

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 9/24/97 12:57:22 PM
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RBTP to AFL-CIO Biennial Convention (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) re Fast Track
[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Remarks by the President
RBTP to AFL-CIO Biennial Convention (Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania) re Fast Track

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT afl-cio biennial convention 0924.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania)

For Immediate Release September 24, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO AFL-CIO BIENNIAL CONVENTION

David Lawrence Convention Center
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

10:25 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. I am delighted to be here. Thank you for the warm welcome. Thank you for the fast introduction. (Laughter.)

The last time I spoke at your convention it was two days before you elected John and Rich and Linda. And I must say, from the outside, it seems to me that they have done a remarkable job, and I know that you must be very, very proud of them. (Applause.)

I am delighted to be here with Secretary Herman, and Deputy Secretary Kitty Higgins, and Secretary Slater, a number of other members of the administration. I should mention one other -- the successor at the White House to Alexis Herman, former Assistant Secretary of Labor for Wage and Hours Maria Echevesta. We're all glad to be here. (Applause.)

I also want to say right at the outset that I am very glad that you voted to support campaign finance reform. Now there will be a vote on the Senate floor, and that will be a time of testing. But I have made clear where I stand. All 45 of our Democratic senators have made clear where they stand. You have now made clear where you stand. We will soon see where the Senate stands, and then where the House stands. This is a good time to make our campaign finance laws better, and I thank you for your crucial role in it. (Applause.)

On a very personal word, I might say, I came in a few moments ago and I was able

to hear Sandy Feldman and hear your tribute to our friend, Al Shanker. And I cannot tell you how much I appreciate that. Under his leadership, and Sandy's, the AFT has been a constant supporter of educational opportunity and educational excellence -- a clear signal that working professionals can be organized for the objectives, the legitimate objectives of the union movement. And one of those objectives would be excellence on the job. And there is no more important place to have excellence on the job than in educating our children. So I'm very, very grateful for the AFT and for Sandy Feldman. (Applause.)

With your new leadership team and the new energy I feel of the presidents who are here on this great stage and all of you in the audience, your members back home, it is clear that American labor once again has a clear voice and you are making it heard. You made it heard loud and proud in the boardrooms of Unite Parcel Service. You made it heard in the halls of the Capitol, standing up to a barrage of anti-worker legislation. (Applause.)

You're making it heard in the strawberry and mushroom fields of California, in the fiery tones of Arturo Rodriguez, with noble echoes of Cesar Chavez. (Applause.) You're making it heard in nursing homes in Minnesota, giving new strength to women workers. And you're making it heard right here in Pittsburgh through the steelworkers biggest organizing campaign in more than 60 years. This must be a proud time for the men and women of the AFL-CIO. (Applause.)

Our nation can clearly see and hear that American labor is back. Thanks in no small part to your leadership in the workplace and your involvement in the political process, America is back, too.

Six years ago, when I announced my candidacy for President, I said that America had a vital mission for the 21st century -- to keep the American Dream alive for every person responsible enough to work for it, to keep America the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity, and to bring our people together across all the lines that divide us into one America. America's oldest, most incandescent ideals -- opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of all. That is what has to illuminate our path as we stride forward to address the challenges of a new era.

I pledged then to take America in a new direction -- toward the future, not the

past; toward unity, not division; with America leading, not following; putting people and values, not power politics, first; reforming government not to do everything or do nothing, but to give all our people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives; and beginning by building an economy that works for all, not the few.

We started with a new economic policy for the new economy, putting in place a bold new strategy to shrink the deficit and balance the budget, invest in our people and lower unfair trade barriers to our goods and services. The philosophy was solid and simple: remove the impediments that have restrained the American people and give them the tools and training to help them race ahead. By reducing the nation's massive deficits, we could free our people of the dead weight that slowed their every step from the early 1980s. By investing in their education and health, we would enable them to run fast and strong over the long run. By reducing trade barriers, we would knock down the unfairly high hurdles that we have had to leap over for far too long, and build bridges to new democracies with growing economies to ensure our leadership for peace and freedom well into the next century.

The strategy has succeeded: nearly 13 million new jobs; America leading the world in auto production once again; unemployment below five percent; over a million new construction jobs, a half a million transportation jobs, a half a million new jobs for machine operators, auto jobs having the fastest increase since Lyndon Johnson's administration; the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history, with welfare reform that is tough on work, but pro-child and pro-family; dramatic drops in crime year after year, putting 100,000 more community police officers on the street and the Brady Bill preventing 250,000 sales of handguns to people with criminal or mental health histories that indicates they should not have them. We know we have more to do, but together we have made progressive government work again.

Let's look at three crucial elements of our economic strategy -- reducing the deficit, investing in our people, expanding exports. First, deficit reduction. Back in 1993, when I introduced our first deficit reduction plan, we both knew it was important to get our fiscal house in order. And we did it the right way -- we did it while increasing investments in our people. And we did it without a single Republican vote, cutting the huge deficit of \$290 billion 87 percent

before the balanced budget law passed. (Applause.)

After a new majority took control of Congress in 1994, they tried to cut the deficit in the wrong way. They sent me a budget that made unjustifiably deep cuts in Medicare, that increased taxes on working Americans, that allowed corporations to raid their workers' pensions, that cut enforcement of worker safety laws, that slashed funding for education and training by \$30 billion. With your support, I vetoed that budget and the veto was upheld. (Applause.)

Later, when they pushed a balanced budget with a harmful independent contractor provision, a misguided privatization scheme for Medicaid, and a shameful plan to deny workfare participants the minimum wage, you and I stood firm together. We stood firm together. And I thank you for your support for that opposition. (Applause.)

I believe this balanced budget that I signed honors our workers and our values and our future. And I will explain by going to the second element of our economic strategy -- investing in our people. In the new economy the most precious resources America has are the skills and securities of working Americans. Here, too, we are succeeding. After decades of working harder and longer for lower wages, millions of working Americans finally are getting a raise. And it's about time.

Since I took office the yearly income of the typical family is up \$1,600. Wages are rising again. In 1995 and 1996, over half the new jobs created in this economy paid above the average wage. With your strong support, we also increased the minimum wage and dramatically increased the earned income tax credit -- it is now worth about \$1,000 a year to the typical family of four with an income of less than \$30,000. And this summer, I signed into law a \$500-per-child tax credit that will mean \$1,000 in take-home pay for a typical family with two children. And I didn't sign the bill until we made it work for rookie police officers, teachers and others of modest means the Republican majority would have left out of their budget and tax cut plans.

From 1945 until the mid-1970s, all of us grew together in America. Each group of our economy, from the lowest 20 percent to the highest, increased their incomes, but, actually, in percentage terms, those in the bottom 40 percent grew

slightly faster than those in the upper 40 percent. And that was as it should have been. We were sharing our prosperity and growing together.

Then, unfortunately, we began to grow apart, partly because of developments in the global economy, historic developments that could not be reversed and offer us great opportunity of seize them -- partly, I believe, because of wrongheaded policies in the United States government throughout the 1980s.

Fortunately, now it looks like our hard work and your hard work is paying off and America is starting to grow together again. I believe the general sense that this should be so is one of the reasons for the renewed success and receptivity of the efforts that you are making all over America.

But we cannot rest. We cannot rest until every single American has a fair chance to reap the rewards of the American economy. That is why, above all, investing in people means giving every American the best education in the world.

Our balanced budget includes the largest increase in aid to education since 1965, when President Johnson was in office, and the biggest increase to help people to go on to college since the G.I. Bill was passed 50 years ago. (Applause.) The budget has \$1 billion more for Head Start; more money to help our schools achieve excellence; the America Reads program to mobilize a million volunteers, organized by our national service program, AmeriCorps, which has already given 70,000 young people a chance to work and serve in their communities and earn the money for college.

It contains money to help connect every classroom and library in this country to the Internet by the year 2000. It also contains a new HOPE Scholarship to guarantee access to all Americans to at least two years of college; other tuition tax credits for all college and skills training; an IRA you can withdraw from, tax-free, to pay for your own education or your children's education; the biggest increase in Pell Grants in two decades; a million, total, work-study slots now; and doubling aid for dislocated workers.

When you put all this together, we can really say for the first time in the history of this country, we have opened the doors of college education to every

American who is willing to work for it money will not be an obstacle again.
(Applause.)

There is still a lot to do. First of all, we have to pass every year for the next five years the funds necessary to make good on the budget agreement. Secondly, we have got to increase the quality of education in our public schools. I have sought to provide more options to parents in public school through public school choice and allowing teachers to organize new charter schools within public school districts. But I also know we need national standards. Every other major economy in the world educates its children according to national academic standards. And I have called for national standards and voluntary national exams to begin with 4th grade reading and 8th grade math to see how our children are doing. Voluntary exams developed not by politicians, but by a non-political board; not by the Department of Education, but financially supported by the Department of Education.

There are those who say no to this, no the standards, no to the idea that we ought to have accountability. Some of them, frankly, don't believe all our children can learn. Some of them see some dark plot to take over local schools. All I see is reading is the same in Minnesota as it is in Maine, and mathematics is the same in Washington as it is in Florida. And our children had better know it if they expect to compete in the world of the 21st century. (Applause.)

There are also those in the Congress who say no to every effort we make to expand educational opportunity -- those who failed to close the Department of Education, but would still like to cut it down; those who still would reduce our commitment to scholarships and grants and shut down completely innovative initiatives, like America Reads, even though we know -- we know -- that 40 percent of our 3rd graders still cannot read independently on their own. We know that and we cannot afford to back up; we need to bear down.

So I need to ask your help again on education in the tough days ahead. With your help we can open up opportunity, build up education and shake up the status quo crowd that fights every effort we make to lift up our children.

We are making progress in this country in education. The teachers of this country are doing a better job. The principals are doing a better job. Parents

are steadily getting more involved. We are learning how to come to grips with all the social problems that our kids bring to school. This year, on international exams, a representative sample of our children by race, by region, by income -- for the first time the 4th graders scored above the global average in mathematics and science. So I know all children can learn, and I know we've got people who can do the job. We just have to support them and bear down and do more of the kinds of things that we know will work.

Al Shanker, for his whole adult life, advocated national standards and meaningful measures and then all the efforts necessary to give every kid in this country a chance to learn. And I am not going to back away from this if it takes me every last minute of the next three years and however many months and days I've got left. And you ought to be there, too, because there's nothing more important for the future of this country than giving our kids a decent education. (Applause.)

Investing in our people also means protecting the rights of workers, to demand their rights. Over the past four years we've defeated callous attempts to repeal prevailing wage laws, to bring back company unions, to weaken occupational safety laws. We cracked down on sweatshops and fought to protect your pension funds and make pensions more portable. I have vetoed every piece of anti-labor legislation that has crossed my desk, and I will continue to do so. (Applause.) Thank you.

A lot of the people pushing these bills have missed the main point: the key to success in tomorrow's economy is people, and you cannot move into the 21st century by restoring the labor policies of the 19th century. I will oppose it, you will oppose and we will prevail. (Applause.)

In that context, let me just say one more word about the UPS strike. I and, indeed, my entire administration believe deeply in the collective bargaining process. In the UPS strike collective bargaining worked. UPS and the Teamsters reached an historic settlement that recognizes that companies have to invest in their workers in order to be competitive in the 21st century. I did the right thing to let the process work. The parties got together, they worked through it and we got a good result. (Applause.) Thank you.

Investing in people also means expanding access to health care, quality health

care. The Family and Medical Leave law that you worked so hard for, the very first bill I signed as President, ensures that millions of people don't have to choose between being good parents and good workers. I still hear from citizens as I travel across the country and just stop at airports, or in crowds in communities and shake hands -- people still come up to me and say, that law changed my life, saved my family, has meant more to me than anything the government has done in my life. It is a good thing and I thank you for your support of it. (Applause.)

The Kennedy-Kassebaum law helps millions to keep their health care if they take a new job or if someone in their family gets sick. The new balanced budget spends \$24 billion to expand health care to 5 million of the most vulnerable Americans -- 5 million children, almost all in working families, without health insurance. That is the largest investment in health care since the creation of Medicaid in 1965. Never -- never -- would this have happened unless you had helped me wage the fight we waged and lost to give health insurance to every American family that doesn't have it. And sometimes you have to lose a battle. I'm glad we fought for it. I'm proud that you helped me. And those kids are going to get insurance because of the issues we raised in 1994. (Applause.)

Finally, I ask for your support to help me pass sweeping legislation to keep tobacco, our number one health problem, out of the hands of our children. The health of our children is my bottom line and I believe it should be the bottom line of the tobacco industry as well.

The final component of our three-part economic strategy, one that is just as essential for the future growth and the future wage growth of our economy, is our continuing work to open new markets and give American workers a fair break. I know we don't see eye to eye on fast track, but I think I owe it to you to tell you exactly why I feel so passionately about it. And I think I've earned the right to be heard on it. (Applause.)

Fast track authority is a tool that has been given by Democratic Congresses to Republican Presidents and Presidents, indeed, of both parties for more than 20 years now. It simply says that if the President or his representative, his trade representative, negotiates a trade agreement, then the Congress has to vote on it if it rises to the level of comprehensive agreement, but must vote it up or down,

so that the other country does not believe it is having to negotiate with 535 people in addition to the person with whom they negotiated.

We cannot create enough good jobs and increase wages if we don't expand trade. There's a simple reason why. Indeed, about a third of the economic growth that has produced 13 million new jobs over the past four and a half years has come from selling more American products overseas. Here's why: We have four percent of the world's population and we enjoy 22 percent of the world's wealth. If we want to keep the 22 percent of the wealth we have as four percent of the world's people, we have to sell something to the other 96 percent.

And this did not happen by accident. There were over 220 trade agreements signed in the first four years of this administration. In the over 20 agreements signed with Japan, in those areas our exports went up by over 80 percent.

The information technology agreement that we just signed, worldwide, covering 90 percent of information technology services in the world, under residual fast track authority that covered that area amounts to a \$5-billion tax or tariff cut on American products -- high value-added products, many of which are made by union workers.

Now, in the next 15 years, the developing countries in Latin America and Asia will grow three times as fast as the United States, Europe and Japan. As I told the United Nations a couple of days ago, early in the next century, about 20 nations comprising half of the world's people will move from the ranks of low-income nations to middle-income nations. They are going to grow in a world economy. We are going to participate in that growth to a greater or lesser extent. The more fair trade deals we have to allow us entry into their markets where we've been at a significant disadvantage for too long, the more we will participate.

You know that our own markets are among the most open in the world. We were able to get 220 trade agreements in the first four years because we made people know that if they wanted access to our open markets, they were going to have to open theirs. We have to insist upon this treatment. If we don't act and we don't lead, nobody else will level the playing field for us.

Indeed, our competitors in the other wealthy countries, in Europe and Japan, would just as soon we not make these trade agreements. They can make them because they read the same predictions we do -- they know that their economies are only going to grow a third as fast as the ones in Latin America and Asia as well, and they are looking for some way in to protect their workers and their longtime economic security.

We can compete if given a fair chance. Last year, I had a chance to visit the Jeep Cherokee plant in Toledo -- a UAW plant producing tens of thousands of right-wheel-drive jeeps for export to Japan and other markets we thought hard to open up for them. They have 700 new jobs at that plant, and I think it's the oldest auto plant in the United States of America still operating. The global economy is working for them. I am determined to see that it works for everyone.

Should we ask other people to adhere to global standards on the environment? Of course, we should. I think you could make a strong case that no administration has done more to preserve and protect the environment against onslaughts than ours has. Should we acknowledge that global trade can pull the rug out from some of our people? Of course, it could. At every period of economic change in our country's history, that has happened to people. The difference is that we have to be committed to give more aid, to do more for people who are suffering, who are displaced. Because nobody should be left behind in the global economy. Nobody. That's why we double funding for displaced workers. That's why I know we have to do more. We don't have to leave people behind. Everybody should have the right to keep a good job and to go into tomorrow.

But we can only do that with a growing population if we continue to grow the economy. So the trick is to get the right economic growth package, to create the right mix of new jobs, to try to make sure always more than half of your new jobs are paying above average wage and not leave people behind. It's not easy to do, but this administration is committed to doing it. And I think we have demonstrated that commitment time and again.

We also have to recognize that the global economy is on a fast track. It is changing amazingly. For example, every month -- every month -- millions and millions of new contacts are made on the Internet. Every single month. It's

exploding like nothing ever has, creating all kinds of networks of commerce and bringing people close together in new and unusual ways. We have to figure out how to make this work for us. If it doesn't work for us, it will work against us.

I believe leaving our trade relations on hold with the fastest growing economies in the world will not create a single job in America, and it certainly won't raise environmental standards or labor standards in other countries. This year -- this year alone, so far, two-thirds of the increase in America's trade has come from Canada to the southern tip of South America, our neighbors. Two-thirds. We could do better. This year, leaders from Europe have gone to South America to tell them that the United States no longer cares about their markets, or the cooperation and leadership that goes along with working with them. They say that their future should be with Europe, and they should organize to give Europe considerations and breaks in opening their markets, and leave us out.

Now, think about it. Think about Chile, or Brazil or Argentina. Their markets are more closed to us than ours are to them. We still are selling more just because they're growing so much. But we know they'll grow a lot more over the next 10 to 20 years. They now need things that we sell and things that your people produce better than any other group of people in the world.

This is not about NAFTA or factories moving there to sell back to here. I think all of us agree it is highly unlikely anyone will move a factory to Chile to sell back to here. This is about how we can best seize our opportunities in the economy that is emerging, and how 4 percent of the world's people can continue to maintain 20 to 22 percent of the world's wealth, and continue to grow the economy so incomes can rise and new jobs can be created.

Now, I know this is a difficult debate and I know we disagree about it. But the debate over fair trade and fast track should itself be fair. It should also be open and honest. I have personally sat alone in the White House and listened to talk shows where your representatives were on the shows, because I wanted to hear the arguments and hear the concerns and know the things that you want. And you know we have had exhaustive numbers of meetings between the administration and leaders of the labor movement. We ought to have an open, fair and honest debate.

We are trying to move as much as we can on a lot of the concerns that you have raised.

But I also want to say that I think we share too many values and priorities to let this disagreement damage our partnership. You just think of all of the things that I reeled off that we've done together and all of the things we've stood against in the last five years. I have worked to make this economy work for middle-class Americans. I care about making sure everybody has a chance and making sure nobody is left behind. But I can't build a better future without the tools to do the job, and America can't lead if it's bringing up the rear.

At the moment of our greatest economic success in an entire generation, we shouldn't be reluctant about the future; we ought to seize it and shape it. And I think I also have to say to you that there are a lot of good members of Congress who agree with me about our trade policy who also stood for the minimum wage. They agree with me about our trade policy, but they fought to provide health care for 5 million more kids. They support open trade, but they also fought to protect Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment, and to open the doors of college to all Americans.

And when the majority in Congress wanted to do so, they stood against them and fought with you against the Contract on America. They fought with you against attempts to repeal the prevailing wage laws, to weaken unions and workplace health and safety laws. They did so in the face of intense pressure. They have fought for you and for all working people, and they deserve our support. If they were to lose their positions because they stood up for what they believe was right for America's future, who would replace them, and how much harder would it be to get the necessary votes in Congress to back the President when he stands by you against the majority?

America is far better off when the friends of working people stand together without letting one issue trump all the others. Friends and allies don't participate in the politics of abandonment; they band together -- disagreeing when they must -- but banding together.

I pledge to do that, and I hope you will, too. We've got a lot to do -- in education, in making sure Medicare and Social Security are there for the next

generation of parents, in bridging the divide of race and all of the differences that are now taking place in this country. That's an area where you've always been out front, and I want to close with that. Because you can help -- perhaps more than almost any other group in America -- to bridge the divides and to preserve the bonds of community.

When I leave you, I'm going home to Arkansas, and tomorrow I will try to focus our nation on a haunting but hopeful moment in our country's struggle to make America the nation live up to America the idea -- a day, 40 years ago, when nine brave African American boys and girls, shielded from a hateful crowd by United States Army paratroopers, walked through the doors of Little Rock Central High School for the first time. I will honor the courage and vision of those whose eyes were fixed on the prize of equal educational opportunity without regard to race.

There are still a lot of doors we have to open. There are still some doors we have to open wider. And now, unfortunately, there are some doors we've got to work hard from being shut again. There is also a new reality we're all going to have to come to grips with that very few Americans have thought about. It will change the workplace. It will change communities. It will change the way we do our business as citizens. That reality is that we are not simply a black-white nation, we are not simply a black-Hispanic-Native-American-white nation. Instead, we are a nation now of nearly all the peoples of the world, with greater diversity in how we work and live together, and greater integration in how we work and live together than virtually any other democracy on Earth. And within the ranks of Caucasians and blacks and Latinos and Asians, there is increasing ethnic and cultural diversity.

As we become the most diverse democracy on Earth --and make no mistake about it, we are becoming that -- today, only Hawaii has no majority race. Within a decade, probably within four or five years, California, our largest state with 13 percent of our population, will have no majority race. And sometime before the next century is half done, America will have no majority race. Are we going to embrace this? Are we going to say that we celebrate our diversity, but we're united by something more important? Or are we going to let it get away from us and drift off into little enclaves and weaken our country and our future and our children's future? You're in a unique position to help. (Applause.)

Labor has a tradition here, established by visionaries like A. Philip Randolph and Walter Reuther. Labor has helped generations of African Americans and new immigrants to gain dignity and respect. Your members reached across racial and ethnic lines to fight for a common future and personal dignity. Few institutions in America can claim anything like the record of the labor movement in fighting for equal opportunity. (Applause.)

It was for that reason and for her own merit that I appointed your Executive Vice President, Linda Chavez Thompson, a member of my Race Advisory Commission. (Applause.) She has seen discrimination firsthand. She knows discrimination is not a thing of the past, but she is determined to see that it has no place in our future. I am grateful for her help, and I ask you for yours.

A century ago the working men and women of labor imagined an America where older people had health security, where African Americans enjoyed equal protection under the law, where working people had the right to organize and fight for a better life. Because they imagined it and because they worked for it, it's the America we're living in today.

Now it is up to us to imagine the America of the 21st century. And on every issue I discussed today, that is all I ask you to do. Imagine it, based on what we now know. Imagine an America in which every child has a world-class education; in which every family can fairly balance the demands of work and child-rearing; in which we lift living standards here and around the world; in which we learn to grow our economy and preserve the common environment which is our home; in which our oldest values of opportunity, responsibility and community guide us into a new time of greatest opportunity.

As American working men and women have shown time and time again, if we imagine it and we work at it, we will build it -- an America for our children, always eager for tomorrow. You have brought new energy to the labor movement. You have brought new energy to America. Let us work to build that into a future we can be proud of.

Thank you, and God bless you. (Applause.)

END

11:04 A.M. EDT

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/9/97 3:32:06 PM
FROM Eddleman, Linda .
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Fast Track Qs and As [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Kyle, Robert D.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Attached is the info you requested. Let me know if you need any additional info.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

berger.doc
FAST TRACK Q&A'S

CONTENT OF SIDE AGREEMENTS

Q: What provisions will be contained in any side agreements you reach?

A: That could vary among countries. Different countries would have different conditions and different needs. As a general matter, agreements could include provisions to:

- * Promote better enforcement of a country's labor and environmental laws and regulations.
- * Encourage greater transparency and public disclosure about a country's labor and environmental standards and performance.
- * Provide greater technical assistance to countries to improve their labor rights and environmental protection.

We would consult extensively with Congress about our approach in any individual case.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
VERSUS
LABOR/ENVIRONMENT

Q: Critics charge that you incorporate intellectual property provisions in free trade agreements, but fail to give the same treatment to labor/environmental provisions? Aren't they correct that you care more about American corporations than about American workers?

* First, no Administration in history has been more aggressive in pressing to improve international labor rights or environmental protection. We have:

* Continued to press this agenda in international institutions, like the ILO and WTO. In fact, our fast track bill contains a negotiating objective directing us to continue this effort.

* Made a commitment to negotiate labor/environment side agreements in the context of future free trade agreements, when appropriate. We will negotiate such agreements in the context of the Chilean free trade talks. Those agreements can make a difference: there have 7 cases brought involving labor violations under the NAFTA side agreement, none brought for IPR violations under the NAFTA itself.

* Other initiatives, like the President's 1996 Apparel Industry Partnership ("No Sweat Initiative"), a collaboration between labor, business and NGO's to encourage adoption of a code of conduct prohibiting exploitative child labor and encouraging humane working conditions.

As to the critics' charge, there is a fundamental difference between intellectual property rights and labor/environment. Violations of intellectual property

rights relate to the product itself, which is being exported to the United States. The issue of labor/environment involves more broadly the entire social and legal structure of the foreign country, which goes beyond trade concerns. That's an important difference.

NAFTA

Q: U.S. companies use the threat of relocation to Mexico or other low wage countries to jawbone down the wages of America's workers. That will just happen over and over again if we reach more free trade agreements.

A: The fact is that NAFTA makes it more attractive to stay in the United States. Before NAFTA, U.S. exports faced an average 10% tariff when sending U.S.-made goods to Mexico. They had restrictions that basically forced us to locate car production down there if we wanted to sell in their market. NAFTA eliminates all of this - and will eliminate only a 2% average tariff on products coming here.

That's true of all of these trade agreements. Their barriers are high; ours are low. So we benefit.

If we let other countries reach trade agreements, while we sit on the sidelines, it will make it even more attractive for U.S. companies to move offshore. If Brazil has eliminated all tariffs it faces in this hemisphere - and we still face high tariffs - U.S. companies have one more incentive to move offshore. If we want to keep jobs here, we should eliminate trade barriers for U.S.-made products.

Q: Some say this debate is not about NAFTA. But NAFTA is relevant to fast track. NAFTA has cost us over 400,000 jobs. Our trade surplus has turned into a deficit. If NAFTA was a failure, why should we extend it to the rest of the

hemisphere and beyond?

A: The critics are wrong. The best information available indicates that NAFTA has had a positive effect on jobs, creating 90,000 to 160,000 jobs in trade with Mexico alone. The trade deficit with Mexico was caused by Mexico's peso crisis and the recession, not NAFTA.

If anything, the trade deficit would have increased further if it were not for NAFTA. When Mexico had its last financial crisis in 1981-82, it imposed 100% duties on American products, U.S. exports fell in half and it took 7 years for us to recover to 1981 levels. This time, Mexico continued to reduce its tariffs as required by NAFTA (even though it raised on them on our competitors). U.S. exports recovered to pre-recession levels in 18 months, protecting the 750,000 jobs dependent on those exports. A Federal Reserve of Dallas study concluded U.S. export growth was 7% higher than it would have been absent NAFTA.

Q: NAFTA was supposed to have improved labor/environment conditions on the border, but it hasn't. In fact, the problem is worse.

A: The problems along the border existed before NAFTA and they won't be solved overnight. But NAFTA has given us better progress and cooperation than we would have had without it. There are clear signs of improvement:

- * From 1993 to 1996, Mexico increased its budget for enforcement of labor laws by 250%.

- * The overall rate of occupational injuries and illnesses fell from 47 per thousand in 1994 to 33 per 1000 in 1996.

- * Mexico has seen the number of environmental violations dropping; with a 72% reduction in serious violations in the maquiladora industry from 1993 to 1996; and a 43% increase in the number of maquiladora facilities in complete compliance.

* The NAFTA institutions financing border cleanup projects have certified 16 projects, including infrastructure projects costing nearly \$230 million.

Q: Opponents have successfully made this a referendum on NAFTA. How do I refute that?

A: I think NAFTA's been good for this country. But no matter what you think, this is not about NAFTA. It's about the global trading agenda I outlined.

* Our competitors would like nothing better than to have us rehash the NAFTA debate for four years, while they seize new market opportunities.

* Inaction will simply let foreign barriers stand. When we reach these trade agreements, we give up very little, while other countries give up far more. When the Uruguay Round is phased in, our tariffs will average only 2.8%. Other countries are far higher: India (31%); Thailand and Turkey (26%); Chile and Indonesia (11%). Becoming mired in a debate about NAFTA won't level the playing field.

Q: NAFTA has diverted investment from the U.S. to Mexico. It was an investment agreement, not a trade agreement.

A: No. U.S. foreign direct investment in Mexico averaged \$3.1 billion in 1994-96, little changed from the \$2.5 billion the year before NAFTA took effect. The \$3.1 billion was less than 0.3% of gross private fixed investment in the U.S. in 1996. The Big 3 invested \$39 billion in the U.S. economy in the last three years, only \$3 billion in Mexico.

Trade Generally

Q: Why should we reach trade agreements with low wage countries? How can U.S. workers compete against foreign workers earning a fraction of U.S. wages?

A: The fact is that U.S. workers do compete successfully with low wage countries. In the last 10 years, U.S. exports to low-wage countries have risen 240%, while exports to high wage countries are up just 140% and domestic sales by 75%. Exports to low wage countries now account for 42% of total U.S. exports. And these are good jobs. Wages for export-related jobs pay 13-16% more than the national average.

Competition from low wage countries does create competitive pressures in industries where skills and productivity are lower, but most such jobs don't compete with imports. In fact, imports from non-oil developing countries account for only 4% of U.S. spending and has grown only 1.5% during the past decade.

For those workers who are affected, we need to maintain our commitment to education and worker retraining. That's why I have made them a priority. It must be part of a complete strategy to prepare us for global competition.

Q: The U.S. trade deficit has hurt the U.S. economy and cost American jobs.

A: It's hard to argue that the trade deficit is devastating the U.S. economy. We are growing at a steady pace of about 3% per year over the past five years, unemployment is at a 23 year low, income levels are rising and exports are at record levels.

But one way to attack the deficit is to break down foreign barriers - and I can't do that unless I have fast track authority.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/31/97 7:18:13 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT RBTP and Secretary of Commerce Bill Daley re Fast Track [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Crowley, Philip J.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.
Miyaoaka, Lester H.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Remarks by the President
RBTP and Secretary of Commerce Bill Daley
re Fast Track

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT Fast track remarks 1031 in Palm Beach, Florida.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(West Palm Beach, Florida)

For Immediate Release October 31, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND SECRETARY OF COMMERCE BILL DALEY

Tropical Shipping Warehouse
Palm Beach, Florida

12:15 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen. As you can see, we are slightly delayed. (Laughter.) When I took off this morning at 6:30 a.m. from the White House it was clear and beautiful. We had our normal 15-minute helicopter ride to Andrews Air Force Base, which was shrouded in fog. We flew around for 20 minutes in the airplane. When we got on the ground it was like being in a sci-fi movie. It took us another 20 minutes to find Air Force One. (Laughter.) You couldn't see your hand before you. And then we sat and sat and sat. So thanks for waiting. And happy Halloween. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, your leader here told me about your normal Halloween dress. And I feel cheated that you didn't wear your costumes this morning. (Laughter.) I used to do that, but since I became President they have relegated me to a small pin. (Laughter.) But I hope you have a good time when we get out of here.

As you can tell, my voice has given out on me, and therefore, most of my remarks are going to be delivered by our fine Secretary of Commerce, Bill Daley, who is from Chicago, my wife's hometown, where they just -- (applause) -- somebody is from Chicago out there. They had a birthday celebration for Hillary's 50th birthday there, and I didn't think anything could make that a pleasant occurrence, but it actually did and she was happy with it. (Laughter.)

Secretary Daley just came back from our trip to Latin America with me and he'll have some more to say about fast track. But before I introduce him, and before I completely lose my voice, I want to say that I have worked very hard so that there would be more stories like Deborah Braziel's in this country. And in the last five years, we have vigorously pursued an economic strategy that would move us away from big deficits and move us away from living day by day, to have long-term, stable growth that hard-working Americans could participate in and benefit from.

We've had a commitment to reduce the deficit and balance the budget, to educate and train people and invest more in that and in technology, and to sell more American products and services around the world. That's been our strategy, and it's worked.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to Congressman Foley and Congressman Deutsch here, a Republican and a Democrat, for helping us to pass the historic balanced budget agreement that passed the Congress last summer. We haven't had a balanced budget since 1969, but the deficit has gone from \$290 billion to \$22.5 billion in the last four years, and now we're going to balance the thing. It's going to be good for us. (Applause.)

We just learned today that over the past year our economy has grown at 4 percent. That's the fastest rate of growth in a decade, and one big reason is \$125 billion in new exports. You helped the American economy to grow. You helped the American economy to create over 13 million jobs, and I thank you for it. (Applause.)

This strategy is working, and we have to continue to pursue it all. Yes, we reduced the deficit by 90 percent, but we needed that bill last August to balance the budget because our costs will keep going up if we don't continue to cut. We also need to invest more in education, and we've done more to open the doors of college than ever before, with tax credits and scholarships and better loans and education IRAs. And a lot of your children will now be able to take advantage of that, and maybe some of you will want to take advantage of that.

But it's a three-legged stool; we have got to have the exports. This fast track debate in Washington is totally, I think, off the radar screen for most

Americans. I bet if you ask most people what fast track was they'd say it's a new television series, or maybe a new offensive football strategy. It's simply the same authority that Presidents have had for the last 20-odd years, to negotiate agreements, take them back to Congress and have them vote up or down.

If I go and make an agreement with somebody who lives in a different system of government, they don't understand it -- they can understand it if the Congress rejects the agreement, but they don't want to have to negotiate it again with 535 people after they negotiate it with my representatives. So most countries simply won't enter into agreements with us unless I have the authority to make an agreement and say, now, the Congress is the ultimate decider here, they've got to vote up or down; if it's bad for America, they're not going to vote for it. But at least you won't have it rewritten, we'll vote it up or down. That's all the bill does and that's why Presidents have had it for the last 20-something years.

So I hope you will stick with us. I hope you'll urge the congressmen and senators to vote for it. And I hope you'll tell them that without regard to party, this is an American issue. It's helped to create jobs here at Tropical. It will help to take us into the 21st century. And if they'll stick with you on this, you will stick with them.

Thank you very much. Now I'd like to ask Secretary Daley to come up and say what I wish I had the strength to say.

Secretary Daley.

Thank you and God bless you. (Applause.)

SECRETARY DALEY: Thank you, Mr. President Thank you, ladies and gentlemen for your patience. Even with an unbelievably bad voice, he is better than anyone else who could stand up here, so it is difficult.

I thank you also for not being cheered out, after the great victory by the Marlins and being here. I thank you for putting up with this late substitution. On Halloween, I know you're all expecting quite a treat, but instead you have gotten a trick, and I'm sorry about that. (Laughter.) But I think we could all

sympathize with the President. And, Mr. President, I do feel your pain.
(Laughter.)

If you'll all bear with me, the President has asked me to read his remarks that he would have given. This is a rather awkward situation for me to stand here in front of him and read his remarks. There's probably only one person in this entire audience who is truly happy that this is occurring, and that's the President's speechwriter, because this will be the first time his entire text has ever been read. (Laughter.) So let me begin.

"Six years ago, when I announced my candidacy for President, I said that America had a vital mission for the 21st century, and that was to keep the American Dream alive for every person responsible enough to work for it; to keep America the world's strongest force for peace, freedom and prosperity; and to bring our people together across all the lines that divide us into one America.

"We started with a new economic policy for the new economy, putting in place a bold three-part strategy to shrink the deficit, invest in our people and lower unfair trade barriers to our goods. And this strategy has succeeded: strong annual growth and low inflation, more than 13 million new jobs, the deficit down 90 percent -- even before the balanced budget law saves a single penny. America is leading the world in auto production once again, and unemployment is below five percent.

"We have made tremendous progress. But we have much more to do to prepare America for the 21st century. And Congress faces a decisive choice, whether to continue with a strategy that has helped give America the strongest economy in a generation. For one week from today, the House of Representatives will decide whether or not to keep America's exports growing with its vote on fast track. I applaud Speaker Gingrich for scheduling this vote and for his commitment to work in a bipartisan basis to enact this most important legislation this year.

"The arithmetic of the new economy is the following: We have 4 percent of the world's population and 20 percent of its income; 96 percent of the world's consumers live outside the United States, and the developing countries are growing three times as fast as the developed countries. So if we want to keep our income with our population base, we have to sell even more to the other 96

percent, especially those who are growing so rapidly.

"The workers here at Tropical Shipping know that more than anyone. And so do the workers throughout this great state of Florida. For the exports from Florida have increased over the past four years by more than 50 percent, to over \$30 billion. And that's one reason why this economy in Florida has been able to create a million new jobs during that same period. And here in West Palm Beach, Boca Raton metropolitan area, exports are up over \$200 million since 1993.

"But there is still much, much more to do and many barriers to those American products. So we owe it to the working men and women of America and around our entire country to level the playing field for trade so that when our workers are given a fair chance they can and they do out-compete anyone anyplace in the world."

Congress must take this opportunity -- it must not take this opportunity away from the American people to compete. For more than 20 years, as the President stated, every President, Democrat or Republican, has had this authority. If Congress grants this authority, we can use it to open trade where American firms are leading, such as computer software, medical equipment, environmental technologies. America can use it to open the markets of Chile and other Latin American countries to our goods and also our services.

We all know we must do better to raise the living standards and environmental standards throughout the world. This trade authority will give me the leverage to negotiate agreements that do exactly that.

The bills now waiting for a vote on the floor of the House and Senate offer the most detailed and concrete authority to negotiate these issues which have ever been included in this sort of legislation. And because we know that expanded world trade does not always benefit all Americans equally, we're working with members of Congress to develop new initiative to bring more Americans into this winner's circle. And with these initiatives we will increase our investment in communities that suffer from dislocation, and in those workers who lose their jobs because of trade agreement technology or any other reason.

So let's all be clear. Walking away from this opportunity will not create or

save a single American job. It will not help a child in any country of the world come out of a sweatshop. It will not clean up a single toxic site in any nation. Turning away will not expand our economy, it will not enhance our competitiveness, and it will not empower our workers. It will give away markets and it will give away jobs. It will jeopardize America's preeminent role and position in this world.

Fast track is the key to U.S. leadership in the world economy, and now is not the time to raise questions about that leadership. Over the past four and a half years our three-part strategy for security and growth has worked better than anyone had imagined. We have reduced the deficit to the lowest levels since the early 1970s. We have invested in our people with historic new commitments to education and health for all Americans. And we have raised American living standards by opening new markets to quality American goods and services. And thanks to this strategy and the hard work of American people, we stand poised at the threshold of a new century, stronger than ever before.

America must not retreat on the strategy that has brought us to this place of promise. America must not return to a mind-set which is rooted in the past. Instead, America must move forward on all three crucial elements to our strategy. As you are doing here in south Florida, America must boldly seize the opportunities that stand before us into this next great century.

Thank you very much. God bless you and God bless America. (Applause.)

END

12:32 P.M. EST

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/31/97 7:22:13 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT EMBARGOED: November 1 Radio Address by the Vice President to the Nation
[UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Crowley, Philip J.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.
Miyaoaka, Lester H.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Radio Address
EMBARGOED: November 1 Radio Address by the Vice President
to the Nation

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT
radnov01.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Embargoed For Release
Until 10:06 A.M. EST
Saturday, November 1, 1997

RADIO ADDRESS
BY THE VICE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

The Vice President's Office

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Good morning. This is Vice President Al Gore. This week, our nation faces a stark and important choice: whether to move forward with the economic strategy that has given America the strongest economy in a generation -- or whether instead to turn away from what we must do to meet the challenge and opportunity of the 21st Century.

Congress will decide whether to give President Clinton the power to open foreign markets that are closed to us today -- to tear down barriers to our products, and create new jobs for our people. This is the same "fast track" authority that every President of either party has been given for more than two decades. And this President knows how to use it. He knows how to strike tough and fair trade deals. He knows how to protect labor rights and the environment.

Expanding trade is a key part of our enormously successful economic strategy -- balancing the budget, investing in the future, and opening new markets for our goods and services. Because of that strategy, we have more than 13 million new jobs now, less than five percent unemployment. And yesterday, we learned that the economy has grown at four percent over the past year, the fastest in nearly a decade -- fueled partly by exports that have grown by \$125 billion. To keep on creating high-wage jobs, we must reach the 96 percent of the world's consumers who live outside our borders.

Critics oppose giving the President this power. But this much we know for sure:

turning our backs on the world won't create a single new job, won't close down a single sweatshop, won't clean up a single toxic waste site. If we want every American to win in the new global economy, we must lead the world, not hide from it.

America must be the leader in bringing democracy and open markets to other nations. For that means stronger democratic partners, more willing to work with us on challenges like international crime, drug trafficking, and environmental degradation. A vote against presidential trading authority is a vote against American leadership in the world -- and a vote for pessimism and retreat.

For decades, America has been unafraid to lead -- and that spirit has crossed the lines of party and politics.

Now, President Carter, President Bush and President Ford have all written to President Clinton, supporting his call for continued authority to negotiate trade agreements. These distinguished public servants have one thing in common: they know that our national interest demands our world economic leadership. President Clinton and I are grateful for their support. And we are pleased that former secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce, and former U.S. Trade Representatives of both parties have also joined our call.

This week, America faces a crucial choice -- and Congress faces a critical vote. Will we turn our backs on the world economy, in a vain struggle to turn back the clock? Or will we move into the future boldly, and continue the economic strategy that has brought us new jobs, new hope, new leadership around the world?

That is our choice -- and this is our chance, because it's our future. Together, we must seize it. Thank you for listening.

END

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/1/97 6:11:47 PM
FROM Rossi, Christopher R.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(d)
DATECLASSIFIEDON 11/26/1997
DECLASSIFYON 11/26/2007
SUBJECT RE: Human Rights Day Address [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]
TO LaFleur, Vinca S.
 Schwartz, Eric P.

DECLASSIFIED
 E.O. 13526
 White House Guidelines, May 16, 2017
 By 10 NARA, Date 5/17/19
 2018-1072-F

CARBON_COPY Busby, Scott W.
 Hill, Roseanne M.
 Letts, Kelly J.
 Malley, Robert
 Ragan, Richard F.
 Rossi, Christopher R.
 Schwartz, Eric P.

TEXT_BODY

No Sweat Initiative: The White House encouraged industry, labor, consumer and human rights groups to unite in an Apparel Industry Partnership (think Kathy Lee). The Partnership is promoting a "no Sweat" label that would indicate goods bearing such a label were not made in sweatshops. The Partnership already presented an initial report to the POTUS in mid-May 1997. Now, the Partnership is working out monitoring and labeling mechanics to ensure that industry, writ large, meets fair labor conditions, including the elimination of child labor in the apparel industry

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

From: LaFleur,
 Vinca S.
 Sent: Monday, December 01, 1997 5:48 PM
 To: Schwartz,
 Eric P.
 Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs
 Subject: RE: Human Rights
 Day Address [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]

Eric -- I've been thinking further
 about areas where I could use some additional info from you and your

team.

It would be great to be able to "put a human face" on the bulleted items in your list below -- i.e. when we talk about supporting democratic activists, have real names or real groups of beleaguered people to refer to; when we talk about promoting rule of law, give a real-life application; etc.

Also, what is the No Sweat Initiative?
What has the Denver Working Group achieved?

Thanks, Vinca.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Schwartz, Eric P.

Sent: Wednesday, November

26, 1997 9:52 AM

To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor

Cc: @PLANNING

- Strat Plan & Comm; @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs

Subject: Human

Rights Day Address [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]

Sandy:

The subject of what the President will say at this Human Rights Day reception is important.

I strongly believe the President should use the occasion to make substantive

comments about the Administration's commitment in this area. The President has yet to offer publicly his perspectives on these issues in any one speech, and the longer we wait for the ideal forum, the less likely it is we will ever see such an address.

I do not think this is too ambitious. Under any circumstances, I expect the President would speak for about 10-15 minutes, and that is really all the time we would need.

While I can provide considerable detail, the core elements of the President's comments could include --

First, a reaffirmation of the role of democracy promotion and human rights in U.S. foreign policy.

President could emphasize the principles of the Universal Declaration at the beginning of the 50th anniversary

year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the connection between democracy, human rights and U.S. national interests (growth of democratic governments enhances U.S. security, provides basis for public support of U.S. foreign policy, etc.).

Second, a description of some of our efforts -- and the particular orientation of the Clinton Administration.

While acknowledging that our tactics vary from one situation to another, and that we will continue to grapple with issues such as sanctions versus engagement -- making judgments on case-by-case basis, the President could emphasize a particular set of priorities/tools his Administration has emphasized in the effort to promote democratization.

- * Support for post Cold-War democratic transitions, from Haiti to Russia to Latin America.

- * Support democratic activists -- keeping faith with those working to promote human rights through aid to civic groups, women's organizations, legal aid, etc.

- * Promoting the rule of law.

- * Enhancing public/private partnerships to promote voluntary initiatives, such as the "No Sweat Initiative."

- * Enhancing cooperation and coordination among democratic governments in the worldwide effort to promote human rights and the rule of law, through initiatives such as the Denver Working Group on Democracy Promotion.

- * Support for international institutions -- to emphasize the universal (rather than western) nature of human rights, such as the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the war crimes tribunals, and human rights treaty ratification.

- * Leading efforts to aid the disenfranchised -- to combat sexual exploitation of children, child labor, violence against women and children -- through efforts that are often supported by governments ill-equipped to deal with these societal problems.

- * Practicing domestically what we preach internationally, through, for example, our refugee resettlement programs.

Third, a description of new initiatives in many (if not all) of these areas.

With the go-ahead from you, we can put together several new initiatives in many of these areas, some of which are already planned or being considered in the context of the FY 99 budget.

I'd appreciate the chance to speak with you about this today. I will be out of town on Thursday and Friday, but can reach you by phone if we don't speak today.

Eric

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/4/97 10:09:18 AM

FROM Busby, Scott W.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: Current state o' play [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO LaFleur, Vinca S.

CARBON_COPY Busby, Scott W.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Letts, Kelly J.
Malley, Robert
Ragan, Richard F.
Rossi, Christopher R.
Schwartz, Eric P.

TEXT_BODY Vinca -- I found this a very good first draft. Here are a few thoughts -- including come stuff on refugee resettlement. Also, a brief reference to our efforts on trafficking in women and children would be helpful. Let me know if you need more.

-----Original Message-----
From: LaFleur,
Vinca S.
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 1997 7:15 PM
To: @DEMOCRACY
- Dem/Human Affairs
Subject: Current state o' play [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Eric, Chris, Scott, Richard -- thanks for all the help so far. I'm still working on this, but wanted you to get an idea of where I'm going... and where I'm struggling.

As you can see, I still haven't written a conclusion, nor have I worked in Bosnian refugee resettlement. I may have inadvertently neglected other things as well -- if so, please tell me now!

Length remains a problem.
Depending on how fast the POTUS reads, 10 minutes = 1300-1500 words.

This is already 1440. I welcome suggested edits; regardless, if we add more language we'll need to find compensating cuts.

I also feel like the "what are we doing" section is a bit list-y. I tried to find some organizing principle, but it was hard. Right now, I've tried to group initiatives loosely into: enlarging cmty of democracies; keeping pressure on bad guys; strengthening int'l orgs; encouraging NGOs. Any advice on how to make the section "sing" would be welcome.

I'll aim to finish a draft by Ann Lewis' 12 noon message meeting... but please feel free to comment on this one before then, especially if you think I'm going off track. Thanks, vinca.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Human Rights Day.doc
12/3/97 7PM
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS DAY
MUSEUM OF JEWISH HERITAGE
NEW YORK, NY
DECEMBER 9, 1997

Acknowledgments: Ambassador Richardson, Gay McDougall, Robert Morgenthau [TK]

I am delighted to join you here tonight as we launch the fiftieth anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As human rights educators, advocates and defenders, you, more than anyone, give life to its words: shining the searchlight of freedom into the darkness of oppression, speaking out on behalf of the voiceless, spurring the conscience of the world. Thank you for all you do every day to make human rights a human reality.

The idea of a global declaration of rights emerged from the trauma of global war - in which the brutal trampling of human rights had driven and defined the conflict. Here at the Museum of Jewish Heritage, we remember the savagery of the Holocaust. But we also celebrate the strength of the human spirit - a spirit the United Nations' founders were determined to defend.

Under Eleanor Roosevelt's wise, compassionate leadership, 18

delegates from China to Lebanon, Chile and Ukraine forged the first international agreement on the rights of humankind. At 3am on December 10, 1948, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration without dissent. Its 30 articles form a shining constellation of principles to which all peoples can aspire. Helen Keller wrote to Mrs. Roosevelt, after reading the charter in Braille: "My soul stood erect, exultant, envisioning a new world where the light of justice for every individual will be unclouded."

Over the past 50 years, the Universal Declaration has lifted the lives of millions - shaping the dreams of people around the world, being invoked in constitutions and courts of law, forming a yardstick of humanity's "best practices" against which to measure ourselves. It is an engine of hope and a catalyst for action as we struggle to build a better world.

But just as the values enshrined in the declaration are relevant for all time, our generation has an obligation to make them real for our time. While communism and fascism are dead or discredited, threats to human freedoms persist. And while, for the first time in history, more than half the world's people live under governments of their own choosing, we still see oppression, inequality and injustice crushing dreams and destroying lives from Burma to Cuba to Nigeria.

Advancing democracy and human rights is a central pillar of America's foreign policy - strengthening their roots where they have taken hold, and extending their reach where they have not. We do this not only because it is right: We do this because it is smart. Promoting democracy reflects our ideals - and reinforces our interest in a peaceful, prosperous world.

History has shown that democracies are less likely to threaten their people or their neighbors. They are more likely to join our fight against the

forces of
destruction, to create the free markets that spur opportunity and to be
good
partners in diplomacy and trade. This is more than a moral issue, an
American
issue, or a developed nation issue. Human rights are not only
universally
endowed, they are universally wise. In the Information Age, the true
wealth of
nations lies in people's ability to create, to communicate, to innovate.
Fully
developing these resources requires people who feel free to speak, to
associate
and to worship without fear of reprisal. And it requires accountable,
open
governments that earn society's trust.

Promoting democracy and human rights must be a long-term effort.
There is no
single formula for democratic change, no combination of prodding,
suasion or
sanction that works every time. That is why we rely on a variety of
tools to
pursue our basic goals - expanding the community of democratic
nations;
sustaining the pressure on undemocratic regimes; strengthening the
international
community's ability to defend and advance human rights; and
encouraging a strong
non-governmental movement committed to human rights and
democracy.

We've helped new democracies on every continent solidify their
reforms - from
helping write Estonia's new constitution to training judges in [where] -
while
keeping the pressure on the most repressive regimes with sanctions
and isolation.

We're expanding our efforts to help countries emerging from conflict
to build a
foundation for lasting peace - such as training police and human rights
monitors
in places like Haiti and Bosnia. We have increased our support for
justice
systems in Africa's Great Lakes region - including helping to ensure
enough
prosecutors, investigators and public defenders so that people enjoy a
legal
process that respects their basic rights. [This sentence is redundant of

the
last, I think.] In Angola, we're providing human rights education to
more than
200 former child soldiers. And throughout the region, we're
supporting
independent human rights commissions and local NGOs so that
fundamental freedoms
take hold at the grassroots.

We also continue to protect victims of human rights abuses by
bringing them as
refugees to the United States in greater numbers than any other
country in the
world. These refugees include victims of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia
who no
longer have homes to which they may return; Somali women in
refugee camps in
Kenya who are at risk of sexual violence; and former political
prisoners in Cuba
who have suffered under the oppression of the Castro regime.

All too often, buried landmines destroy the lives of innocent people
long after a
conflict has ended. Last month, the United States announced a new
initiative to
greatly accelerate global demining by marshalling \$1 billion per year -
five
times more than current funding levels - to remove from the ground
every landmine
that threatens civilians by the year 2010. [Why not avoid landmines
here;
haven't we said enough elsewhere? Or would an absence here be
conspicuous?]

In the international arena, our nation led the effort to create a UN
High
Commissioner, and we're working hard to make sure that Mary
Robinson has the
resources to carry out her mandate. We are the top contributor to the
war crimes
tribunals for Bosnia and Rwanda, and I intend to expand our support
[TK]. And
we've moved ahead on key global treaties on racism, children's rights
and an
international criminal court.

But we must do more. One year ago, I asked the Senate to take the
same step for
women that it had taken on the issue of racial discrimination by
ratifying the

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination
Against Women.

Today, I renew that call. This is not a partisan issue: It's a principled
issue. An American issue. Now is the time to show that world that our
nation
stands with those who stand against discrimination, violence and
abuse against
women.

[Might it be useful to say something here about our efforts to work
with the
international community to address the issue of trafficking in women
and
children. Just a brief reference should do it.]

Governments play an essential role in promoting human rights, but
they cannot
succeed alone. That is why we've encouraged voluntary efforts, such
as the
partnership the apparel industry forged last year to crack down on
sweatshops and
child labor. That is why we've kept faith with democratic activists
around the
world - through aid to civic groups, women's organizations and legal
providers.
And that is why we count so much on all of you.

Amnesty International has asked world leaders to affirm that we will
do
everything in our power to uphold the principles of the Universal
Declaration. I
take that pledge today. I also want to thank the Franklin and Eleanor
Roosevelt
Foundation for their efforts to educate and inspire a new generation on
the
importance of human rights.

In many ways, the prospects for progress are more encouraging than
ever. In a
world where blocs and barriers have crumbled, where information and
ideas can
spread faster than ever, the more these universal rights take hold, the
more
people who do not have them will demand them. Armed with
photocopiers, fax
machines and e-mail, supported by a growing community of non-
governmental
organizations, they will rally support for freedom - which, as the
history of the
last 10 years has shown us, ultimately will prevail.

But this openness we celebrate has also sparked new challenges. As liberty spreads, people often use their newfound freedom to affirm their special differences and distinctive religious, ethnic or cultural identities. Democracy nurtures diversity - and that is good. But the yearning to develop and assert uniqueness can also lead to problems. When groups invoke their special traditions to trample the rights of others, new forms of injustice can rise to replace those we've worked so hard to overcome.

This phenomenon threatens two core precepts of the UN declaration: that human rights and freedoms are indivisible and universal. We have seen the results in Bosnia, where religion and ethnicity were used to justify a brutal war... in Central Africa, where tribal armies attack defenseless people under the banner of self-determination... in Afghanistan and Iran, where women's rights are abused in the name of cultural belief. We have seen assaults on basic human rights explained away by some as "Asian Values."

Our response to this challenge demands not only conviction but sensitivity. America's way of implementing the declaration may be inappropriate for others. But we must not let respect for diversity be turned into a weapon against democracy and human rights... or let affirmations of group identity become attacks on the dignity of any man or woman. In our own experience, as this vibrant city shows, democracy is not a threat to cultural identity: It is often its best protector.

[Conclusion TBD]

ER: "Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home - so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person: the neighborhood he

lives in, the school or college he attends, the factory, farm or office
where he
worlds. Such are the places where every man, woman and child seeks
equal
justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination.
Unless these
rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere.
Without concerned
citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for
progress
in the larger world." (1958)

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/4/97 11:36:25 AM
FROM LaFleur, Vinca S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Human rights day draft [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Blinken, Antony J.
Busby, Scott W.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Letts, Kelly J.
Malley, Robert
Ragan, Richard F.
Rossi, Christopher R.
Schwartz, Eric P.

CARBON_COPY Gray, Wendy E.

TEXT_BODY

Attached the current hr day draft. It is barely under 1,500 words... and I predict now that Berger will insist I cut it back to 5 pages.

Democracy,
please:

- * review carefully for substance
- * fill in the blanks
- or help me check facts anywhere I've noted [TK]
- * help me highlight "new initiatives"
- * identify potential cuts!

This should go to
Berger tomorrow morning.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Human Rights Day.doc
12/4/97 11:30 AM
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS DAY
MUSEUM OF JEWISH HERITAGE
NEW YORK, NY
DECEMBER 9, 1997

Acknowledgments: Ambassador Richardson, Gay McDougall, Robert Morgenthau [TK]

I am delighted to join you here tonight as we launch the 50th anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As human rights educators, advocates and defenders, you, more than anyone, give life to its words: shining the searchlight of freedom on oppression, speaking out on behalf of the voiceless, spurring the conscience of the world. Thank you for all you do every day to make human rights a human reality.

The idea of a global declaration of rights emerged from the trauma of global war - in which human rights had been the first casualty. Here at the Museum of Jewish Heritage, we remember the savagery of the Holocaust. But we also celebrate the strength of the human spirit and the will to human dignity.

Under Eleanor Roosevelt's wise, compassionate leadership, 18 delegates from China to Lebanon, Chile and Ukraine forged the first international agreement on the rights of humankind. On December 10, 1948, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration without dissent. Helen Keller read the Charter in Braille and wrote to Mrs. Roosevelt: "My soul stood erect, exultant, envisioning a new world where the light of justice for every individual will be unclouded."

Over the past half century, the Declaration's 30 articles have formed a shining constellation of principles to which all people can aspire - entering the consciousness of people around the world, being invoked in constitutions and courts of law, forming a yardstick of humanity's "best practices" against which to measure ourselves.

But just as the values enshrined in the declaration are relevant for all time, our generation has an obligation to make them real for our time. Communism and fascism are dead or discredited, but threats to freedom persist. For the

first
time in history, more than half the world's people live under
governments of
their own choosing, yet still we see oppression destroying lives from
Burma to
Cuba to Nigeria. And while we celebrate the newfound freedom of
many people to
affirm their special differences, whether religious, ethnic or cultural,
we have
seen from Bosnia to Rwanda to Afghanistan that when groups invoke
their special
traditions to constrain the rights of others, new forms of injustice can
rise to
replace those we've struggled to overcome.

Today, no less than at the height of the Cold War, the universality of
human
rights is under siege. Each nation must find its own way forward,
consistent
with its history and culture. But we will not permit respect for
diversity to be
turned into a weapon against democracy and human rights... or let
affirmations of
group identity become attacks on the dignity of any man or woman. In
America's
experience, as this vibrant city shows, democracy is not a threat to
cultural
identity: It is often its best protector.

Advancing democracy and human rights is a central pillar of
America's foreign
policy - strengthening their roots where they have taken hold, and
extending
their reach where they have not. We do this not only because it is
right: We do
this because it is smart.

The history of the 20th century has shown that democracies, for all
their
imperfections, advance the values that make life worth living: dignity,
equality, security and prosperity. They are less likely to threaten their
people
or their neighbors; and more likely to stand firm against the forces of
destruction, to support free markets and to be good partners in
diplomacy and
trade.

This is more than a moral issue, an American issue, or a developed
nation issue.

Human rights are more than universally endowed, they are universally wise. In the Information Age, the true wealth of nations lies in people's ability to create, to communicate, to innovate. Fully developing these resources requires people who feel free to speak, to associate and to worship without fear of reprisal. And it requires accountable, open governments that earn society's trust.

America's democracy and human rights agenda is framed around four basic goals - expanding the community of democratic nations; sustaining the pressure on undemocratic regimes; strengthening the international community's ability to defend and advance human rights; and encouraging a strong non-governmental movement committed to these goals. There is no single formula for democratic change, no mixture of prodding, suasion or sanction that works in every case. That's why we rely on a variety of tools... and why our efforts are for the long haul.

We've helped new democracies on every continent solidify their reforms - from helping write Estonia's new constitution to training judges in [where] - while keeping the pressure on the most repressive regimes with sanctions and isolation.

We're expanding our efforts to help countries emerging from conflict to build a foundation for lasting peace - such as training police and human rights monitors in places like Haiti and Bosnia. We have increased our support for justice systems in Africa's Great Lakes region - including helping to ensure enough trained prosecutors, investigators and public defenders so that people enjoy a legal process that respects their basic rights. In Angola, we're providing human rights education to more than 200 former child soldiers. And throughout the region, we're supporting independent human rights commissions and

local NGOs so
that respect for fundamental freedoms takes hold at the grassroots.

One of the greatest challenges in post-conflict societies is dealing with buried landmines, which can ruin the lives of innocent people long after the fighting has stopped. Last month, the United States announced a new initiative to greatly accelerate global demining by marshalling \$1 billion per year - five times more than current funding levels - to remove from the ground every landmine that threatens civilians by the year 2010.

We also aid victims of human rights abuse by resettling more refugees in the United States than any country in the world. These include victims of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia - some of whom I met with two years ago this month; Somali women in refugee camps in Kenya who are at risk of sexual violence; and former Cuban political prisoners who suffered under the Castro regime.

To strengthen the hand of the international community, our nation led the effort to create a UN High Commissioner, and we're working hard to make sure that Mary Robinson has the resources she needs. We are the top contributor to the war crimes tribunals for Bosnia and Rwanda, and I intend to expand our support [TK]. We've spearheaded efforts to put a stop to trafficking in women and children. We've encouraged concerted, collective action among the Denver Summit nations. We've moved ahead on global treaties on racism, children's rights and an international criminal court.

But we must do more. One year ago, I asked the Senate to take the same step for women that it had taken on the issue of racial discrimination by ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Today, I renew that call. This is not a partisan issue: It's a principled issue. An American issue. Now is the time to show that world that our nation

stands with those who stand against discrimination and violence against women.

Governments play an essential role in promoting human rights, but they cannot succeed alone. That is why we've encouraged voluntary efforts, such as the partnership the apparel industry forged last year to crack down on sweatshops and child labor. That is why we've kept faith with democratic activists around the world - through aid to civic groups, women's organizations and legal advocates. And that is why we count on all of you.

In this 50th anniversary year, Amnesty International has asked world leaders to affirm that we will do all we can to uphold the principles of the Universal Declaration. I pledge that to you today. I also want to thank the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation for their efforts to educate a new generation of Americans on the rights of the human family.

Eleanor Roosevelt understood the importance of American leadership. She also knew that our most invincible strength was the power of our example. What enables us to act on our values abroad is our commitment to live by our values at home - to work together across our countless divides to create one from many, and opportunity for all.

By striving to make our communities and our country the best expression of liberty in the world, we are living proof to the cynics and tyrants that economic growth and democratic development can and must go together... that diversity is a source not of weakness but of strength... that out of the harmony of different views there can be a coherence of loyalty to the nation because everyone has a say. That is our responsibility to each other and to humanity as we celebrate the lasting goals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

###

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/4/97 1:38:25 PM
FROM LaFleur, Vinca S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Latest HR Day draft [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Schwartz, Eric P.

CARBON_COPY Busby, Scott W.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Letts, Kelly J.
Malley, Robert
Ragan, Richard F.
Rossi, Christopher R.
Schwartz, Eric P.

TEXT_BODY Still needs religion worked in.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT Human Rights Day.doc
12/4/97 1:30 PM
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS DAY
MUSEUM OF JEWISH HERITAGE
NEW YORK, NY
DECEMBER 9, 1997

Key Acknowledgments: Bob Morgenthau, Ambassador Richardson,
Gay McDougall

I am delighted to join you here tonight as we launch the 50th anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As human rights educators, advocates and defenders, you, more than anyone, give life to its words: shining the searchlight of freedom on oppression, speaking out on behalf of the voiceless, spurring the conscience of the world. Thank you, Gay McDougall, for your lifelong commitment to justice and equality. And thank you all for all you do every day to make human rights a human reality.

The idea of a global declaration of rights emerged from the trauma of global war - in which human rights had been the first casualty. Here at the Museum of Jewish Heritage, we remember the savagery of the Holocaust. But we also celebrate the strength of the human spirit and the will to human dignity.

Under Eleanor Roosevelt's wise, compassionate leadership, 18 delegates from China to Lebanon, Chile and Ukraine forged the first international agreement on the rights of humankind. On December 10, 1948, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration without dissent. I'm very proud that the First Lady will take part in tomorrow's United Nations commemoration.

When Helen Keller read the Charter in Braille, she wrote to Mrs. Roosevelt: "My soul stood erect, exultant, envisioning a new world where the light of justice for every individual will be unclouded." Over the past half century, the Declaration's 30 articles have formed a shining constellation of principles to which all people can aspire - entering the consciousness of people around the world, being invoked in constitutions and courts of law, forming a yardstick of humanity's "best practices" against which to measure ourselves.

But just as the values enshrined in the declaration are relevant for all time, our generation has an obligation to make them real for our time. Communism and fascism have been discredited, but threats to freedom persist. For the first time in history, more than half the world's people live under governments of their own choosing, yet still oppression shackles human aspirations from Burma to Cuba to Nigeria. And while we celebrate the newfound freedom of many people to affirm their special differences, we have seen from Bosnia to Rwanda to Afghanistan that when groups invoke their own religious, ethnic or cultural traditions to constrain the rights of others, new forms of injustice can

rise to
replace those we've struggled to overcome.

Today, no less than at the height of the Cold War, the universality of human rights is under siege. Even as we recognize the culture and customs of every nation, we must not permit respect for diversity to be turned into a weapon against democracy and human rights... or let affirmations of group identity become attacks on individual dignity. In America's experience, as this vibrant city shows, democracy is not a threat to cultural identity: It is often its best protector.

Advancing democracy and human rights is a central pillar of America's foreign policy - strengthening their roots where they have taken hold, and extending their reach where they have not. We do this not only because it is right: We do this because it is smart.

The history of the 20th century has shown that democracies, for all their imperfections, advance the values that make life worth living: dignity, equality, security and prosperity. They are less likely to threaten their people or their neighbors; and more likely to stand against the forces of destruction, to support free markets and to be good partners in diplomacy and trade.

This is more than a moral issue, an American issue, or a developed nation issue. Human rights are more than universally endowed, they are universally wise. In the Information Age, the true wealth of nations lies in people's ability to create, communicate and innovate. Fully developing these resources requires people who feel free to speak, to associate and to worship without fear of reprisal. And it requires accountable, open governments that earn society's trust.

America's democracy and human rights agenda is framed around four basic goals - expanding the community of democratic nations; sustaining the pressure on undemocratic regimes; strengthening the international community's ability to defend and advance human rights; and encouraging a strong non-governmental movement committed to these goals. There is no single formula for democratic change, no mixture of prodding, suasion or sanction that works in every case. That's why we rely on a variety of tools... and why our efforts are for the long haul.

We've helped new democracies on every continent solidify their reforms - from helping write Estonia's new constitution to training judges in [where] - while keeping the pressure on the most repressive regimes with sanctions and isolation.

We're expanding our efforts to help countries emerging from conflict to build a foundation for lasting peace - such as training police and human rights monitors in places like Haiti and Bosnia. We have increased our support for justice systems in Africa's Great Lakes region - including helping to ensure enough trained prosecutors, investigators and public defenders so that people enjoy a legal process that respects their basic rights. In Angola, we're providing human rights education to more than 200 former child soldiers. And throughout the region, we're supporting independent human rights commissions and local NGOs so that respect for fundamental freedoms takes hold at the grassroots.

One of the greatest challenges in post-conflict societies is dealing with buried landmines, which can ruin the lives of innocent people long after the fighting has stopped. Last month, the United States announced a new initiative to greatly accelerate global demining by marshalling \$1 billion per year - five times more

than current funding levels - to remove from the ground every landmine that threatens civilians by the year 2010.

We also aid victims of human rights abuse by resettling more refugees in the United States than any country in the world. These include victims of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia - some of whom I met with two years ago this month; Somali women in refugee camps in Kenya who are at risk of sexual violence; and former Cuban political prisoners who suffered under the Castro regime.

To strengthen the hand of the international community, our nation led the effort to create a UN High Commissioner, and we're working hard to make sure that Mary Robinson has the resources she needs. We are the top contributor to the war crimes tribunals for Bosnia and Rwanda, and I intend to expand our support [TK]. We've spearheaded efforts to put a stop to trafficking in women and children... encouraged collective action among the Denver Summit nations... and moved ahead on global treaties on racism, children's rights and an international criminal court.

But we must do more. One year ago, I urged the Senate to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which has been before that body for almost a decade. Today, I renew that call. This is not a partisan issue: It's a principled issue. An American issue. Now is the time to show that world that our nation stands with those who stand against discrimination and violence against women.

Governments play an essential role in promoting human rights, but they cannot succeed alone. That is why we've encouraged voluntary efforts, such as the partnership the apparel industry has forged to crack down on sweatshop labor. That is why we've kept faith with democratic activists around the world - through aid to civic groups, women's organizations and legal advocates. And

that is why
we count on all of you.

In this 50th anniversary year, Amnesty International has asked world leaders to affirm that we will do all we can to uphold the principles of the Universal Declaration. I pledge that to you today. I also want to thank the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation for their efforts to educate a new generation of Americans on the rights of the human family.

Eleanor Roosevelt understood the importance of American leadership. She also knew that our most invincible strength was the power of our example. What enables us to act on our values abroad is our commitment to live by our values at home - to work together across our countless divides to create one from many, and opportunity for all.

By striving to make our communities and our country the best expression of liberty in the world, we are living proof to cynics and tyrants that economic growth and democratic development can and must go together... that diversity is a source not of weakness but of strength... that out of the harmony of different views there can be a coherence of loyalty to the nation because everyone has a say. That is our responsibility to each other and to humanity as we dedicate ourselves to the lasting goals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

###

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/4/97 4:56:36 PM
FROM Rubin, Eric S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Last New Transatlantic Agenda [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Rubin, Eric S.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY****TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT**

USEU0022____.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
December 5, 1997

FACT SHEET**THE NEW TRANSATLANTIC AGENDA**

The New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA), launched in December 1995, provides a framework for managing and enlarging U.S. cooperation with the EU, as a whole, through a regular consultative process involving the EU Presidency country and the European Commission. The NTA lays out an ambitious agenda for expanding cooperation on promoting peace and stability, democracy, and development around the world; responding to global challenges; contributing to the expansion of

world trade and closer economic relations; and "building bridges" between Americans and Europeans.

A key element of the U.S.-EU worldwide partnership is intensified diplomatic cooperation. The U.S. and EU are, for example, working together to support reconstruction and reconciliation in Bosnia and to promote needed reform in Ukraine. The U.S. also is working with the EU to reinforce political and economic cooperation with Turkey and has encouraged dialogue among the parties in the Middle East Peace Process. The EU has joined the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization to help the U.S., Japan, and South Korea prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons technology. The U.S. and EU have worked closely to meet humanitarian needs in Africa.

The U.S. and EU have undertaken several new initiatives to expand cooperation on law enforcement, counternarcotics, environmental degradation, and health issues. Consultations have spurred development of a successful joint counternarcotics program in the Caribbean, planned exchanges of law enforcement officials, and an initiative to combat trafficking in women in central Europe and the New Independent States. Consultations to fight organized crime have been intensified.

Joint U.S. and EU trade efforts are helping to reduce transatlantic barriers and support the multilateral trading system. The U.S. and EU are working closely to conclude the WTO financial services negotiations and have concluded negotiations on a package of mutual recognition agreements on product testing, inspections, and other procedures, covering \$50 billion in U.S.-EU trade. Work is underway to further deepen regulatory cooperation while assuring high standards of protection for consumers. The governments are cooperating closely with the Transatlantic Business Dialogue, a U.S.-European business partnership, to address a wide range of trade barriers important to the business community. The U.S. and EU are finalizing an initiative to combat sweatshop conditions around the globe.

A key part of the agenda is a fourth chapter dealing with "building bridges" between the different constituencies in the transatlantic community. Following up on the successful May 1997 "Bridging the Atlantic" conference, the U.S. and EU are working closely with NGOs to launch the Internet-based Transatlantic Information Exchange Service, a transatlantic digital library project linking the

Library of Congress with key European and U.S. libraries, new parliamentary exchanges and electronic linkages, and new civil society initiatives in central Europe and the New Independent States. At the December 5, 1997, U.S.-EU Summit, the governments will sign the first U.S.-EU agreement to promote cooperation between scientists and scientific institutions.

#

- 2 -

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/5/97 11:18:53 AM
FROM Rubin, Eric S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT US-EU SUMMIT GUIDANCE [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT USEUGUID_.doc
US-EU SUMMIT
Dec. 5, 1997

* President was delighted to welcome two distinguished Luxemburgers, both in service of European Union.

* U.S. relations with Luxembourg are strong, reflecting our overall European relationship. We appreciate PM Juncker's leadership during Luxembourg's EU presidency, moving the Union forward in areas of common interest.

* Past six months of our mutual agenda have been particularly fruitful, especially on diplomatic front in important areas such as Ukraine, Middle East.

* We (Talbot) signed a Science agreement today at Blair House, as well as collaborating on cutting-edge electronic commerce and working to find solutions to trade disagreements.

* Also cooperating in fighting transborder scourges of crime, trafficking in

women.

* We discussed common interests in preventing spread of weapons of mass destruction, promoting human rights and democracy in such places as Iran and Cuba. We share common goals, but don't always see eye-to-eye on the means. We will work together to manage these differences with our friends and partners, but the EU knows that we are also committed to enforcing our laws.

* Europe undergoing dramatic transformation. The EU is tackling unemployment, deepening integration via EMU, expanding to bring in new members in Central and Southeastern Europe, Baltic regions. Likewise, our relationship with the EU is deepening, expanding.

DRAFT

FACT SHEET

U.S.-EUROPEAN UNION RELATIONS

With the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has sought to strengthen its partnership with the European Union (EU) as part of a broader effort to build a New Atlantic Community and a New Transatlantic Marketplace.

The U.S. and the EU share the goal of promoting a healthy, open commercial relationship and strong multilateral economic institutions. The U.S. supports greater European political and economic integration and ongoing EU efforts to enlarge to include central and east European and Baltic states. This process of integration and enlargement contributes to a more stable and prosperous Europe, an objective that is also an important U.S. national interest. It should proceed, however, without creating new trade barriers.

Since December 1995, the New Transatlantic Agenda has provided the framework for enhanced political and economic cooperation between the U.S. and the EU. The President meets semiannually with the EU leadership. At today's summit meetings, the U.S. and EU blessed new initiatives to promote needed reform in Ukraine and combat illegal trafficking in women in central Europe and the New Independent States.

In addition, since the last U.S.-EU Summit, negotiations on mutual recognition of testing procedures in telecommunications, pharmaceuticals, and electrical machinery, and other sectors, covering \$50 billion in trade, were completed. The U.S. and EU are working closely with the Transatlantic Business Dialogue to address barriers to trade. Following the successful "Bridging the Atlantic" Conference, the U.S. and EU worked closely with NGOs to launch the Internet-based Transatlantic Information Exchange Service, an important digital library project, and an exchange program involving the U.S. Congress and European parliaments. The U.S. and EU signed a science and technology agreement that will promote closer cooperation between our scientists and provide new opportunities for collaboration on cutting-edge issues.

The EU is the United States' largest economic partner, its largest investment partner, and second-largest trading partner. Total U.S.-EU trade was \$270 billion in 1996, up from \$256 billion in 1995. This two-way trade supports six million jobs directly on both sides of the Atlantic and accounts for 44% of U.S. foreign direct investment. By the end of 1995, the EU had more than \$315 billion invested in the United States, and the United States had more than \$320 billion invested in the EU. Investment in Europe supports hundreds of thousands of U.S. manufacturing jobs. European companies are the number one investor

in 41 of 50

U.S. States and number two in the remaining nine.

The EU also has taken on an increasingly important role in foreign affairs, especially in the area of humanitarian and development assistance. The EU's foreign aid budget for 1995-98 exceeds \$36 billion. This assistance reinforces many important U.S. interests. For example, the EU is the largest donor of grant assistance to the countries of central and eastern Europe -- \$7.3 billion during the period 1990-94 -- and has a similarly large assistance program for the former Soviet Union to help promote democracy and free market reforms. EU aid also supports U.S. efforts to bring stability and prosperity to the Middle East, the former Yugoslavia, Albania, and Central Africa.

DRAFT

FACT SHEET

THE NEW TRANSATLANTIC AGENDA

The New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA), launched in December 1995, provides a framework for managing and enlarging U.S. cooperation with the EU, as a whole, through a regular consultative process involving the EU Presidency country and the European Commission. The NTA lays out an ambitious agenda for expanding cooperation on promoting peace and stability, democracy, and development around the world; responding to global challenges; contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations; and "building bridges" between Americans and Europeans.

A key element of the U.S.- EU worldwide partnership is intensified diplomatic cooperation. The U.S. and EU are, for example, working together to support reconstruction and reconciliation in Bosnia and to promote needed reform in

Ukraine. The U.S. also is working with the EU to reinforce political and economic cooperation with Turkey and has encouraged dialogue among the parties in the Middle East Peace Process. The EU has joined the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization to help the U.S., Japan, and South Korea prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons technology. The U.S. and EU have worked closely to meet humanitarian needs in Africa.

The U.S. and EU have undertaken several new initiatives to expand cooperation on law enforcement, counternarcotics, environmental degradation, and health issues. Consultations have spurred development of a successful joint counternarcotics program in the Caribbean, planned exchanges of law enforcement officials, and an initiative to combat trafficking in women in central Europe and the New Independent States. Consultations to fight organized crime have been intensified.

Joint U.S. and EU trade efforts are helping to reduce transatlantic barriers and support the multilateral trading system. The U.S. and EU are working closely to conclude the WTO financial services negotiations and have concluded negotiations on a package of mutual recognition agreements on product testing, inspections, and other procedures, covering \$50 billion in U.S.-EU trade. Work is underway to further deepen regulatory cooperation while assuring high standards of protection for consumers. The governments are cooperating closely with the Transatlantic Business Dialogue, a U.S.-European business partnership, to address a wide range of trade barriers important to the business community. The U.S. and EU are finalizing an initiative to combat sweatshop conditions around the globe.

A key part of the agenda is a fourth chapter dealing with "building bridges" between the different constituencies in the transatlantic community. Following

up on the successful May 1997 "Bridging the Atlantic" conference, the U.S. and EU are working closely with NGOs to launch the Internet-based Transatlantic Information Exchange Service, a transatlantic digital library project linking the Library of Congress with key European and U.S. libraries, new parliamentary exchanges and electronic linkages, and new civil society initiatives in central Europe and the New Independent States. At the December 5, 1997, U.S.-EU Summit, the governments will sign the first U.S.-EU agreement to promote cooperation between scientists and scientific institutions.

###

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/5/97 6:53:36 PM
FROM Crowley, Philip J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT DAILY GUIDANCE UPDATE [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Abdulmalik, April B.
Akers, Dale W.
Albert, Ronda A.
Amiri, Rukhsana N.
Andreasen, Steven P.
Antholis, William J.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Bader, Jeffrey A.
Baker, James E.
Baker, Jane E.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Bandler, Donald K.
Barks-Ruggles, Erica
Battenfield, Pat A.
Beers, Rand R.
Behring, Deanna M.
Bell, Robert G.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bemisderfer, Dwight D.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Birkland, Andrea L.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bobbitt, Philip C.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boone, Sherman G.
Bouchard, Joseph F.
Braden, Susan R.
Branscum, Sean D.
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Brooks, Jennifer M.
Bryan, Dave L.
Burrell, Christina L.
Busby, Scott W.
Busick, Paul E.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Campanella, Anthony
Caravelli, John M.
Chastain, George M.
Cicio, Kristen K.

Clark, Bronya H.
Clarke, Richard A.
Collier, Dorothy A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Cosgriff, Kevin J.
Countryman, Thomas M.
Courtney, William H.
Covey, James P.
Crowder, Stevan D.
Crowell, Thomas R.
Crowley, Philip J.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Davies, Glyn T.
Davis, William K.
Dean, Susan W.
DeLaurentis, Jeffrey J.
DeRosa, Mary B.
DeSouza, Patrick J.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dobbins, James F.
Dollar, Carolyn J.
Dowling, John N. (Nick)
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Durham, Robert J.
Edwards, Joan K.
Elkon, Nicole L.
Epstein, Gerald L.
Erdahl, Douglas M.
Feeley, John F.
Ficklin, John W.
Figueredo, Orlando
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Fooks, Michael D.
Ford, Robert G.
Fort, Jane B.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Fung, Mark T.
Gagnon, James M.
George, Christopher L.
Glick, Bonnie L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy E.
Greer, Jason H.
Gregory, Susan J.
Haines, Mary A.
Hale, John E.
Hall, James A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Harris, Elisa D.
Harris, Karen

Harrison, Lyle M.
Hasman, Thomas M.
Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Hawley, Leonard R.
Helweg, M. Diana
Heyl, Phillip J.
Higgins, David B.
Highsmith, Newell L.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hillman, Thomas W.
Hofmann, Karl W.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Huggins, Peter
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Hurwitz, Marc I.
Jansen, Christian P.
Johnson, David T.
Jones, Kerri-Ann D.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Kiernan, Gerald P.
Kinser-Kidane, Brenda J.
Knepper, Charlotte
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Kyle, Robert D.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Langley, Janice M.
Lawrence, Cynthia
Leary, William H.
Leavy, David C.
Lee, Malcolm R.
Letts, Kelly J.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
MacDonald, Bruce W.
Malley, Robert
Marsh, Thomas S
Marshall, Betty A.
Marty, Joseph H.
Matera, Michael A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McCarthy, Mary O.
McClellan, Christina L.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian T.
Metzl, Jamie F.

Millison, Cathy L.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoaka, Lester H.
Motherway, Daniel J.
Mueller, William (Doug)
Naplan, Steven J.
Neil, M. Elise
O'Shaughnessy, Patrick
Panerali, Kristen E.
Papadimitriou, Marianna
Pascual, Carlos E.
Payne, Raymond H.
Pedersen, Amy F.
Peterson, G. Deane
Piccone, Theodore J.
Poole, Jennifer C.
Porter, Pete
Prendergast, John P.
Prise, Edith M.
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ragan, Richard F.
Rathke, Jeffrey D.
Rice, Edward A.
Rice, Sean P.
Riedel, Bruce O.
Rinaldi, Steven M.
Roach, Darren S.
Rosa, Frederick M.
Rossi, Christopher R.
Roundtree, Beverly
Rubin, Eric S.
Rudman, Mara E.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Samore, Gary S.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Sandalow, David B.
Sanders, Robin R.
Sapiro, Miriam E.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Sherman, David J.
Sigler, Ralph H.
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Smith, James A.
Smith, Michael P.
Snyder, Julie A.

Soderberg, Nancy E.
Soubers, Richard R.
Sparks, John E.
Storey, Sharon V.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sulser, Jack A.
Todd, Gwenyth E.
Tucker, Maureen E.
Unrue, Michael
Verville, Elizabeth G.
Wadsworth, Valon J. (Val)
Ward, JoAnn
Wechsler, William F.
Widmer, Edward L.
Williams, Mary C.
Wilson, Joseph C.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.
Wright, Joseph (Larry)
Yokum, Jeffrey G.
Babcock, Douglas W.
Bolan, Christopher J.
Boulton, Darrien D.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Hamel, Michael A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Hilty, Joanne M.
Jordan, Donald L.
Norris, John J.
Orfini, Michael H.
Roberts, Michael W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Storey, Sharon V.
Woolston, Ann E.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Please update by 10 am Monday. Thanks and have a good weekend.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Dec5guide.doc
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

December 5, 1997

US-EU Summit

Iraq

Haiti

Landmines

Meetings with Japanese Foreign Minister Obuchi

Bosnia

Northern Ireland

Human Rights Day

Russia: Yeltsin Comments

Ron Brown Crash

US-EU SUMMIT

Dec. 5, 1997

- * President was delighted to welcome two distinguished Luxemburgers, both in service of European Union.
- * U.S. relations with Luxembourg are strong, reflecting our overall European relationship. We appreciate PM Juncker's leadership during Luxembourg's EU presidency, moving the Union forward in areas of common interest.
- * Past six months of our mutual agenda have been particularly fruitful, especially on diplomatic front in important areas such as Ukraine, Middle East.
- * We (Talbot) signed a Science agreement today at Blair House, as well as collaborating on cutting-edge electronic commerce and working to find solutions to trade disagreements.
- * Also cooperating in fighting transborder scourges of crime, trafficking in

women.

* We discussed common interests in preventing spread of weapons of mass destruction, promoting human rights and democracy in such places as Iran and Cuba. We share common goals, but don't always see eye-to-eye on the means. We will work together to manage these differences with our friends and partners, but the EU knows that we are also committed to enforcing our laws.

* Europe undergoing dramatic transformation. The EU is tackling unemployment, deepening integration via EMU, expanding to bring in new members in Central and Southeastern Europe, Baltic regions. Likewise, our relationship with the EU is deepening, expanding.

DRAFT

FACT SHEET

U.S.-EUROPEAN UNION RELATIONS

With the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has sought to strengthen its partnership with the European Union (EU) as part of a broader effort to build a New Atlantic Community and a New Transatlantic Marketplace.

The U.S. and the EU share the goal of promoting a healthy, open commercial relationship and strong multilateral economic institutions. The U.S. supports greater European political and economic integration and ongoing EU efforts to enlarge to include central and east European and Baltic states. This process of integration and enlargement contributes to a more stable and prosperous Europe, an objective that is also an important U.S. national interest. It should proceed, however, without creating new trade barriers.

Since December 1995, the New Transatlantic Agenda has provided the framework for enhanced political and economic cooperation between the U.S. and the EU. The President meets semiannually with the EU leadership. At today's summit meetings, the U.S. and EU blessed new initiatives to promote needed reform in Ukraine and combat illegal trafficking in women in central Europe and the New Independent States.

In addition, since the last U.S.-EU Summit, negotiations on mutual recognition of testing procedures in telecommunications, pharmaceuticals, and electrical machinery, and other sectors, covering \$50 billion in trade, were completed. The U.S. and EU are working closely with the Transatlantic Business Dialogue to address barriers to trade. Following the successful "Bridging the Atlantic" Conference, the U.S. and EU worked closely with NGOs to launch the Internet-based Transatlantic Information Exchange Service, an important digital library project, and an exchange program involving the U.S. Congress and European parliaments. The U.S. and EU signed a science and technology agreement that will promote closer cooperation between our scientists and provide new opportunities for collaboration on cutting-edge issues.

The EU is the United States' largest economic partner, its largest investment partner, and second-largest trading partner. Total U.S.-EU trade was \$270 billion in 1996, up from \$256 billion in 1995. This two-way trade supports six million jobs directly on both sides of the Atlantic and accounts for 44% of U.S. foreign direct investment. By the end of 1995, the EU had more than \$315 billion invested in the United States, and the United States had more than \$320 billion invested in the EU. Investment in Europe supports hundreds of thousands of U.S. manufacturing jobs. European companies are the number one investor

in 41 of 50

U.S. States and number two in the remaining nine.

The EU also has taken on an increasingly important role in foreign affairs, especially in the area of humanitarian and development assistance. The EU's foreign aid budget for 1995-98 exceeds \$36 billion. This assistance reinforces many important U.S. interests. For example, the EU is the largest donor of grant assistance to the countries of central and eastern Europe -- \$7.3 billion during the period 1990-94 -- and has a similarly large assistance program for the former Soviet Union to help promote democracy and free market reforms. EU aid also supports U.S. efforts to bring stability and prosperity to the Middle East, the former Yugoslavia, Albania, and Central Africa.

DRAFT

FACT SHEET

THE NEW TRANSATLANTIC AGENDA

The New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA), launched in December 1995, provides a framework for managing and enlarging U.S. cooperation with the EU, as a whole, through a regular consultative process involving the EU Presidency country and the European Commission. The NTA lays out an ambitious agenda for expanding cooperation on promoting peace and stability, democracy, and development around the world; responding to global challenges; contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations; and "building bridges" between Americans and Europeans.

A key element of the U.S. - EU worldwide partnership is intensified diplomatic cooperation. The U.S. and EU are, for example, working together to support reconstruction and reconciliation in Bosnia and to promote needed reform in

Ukraine. The U.S. also is working with the EU to reinforce political and economic cooperation with Turkey and has encouraged dialogue among the parties in the Middle East Peace Process. The EU has joined the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization to help the U.S., Japan, and South Korea prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons technology. The U.S. and EU have worked closely to meet humanitarian needs in Africa.

The U.S. and EU have undertaken several new initiatives to expand cooperation on law enforcement, counternarcotics, environmental degradation, and health issues. Consultations have spurred development of a successful joint counternarcotics program in the Caribbean, planned exchanges of law enforcement officials, and an initiative to combat trafficking in women in central Europe and the New Independent States. Consultations to fight organized crime have been intensified.

Joint U.S. and EU trade efforts are helping to reduce transatlantic barriers and support the multilateral trading system. The U.S. and EU are working closely to conclude the WTO financial services negotiations and have concluded negotiations on a package of mutual recognition agreements on product testing, inspections, and other procedures, covering \$50 billion in U.S.-EU trade. Work is underway to further deepen regulatory cooperation while assuring high standards of protection for consumers. The governments are cooperating closely with the Transatlantic Business Dialogue, a U.S.-European business partnership, to address a wide range of trade barriers important to the business community. The U.S. and EU are finalizing an initiative to combat sweatshop conditions around the globe.

A key part of the agenda is a fourth chapter dealing with "building bridges" between the different constituencies in the transatlantic community. Following

up on the successful May 1997 "Bridging the Atlantic" conference, the U.S. and EU are working closely with NGOs to launch the Internet-based Transatlantic Information Exchange Service, a transatlantic digital library project linking the Library of Congress with key European and U.S. libraries, new parliamentary exchanges and electronic linkages, and new civil society initiatives in central Europe and the New Independent States. At the December 5, 1997, U.S.-EU Summit, the governments will sign the first U.S.-EU agreement to promote cooperation between scientists and scientific institutions.

###

Iraq
December 5, 1997

Q: Did the Administration pass a secret message to the Iraqis that the U.S. would not launch airstrikes against Iraq if it allowed UNSCOM to inspect visit sensitive sites?

* This is, as Sandy Berger said, total and complete nonsense. It is also naive.

* Prior to Iraq's decision to allow USNCOM inspectors back into Iraq, the Administration made it clear from every podium in town that the only way Iraq could end the crisis was to allow UNSCOM the access for which it asked.

* The Administration actively pursued diplomatic means to gain Iraq's reversal, but never ruled out potential use of force as an option if Iraq continued to stall.

* It was clear to anyone paying attention that, if Iraq wanted to eliminate the possibility of the crisis coming to use of force, the clear way to do it was to

allow UNSCOM inspectors in.

* With this clear message appearing in every news outlet in the Western world, this was not a message we needed to relay quietly to the Russians.

* How the Russians portrayed Russian-U.S. discussions is of course up to the Russians. But no secret message to Iraq from us, and no secret commitments beyond the very public statements we made.

HAITI: U.S. TROOP PRESENCE
December 5, 1997

Q: What has the President decided about the U.S. troop presence in Haiti?

The President has determined that the current U.S. posture in Haiti is appropriate and should continue for the time being.

Q: What does this mean? What is our posture?

Since the departure of the last of our peacekeeping forces early in 1996, the U.S. has conducted periodic deployments of engineering and medical units to Haiti for exercises purposes. These training exercises, similar to those we conduct in other friendly countries around the world, provide valuable training opportunities, contribute to Haiti's development, and serve as a visible manifestation of continued U.S. support for Haiti's democratic and economic development.

Q: How many U.S. troops are there?

The number varies, depending on the exercises underway at any given time. A small core of forces organized as the U.S. Support Group, Haiti, provides logistical and planning support to the troops arriving for exercises. Over the past year, the U.S. troop presence has averaged between 400 and 500.

Q: What about the future?

We intend to continue to conduct training exercises and deployments at approximately the same pace as we have maintained over the past year.

Q: What about force protection?

As is the case elsewhere, U.S. forces provide for their own force protection. The number of personnel involved in force protection varies from month to month depending on the activities our forces are undertaking, at the determination of the responsible military commanders.

Q: Will force protection increase as a result of the UN troop withdrawal?

The responsible military commanders will determine the necessary level of force protection on an ongoing basis, which will vary depending on the exact nature of the training which is taking place at any given moment. In the coming months, force protection levels are likely to increase, as a result of the departure of UN troops.

Q: Has the Government of Haiti requested our presence? Don't we need their agreement?

We have an ongoing dialogue with the Haitian Government to identify and agree upon appropriate training projects for our forces. This dialogue will continue as we identify projects for the coming months.

Q: Is there some overarching agreement covering U.S. forces?

Our Status of Forces Agreement with Haiti, which addresses the usual issues associated with the deployment of U.S. troops overseas and is similar to such agreements we have elsewhere in the region, remains valid.

Q: Do U.S. forces have an implicit security mission? Are they a "tripwire"?

The President has made clear that our forces in Haiti have no security

mission,
other than their own force protection. They are not a tripwire, nor do they have any role in maintaining public order in Haiti.

The United Nations is continuing its peacekeeping mission in Haiti in the form of 300 civilian police, some 40 of whom are Americans. This UN civilian police unit has the mission of mentoring and advising the Haitian National Police. The U.S. military has no mission in this regard.

ANTI-PERSONNEL LANDMINES

December 5, 1997

* There are two changes we sought in Oslo that would have allowed us to sign but unfortunately were not accepted. The first was an adequate transition period. The second was protection of our mixed systems containing anti-tank mines protected by anti-personnel submunitions.

* I want to reiterate the policy of the President on anti-personnel landmines, which he announced on September 17. The President has directed the Department of Defense to end the use of all anti-personnel landmines outside Korea by 2003, including those that self-destruct. For Korea, the objective is to have alternatives to anti-personnel landmines ready by 2006. DoD is now embarked on a program to develop new systems that will permit meeting those deadlines.

* Assuming we do in fact find alternatives by 2006 (which is the transition period we proposed in Oslo), we would still be faced with the fact that the treaty as now written bans our mixed munitions -- our anti-tank mines. The anti-personnel submunitions in those systems quickly self-destruct so as to pose very little risk to non-combatants. However, the treaty as now written bans our principal anti-tank systems, but not those of our allies.

* We have not yet found a viable concept for replacing these systems with an alternative that is comparable in terms of military effectiveness, safety of use, and minimal risks for non-combatants, which is why we were unable at Oslo to agree to a date certain for ending their use under the treaty as now written.

* If we succeed in identifying a comparable alternative for our mixed systems, it would put us in a position to sign the Ottawa Convention as soon as we have also developed our alternatives for Korea.

FOREIGN MINISTER OBUCHI MEETINGS December 5, 1997

* The Foreign Minister took this opportunity while he was in North America (to sign the Ottawa Convention on Anti-Personnel Landmines) to visit Washington for the first time as Foreign Minister, since assuming his post in September.

* He met with the Vice President. They discussed Kyoto and other issues.

* He met with APNSA Berger and the two discussed a wide range of issues, to include economic and security matters.

BOSNIA December 4, 1997

NATO Defense Ministerial/Bosnia

* Secretary Cohen has been meeting with his NATO counterparts in Brussels yesterday and today to review a range of Alliance issues, including Bosnia.

* They endorsed the recommendation of NATO military authorities that the force size remain at current levels until the Alliance makes a decision on a

possible
follow-on force.

* NATO military authorities have been asked to study a range of possible security options after June 1998, but no decisions have been made about a possible NATO mission or what the U.S. role should be.

Cohen/SACEUR Comments on post-SFOR/Police

* As we said following meetings with Congress last month, there is a developing sense that some form of international military presence will be needed post-June, but no decisions have been made about what form that should take or what the U.S. role should be.

* Secretary Cohen and General Clark's statements echo that view.

* A key aspect of improving security in Bosnia is strengthening public safety through restructuring police forces and establishment of a proper judicial system. Both Secretary Cohen and General Clark emphasized the need for the international community to do more in these areas.

Iranian Influence

* We remain concerned about Iranian influence and continue to watch the situation closely. We take all reports regarding this issue seriously, including the uncorroborated allegations reported by the New York Times.

* We have enforced the Dayton agreement ban on foreign forces and insisted that Bosnian government sever all military and intelligence links with Iran as a condition of the train and equip program. Those conditions were met and there are no indications that military or intelligence cooperation has resumed.

* We remain in close contact with the Bosnian leadership regarding allegations of

Iranian activity and remain firm with them on this issue.

* There is no need to spy on train and equip program -- it is an open and transparent program.

* Overall, we and the intelligence community assess that Iranian influence has substantially diminished since the implementation of Dayton because of the firm U.S. position we have taken with the Bosnian leadership.

Republika Srpska Assembly Elections

Background: RS Assembly elections were held last weekend without incident.

Turnout was reported as low in many areas, but no results are available (Pale

Serbs have released some self-serving unofficial results - disregard).

OSCE

estimates that official results will be available by December 10.

* Want to congratulate the Bosnian Serb people for taking another step toward democracy and electing a new Republika Srpska Assembly.

* Balloting was completed without incident. Thanks to the OSCE for organizing and supervising these successful elections on short notice, with support from SFOR, IPTF, OHR and other international organizations.

* No results are yet available due to absentee balloting . We do not expect official results for several weeks.

Are you taking sides? Has the SFOR mandate changed?

* We are for the active, consistent implementation of Dayton. That doesn't mean just trying to just defuse disputes between those who want to cooperated with Dayton and those who won't. It means supporting those who support Dayton and resisting those who are undermining it.

* It means standing up to those who attempt to provoke SFOR or who try to break down the secure environment which SFOR must help maintain under

Dayton.

* We intend to play our part squarely and resolutely. The parties will decide for themselves which side they are on -- and whether they will get the active support of the allies and the international community, or be made to bear consequences.

Are Plavsic forces gaining control?

* President Plavsic has been gaining strength. Most of the police and many other local officials and community leaders in Western RS have broken away from Pale and are now performing their duties under the authority of the elected President.

* Thousands of Bosnian Serbs have taken to the streets of different cities in Republika Srpska in support of President Plavsic. The Bosnian Serb people are clearly fed up with the corruption and repression of the Karadzic wing in Pale. This was most vividly demonstrated when the Pale hard-line leadership was pelted with debris as they fled Banja Luka following their failed attempt to hold a rally.

* We should be encouraged by the challenge to the Pale leadership in RS because it is over exactly the right reasons -- whether to cooperate with Dayton. More cooperative Bosnian Serb leadership will make a big difference in our efforts to build a lasting peace.

SFOR take-over Pale controlled transmitters

* We will not tolerate broadcasts of propaganda that incite violence or that create a dangerous environment. SFOR has taken control of five SRT transmitters because the Pale-controlled media violated agreements not to broadcast dangerous

messages.

* SFOR will continue to take action to keep Pale SRT off the air until the SRT network is restructured along international standards of journalism and can no longer be a tool of the Pale hard-liners for anti-SFOR and anti-Dayton propaganda.

* In the interim, we expect Banja Luka SRT will have increased coverage to most, if not all of Republika Srpska. Banja Luka SRT and independent television in Republika Srpska should give the Bosnian Serb people access to news and views representing all major political viewpoints.

* These actions were in accordance with NATO decisions and paragraph 70 of the Sintra Declaration that authorized the High Representative and SFOR to take action against media in blatant contravention of the letter or spirit of the Dayton agreement.

War Criminals Operation?

* We continue to remain deeply concerned with the presence of war criminals in Bosnia, including Karadzic.

* We continue to press the Parties to live up to their obligation to turn over war criminals. The recent surrender of ten Bosnian Croat war criminals demonstrates that our continued pressure is yielding results.

* We will not be satisfied until all war criminals are delivered to the Hague. We are considering a full range of options to facilitate delivery of war criminals to the International Tribunal. No new decisions have been made, at NATO or otherwise.

* SFOR is authorized to detain war criminals encountered in the course of its regular duties and if the tactical situation permits. The SFOR operation to

detain war criminals in Prijedor conformed to this mandate. Any indicted war criminal would be subject to detention (if pressed, cannot comment on possible future operations)

NORTHERN IRELAND
December 3, 1997

PEACE PROCESS

Q: U.S. Position on the Belfast Talks?

A: Our position has consistently been that the only way forward to a lasting and just peace in Northern Ireland is through inclusive political negotiations. We strongly support the efforts of the British and Irish governments to build a process which includes all the parties, such as exists now. We have no view of what the right outcome in the talks should be -- that is for the parties to decide. But the President is firmly committed to encouraging and supporting those who take risks for peace as is happening this very minute in Northern Ireland. We will make every effort to back them up as they deal with the difficult and emotional issues involved.

The President was heartened by recent reports from Belfast on steps in the talks process (background: the parties agreed to set up a small working group consisting of two senior reps from each party charged with identifying key issues and reporting back in two weeks. The talks go into recess December 17.) The talks, which started in earnest at the end of October, are historic in the sense that all the major strands of Northern Ireland political life are represented at one venue for the first time in 75 years, and that a double cease fire is in effect. This opens the way to a very different future for the people in Northern Ireland. The leaders of the unionists and the nationalists showed determination

and courage in reaching this stage where people are beginning to speculate whether an outline of a settlement might be achievable already this month.

We are under no illusion, given the history, that the road ahead will be easy or predictable, but the talks offer the best chance in the last 27 years to find an acceptable, just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

In particular, I want to note our pride in the role played by Senator Mitchell in chairing the talks.

In addition to our role as cheerleaders for the peace process, the President's White House Economic Initiative for Northern Ireland continues to play a role in encouraging investment and creating job opportunities for young people so that they can have a stake in the prosperity that peace is bringing. The President named Jim Lyons as his Special Advisor to coordinate the economic initiative, which features trade missions, contributions to the International Fund for Ireland and community building efforts.

Q: Unionists not engaging?

A: We have met with representatives of all the parties, including Gerry Adams, David Trimble and Gary McMichaels. We hope to see John Hume here soon. We are encouraged that UUP is participating in the talks with Sinn Fein -- a development made possible with the IRA cease fire and Sinn Fein's subscribing to the Mitchell Principles of non-violence in the talks process.

Q: Arms decommissioning?

A: The Independent Commission has presented a draft to the governments on arms decommissioning. The President has seconded to that Commission, which operates under the authority of the UK and Irish governments, a senior American diplomat, Donald Johnson. He is based in Dublin and is one of three members of

the Commission. Decommissioning is an essential element of an overall settlement.

Q: First Lady's visit to Belfast?

A: Hillary Rodham Clinton visited Belfast and the United Kingdom at the end of October, almost two years after the President's and her visit there. She received a warm and enthusiastic welcome from the participants in a lecture at the University of Ulster in honor of the late community activist Joyce McCartan and at a Conference on youth in Northern Ireland.

DEPORTATIONS

Q: The Administration's decision to suspend deportation proceedings for a number of IRA members?

A: The AG suspended deportation proceedings in September against a number of persons in the U.S. with a history of IRA activity, based on a recommendation from the Secretary of State. All of those persons completed prison terms and none are wanted by the British. Our hope was that the suspension would serve to encourage those engaged in peaceful negotiations. This step was taken in connection with the renewal today of the Belfast all-party talks, at which Sinn Fein signed up to the Mitchell Principles. This is in addition to the renewal of the IRA cease-fire July 14. Our goal was to encourage those engaged in peaceful negotiations.

Q: What happens if the IRA breaks the cease-fire? Will we go ahead with the deportation efforts?

A: It is our expectation that the IRA cease-fire will not be broken. We are not going to speculate on a hypothetical situation except to say there is no going back to old patterns of violence. We are committed to helping

those parties who follow exclusively peaceful, democratic means to achieve political change.

Q: Isn't this caving into terrorism? These people are convicted terrorists. Some of them are murderers. How do you justify this action at a time when the Administration is seeking to strengthen action against international terrorism?

A: I want to emphasize that this action does not constitute an approval of these individuals' past acts of terrorism, for which they were convicted and served prison sentences. Nor do we accept the legal arguments against deportation advanced in some of their cases. We want to demonstrate that we when people renounce violence, we will respond. As long as the IRA cease-fire holds, there will be a suspension of deportation efforts.

Q: Isn't this just pandering to the Irish-American vote?

A: Irish Americans, indeed all Americans, are keenly interested in seeing a Northern Ireland which is at peace. The Administration has supported a peace process since its first day and is prepared to support all those who are prepared to renounce violence in the pursuit of a lasting settlement.

Q: What was the reaction of the British government. Doesn't this cause problems for them?

A: None of these individuals are wanted by the British. They have long since served their sentences and been released. London has not asked that these persons be returned to the United Kingdom. We feel that returning them against their will would be counterproductive to the peace process.

Q: Why aren't the three Irish persons awaiting extradition covered by this?

A: We are obligated by international treaty and other considerations to

continue
the extradition process. The three individuals involved escaped from
prison in
the United Kingdom, and thus have not completed their sentences.

IRA CEASE FIRE

Q: During your meeting with David Trimble earlier this year, he said
you assured
him that Sinn Fein/IRA would not get "a third bite at the apple." What
you mean
by that?

A: We have been very clear since the announcement in July of the
renewed IRA
cease fire that we accepted it as unequivocal, expected it to hold, and
that
there would be serious consequences if there was a resumption of
violence --
there is no going back. We undertook a number of confidence
building measures in
response to the cease fire to help build support for the peace process,
including
visas for Sinn Fein representatives and suspension of deportation
proceedings for
a number of former IRA members.

The cease fire has held firmly, as recognized by the British
government which
found it genuine in word and deed August 30. Subsequently Sinn Fein
signed up
the Mitchell principles governing the talks process. We remain
committed to
helping those parties who are now following exclusively peaceful,
democratic
means to achieve political change.

Q: What will happen to the IRA/Sinn Fein if the cease fire breaks
down? How will
you punish them? Would you resume deportation efforts?

A: We are not going to speculate on hypothetical situations except to
say there
is no going back to old patterns of violence. The IRA cease fire has
held
firmly, allowing the authorities in Northern Ireland to adjust security
measures
appropriately. Sinn Fein is participating as a full member in the talks,
which

are beginning to show promise.

Q: Non-designation of IRA as Foreign Terrorist Organization?

A: Secretary Albright, in light of the British determination that the IRA cease fire was good both in word and deed, did not designate the IRA as a foreign organization actively engaged in terrorism. We have made clear that a resumption of violence would be immediately factored in the Secretary's review.

HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

December 4, 1997

* Human Rights Day on December 10 is particularly significant this year as it will kick off a year-long 50th anniversary celebration for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948-98) -- a cornerstone of the international human rights regime.

* To mark this occasion, POTUS will participate in an evening reception on December 9 sponsored by the US/UN Mission at the Museum of Jewish Heritage in New York. He will give brief remarks. The event will be attended by prominent governmental and nongovernmental figures involved in the promotion and protection of human rights.

* On December 10, FLOTUS will give a keynote speech at a UN-hosted event aimed at officially launching the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The event will begin at 10 a.m. in the ECOSOC chamber at the UN and will include governmental and nongovernmental representatives as well as the media.

RUSSIA: YELTSIN COMMENTS

December 5, 1997

What is your reaction to President Yeltsin's conventional arms reduction proposals for Russia's northwest region?

-- Aware Yeltsin called for broad defense-military reform, to include downsizing of Russian conventional forces; this is in keeping with trends elsewhere, fits with the vastly-different and improved security environment throughout Europe. Would like to see more of the details.

-- Makes sense as part of Russia's transition to democracy and market economy; would expect such a new Russian military to contribute to enhanced security throughout Europe, including in Baltic-Nordic region -- this very much in spirit of NATO-Russian partnership, PFP.

-- Meanwhile, U.S. continues to encourage and support dialogue and cooperation among Russia and its Baltic and Nordic neighbors on wide range of issues, including security matters.

If asked:

Confidence Building Measures

Yeltsin also called for a number of ideas on arms control and confidence-building measures, some of which we have seen before.

-- As we have indicated before, we are willing to explore confidence-building measures for conventional forces that are acceptable to all states concerned and contribute concretely to regional security.

Security guarantees

Yeltsin repeated previous proposals on joint security guarantees for the Baltic states.

-- In accordance with OSCE principles, we support the right of states to choose their security orientation. The Baltic states have made clear they are

not interested in joint security guarantees; they aspire to join NATO. The U.S. welcomes these aspirations and supports the efforts by the Baltic states to realize them.

-- For its part, U.S. will reaffirm its enduring interest in the independence and security of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by signing a Charter of Partnership with those countries on January 16. Charter is a statement of common principles that will guide the deepening of mutual cooperation and advance common objectives, including Baltic integration into the European and transatlantic communities.

SECRETARY RON BROWN CRASH CONSPIRACY
December 5, 1997

The Washington Times noted that an Air Force deputy medical examiner said he believed former Commerce Secretary Ron Brown may have suffered a head wound from a .45 caliber gun (rather than from the 1996 plane crash in Croatia) and that this possibility "deserved further investigation."

* The head of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, and the pathologist at the crash scene who conducted the postmortem examination do not support the Air Force officer's claim.

* Further, they have both said the individual who made this statement did not arrive at the crash scene until five days after the crash and did not participate in the postmortem exam.

* There was a thorough investigation in the immediate wake of the crash and the evidence does not support the claim that Secretary Brown died from a .45 caliber gunshot wound.

