMO BAY

MIDDLE EAST

IRAN
IRAQ
LIBYAN SANCTIONS
PAKISTAN
RESUMPTION OF MIDDLE EAST PEACE TALKS
RESIGNATION OF THE U.S. AMBASSADOR TO ISRAEL

ARMS CONTROL ISSUES

ACCELERATING START DEACTIVATIONS
ACDA STATUS
DETARGETING
U.S. NUCLEAR TESTING PROGRAM

11

DEFENSE ISSUES

CHEMICAL WEAPONS
DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE
GAYS IN THE MILITARY
TAILHOOK
WOMEN IN COMBAT

ENVIRONMENT

BIODIVERSITY
CLIMATE

INTELLIGENCE

BUDGET
ENCRYPTION

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

TRADE ISSUES: GENERAL

CHILE
EC PROCUREMENT DISPUTE
NAFTA
SUPER 301
TRADE POLICY MAKING
URUGUAY ROUND

TRADE ISSUES: U.S./JAPAN

AUTOS/AUTO PARTS
MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLES
NEGOTIATING FRAMEWORK
SUPERCOMPUTERS
TRADE RESULTS VS. MANAGED TRADE

11

Q: When will the United States give diplomatic recognition to the Luanda government?

A: Our first priority is to get both sides to end the fighting so humanitarian aid can resume. At the same time, we want the parties to negotiate a long-term solution to Angola's political problems.

Whatever we do on recognition, and when we do it, will be designed to maximize the chances for peace.

We are encouraged that the government and UNITA resumed face-to-face talks under U.N. auspices in Abidjan and urge them to negotiate seriously. We hope these discussions will make rapid progress.

□

Somalia

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

A: The number of U.S. troops in Somalia was over 24,000 when I took office. By early next month, we expect to have withdrawn all but 4,000.

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

Their withdrawal will be worked out with the U.N. 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: Many have been critical of the U.S.-led operation in Somalia. How would you characterize the U.S. role in Somalia?

A: There is no doubt that the U.S.-led coalition has been a great success. We have eliminated the risk of mass starvation and greatly alleviated the humanitarian crisis we found when we arrived. We look forward to the transition from UNITAF to UNOSOM II, which will take place early next month, and to the continued success of the U.N. in Somalia.

□

South Africa

Q: What about the death of Chris Hani? Will it disrupt the negotiating process in South Africa?

A: Hani's assassination was tragic, but most South Africans recognize it for what it was -- an attempt by extremists to use violence to block the political evolution underway. Some in South Africa would prefer civil war to equality.

However, the vast majority of South Africans remain committed to the process of democratization and the multiparty talks have resumed. We will support this process in every way we can.

||

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.

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

We continue to take steps to ensure that food and medicine is provided to those in need.

We will do whatever we can to support the talks that are to take place in Abuja under Nigerian auspices between the Government and SPLA factions.

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.

I call on them to negotiate seriously and reach a settlement that will allow the reconciliation and rehabilitation that Sudan so desperately needs.

||

Zaire

Q: When are you going to get rid of Mobutu?

A: We have made it abundantly clear to Mobutu that we want him to transfer effective power immediately to the transitional government and stop blocking efforts to bring political and economic progress to Zaire.

He continues to rebuff our efforts, and we are working with other governments to increase the pressure on him.

For instance, we agree with the European Community's rejection of Mobutu's unilateral appointment of a prime

minister.

Such an appointment violates the democratic process established by the national conference.

President Mobutu's refusal to permit a genuine democratic transition, contrary to his many promises, will only perpetuate Zaire's political and economic crisis. We will not replace our ambassador to Zaire until Mr. Mobutu allows that process to resume.

11

Cambodia

Q: Can the Cambodian elections precede as planned in light of the recent fatal attacks on UNTAC personnel and ethnic Vietnamese?

A: Yes, we are committed to holding the election in May as scheduled.

But we condemn in the strongest terms the cold-blooded attacks on UNTAC personnel and on ethnic minorities.

The international community will not be intimidated. We will hold the Khmer Rouge fully responsible for their actions.

Q: What will be done to improve the security of U.S. citizens and other UN personnel serving in Cambodia?

A: The U.N. and the main troop-contributing countries in Cambodia are taking concrete steps to enhance the security of U.N. soldiers and election monitors.

UNTAC's mandate allows the U.N. soldiers to defend themselves and their mission with force when threatened.

We expect UNTAC troops to take all measures necessary within the scope of their mandate to defend the election process.

Q: Should UNTAC's mandate be strengthened?

A: UNTAC is over 22,000 people strong -- until recently the largest U.N. peacekeeping force ever contemplated.

Under its current Chapter VI mandate, it can and will respond with force in self-defense. But UNTAC was not conceived as a peace-enforcing mission.

Any change in its mandate will be a matter for the Security Council to decide.

11

China: MFN

Q: During the campaign, you spoke out on your concerns over human rights abuses in China and criticized the previous administration for coddling China. China's Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) treatment comes up for renewal in a couple of months or so. How will you deal with that?

A: We have no interest in isolating China. China is changing rapidly, growing quickly and, I hope, will be a partner in building a more secure and prosperous world. But enduring progress in our relations must include progress in human rights, trade access, and nonproliferation.

As we chart our China policy, my administration is resolved to consult closely with key members of Congress, including on the issue 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 China MFN bill introduced in Congress on Thursday by Pelosi and Mitchell?

A: I share the concerns of the Congress about China's record. In formulating our policy toward China, including the issue of MFN, we will consult closely with the Congress to build a solid bipartisan basis for relations with China.

Q: Will you meet with the Dalai Lama when he visits Washington next week?

A: I have great respect for the Dalai Lama as a spiritual leader and one who advocates non-violent resolution of ethnic and nationalist disputes, [i.e., the U.S. does not recognize him as the head of the state 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.

[If pressed on a meeting]:

He will be received at a high level at the White House.

1,1

China: Military Build-Up

Q: Do you have any assessments or comments on reports of a Chinese arms build-up that is provoking an arms race in Asia?

A: China has a legitimate right to modernize its forces to

ensure adequate defense needs. I hope it will limit itself to such forces.

However, we are concerned about China's sales of sophisticated military equipment to trouble spots around the world, especially Iran.

□

North Korea

Q: Why are we not pressing for sanctions against North Korea? Are the Chinese opposed?

A: North Korea's failure to comply with its nonproliferation obligations and its stated intention to withdraw from the NPT are serious concerns to us and to the international community. That failure now has been formally reported to the U.N. Security Council by the IAEA, and North Korea has informed the Council that it intends to withdraw from the NPT.

We're consulting closely with other members of the Council about next steps.

Q: Is the U.S. willing to have direct contact with the North Koreans on this issue, as reported today by the New York Times?

A: First, let me emphasize that this is an issue between North Korea and the international community, not just the U.S.

We have not ruled out appropriate U.S. officials meeting with North Korea, although no such meeting is scheduled. The primary task is, however, to support the efforts of the appropriate international bodies in working for a resolution.

□

Vietnam: Vessey Mission

Q: What can you tell us about General Vessey's trip to Vietnam? Will you change U.S. policy towards Vietnam?

A: I have received General Vessey's report of his mission to Hanoi.

The General met with a number of Vietnamese government officials in an effort to seek further, visible progress toward the fullest possible accounting for American MIA/POWs.

Our experts are reviewing the documents the General has

brought home with him to assess whether they contribute concretely to resolving the issues of American POW/MIAs.

Q: When will you normalize relations?

A: There has been no decision on further steps in U.S.-Vietnam relations. Any decisions will depend on our evaluation of Vietnamese cooperation and results in the fullest possible accounting.

There is no special timetable for our decisions on next steps. My core aim remains doing what is best to secure the fullest possible accounting.

[If pressed]:

I believe we need further results in the areas of resolving the discrepancy cases, increased efforts on remains, implementing trilateral investigations with the Lao and access to military archives.

Q: Is the Russian document accurate? Are you satisfied all questions on it have been answered?

Regarding the veracity of the Russian document, our experts are reviewing the facts in the document and the documents General Vessey brought back. I will reserve judgement until that evaluation is complete.

Q: How will the U.S. vote at the end of the month on Vietnamese arrears in the IFIS?

A: We are reviewing the issues. No decision has been made.

[]
[]

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.

[]

Russia: April 25 Referendum

Q: What do you expect to be the result of the April 25 referendum in Russia, and do you hope it will give Yeltsin a boost?

A: I have said many times that it is a good thing that the Russian people will have a chance to speak on Sunday through this referendum.

We should not forget what a momentous and positive change this referendum represents from the past thousand years of Russian history.

The Russian people are voting on democratic political and market economic reform. That is the best way to ensure their freedom and Russia's integration with the West.

Q: What will the U.S. do if Yeltsin loses the referendum vote? Could you still continue economic assistance?

A: I am not going to answer a hypothetical question. Our policy is clear, however: we support reform and reformers and hope to build a close relationship with Russia on that basis.

Q: Has President Yeltsin reached the limit of his political usefulness? Are his days numbered as Russian President?

A: President Yeltsin proposed to break the political impasse in Russia by letting the Russian people decide their future at the ballot box in a nation-wide plebiscite on Sunday (April 25). This was a courageous step.

He is the leader of the reform movement, and I expect to maintain a close relationship with him based on his commitment to reform.

It would be counterproductive for us to comment on the twists and turns of the complex political, legal, and constitutional questions now at issue in Russia.

Q: Many observers criticized the Bush Administration for relying too much on President Gorbachev for too long. Is the Clinton Administration now making that same mistake with President Yeltsin?

A: The situation is very different. President Yeltsin remains Russia's first democratically elected President, via the freest and fairest elections in Russian history. He is not opposed by reformers; he represents them.

strongly supports political and economic reform in Russia and the leading role played in that process by President Yeltsin.

This Administration is firmly committed to placing our full support behind ensuring that President Yeltsin's reform efforts succeed.

I intend to continue working with President Yeltsin to build a close and effective partnership between the U.S. and Russia.

11

Russia: Assistance

Q: How will you fund the \$1.8 billion U.S. assistance program for Russia announced last week? 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.

[]

Russia/U.S.: HEU Sales

Q: What's the current status of the highly-enriched uranium (HEU) purchase from Russia?

A: President Yeltsin and I agreed at Vancouver to try to bring the purchase of highly enriched uranium from dismantled former Soviet weapons to rapid conclusion.

We look forward to the prompt resumption of negotiations with Russia to fix the price and the other commercial terms of this purchase.

{ IF ASKED }:

-- This transaction will be compatible with the agreement suspending the anti-dumping proceeding against importers of Russian uranium.

That agreement has a provision providing for the importation of uranium derived from dismantled nuclear weapons.

||

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/U.S.: Peacekeeping

Q: You have just announced a series of new peacekeeping initiatives with Russia. Why are you doing this?

A: We attach a great deal of importance to U.N. peacekeeping, because it provides additional ways to resolve conflicts that threaten international peace in ways that reduce the cost for each country. The Russians share that view.

My Administration is actively examining ways to enhance the U.N.'s peacekeeping capability.

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. We would like the U.N. Security Council to begin to consider these issues at a Ministerial level meeting scheduled for mid-May.

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.

U

Russia/U.S.: Participation in Space Station

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

A: Russian space officials arrived in Washington this week to participate in the redesign effort.

No decisions, of course, 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.

U

U.S. Policy Toward Ukraine

Q: Why is the U.S. ignoring Ukraine when there are so many nuclear weapons on its territory?

A: Ukraine is a clear priority for this Administration. President Kravchuk was among the first leaders I called after coming into office.

I told him, as I told Foreign Minister Zlenko during his visit to Washington in March, that we look forward to a broad and rich relationship with Ukraine. I see a great deal of potential, particularly in the prospects for our long-term economic cooperation.

In May, I will be sending Ambassador Strobe Talbott to Kiev to talk about this future with the Ukrainian leadership, in government and parliament. Kiev will be Strobe's first stop on a 10-day trip to the Newly Independent States.

At the same time, however, I have to stress the continued importance we place on Ukraine living up to its commitments under the Lisbon Protocol, to ratify START and accede to the NPT.

Q: Why did you refuse to see Prime Minister Kuchma when he wanted to come to Washington?

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 that's better for both

of us.

[]

Bosnia

Q: Why is the U.S. immobile on Bosnia? What are you doing about the continuing Serb aggression?

A: 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 situation in Bosnia is among my top foreign policy priorities. At the outset of my Administration, we announced a comprehensive initiative that we have been pursuing actively.

We sought, and won, passage of a No-Fly Zone enforcement resolution, a resolution calling for the establishment of a war crimes tribunal, and a comprehensive sanctions resolution to demonstrate to the Serbs that their aggression has a high cost.

The recent events on the ground in Bosnia clearly show that the Serbs are defying the will of the international community. In view of their continued aggression, we have undertaken a thorough-going review to examine tougher steps to take to help end the conflict.

I and my advisers have been in touch with world leaders and with leading members of Congress on this crisis. No final decisions have been made.

The Serbs should be under no illusions; we condemn what they have done and are doing in Eastern Bosnia, and we are prepared to consider stronger actions if their blatant disregard for human life and the rule of law continues.

Q: In today's New York Times, the lead story reveals that a number of State Department officials who follow the situation in the former Yugoslavia very closely have registered strong views with the Secretary of State that the course the Administration is following will only lead to the destruction of Bosnia. What do you make of this policy revolt?

A: This isn't a policy revolt.

The issues raised by these officials in the recognized dissent channel process have been under full discussion already in the Administration.

The Secretary welcomed their views, as you might expect that he would as part of a thorough-going policy

review.

11

We have listened to many views during the process of formulating our policy on the terrible situation in Bosnia. That process continues as we evaluate our options and coordinate with the international community; no decision has been made.

Q: What about Madeleine Albright's letter calling for military action? How can you ignore so many of your foreign policy advisors' suggestions?

A: Ambassador Albright is one of my key foreign policy advisors and her views are expected to be expressed. I won't get into a discussion of any particular correspondence.

Q: What is the situation on the ground in Eastern Bosnia? How can the West just stand by while the Serbs continue their ethnic cleansing?

A: A cease-fire is in place in the area of Srebrenica. The U.N. forces that have moved in there are playing an important role in helping to maintain that cease-fire and get additional aid in.

The U.S. is continuing its air drops and we have been in touch with allies and others to help ensure that the operation does not run short of supplies.

Q: What is the West doing about the Serb's unwillingness to negotiate in good faith?

A: Active enforcement of the No-Fly Zone over Bosnia sends the message that the Security Council will back up its resolutions.

The recent passage of the U.N. Security Council Resolution (820) was an important step in tightening sanctions dramatically on Serbia.

Most transshipment through Serbia will be banned, as will most services, and Serbian controlled financial assets abroad will be frozen.

Additionally, I have been in touch with Prime Minister Major of Great Britain and President Mitterrand regarding next steps. We all agree that the wanton killing simply cannot continue.

I have just sent Mr. Leon Fuerth, National Security Adviser to the Vice President, to discuss with our allies ways in which we can act swiftly to enact the U.N. resolution and close loopholes. We're aiming for the complete isolation of Serbia.

[]

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

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

Q: How about consultations with Congress?

A: I and my advisers have been in touch with Congressional leaders on the Bosnian situation to receive the benefit of their thinking. We will, of course, keep them informed as we reach decisions.

[]

Bosnia: Fighting Between Croats and Muslims

Q: What are you doing about the fighting between Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Muslims?

A: Heavy fighting between Bosnian government and Bosnian Croat forces continues in central Bosnia.

So far, efforts to stop the fighting have had little effect. We strongly urge both sides to halt the fighting.

We have seen reports that both forces have committed atrocities in the fighting. We have no confirmation of these reports but are looking into them.

[]

Croatia: Tudjman Visit

[Background: Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, who you met Wednesday, has been criticized for making anti-Semitic statements, most notably in his 1988 book Wasteland: Historic Truth. Among these reportedly are: only 900,000 Jews died in the Holocaust, Jews ran a concentration camp in Croatia during World War II, and that he is thankful that neither he nor his wife are Jewish. A Tudjman spokesperson claims that his works were mistranslated.]

Q: How come you met with Croatian President Tudjman?

A: President Tudjman, as well as other European leaders, was invited by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, a

private entity chartered by Congress.

I saw him as part of the reception we held for all heads of government visiting for the opening.

I expressed to him our concerns about the current fighting between Bosnian Croats and Bosnian government forces.

Q: But how could you justify seeing someone who has referred to Israel as a "Judeo-Nazi state?"

A: I find those comments abhorrent.

□

International Broadcasting

Q: With so many Eastern European leaders in Washington, did you reconsider your decision to close Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty?

A: First of all, I remain committed to U.S. broadcasting to Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, and those types of broadcasts will continue.

We are also looking at ways to modernize our international services to make them more effective and to save some money.

I assured the leaders that my administration will continue broadcasts to their citizens.

□

Cuba

Q: Mr. President, one of the last vestiges of Communism in the world is Cuba. Fidel Castro said in a recent interview that he would be willing to meet with you. What is your policy toward Cuba and would you be willing to meet with Castro?

A: As I have said before, I continue to believe that the Cuban people have a right to freedom and democracy. I would like to see free elections under international observation as soon as possible. We would support such elections and accept the outcome, as provided for in the Cuba Democracy Act.

I would be happy to meet with the leaders of a free Cuba and hope that day will come soon. I see no point to a meeting with Fidel Castro, who has denied the Cuban people basic freedoms and rights for over thirty years.

Q: What about Russian assistance programs for Cuba?

A: We understand that the Russians may be considering concessional assistance for certain projects that the

former Soviet Union had initiated, including support for a nuclear power facility under construction.

We have expressed our concern about such assistance. To date, it appears that construction has not resumed on this project.

Q: What about the relationship between Russia and Cuba? Is Russia still subsidizing trade with Cuba?

A: The Russians have told us that they are not subsidizing trade with Cuba. We have no evidence that such trade is being subsidized by the Russians.

Q: Are there still Russian troops in Cuba? If so, how long will they remain?

A: President Yeltsin confirmed at Vancouver that the process of returning Russian troops to Russia has been initiated, and that his government is preparing plans for removing those that remain.

11

Q: I understand Cuba suffered major damage from a storm several weeks ago and has appealed for international assistance. Are you opposed to such assistance?

A: We will not oppose humanitarian assistance to Cuba provided by the United Nations or third countries.

In accordance with the Cuba Democracy Act, Americans may provide humanitarian assistance if the recipient is not the Cuban government, but rather an individual or non-government organization. I support the CDA and have no problem with such assistance.

11

Haiti

Q: What is the U.S. doing to get the Haiti talks back on track?

A: I do not want to comment in detail on the negotiations. I have confidence in UN/OAS Representative Caputo and in our own Special Representative Ambassador Pezzullo. They know that I am committed to the restoration of constitutional government and the return of President Aristide to Haiti.

We have made that crystal clear to the current military leaders in Haiti.

I believe the negotiations will succeed. We will not back off from our commitment to the Haitian people.

We will not accept any dilatory tactics to derail this important process.

In recent days, we have made very clear to the de facto authorities and their supporters in Haiti that the status quo is unacceptable.

All Haitian parties must come together to ensure that the talks move ahead quickly and seriously.

Q: Is the U.S. prepared to institute tougher sanctions against Haiti if the negotiations remain stalled?

A: We already have tough sanctions in place against Haiti. In addition, we have made it clear that we will take stronger measures against anyone seeking to stall the negotiating process.

As I said, I am confident that the talks will continue and that they will be successful.

[]

Haitians at Guantanamo Bay

[Background: There are now 181 Haitians remaining at Guantanamo Bay, down from about 267 when you took office. About 36 have been admitted due to pregnancy, medical or diagnostic problems that could not be treated at Guantanamo, or other medical/humanitarian reasons. About another 50 were admitted when you chose not to seek a stay of a District Court judge's order mandating "adequate care" for those who had suffered significant deterioration of their immune system. The Attorney General complied with the order by allowing the 50 to come to the U.S.]

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

A: There are now 181 Haitians remaining at Guantanamo Bay.

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 without creating serious problems for severely overburdened state and local health care facilities.

[]

Libyan Sanctions

Q: You promised you would press for an oil embargo against Libya. When the issue came up for review on April 8 at the UN did Ambassador Albright press for additional sanctions?

A: We are convinced that Libya will not comply with UN Security Council Resolution 731 and 748 without additional sanctions.

On April 8 the UN Security Council voted unanimously to continue the current sanctions. The US representative, Madeleine Albright, joined by England and France, issued a strong warning to Libya that if they failed to comply with the UN resolutions soon, we will press for additional sanctions, including oil.

Last week, Secretary Christopher met with his British and French counterparts at the G-7 meeting in Tokyo and they agreed to begin immediately to work out the details on how best to proceed with additional sanctions.

11

Iran

Q: What is your view of Iran?

A: Iran's behavior on a number of important issues puts it outside the family of nations. It sponsors terrorism and assassination, it supports extremist violence in Egypt and elsewhere, it violently opposes the Middle East peace process, and it is seeking nuclear weapons. We and our allies need to contain the Iranian threat.

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

A: This issue is under review in the administration, together with other aspects of our policy toward Iran.

12

Iraq

Q: Are you softening your approach to Iraq and Saddam Hussein?

A: -- There is no softening of our approach to Iraq. We insist that Iraq comply fully with all UN resolutions. It is inconceivable that Saddam Hussein's regime will ever meet the standard of behavior established in the UN resolutions. We want to make sure that once Saddam is gone, however, his successors also comply fully with the UN resolutions.

Q: Have you cut the CIA budget to overthrow Saddam?

A: I won't discuss intelligence issues but as I just said, we are not softening our policy on Iraq.

1.1

Resignation of U.S. Ambassador to Israel

[Background: The Department of State will announce your acceptance of Ambassador Harrop's resignation today. The following Q and A is for contingency use if the announcement is made prior to your press conference.]

Q: Why has Ambassador Harrop been replaced? Were you dissatisfied with his performance?

A: Ambassador Harrop, along with all other Ambassadors, submitted his resignation on January 20. He was informed some time ago that I had decided to accept the resignation. The timing of his departure was a matter of mutual convenience.

Ambassador Harrop has had a long and distinguished career and I understand he will be retiring. My decision was purely a matter of having my own representative in this key post.

1.2

Pakistan

Q: What is your reaction to Pakistani President Khan's decision to dissolve parliament and fire his Prime Minister?

A: We hope all parties there will act in a manner consistent with the democratic process.

We hope that the elections scheduled for July will occur in a free and fair manner.

1.3

Resumption of Middle East Peace Talks

[Background: The Middle East peace talks will resume in Washington on April 27. This represents a fulfillment of your pledge to ensure continuity in the peace process.]

Q: Do you think the peace negotiations can make progress?

A: I welcome the announcement of resumption of negotiations. I have repeatedly stressed my commitment to continuity in the Middle East peace talks.

Our objective now should be to make 1993 the year of a breakthrough to peace in the Middle East. The United States will be a full partner in this process. We are dedicated to demonstrating that the negotiations can produce early results.

Q: What promises or commitments have been made to Palestinians to induce them to return to the negotiations?

A: The Secretary of State has worked hard over the past few months with the Palestinians and with Prime Minister Rabin to address the concerns of all parties.

Agreement was reached on several measures which all believe address their concerns. The important thing now is to show that negotiations can resolve these issues. It is time to deal with the causes rather than the symptoms.

[Background: The Madrid terms of reference exclude the participation of East Jerusalem residents in the talks. Hussein, however, also has a residence in Ramallah. We suggest you avoid discussion of such distinctions.]

Q: Why is Faisal Hussein now on the delegation? Isn't this a change in the Madrid terms of reference?

A: The United States proposed that Mr. Hussein join the Palestinian delegation and the parties did not object.

We hope this and other steps that will be taken will help the parties make rapid and significant progress in the negotiations.

(If pressed) We have not changed the terms of reference.

Q: Isn't Hussein an East Jerusalemite?

A: He is a Palestinian leader who helped reach the agreement to resume talks on the 27th.

11

Q: Have we changed our policy on Jerusalem?

A: No. Nor have we changed our position on any matter of substance in the negotiations which led to the resumption of talks.

Q: Was Arafat helpful in this process?

A: A lot of parties played helpful roles. I am not going to go into details, except to say that we commend the parties for taking the decision to return to negotiations.

Q: Will the Israelis agree to resume the talks on April 27 as suggested by the Arabs? Have all parties formally accepted to return then?

A: All of the parties, including the Israelis, have agreed to resume the talks on April 27.

Q: Can you confirm that you have proposed the talks be conducted continually and no longer in rounds?

A: The Secretary of State has proposed that talks be held on a continuous basis and we are in the process of consulting with the parties.

We believe that the concept has merit and could help advance the process.

Q: Did the U.S. secure Saudi funding for the PLO?

A: No. We did not secure funding for the PLO. We believe it is helpful to encourage Saudi Arabia and others to help alleviate the economic difficulties Palestinians are experiencing in the Territories.

Q: Do you plan to restore the U.S.-PLO dialogue?

A: We have no plans to resume the dialogue with the PLO. Our policy on this remains unchanged. Palestinians are represented by their delegation at the negotiating table in the peace talks. It is that direct dialogue between the parties to the Middle East conflict that should be the focus.

Accelerating START Deactivations

Q: What do you mean when you say "deactivating" nuclear strategic systems?

A: By "deactivating," I mean the removal of warheads from missiles.

Q: What about getting started with actual elimination of systems?

A: The United States has already begun the process of beginning physical elimination of some U.S. launchers and heavy bombers. Elimination of silos, submarines, and bombers will necessarily lag somewhat behind the deactivation schedule, though.

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) Status

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 nonproliferation, one of our key considerations will be the high priority that I place on both these areas.

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

11

Detargeting

Q: When do you expect to complete the review of confidence building measures?

A: The review I have tasked is meant to be comprehensive. These are complex issues that require detailed analysis. I expect it will take a few months to complete.

Q: Why can't you say now that we will no longer target Russia?

A: Detargeting, by itself, is only one step. While this should send an important symbolic signal, it is very difficult if not impossible to know whether or not one nation is targeting its missiles at another, and missiles can be targeted or retargeted within a very short period of time.

That's why I want to review this issue in the broader context of such related questions as alert rates and readiness posture to see what makes the most sense in terms of enhancing strategic stability.

11

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: No.

I support a phased approach to a CTB 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.

11

Chemical Weapons

Q: The Army released a report Tuesday that indicates there may be a lot of old buried chemical weapons around the U.S and overseas. How big is the problem and is there a serious health or safety problem?

A: The Army report identifies possible sites where old chemical weapons materiel may be buried, and most of these sites are located on military installations. The report emphasizes that the Army has extensively studied the problem, and believes there is no immediate threat to public health or safety.

The Army has a detailed program already in motion using specially trained personnel to safely and effectively clean up all the sites. We will not know the precise extent of the problem until the Army has had a chance to conduct in-depth investigations at each site.

We must take every necessary step to ensure the public's safety.

Q: How long will it take to clean up all the sites, and how much will it cost?

A: -- The Army will have detailed cost and schedule estimates after it has had a chance to investigate each site. We will ensure that all sites are completely cleaned up in accordance with applicable environment and health laws. The public will be kept informed and involved in all decisions.

[])

Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) Consolidation

Q: When Secretary Aspin made his base closure recommendations last month, he put off the decision on consolidating the defense finance and accounting centers. When will he make an announcement regarding these new centers?

A: Secretary Aspin rejected the approach that the Bush Administration had established for consolidating the defense finance and accounting centers because he felt it put an unfair burden on the local communities.

The Secretary is currently reviewing options on how best to proceed with the DFAS selection process and consolidation. I expect he will be making a statement on how he intends to proceed in the near future.

[])

Gays in the Military

Q: At your meeting in the White House last Friday with gay rights leaders, you reiterated your commitment to lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military. Has there been anything in your discussions with military leaders that

leads you to believe that they are now more willing to go along with this policy?

A: The Department of Defense has begun its review of lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military and will report its findings to me on July 15. This review is looking carefully at options for drawing a distinction between status and conduct.

I look forward to reviewing the DoD report when it is submitted on July 15.

Q: The Senate Armed Services Committee has held hearings and conducted field interviews on the topic of homosexuals in the military. The House Armed Services Committee will begin their hearings in a couple of weeks. Are you planning to coordinate with Congress on this issue?

A: The initial Defense Department reviews will be completed by June 4. Secretary Aspin will consult with Congress and other interested groups.

Q: Do you expect Congress to support you on this policy?

A: I have worked closely with Senator Nunn and others on this issue and look forward to developing a procedure that Congress will support.

□

Tailhook Investigation

Q: What is the status of the Tailhook investigation? Are the results being held up by the absence of a Secretary of the Navy?

A: The Department of Defense plans to release the results of the Tailhook investigation today.

The Acting Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Frank Kelso, has assigned two senior military officers to act as Convening Authorities to handle any charges that may result from this investigation.

The new Secretary of the Navy will oversee the implementation of actions recommended in the report.

□

Women in Combat

Q: Secretary of Defense Aspin has said that he believes that women should be allowed to fly jet aircraft in combat. What is your position on allowing women to fly aircraft in combat or be assigned to Navy combatant ships?

A: Secretary Aspin is reviewing the issue of women in combat in order to provide a recommendation that is consistent across Service lines.

I look forward to reviewing his recommendations in the near future.

LJ

Biodiversity

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

A: Yes. We have worked with leaders in the pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries and in the environmental community. Some of them have played a very active 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 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: 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.

ll

Climate

Q: What was the Bush administration policy?

A: Last June at the Earth Summit, most other nations -- including all of our major industrial partners -- were prepared to make a firm commitment in the Climate Change Convention to reduce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases to their 1990 levels by 2000. But the Bush administration refused to agree, and insisted that

this be only a goal.

I said last year that the prior administration's policy was wrong, that the U.S. should make that commitment. Our country puts more of these emissions into the air than any other, and if we want other industrial countries and developing countries to work on this problem with us, we have to take the lead.

Q: What commitment did you make yesterday?

A: The United States is committed to reduce its emissions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2000. I have instructed my administration to prepare a cost-effective plan by August to accomplish this. The plan will be one that can continue the trend of reduced emissions. It will take advantage of the best and most energy-efficient technology that America has to offer.

Q: What will the greenhouse commitment cost?

A: The economic and environmental policies that our administration has already announced will go a long way toward meeting this commitment.

We recognize that more needs to happen, but we are confident that this can be done in a cost-effective way. The National Academy of Sciences and Congress's Office of Technology Assessment, among others, have shown that we can reduce carbon dioxide emissions at little or no net cost. The investments in new technology will be paid back by the fuel savings.

My Administration will prepare a plan by August that translates the findings of studies such as these into concrete actions. Just as we did on biodiversity, we will be seeking the ideas of those leaders in business, labor, environmental groups, and Congress who know where the opportunities are to cut emissions, save energy, and create new jobs and new business opportunities.

11

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.

[]

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.

[]

Chile

Q: You have said that you support a free trade agreement with Chile. 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 great deal 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. 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 request for fast track authority on the Uruguay Round at this time.

L1

EC Procurement Dispute

Q: Ambassador Kantor and Sir Leon Brittan settled part of a dispute with the EC over government procurement, yet the United States is still retaliating. 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 negotiate over other outstanding issues. As Ambassador Kantor explained, the U.S. will move ahead with measured retaliation over barriers that remain in the 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.

L1

NAFTA

Q: You talked tough about the NAFTA supplemental agreements during the campaign. But now it looks like you are backing down in the negotiations. How can you hope to get a weak agreement through Congress?

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.

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.

As for the specifics of the U.S. position, I do not intend to do our negotiating in a press conference. Let me just say that our negotiators will promote U.S. interests.

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.

||

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.

||

Trade Policy Making

Q: Mickey Kantor is supposed to be your Trade Representative. Yet State and Treasury co-chair the working group on Japan, the NEC, with the NSC, are said to have the lead in making general trade policy, and Laura Tyson speaks frequently on the subject. Who's in charge of your trade policy?

A: Ambassador Kantor is our U.S. Trade Representative and he is the quarterback of our various trade negotiations.

||

Uruguay Round

Q: When will you send to the Hill your request for a renewal of fast-track authority 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. U.S. industries lose \$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.

We are in the process of consulting with Congress as to the appropriate timing to submit our request for fast-track renewal.

[]

Autos/Auto Parts

Q: Last year, Japanese auto producers agreed to buy more auto parts, increase the local content of cars made in U.S. plants, and import more cars into Japan. (These commitments grew out of Bush's ill-fated Japan trip.) What are you going to do, either to enforce these undertakings or as part of a new approach, to aid the U.S. auto industry?

A: We take seriously the pledges of Japanese auto manufacturers and will look to them to fulfill their plans.

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.

[]

Multi-Purpose Vehicles

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 is comprised of autos and auto parts. Our industry has taken the difficult steps necessary to produce competitive goods. Japan must open its market to competitive U.S. goods.

[]

Negotiating Framework

Q: The new negotiating initiative sounds identical to initiatives past Administrations have pursued (e.g. MOSS talks, SII). How is this one different?

A: The exact content of this initiative will be worked out in the next three months, but several things fundamentally are 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 request action from Japan. Third, I will remain personally committed to these talks and will stay actively involved.

Q: How will the framework discussions proceed? Who will lead them from the American side?

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. On the U.S. side, the economic agencies -- Treasury, USTR and Commerce -- will play leading roles.

We view the U.S.-Japan relationship as having three, interconnected parts: economic issues, political/security partnership, and cooperation on global problems. Consequently, there must be a great deal of interagency coordination, as there was in the preparation for the Miyazawa visit.

11

Supercomputers

Q: There is evidence that Japan is not living up to its commitments under the Supercomputer Agreement. What do you intend to do about it?

A: U.S. supercomputer producers are the most competitive in the world. However, while we hold 84 percent of the European public procurement market, we have only 11 percent of the Japanese market.

As I told Prime Minister Miyazawa, our companies have the responsibility to produce competitive goods, but when they do so, Japan has the obligation to open its markets.

We are now considering what action to take concerning the Supercomputer Agreement. We will be looking very closely at the upcoming procurements, and we are looking for measurable progress -- both in terms of process and in terms of results -- under that agreement.

11

Trade Results vs. Managed Trade

Q: At your meeting with Prime Minister Miyazawa last week, you said you wanted to see results. The Japanese equate results with managed trade. How can you be for results and against managed trade?

A: I told the Prime Minister that I am concerned about Japan's substantial and long-lasting trade surplus with the U.S. He recognized that 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.

We think that it is appropriate 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: 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: 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 (SHELTON@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: 13-May-1993 10:44
 Deletable Flag: Y
 DOCNUM: 006496
 VMS Filename: OAS\$SHARE50:ZURHFDMRQ.WPL
 A1 Folder: MAY93
 Message Format:
 Message Status: READ
 Date Modified: 13-May-1993 10:45
 Forward Flag: YES
 Read-Receipt Requested: NO
 Delivery-Receipt Requested: NO
 Message Priority: FIRST_CLASS