

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1997 09:07:46.57

SUBJECT: briefing with Tarullo and Steinberg and McCurry

TO: Darby E. Stott (Darby E. Stott@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J) Autoforward to: Remote Adresse
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patricia F. Lewis (LEWIS_PF) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan C. Moloney (MOLONEY_M) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan Murchinson (MURCHINSON_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christa Robinson (ROBINSON_C) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Roger V. Salazar (SALAZA_R) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard Socarides (SOCARIDES_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addr
READ:NOT READ

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
READ:28-MAY-1997 13:02:59.90

TO: William H. White, Jr. (William H. White Jr.@eop@lngtwy@eopmrX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
see attachment

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:28-MAY-1997 09:02:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD
MORE
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(The Hague, Netherlands)

For Immediate Release

May 28, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING

BY

DEPUTY NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR JAMES STEINBERG
AND ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR INTERNATIONAL
ECONOMIC AFFAIRS AT THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL DAN TARULLO,
AND PRESS SECRETARY MIKE MCCURRY

The Carlton Hotel
The Netherlands

1:13 P.M. (L)

MR. MCCURRY: We'd like to get started with this briefing, which is on the record, except for those portions that one senior administration official will put ON BACKGROUND AT HIS OWN DISCRETION. So our two briefers on the record, James Steinberg, the Deputy National Security Advisor to the President; Dan Tarullo, Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs at the National Economic Council .

Jim wants to do a little overview and go through some of the aspects of the U.S.

□

-EU Summit that occurred today, and then Dan wants to talk specifically about the Mutual Recognition Agreements, understandings reached in the very wee hours of this morning.

Take it away, James.

MR. STEINBERG: Thank you, sir. Well, we've just concluded another very successful U.S.

□

-EU Summit. The effort that this represents sort of comes out of the agreements that the President reached with the EU in Madrid about a year and a half ago to try to strengthen the range of our cooperation with the EU, and it really is a parallel to a number of the other efforts that are taking place as a part of both strengthening the U.S. link to Europe and also building the structures for cooperation

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

for the 21st century.

The tradition in these summits since Madrid has been to divide the discussions into four broad baskets: foreign policy issues, the first; global and transnational challenges; the economic issues and the new transatlantic marketplace; and

□

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

finally, cultural, social, educational contacts and ties. And

today there was a lot of discussion in each of these four areas.

I think the most important thing coming out of today's summit was the sense that the cooperation and the interaction that takes place in these summits now is not limited to or even necessarily focused solely on bilateral issues between the United States and the EU, but rather on how the United States and the European Union and the European Union countries can cooperate on broader global and international issues. And that was really reflected in the two agreements that were signed today -- the agreement on chemical precursors and the customs agreement, which really represent an attempt to deal with some of these new security challenges.

Indeed, the President said at the meeting today that one of the things that we were engaged in here at the U.S.

□

-EU

Summit, in the NATO

□

-Russia event yesterday, and leading up towards Madrid, is creating the organization and the structure to deal with the real security challenges that were going to be facing in the 21st century.

And so a considerable part of the discussion focused on cooperation on issues like drugs, international crime, terrorism, and the like. In addition to the two agreements that were announced, the President and the EU leaders talked about strengthening ties between Europol and the United States as the Europeans themselves are strengthening the role of Europol in between the member nations.

You heard the President talk about on the international crime front a particular interest in dealing with the problem of traffic in women. They had a long discussion about -- as a preview to some upcoming events on environmental issues, particularly climate change, looking forward to the Denver summit, the U.N. General Assembly Special Session, and the Kyoto meeting on climate change.

As another example of the kind of international cooperation that comes out of these meetings was the decision by the EU to join the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization and to contribute \$100 million over the next five years, really shows again, coming out of this, working on global proliferation issues, not just bilateral issues.

As always is the case in these meetings, there was a discussion of a number of the more important foreign policy issues that we're all facing. The leaders reviewed the results of the NATO

□

-Russia summit and had a brief discussion of the events coming up in Madrid. They had a discussion of the status of the Middle East peace process; in particular the President was able to review for them a little bit about the meetings between Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Mubarak yesterday. They had a discussion about Iran and also about the Aegean; in

TOP ODD

- \p -

BOTTOM ODD

MORE

particular, the President expressing appreciation to the Dutch for their leadership in making sure that the association and the links between Turkey and the EU would remain open.

They discussed in some length a number of issues related to China, including the reversion of Hong Kong on July 1st, and the continued and shared interest that the United States and the EU countries have in a successful reversion of Hong Kong, and the respect for the Basic Agreement of 1984 that provided the terms for that reversion.

They discussed human rights and nonproliferation issues. They also discussed WTO and MFN, and Dan will have a word or two more on that in his part of the briefing.

They had a discussion on Helms

□

-Burton. In particular, the President stressed the need for the European Union countries to maintain the momentum on their efforts to support and promote democracy in Cuba. And they had a brief discussion on Bosnia, although they agreed to defer most of that discussion to the meetings that the EU leaders and Secretary Albright will be having in connection with the Bosnian ministerial that's going to be taking place in Portugal in two days' time.

As you can see, it was a fairly broad

□

-ranging discussion. And as I say, I think the most significant from our point of view was this renewed commitment by the EU to work with us on these transnational issues. We now have a new forum that's very important for trying to address these things by countries which are deeply affected by them.

Q Jim, can we ask a question?

MR. STEINBERG: Sure.

Q This is the second reference to traffic in women, you and the President, but I still have no idea what happened here so far as that subject is concerned.

MR. STEINBERG: It's a very serious subject, Barry, and I think you should --

Q Right, what are they going to do about it?

MR. STEINBERG: What they talked about was the fact that one of the concerns that they have both in terms of the impact on Western Europe but also in terms of Central and Eastern Europe is the impact of organized crime groups, sort of taking advantage of some of the uncertainties -- the economic uncertainties and the law enforcement uncertainties -- in the new democracies where, as a result of the transition, there is a lot of dislocation and there is very weak law enforcement links in those countries. And as a result, you're seeing international

organized crime groups in the Central European countries in Russia which are beginning to exploit the situation and traffic in women, largely focused on Western Europe. But it is sort of part of the more corrosive impact that really undermines confidences of those societies in the democratic and economic transformation.

And so as part of their general effort to increase their cooperation on international organized crime, this is one area that they thought was a particularly important area for focus.

Q What exactly is going on?

MR. STEINBERG: In terms of the trafficking? I mean, what you have is you have international organized crime groups in Russia and in some of the Central European countries which are in effect running prostitution rings, taking advantage of the fact that there is a lot of economic and social dislocation in these countries, and peddling and running these rings into Western Europe, and to some extent in Asia as well.

And this is, as I say -- I mean, it's both of a concern in the countries where these women are being sent to, because it creates social problems here, but also in terms of the impact on those countries in the sense that one of the adverse consequences of change is this kind of sense that people can be preyed on. And the same rackets that are involved in these things are often involved in drug

□

-trafficking, in arms

□

-trafficking and the like. It's a way of both getting at one particular law enforcement and social problem, but also as a part of the broader effort to coordinate, as I say, talking about greater U.S. police cooperation with Europol and a whole strategy to deal with international organized crime.

Q Did they agree to exchange information, or what?

MR. STEINBERG: Right, exchange information, to understand better what the networks are, and to work with the Central and East Europeans to strengthen their law enforcement efforts. The President recounted how, during his trip to Latvia right after the Russian troops left Latvia that the first request that he got from the Latvian authorities was for the United States to help establish an FBI office there. And there's a real sense that one of the things that we could do to help those societies -- you've heard a lot about the problems, obviously, of the crime and corruption in Russia and some of these other countries -- is to work with them to strengthen their own law enforcement so that their own citizens sense that they're not being preyed on.

Q Well, which countries in particular are you referring to, and are they taking women from other countries into these countries? You make it sound like there's some sort of changing movement here.

MR. STEINBERG: No, I think the largest concern is women coming out of the Central and East European countries, including parts of the former Soviet Union. Some focus on Western Europe, but there is also some evidence of that kind of trafficking going on in Asia as well.

So as I say, it's both a way of strengthening law enforcement and protection of women here in the West, but also making sure that they are not being exploited as part of the development of these new economies in the East.

Dan?

MR. TARULLO: The economic discussion in the meetings themselves actually was more focused on the subject of mutual recognition agreements which, as you know, was not an announced outcome of the summit. However, in discussions yesterday between Ambassador Barshefsky and Sir Leon Briton of the European Union, there was a breakthrough in what had been rather elongated negotiations over the course of the last year, and we now have in negotiations resolved all the major outstanding issues and expect that an agreement will be finalized hopefully within the next few days.

For those of you who haven't followed this sometimes arcane but in dollar terms big stakes issue, mutual recognition agreement allows a product or a manufacturing process to be assessed for conformity under the laws and regulations of one country based on the laws and regulations of another. So in practical terms, what that means here is that a piece of European telecommunications equipment that undergoes the relevant testing in Europe would be certified as conforming to any relevant standards in the United States as well.

It's important to indicate that this is not the approval of the product or the pharmaceutical itself, it's the approval of the process by which it's produced and the testing that's done to make sure that the product conforms to its stated standards.

The agreements, if they are finalized, will be in five sectors: telecommunications equipment, information technology products, pharmaceuticals, medical devices and recreational boats. The total value of two

□
-way trade between the United States and Europe in this area is close to \$50 billion a year. The businesses that produce these things on both sides of the Atlantic suggest that up to 10 percent of the cost of their product in one market can be attributable to duplicative testing and certification requirements, so the consumer savings can be quite significant.

As I say, we don't have an agreement yet, but I think it's important to emphasize a couple of things here. One, that this in no way undermines the capacity of U.S. regulatory agencies to inspect or test where they feel the health or safety of the American people is concerned. What it does do is to create a set of mutual procedures whereby testing results and testing procedures and approaches are understood better on both sides of the Atlantic and thus recognized by one

□
-another's testing authorities.

The discussion on economics was far ranging in a sense that it touched a number of topics, although most of them just for a couple of minutes both Presidents and the Prime Minister recounted the efforts that have been made to conclude the information technology agreement and the telecommunications agreements, both of which the U.S. and E.U., a year and a half ago, had undertaken to work together multilaterally to achieve.

The President also raised with his European counterparts the bananas case, which was a subject of discussion during his recent trip to the Caribbean. As you may know, the United States has won a WTO case against the European regime. It gives preferences on imports of certain bananas. The President indicated to his European counterparts that we would like to resolve the case in such a way that protects the interests of the Caribbean exporters while eliminating discrimination against other exporters. And he proposed that our trade authorities get together and over the course of the next month or month and a half before the Denver summit try to resolve the issue amicably.

There was also some talk about China MFN, as Jim mentioned. Here, there is an agreement between the two sides that the admission of China to the WTO is desirable, but that it must take place on terms that are consistent with commercial considerations, which is to say China meeting the normal rules of the game and providing meaningful market access.

The President also indicated in connection with some of the transatlantic bridging activities his interest in moving forward the transatlantic labor dialogue, and in that context perhaps trying to extend the sweatshops initiative that we've begun domestically to Europeans as well. And I think the European side indicated some interest in exploring that and will probably do so over the course -- between now and the next summit.

Finally, the President mentioned our continuing concern with biotechnology items and the hope that decisions on the importation or regulation of biotechnology items will be made in accordance with principles of sound science. This is a matter which, as you may know, has occasioned some dispute between the U.S. and Europe in recent months, with respect to some of our agricultural commodities. Most of those specific problems have been resolved, but it has made clear the need for broader talks to try to determine exactly what the framework for dealing with these problems is.

Q In this labor dialogue, where is or was or has been or continues to be the emphasis? Are you talking about minimum wage standards?

MR. TARULLO: No, here, as you may know, from the outset of the new transatlantic agenda, the businesses on both sides of the Atlantic have been pushing very strongly. They organized themselves before the governments organized. Once the new transatlantic agenda began, the AFL

□
-CIO in the United States indicated some interest in having a similar labor dialogue, and we worked them and with our European counterparts to set that up.

The agenda would be determined, obviously, by what the labor leaders on both sides are interested in. They have shown some interest in discussing changes in labor markets, maybe minimum wages, although I suspect more the ways in which workers need to respond in the more globalized economy to changes in the labor markets.

The President brought this up in connection with our own initiative domestically. It need not fit specifically into the labor dialogue.

Q That doesn't mix in with the corporations, which, of course, are enjoying the cheap labor they get in various parts of Europe. There is no --

MR. TARULLO: In various parts of Europe? In the European Union?

Q Yes, when you get into Central Europe, if they can get these goods manufactured in Central Europe they don't have to pay living wages, pretty much.

MR. TARULLO: Well, I'm not going to comment --

Q Forget the aside -- are the corporations part of this dialogue?

MR. TARULLO: In the United States, they most certainly are. The sweatshops initiative the President has initiated in the United States involves the companies themselves setting up voluntary methods for monitoring where their goods come from and the labor conditions in the places where they market. And that would be extended to Europe as well.

Q Can you give us a specific example of the MRAs, a real

□
-world example how that could save money to American consumers?

MR. TARULLO: Let me take a hypothetical example. Assume the agreements are in place and assume we have a medical

device, a diagnostic device, which is manufactured by a European company. The device itself is approved for use in the United States, but of course it has to be tested to be sure that it complies with any health and safety standards and also to make sure that it performs as it's supposed to, obviously. Reliability is extremely important in these cases.

Historically, different countries have developed different ways of testing, different kinds of standards, different approaches. You'd find one approach in Britain, another approach in Germany, another in Sweden, and another in the United States. They're not necessarily more or less rigorous than one another, but in technical terms they're different.

If you as the manufacturer have to comply with each of those four testing approaches, then you need to run your product through four different kinds of laboratory tests and submit four different kinds of results. Under what Europe has already done internally and what, with these agreements in place, we would be doing together, is in essence to say, any one set of testing approaches which indicates that the product is reliable and safe can be accepted on both sides of the Atlantic. And that means that companies don't have to pay the extra money for what should be redundant testing.

I just make the point again in passing, the FDA would retain the capacity whenever it felt necessary to conduct an on

□
-site inspection on its own. But I think their expectation and our expectation is that in most cases, this will work very smoothly because of understandings between the regulatory authorities on both sides of the Atlantic.

Q You're saying --

Q -- to harmonize the testing --

MR. TARULLO: No, the idea is not harmonize the testing, but the idea is to recognize the testing methods and certification methods in the other country subject always to the domestic statutory duties of the regulatory authorities.

Q You're saying they can use the other testing standards, but they don't necessarily have to?

MR. TARULLO: The expectation is that they will, but if the FDA had a question about whether those were adequate to meet public health and safety standards, then they could, on their own, inspect to make sure that the product was being produced adequately.

Q As a matter of practice, will we expect all of the signatories to then accept one set of standards or any other set of standards?

MR. TARULLO: That the mutual recognition will evolve over time. And, really, the purpose of this in a lot of ways is confidence

-building that the testing procedures in one country meet, achieve the same health and safety and public protection effects that the testing standards in another country do.

Did you have a question ma'am?

Q I'm just wondering if that means they would most likely just undergo one set of tests in whichever country they were manufactured in, or if they would still be tested in the United States.

MR. TARULLO: Remember, the product itself still

-

-if it requires certification like a new drug, it would still have to meet the normal FDA standards. The question of how it's manufactured once it's approved for usage is what this would apply to.

Any other questions?

Q Did you guys discuss Boeing/McDonnell

-Douglas?

MR. TARULLO: No. Boeing/McDonnell

-Douglas was not discussed in the sessions themselves. I think our position on this is well

-known, which is that the United States does not want to politicize an antitrust or competition policy decision

-making process. We don't want to see it politicized in the European

Union; it certainly won't be politicized in the United States. We just would hope that the decision will be made on the competition law merits.

Q Was it discussed privately then? Is that what you're trying to --

MR. TARULLO: Privately in this session? No, it wasn't discussed in the small meeting, either. I'm saying there have been numerous contacts between U.S. authorities and EU authorities over the course of the last several weeks in which the concern I just mentioned has been expressed.

Q Do you know when this may be signed? You say it will take a few more days. You've got your breakthrough. You have an event coming up that could provide for a signing --

MR. TARULLO: I don't know of any event specifically in tow, but I assume that we'll go ahead -- we won't wait artificially for something; we'll sign it and get going when we can get going.

Q Can you tell me if Helms
□
-Burton was discussed?

MR. TARULLO: Yes, Helms
□
-Burton was discussed, I

think, as Jim mentioned earlier, and the President reiterated the need for continued dialogue, continued activities by the European Union as they have said they would do to promote democracy in Cuba.

MR. MCCURRY: We're going to take a break in the transcript at this point. For purposes of transcript we're going to move into a BACKGROUND session. A senior administration official has one or two observations to make ON BACKGROUND. Everyone understand that? Any confusion about the term BACKGROUND by anyone in the room? All right, it's a senior administration official briefing ON BACKGROUND.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: I just wanted to say a couple more things about the process that led to the MRAs, and this is, as Mike said, on BACKGROUND.

This has essentially been stuck for several months now, almost six months -- really, since the last U.S.

□
-EU summit
in Washington. And we came to the conclusion that we really needed to push this thing forward, that we couldn't allow either internal EU issues between member states and the Commission or just bureaucratic inertia to get in the way of either completing these things or determine that we weren't going to be able to do it.

And the one additional point I'd make for you ON BACKGROUND is that Secretary Albright last week called President Santer of the European Commission and indicated to him her sense

that the time had come to resolve the remaining issues, that she thought it could be done consistent with both the interests of companies in trading and with proper health and safety concerns, and that she very much hoped to see the agreements concluded this week. I don't know what kind of clausal link one can or cannot draw, but I'll tell you the negotiations on Monday and Tuesday were very productive. We only regret that this wasn't done early enough to be really be able to wrap the whole thing up.

That's all ON BACKGROUND.

Q What were the issues that were opened -- the main issues, sticking points and how they compromised?

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL: One of them was the capacity of our regulatory agencies always to take action if they thought they needed to in order to protect the health and safety of the American people, and that was preserved.

MR. MCCURRY: All right, we're back on the record. Any other subjects, any other issues? Okay, thanks.

Q The President touched on what could almost be called a Marshall Plan for Eastern and Central Europe. Will we hear more on that today?

MR. MCCURRY: We're going to have -- Barry's question was about the President's remarks today. He talked a little bit about an idea that originates out of the Dutch government for a discussion about further efforts on their reconstruction and recovery of Central Eastern European countries.

The President will talk generally about that today in remarks that we think we'll have for you in prepared form pretty shortly. We're going to try to put out something of an advanced text on this, although the President reserves the right to deviate, as he usually does. But that should be coming within an hour or so, if we can get it.

Q Can I ask you one basic, general question about his remarks or just a few? Is he speaking in terms of investment or investment and assistance? Because the Marshall Plan was assistance as well.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have a combination of both investment and assistance programs. We have pursued multilateral lending through the multilateral lending banks that are available. We also have some direct assistance programs that grew out of the old Support for Eastern European Democracy Act programs, the so

□
-called SEED act programs. I don't -- maybe Jim or David can get you some of the specific assistance levels that we've expended. But the President's rough calculation on the amounts that have been expended and then the comparison to what in real dollars would be the Marshall Plan today people told me held up pretty well, that the calculations were roughly correct.

Q That seems kind of a counterintuitive argument to be coming out and saying we need to have another Marshall Plan and then saying, well, it looks like the dollars stack up. Is he planning on any additional aid or additional --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we're not -- the President is not -- I mean, he's not calling for a new Marshall Plan today; he's saying that the Marshall Plan created something important, an architecture of a continent at peace and able to resist a threat from the East during the years of the Cold War.

What we need to do today is to expand on the general theory of how you construct an architecture that deals with the challenges and realities of the world we live in -- which are new and different and many of them we've been dealing with during the course of this briefing -- the transnational threats of organized crime, drug trafficking, social pathologies that continue to exist that we need to deal with in a world in which approximate threat is not one that is strategic in nature or military security oriented.

Q -- Europe need to do more or --

MR. MCCURRY: We'll get you the prepared speech and I think you'll see how he intends to address those remarks.

Q Mike, can you talk a bit about how you would address the concerns of people who say that everything that's being done here in NATO and the EU are, in fact, excluding Russia, and it's Russia which is the real problem?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I mean, to the contrary; we see an inclusive future for Europe that extends the peaceful, undivided architecture of this continent all the way from the United Kingdom to the Urals. I mean, we see Russia as a part of that future. And, indeed, nothing is exclusive about any of the arrangements that have been under discussion here.

In theory, NATO membership itself is one day open to Russia. Russia is currently a valued participant in the Partnership for Peace program. And as the President noted, they are participating with us in Bosnia, in the S

□

-FOR deployment

there. So that is within the realm of the considerable in the structure that we now have for the future adaptation of NATO.

Q Mike, getting back to the Marshall Plan, you said that the former communist countries had received more money than was in Europe during the Marshall Plan. But it seems --

MR. MCCURRY: No, he made very specifically the opposite point. I mean, it's less than the real dollar investment would have been in the Marshall Plan; but I think he was pointing out it was a significant investment .

Q Yes, but he seemed to say that the problem was not the amount invested, but the way to make sure this money reaches the places that it should reach, to make sure that the money was used properly. Is it correct to say that?

MR. MCCURRY: Dan may want to jump on this, too. One feature of our assistance to all of the emerging states coming out of totalitarianism and communism has been an effort to push this money to the place where it does the best -- at the grass roots, to eliminate as much as possible the administrative diversion of funds or to ensure, as best we can, as methodically as we can, that there's any inappropriate diversion of this funding, and we are pretty scrupulous in the way we administer that.

Q Do you think that the European Bank or the World Bank or the IMF should provide more money for these countries on top of what they have done already?

MR. TARULLO: He was not making reference to that issue. What he was saying in quoting the figures was, I think, an indication that in today's world, development generally, whether in the economies in transition or in the developing countries is much more driven by private capital and private capital flows than was the case 50 years ago.

And as Mike says, our aim both in our bilateral assistance and in our work with the multilateral lending institutions has been to get them to put money in that gives the countries the capacity to run economies efficiently, to give them the institutions that are necessary to operate market economies, but as the President indicated, more private investment both generated domestically and from abroad are going to be necessary.

And I think our view is that if for the economies to function effectively and to grow in a sustained basis, they need to develop savings domestically and be an attractive place for investment in general.

Q Can you give a quick rundown on money comparisons that the President made and how much of that comes from U.S. sources -- the \$88 billion?

MR. TARULLO: You mean the combined official development assistance plus the private capital flows? I don't know, John.

MR. MCCURRY: Eighty
□
-eight billion was the estimated
real dollar value of the Marshall Plan.

MR. TARULLO: That was Marshall Plan in today's dollars. Fifty billion in official assistance that's been put in.

Q And \$45 billion in private assistance?

MR. TARULLO: Not private assistance, but private investment, and that gets to the point I just made, that --

Q -- billion in U.S. money?

MR. TARULLO: Well, it depends on how you calculate it. There are several billions that are direct assistance, but in addition to that, we have the fact that we contribute to the multilateral lending institutions. I couldn't divide that and break it down for you precisely; we can have somebody try to do it for you.

Q Can you get more specific on --

MR. TARULLO: I can't offhand and aggregate it to all of the countries; I'm sorry.

Q Can you get it to us later on?

MR. TARULLO: Yes, absolutely.

MR. MCCURRY: Okay, the toasts are about to begin momentarily.

Q Any reaction to how the Supreme Court decision yesterday is impacting on the President and the fact that it's having in detracting from some of his achievements here back in the United States?

MR. MCCURRY: It's not. The President, aside from just a phone call with his lawyer last night to understand better what the opinion said and a discussion of how to deal with the questions that we inevitably knew would arise today, hasn't spent any time on the issue at all.

Q How long was the phone call?

MR. MCCURRY: Probably about five or 10 minutes.

Q And what was sort of the issue -- I mean, telling about it, or what went on?

MR. MCCURRY: The President heard about the decision just prior to his meeting with President Yeltsin and said, well, what did the decision say. That was his reaction. He wanted to know what the opinion said. We didn't know at that point. We said we would try to get a hold of Mr. Bennett, and the President talked to Mr. Bennett later just to get a better understanding of what was in the opinion. And Mr. Bennett's commented on it, the President's commented on it and that's all we have to say on it.

Q -- The New York Times assessment, at least on the Internet says, "sense of siege deepens," meaning of the White House. Is that a fair assessment?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't see any sense of siege around here. I haven't heard of any back at the White House.

Q What about the 9

□
-0 decision? Was that a surprise that it was unanimous?

MR. MCCURRY: I'd really -- Mr. Bennett commented on all of those questions yesterday.

Q Texas tornadoes --

MR. MCCURRY: We are concerned about the devastating tornadoes in Texas. We have had -- federal emergency officials have been in contact with their state counterparts who are monitoring the situation. We don't have any request as of yet

□
TOP EVEN
- \p -

BOTTOM ALL
from the state for any disaster assistance, but our folks will continue to be in contact with Texas state authorities.

The President was concerned, saw some of the television coverage even here in the Netherlands, about the impacts of the storm.

Q Did he have any comment, Mike?

MR. MCCURRY: He was concerned about it. He said it looked like it had been a very devastating storm, just based on some of the television coverage, and the staff they would get him any updates as we have them later in the day.

Okay, we're starting in with the toast. That's it for today. We don't intend to do any more briefing. Later on, you'll get, as I say, probably an advanced text of the speech to help you out if we can do that in the next half

□
-hour or so.
END

1:47 P.M. (L)

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-es-solidarity@igc.apc.org@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-MAY-1997 11:15:00.00

SUBJECT: Re: Labor Alert: Salvadoran Factories

TO: es-solidarity (es-solidarity@igc.apc.org@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

IND_TO: Robert C. Orr (ORR_R) (NSC)
READ: 3-JUN-1997 17:02:22.47

TEXT:

In reg.elsalvador, Nicaragua Network <nicanet@igc.apc.org> wrote:

>UPDATE!

>Factory Owners in El Salvador Announce Their Own Code

>CISPES Launches "Pledge for Workers Rights!"

>

>Two days after the White House Rose Garden press conference announcing
>the accord of the President's Task Force on Sweatshops, the Salvadoran
>clothing manufacturers' association ASIC announced its own "Code of
>Conduct" with terms similar to the U.S. agreement. ASIC will use
>transnational auditing companies "to certify that international
>labor norms are not violated." They expect most of their 230 member
>companies to adopt the code, which according to one newspaper
>headline, will "eliminate the effects of international campaigns."
>Unlike the U.S. agreement, ASIC's Code was designed by the factory
>owners and imposed unilaterally without apparent union or labor rights
>participation.

>

>According to the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El

>Salvador (CISPES), the factory owners' motivation is clear. El
>Salvador's maquila industry is not in good shape. Factories are
>losing contracts, and one maquila closed March 31, leaving 460 workers
>with. out work. A February report by the Human Rights Ombudswoman's
>office finds that harassment, pay levels, health and safety risks, and
>anti-union pressures remain serious problems, despite industry
>statements that "because of one person, because of one factory that is
>not doing things the way it should, the whole country gets criticized
>and blamed."

>

>CISPES believes that the U.S. accord is an advance in establishing
>international standards and a mechanism to enforce them. But, the
>organization goes on, we are not yet strong enough to make either the
>standards or the enforcement mechanism adequate. Both the new U.S.
>and Salvadoran codes allow factory owners to continue organizing
>production (work hours, working conditions, pay) with little threat of
>worker organization. When injustices occur, there is only a random
>chance that the news will reach a monitor, or that the monitor will
>take that grievance all the way to justice.

>

>Two important questions, according to CISPES, are 1) How can the U.S.
>task force accord can be turned into a real tool for global labor
>organization; and 2) Is there a way to challenge ASIC's false solution
>without seriously harming the interests of Salvadoran maquila workers?

>

>At the Mandarin factory in El Salvador, another model of monitoring
 >from that of the U.S. and ASIC's is in place and functioning. The
 >Independent Monitoring Commission with representatives from Salvadoran
 >non-governmental organizations (NGOs) set up at a Mandarin after the
 >1995 GAP campaign is in the factory every week. It has gained the
 >confidence of workers by registering their complaints and negotiating
 >solutions with management. The bathrooms have been unlocked; there is
 >no more abuse; and discussions have begun about health and safety
 >upgrades. Management also supports the commission because it
 >depolarized an extremely tense workplace. The National Labor
 >Committee has called for extending the Salvadoran model to other
 >factories and other countries, but this has not yet happened.

>

>Meanwhile, beginning on May 1, International Workers' Day, CISPES is
 >launching a "Pledge for Workers Rights" in which concerned people sign
 >a pledge to "take monthly action to stop the global assault on
 >workers, and to build just alternatives through international worker
 >solidarity." Action Number 1 will take place in June and will target
 >the support by the U.S. government for the privatization of public
 >services in El Salvador by Presidential Commissioner for the
 >Modernization of the Private Sector Alfredo Mena Lagos. Some of the
 >actions that are suggested are banner drops, interviews on talk shows
 >on the radio or public access television, street theater, fake
 >newspaper fronts and other activities.

>

>To find out how you can participate in the "Pledge for Workers Rights"
 >or more about the Salvadoran corporate code, contact CISPES National
 >Office at P.O. Box 1801, New York, NY 10159, tel. (212) 229-1290.

>

>To receive the Campaign for Labor Rights newsletter, send \$35.00 to
 >Campaign for Labor Rights, 1247 "E" Street SE, Washington, DC 20003.

>To receive a sample copy of the newsletter, send your postal address
 >to clr@igc.apc.org or 541-344-5410. We rely on subscriptions to help
 >us provide our many services. Please join! Also check out our web
 >site at <http://www.compugraph.com/clr>

>

>To receive email Labor Alerts directly, send an email to
 >clr@igc.apc.org with "labor alerts -- El Salvador campaign" or "labor
 >alerts -- all campaigns" in the subject line.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
 ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:31-MAY-1997 11:15:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
 id <01IJIN2LK2BK006KF6@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for orr_r@al.eop.gov; Sat,
 31 May 1997 11:15:02 -0500 (EST)

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
 by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IJIN2I1C7K004W2M@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for
 orr_r@al.eop.gov; Sat, 31 May 1997 11:14:59 -0500 (EST)

Received: from Princeton.EDU ([128.112.128.1])
 by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)
 with SMTP id <01IJIN2B03WM001P1S@STORM.EOP.GOV> for orr_r@al.eop.gov; Sat,
 31 May 1997 11:14:48 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from igc7.igc.apc.org by Princeton.EDU (5.65b/2.128/princeton)
 id AA13956; Sat, 31 May 1997 11:04:28 -0400

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.apc.org [192.82.108.33])
by igc7.igc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) id IAA26874; Sat,
31 May 1997 08:01:27 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from parvidso.superlink.net (rb38.superlink.net [204.249.107.189])
by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id IAA21530 for
<es-solidarity@igc.apc.org>; Sat, 31 May 1997 08:00:09 -0700 (PDT)

Precedence: bulk

X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.0.82

X-Authentication-warning: igc7.igc.org: Processed from queue
/var/spool/mqueue-maj

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-es-solidarity@igc.apc.org@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JUL-1997 22:16:00.00

SUBJECT: El Salvador Watch: July 1997

TO: es-solidarity (es-solidarity@igc.org@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: cis (cis@nicarao.apc.org@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: sfbaycispes (sfbaycispes@igc.org@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

IND_TO: Robert C. Orr (ORR_R) (NSC)
READ:22-AUG-1997 11:29:07.90

TEXT:
EL SALVADOR WATCH
July 1997
Number 61

Produced by CISPES,
the Committee in Solidarity with
the People of El Salvador,
P.O. Box 1801, New York, NY 10159
(212) 229-1290, cispesnatl@igc.org

* * * * *

WHITE HOUSE TASK FORCE
PUTS INDEPENDENT MONITORING IN JEOPARDY

"Recently, a White House Apparel Industry Task Force announced an accord to establish an industry-wide code of conduct and monitoring of clothing production facilities. The agreement, while potentially representing a step forward, needs to be greatly strengthened in several key areas if it hopes to contribute to improving the conditions of workers in many countries of the world that produce for the industry. Certainly, this is the case for workers in El Salvador, a country that exported \$721 million in apparel to the US market last year alone."

- From "A Response to the White House Apparel Industry Task Force,"
by El Salvador's Independent Monitoring Group
(see "Ending Sweatshop Practices" below for more excerpts)

* * * * *
" Unfortunately, the President's program could more accurately be called
It Is No Sweat for Companies to Meet This Code...
...As usual, the most significant changes will begin at the grassroots."

- Bangor Daily News

THE EMBODIMENT OF EXPLOITATION

Sweatshops have increasingly begun to symbolize the vast gulf between the haves and the have-nots in the new global economy.

Capital is free to roam the world in search of the lowest wages and working conditions. (People, however, are stopped at the borders, restricted by ever harsher immigration laws.)

This engenders a global "race to the bottom." It encourages countries to place the satisfaction of international investors above their people's own needs: they set low minimum wages and tolerate lax labor and environmental laws simply to attract multinational corporations.

They build so-called Free Trade Zones where young women toil at mind-numbing jobs in sweatshops, known as maquiladoras in Mexico and Central America.

To combat the ill effects of globalization - the disparity of wealth it reinforces, and the exploitation of labor that it requires - a new movement for global economic justice is emerging to combat the ill effects of globalization.

This movement, which CISPES is a part of, has focused the public eye on inhuman conditions in the world's sweatshops from which US corporations reap astronomical profits.

A Clinton Solution

The combined momentum of the movement's grassroots campaigns obliged the Clinton administration to act. It put together a White House Task Force on Sweatshops, comprising several apparel and footwear industry giants (including Liz Claiborne, Kathy Lee Gifford, Nike) and labor and human rights organizations (among them the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, the International Labor Rights Fund, and UNITE, the Union of Needletrades, Industrial & Textile Employees).

In April, this task force - actually called the "Apparel Industry Partnership" (AIP) - issued a woefully inadequate report, outlining the basis for an accord that is "intended to provide the public with confidence" that the clothes and shoes they purchase are not made in sweatshops.

Disappointing,
But Not Surprising

The Workplace Code of Conduct it developed is currently very far from the "set of standards defining decent and humane working conditions" that it aspires to be. This is disappointing but not surprising :

The White House Task Force included not a single worker from El Salvador, nor from Haiti, nor from Indonesia; not one of the 2.5 million workers the garment industry employs in overseas assembly plants had a voice in the "partnership."

Long Hours, Low Pay -
But Don't Call It A Sweatshop

The main drawbacks of the report are unacceptable compromises related to basic working conditions - wages and hours - and to the monitoring process.

First, wages need only be the local minimum, which is far below a livable wage in most countries. (Indeed, sweatshops are located where they are precisely because they have been lured there by an artificially low wage structure.)

Second, the Code allows manufacturers to demand a 60 hour work week (including 12 hours of involuntary overtime). In "extraordinary business circumstances" (which the report does not define), there is no limit to the hours that can be required of workers.

A letter to President Clinton signed by the member organizations of the Latin America Working Group (of the National Council of Churches) emphasizes that further clarification of the exception clause, and monitoring when companies invoke it, is crucial: "[A]n influx of orders or bad planning must not be considered extraordinary business circumstances," it cautions.

Who Monitors the Monitors?

Equally troubling is the Task Force's conception of how to ensure compliance with the Code. An association to be established by the AIP will accredit "independent external monitors" who will be paid by the companies.

But even "the most respected monitor in the world, if paid by the company being monitored, is not independent." So said UNITE President Jay Mazur in response to Andrew Young's whitewashed evaluation of Nike's labor practices. Nike hired Young, the former mayor of Atlanta and Ambassador to the United Nations, to produce the report, issued on June 24.

There is no guarantee that AIP monitors will merit anyone's respect: It allows the companies to hire multinational auditing firms, who are unlikely to have the necessary trust of the workers.

The companies' monitors must only "consult" local human rights, labor or religious institutions. The report does not specify that these groups will have any access whatsoever to the workplace being monitored.

Truly Independent Monitoring In Jeopardy

It is puzzling that in its deliberations, the Task Force has thus far not consulted with the only functioning independent monitoring commission overseeing garment production anywhere in the world - the one at the Mandarin factory in El Salvador. (This was established last year after the successful pressure campaign on The GAP, which contracts with Mandarin.)

It has excellent (but sadly unsolicited) advice for the Task Force, rooted in its own successful experience. (See its response to the AIP report, below.)

Its monitoring has produced results: it has gotten fired union leaders and activists rehired; it has stopped physical and sexual abuse; workers are no longer locked out of the bathrooms. The reason it works is that it is truly independent of management, comprising members of Salvadoran labor, religious and human rights institutions.

Unfortunately, its existence is at risk. If the apparel industry wins on the monitoring point, additional pressure on The GAP may well be needed to prevent it from being displaced by some corporate auditor.

A POTENTIAL Step Forward

The anti-sweatshop movement has harshly criticized the AIP report for these inadequacies. The consensus is that the weaknesses demonstrate the need to mobilize more grassroots pressure in order to strengthen the position of the labor and human rights camp on the Task Force.

The movement also acknowledges it as a "potential step forward." This potential will be realized only if the flaws are corrected. And there is a move on to do just that.

Taking the Task Force to Task

CISPES will contribute to a concerted effort by the anti-sweatshop movement to improve the terms of the AIP agreement.

The July action of CISPES's "Pledge for Working People's Rights" Campaign is street outreach to educate the public about the AIP's shortcomings, and to gather signatures on a petition to President Clinton urging that the Code be improved. (See "Call to Action" below.)

We will also take the opportunity to promote the work of the Independent Monitoring Group in El Salvador as a successful alternative, seeking to expand its work within El Salvador's Free Trade Zones. Ultimately, it (not the AIP's seriously flawed scheme) should serve as the model for monitoring worldwide.

Labor activists, students, and religious organizations are all participating in a larger petition drive, and will join in a national "Day of Conscience" called by the National Labor Committee for October 4. That day cities and towns across the country will organize protests, theater, religious vigils and other actions dramatizing the need to improve the terms of the Code of Conduct.

Petition gathering will continue until November 6, when the AIP is scheduled to finalize its agreement.

CALL TO ACTION

Thus, four months remain in which to pressure for the first worldwide agreement against sweatshop exploitation.

Help ensure that it is worth the paper it is written on! Call your nearest CISPES regional office for a copy of the following petition, reproduce and circulate widely.

* * *

Dear President Clinton:

We are outraged that sweatshops are violating workers' rights around the world. People who work should be paid a wage they and their families can live on, not just the local minimum wage.

Workers should not have to work more than 40 hours a week, and they

should never be compelled to work overtime.

However, unscrupulous companies are covering up unfair and unsafe factory conditions around the world. To stop this, garment factories must be monitored directly by unions or local human rights groups that are truly independent of management - groups the workers trust.

Please make sure that the global anti-sweatshop agreement you are helping negotiate includes these essential terms.

Signed,
Jane Q. Activist

* * * * *

ELIMINATING SWEATSHOP PRACTICES:

A RESPONSE TO THE WHITE HOUSE APPAREL INDUSTRY TASK FORCE (excerpts)

by Mark Anner, Benjamin Cuellar, & Maria Julia Hernandez. The authors are members of the Independent Monitoring Group of El Salvador. They represent the Center of Labor Studies, the Human Rights Institute of the University of Central America; and Tutela Legal (the Human Rights office of the Archdioceses of San Salvador) respectively.

...

Low wages, high production goals and long hours characterize conditions in overseas, clothing assembly plants in countries like El Salvador...

[B]asic necessities such as housing, clothing, health care and education are not covered by the minimum wage.

...As one corporate executive stated, "we could pay 20% more, we could probably even pay 100% more, and our company would continue to be very profitable. But we are not going to do that because the labor market says we do not have to."

...The long hours and harsh conditions that these women face reflect the fact that while the concentration of corporate power is at an all time peak, collective efforts to represent and defend workers in the sector are systematically and sometimes violently destroyed.

...Thus, ensuring the right to organize is one way to provide for a more level playing field. Yet the procurement of this right will not be resolved simply by including it in one more document, but rather through proper, independent, external monitoring.

...Our experience has shown that for monitoring to function properly, monitors must be trusted by the workers. And - given the harsh and bitter experience that many of these young women garment workers face - representatives of local, respected civil society organizations will always be more trusted than outside auditing firms.

...In the case of the White House Task Force, companies are trying to ensure that they control the monitoring process as much as possible. But to the extent that this becomes clear to the public, no one will even believe the monitors, and the entire effort will backfire.

...[M]uch needs to be done before we start sewing "No Sweat" labels into clothing...

Economic globalization has produced greatly needed jobs in many countries of the world. The challenge - which in part now faces the White House Task Force - is to ensure that it produces jobs with dignity.

* * * * *

THE GROWING ANTI-SWEATSHOP MOVEMENT

One segment of the movement for global economic justice has focused on the international financial institutions set up by the capitalist powers at the post-WWII conference at Bretton Woods: the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and their sibling agencies. It exposes their role in inflicting structural adjustment programs upon so-called developing countries.

Another part of the movement is focusing on corporate exploitation of the work force, particularly in sweatshops, or maquiladoras. Recent grassroots campaigns have shone the spotlight on companies who are profiting from their exploitation of workers in various countries. Examples include: The GAP campaign spearheaded by the National Labor Committee, which has also had a hand in highlighting Disney's abuses in Haiti; the challenge by Global Exchange and others to Nike's exploitation of its workers in Asia; and the campaign to "Stop Sweatshops!" in the US launched by UNITE and the National Consumers League.

The issue is one that encompasses basic human and labor rights, working conditions and the abuse of women and of immigrants, class politics and international solidarity. It also dramatically depicts what's wrong with the rules of the new global economy.

"Making the Sweatshops Sweat"!

A year ago, CISPES launched its own Campaign for Working People's Rights (with the slogan "Educate and Agitate for Working People's Rights!"). Its aims are to support organizing efforts in El Salvador's maquiladoras (and in state agencies threatened with privatization), and to compel the Salvadoran government to enforce its own labor laws.

Highlights of this campaign are plentiful:

(*) Last fall, CISPES organized a 22-city tour of maquiladora organizer Ana Maria Romero and telecommunications union leader Wilmer Erroa Argueta. (See the July/August issue of Dollars and Sense for an interview with Argueta.)

The two testified before US Congress on the appalling conditions faced by workers in El Salvador, prompting Salvadoran President Calderon Sol to label them "traitors."

His administration then fraudulently claimed CISPES was promoting a boycott and trying to destroy the Salvadoran economy by driving investors away. These accusations are typical of the propaganda war waged by those who would rather overlook the exploitation that they profit from.

In October and November of 1997, CISPES will again organize a US speaking tour for a maquiladora organizer from El Salvador.

(*) Our tongue-in-cheek "SweatGear" catalog earned CISPES international press - and again the wrath of the Salvadoran government and business elites. It was this catalog that inspired Business Week to write in its headlines that CISPES was "Making the Sweatshops Sweat"!

(See also the accompanying article on our "SweatGear Fashion Shows.")

(*) Our new video "El Salvador: Not For Sale!" depicts the organized resistance of maquiladora workers. It includes footage of the takeover of the San Marcos Free Trade Zone by workers at the Mandarin factory contracted by The GAP.

A number of CISPES chapters had participated in The GAP Campaign, which eventually led to the creation of the world's only independent monitoring commission at Mandarin.

* * * * *

FASHION SHOWS FUEL CISPES'S POLITICAL CREATIVITY

A highlight of the new organizing CISPES has carried out over the last year is the level of creativity it has inspired. From the tongue-in-cheek satire of the "Sweatgear Catalog" grew fashion show spoofs which have established CISPES in the forefront of political creativity.

The fashion shows debuted in Boston. There, CISPES called on the experience of political theater director Ian MacKinnon and brought together a talented crew of musicians, performers and fashion professionals.

In 45 minutes the fashion show covered everything from NAFTA to immigration to right-wing ideologue "Bat Pukecannon." In musical numbers Maria Maquila and UR Conned re-worked West Side Story, James Brown and "La Bamba"! It premiered before a standing-room-only crowd of 200, who collectively raised \$6,000 for the Melida Anaya Montes Women's Movement's maquila organizing project in El Salvador.

This success had to go on the road! Members of the Boston troupe then collaborated with New York CISPES to stage the production at Meow Mix, an East Village hotspot. Accompanying the runway choreography were Diane Greene's slides, showing contrasting images of the Triangle Shirtwaist fire, US fashion models, and '90s sweatshops.

The fashion show concept then took off at colleges as students across the country took it to their campuses. CISPES-affiliated groups at Wooster College in Ohio, at Cornell, and at The Evergreen State College (TESC) in Washington all pulled together broad coalitions to perform similar fashion-inspired political satire.

Runway choreography featured models wearing GAP pants "made by women who make 60 cents an hour while you pay \$50 - you gotta wonder where the rest goes!" and "Guatemalan textiles stitched in a country where soldiers trained by the US at the School of Americas have killed thousands."

At TESC, a Master of Ceremonies smugly extolled the virtues of corporations exploiting cheap labor. At the end of the show, they shared their research about alternatives, including where consumers could buy clothing and other products locally.

Activists from Wooster College headlined at an annual campus event, the "International Week Fashion Show," then toured local high schools with the performance.

Those students then joined the Inter-Religious Task Force in Cleveland to organize "mall actions" during the Christmas shopping season. Unassuming "shoppers" suddenly called for the attention of passers-by, and in the aisles of major retailers carried out 2 minute fashion shows. The

actors successfully eluded security guards by re-assuming their former, inconspicuous roles as shoppers, only to re-assemble their action in another, pre-determined spot.

Unleashing creativity has been key to the success of our latest program. Scripts, photos and videos are available for all of these shows: call the National Office for information, or call your local committee to find out what they have planned! And don't miss the fashion show event of the season on August 16 at the CISPES National Convention in San Francisco!

THE GUERRILLA ACTIVISTS OF TWIN CITIES CISPES

Editor's note: El Salvador Watch continues its series of chapter profiles. The following portrait was a collaborative effort by (and is itself a good example of the youthful exuberance of) the Twin Cities chapter. Next month, stay tuned for a look at New York CISPES.

Twin Cities CISPES has grown, shrunk, regrown, reached out, out reached, developed, organized, reorganized, aligned, and coaligned a whole lot in the past months. And rightfully so, as it's been a busy stretch: integrating four new members into the committee, reaching new volunteers, doubling our mailing list and, most importantly, reinforcing strong ties to local activist groups while continuing to educate and agitate about the situation in El Salvador. So who in the Sam Hill are we? To get personal info and current stats, call us for our TC-CISPES Collector Cards, but for now we must paint with a slightly larger brush.

TC-CISPES is young, energetic, creative and queer. Many things have contributed to the direction we've grown in. The dynamic flavor of our actions and guerrilla theater has definitely set us apart from other solidarity groups. We stress participation, imagination and flare. At Mayday, for instance, the annual parade has become more puppets than politics. So we decided to "hire" bodyguards, don extravagant outfits (ask Jess about a certain gold lame dress!) and march for 'Profits Before People' in order to educate about the irrationality and injustice of Welfare cuts, attacks on immigrants and labor, and US foreign economic policy.

By offering political perspective at cultural or social events and encouraging involvement, we broaden the dialogue and appeal to people that see issues as more than a reason to hang in the park.

Pride in Minneapolis has become outright corporate, but by offering a political and liberatory message TC-CISPES is able to stand out amongst broader, more liberal groups (and to successfully recruit, recruit, recruit!)

This political presence is a piece of a larger endeavor we have to integrate our El Salvador work into local struggles. By doing this, we give localized relevance to our El Salvador work, bring an international, holistic perspective to local concerns, expose and build the committee, and strengthen solidarity between movements, issues and activists.

Our Work-A-Thon was a prime example of this integration: we worked closely with the AFSCME union (fighting privatization and union-busting at

the university hospital) and the Welfare Rights Committee (organizing working and non-working poor around the welfare cuts).

Our recent banner-drop was part of an ongoing effort to educate people about the changing face of US intervention in El Salvador by offering historic context and drawing connections to attacks on US workers. Three huge banners turned heads while flyers detailed the situation. Participants engaged bottle-necked and red-necked commuters alike, getting every response from cheers to The Bird. We relied on our relationships with local groups (both in solidarity and practice) to pull it off, and see the success as another step towards bringing struggles here and abroad into a perspective that can continue to integrate the Minneapolis activist community.

We hope to educate, agitate and grow this summer with the same holistic, radical perspective and fiery piss 'n' vinegar approach to our daily struggles.

* * * * *

"El Salvador Watch" is produced nationally by CISPES. CISPES is a national organization with chapters in 25 cities around the country. In addition to our National Office listed above, we maintain the following regional offices:

Western States Regional Office
San Francisco, CA
(415) 648-6520

Midwest Regional Office
Minneapolis, MN
(612) 872-0944

East Coast Regional Office
New York, NY
(212) 229-1290

New England Office
Boston, MA
(617) 524-1166

* * * * * E N D * * * * *

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 9-JUL-1997 22:16:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IL1RIA6900006GFV@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for orr_r@al.eop.gov; Wed, 09 Jul 1997 22:15:51 -0500 (EST)

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov) by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IL1RI6A4N4007H4N@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for orr_r@al.eop.gov; Wed, 09 Jul 1997 22:15:45 -0500 (EST)

Received: from Princeton.EDU ([128.112.128.1]) by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879) with SMTP id <01IL1RHQIMQU0025GP@STORM.EOP.GOV> for orr_r@al.eop.gov; Wed, 09 Jul 1997 22:15:21 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org by Princeton.EDU (5.65b/2.128/princeton)
id AA24093; Wed, 09 Jul 1997 22:01:02 -0400
Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.apc.org [192.82.108.33])
by igcb.igc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id SAA07422; Wed,
09 Jul 1997 18:47:15 -0700 (PDT)
Received: (from majordomo) by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) id SAA24590; Wed,
09 Jul 1997 18:47:07 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from [198.94.6.39] (cispesnatl@ppp39.igc.org [198.94.6.39])
by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA24086; Wed,
09 Jul 1997 18:41:10 -0700 (PDT)
X-Sender: cispesnatl@pop.igc.org (Unverified)
Precedence: bulk
X-Priority: 5 (Lowest)
===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-SEP-1997 09:43:14.00

SUBJECT: 1997-09/09 briefing on fast track

TO: klaskyh (klaskyh @ PANET.US-STATE.GOV@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP on 09/11/97
09:37 AM -----

SUNTUM_M @ A1
09/10/97 04:23:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1997-09/09 briefing on fast track

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 10, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING BY
SECRETARY OF TREASURY BOB RUBIN,
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE BILL DALEY,
U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE CHARLENE BARSHEFSKY,
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR ECONOMIC POLICY GENE SPERLING;
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY
DAN TARULLO

The Briefing Room

3:20 P.M. EDT

SECRETARY RUBIN: Thank you. There's a copy of Road and Track, All New Cars, for those who are interested. (Laughter.) I'm not exactly sure why, but in any event, there is.

Let me start with just a word. I think the President and the Vice President did extraordinarily well. We've had a consistent economic strategy since the beginning of the

administration and we now have, and have had for quite some time, the best economic condition in the industrial world. I don't think there's any question but trade liberalization has been very important to the economic success we've had so far, and I think it's absolutely central in terms of our economic strength and economic health in going forward.

Millions of Americans owe their jobs to the trade liberalization that has taken place so far, and all Americans as consumers have benefitted from lower prices and greater choice.

As you look around the world and you meet with finance ministers and other public officials, one thing is absolutely clear, and that is globalization is continuing and countries around the world are entering into all kinds of trade liberalization agreements. The only question -- there is no question this is going to continue; the only question is will we be inside of it or will we be outside of it. And if we're outside of it, in our judgment, it will be enormously to our economic detriment.

What we must now do is work together to implement and enact fast track negotiating authority for the President so that as we go forward we can be part of the globalization of trade and the trade agreements, as I said a moment ago, are developing around the world.

And with that, I would like to introduce Secretary of Commerce Bill Daley. And I'm going to apologize, but I have to leave because I'm going up to the Hill in furtherance of this effort. Thank you.

SECRETARY DALEY: I would assume we'll all be going to the Hill very shortly for a very long time. Let me also be brief and just express a couple comments. One, obviously, the fact that our export growth over the last four years has created jobs. Some people believe that we should be fearful of competition in this new global economy. American business, American workers have proven that instead of being frightened of competition, we should welcome it because we are the victors over the last number of years in this very competitive world economy.

□,

So we have proven through our export growth and through the competitive nature of American businesses and American workers that we welcome this global economy, and we look forward to furthering the lowering of barriers, as the President said today, because it will create additional American jobs, not lose American jobs.

So we in the Commerce Department, and speaking on behalf of the business community, who I know many of you have heard from outside, are very committed to this endeavor. The Cabinet is working very hard. Dan Glickman will go to Kansas City; I'll go to Minneapolis tomorrow; Secretary Pena will be travelling -- we will be fanning out around the nation in addition to a tremendous number of visits that will take place on the Hill, as we once again engage the American people and engage the political establishment around the world and around this country in the debate over competition and opening of barriers and lowering them for the sole purpose of

creating American jobs and improving our economy.

Thank you. And I, at this point introduce Ambassador Barshefsky.

AMBASSADOR BARSHEFSKY: Thank you. I thought I would just take a minute and talk about what fast track is, and then talk a little bit about the trade agenda and what we would intend to use fast track authority for. And then I'll introduce Gene Sperling.

The original fast track began in 1934 and gave the President of the United States the ability to cut tariffs by his own proclamation. The Constitution reserves to Congress the ability to cut tariffs. In 1934, that authority was delegated to the President of the United States by Congress under what we would now call fast track authority. It was called something a little bit different then. That authority has continued virtually without exception until it expired in 1994 with the last grant of fast track authority.

So the President had the ability to proclaim reductions in U.S. tariffs if a trade agreement was negotiated. But in the late 1960s it became apparent that nations began putting up non-tariff barriers to compensate for their reductions in tariff and to try and keep foreign goods out. So, in 1974, the partnership between the Congress and the President with respect to trade agreements negotiation was broadened, and the deal struck was this: Congress would be able to consult with the President, direct the course of a particular trade negotiation, agree on trade policy objectives. And in exchange, when the President brought back a trade agreement, Congress, in implementing legislation, would vote the agreement up or down without amendment.

This gave the President the ability to negotiate from strength because foreign countries understood once they negotiated with the Executive Branch, Congress would not renegotiate individual provisions of the agreement. But, at the same time, Congress would be involved through consultation and other mechanisms in the goals set out for the agreement and in the achievement of those goals. That is the fast track authority, coupled with tariff cutting authority, that has been in existence since 1974, and to which President Clinton and Vice President Gore alluded.

That is precisely the authority sought here. We are not seeking the approval of any particular trade agreement at this juncture. We are simply seeking a reinstatement of the process by which certain of these agreements can come back to the Congress for an up or down vote. But let me emphasize a final vote on whether implementing legislation passes to implement a trade agreement resides with the Congress of the United States.

□,

Let me talk a moment about the trade agendas. As the President said, exports have been the driver of economic growth for this country. We've seen in the last 10 years a tripling of our export performance. We are the world's single largest exporter -- about 12 million jobs depend on exports. And we know that those jobs tend to pay between 13 and 15 percent higher than non-trade related jobs. The way one shifts the locus of job creation in this country to higher-paying jobs, to better jobs, is through increasing it --

through, among other things, but increasing our export performance.

So as we look at the trade agenda ahead, we want to capitalize on our current economic strength and our current competitiveness, because, after all, we ought to be at our most aggressive internationally now and not pull back. And we want to also take a look at those sectors where we are highly competitive, but where foreign trade barriers tend to be rather high.

There are three basic uses, therefore, to which we would put fast track authority. The first has to do with the built-in agenda from the Uruguay Round. You know at the end of the Uruguay Round negotiations, which are the large, global trade talks, the United States, among other countries, pushed for a timetable at which negotiations in different areas would resume. We did that, as did Europe and other countries because we wanted more out of the Uruguay Round than we got.

This year, we begin again the negotiation on intellectual property rights -- sorry, on government procurement; next year, intellectual property rights; then agriculture; then services. Government procurement is a trillion-dollar market for us in Asia alone over the next decade; agriculture, a \$600-billion market globally; services, \$1.2 trillion market. We want better access into those global markets. We must have fast track authority going into this group of talks or countries will not put meaningful offers for market access on the table.

Second major use -- the President talked and the Vice President talked about the information technology agreement, under which we will reduce to zero tariffs on all of the kinds of information technology products associated with the Information Superhighway -- semiconductors, computers, telecommunications equipment, faxes, phones, integrated circuits -- a huge array of products in which we tend to be a global leader. Our tariff barriers in those areas are zero or very low. Asia's averaged 30 percent. We've agreed with another 43 countries that those tariffs should be brought to zero across the board, all countries, by roughly the year 2000.

We already have agreement among our trading partners for an ITA-2 -- that is to expand the scope of the products encompassed by this extremely ambitious initiative. Fast track authority will be used to implement that arrangement.

We're also in the process of looking at a number of other individual sectors, again where we're very competitive but global barriers tend to be high. For example, environmental equipment and services, medical equipment and technology, transportation equipment, a range of sectors as -- where fast track authority will be needed.

The third area of the trade agenda is the area of more comprehensive market access agreements with individual countries, free trade agreements. The country that has been identified by the administration thus far is Chile. Chile has already indicated that they will sign on to labor and environmental agreements, subject to fines for enforcement. They just completed a bilateral trade agreement with Canada in which Chile signed on to labor and environmental agreements. They will do the same with the United

States.

As to any other individual country we may wish to negotiate with, we would obviously have to identify that country and then undertake rigorous consultations with Congress before we embarked on any additional negotiation.

Those are the uses of fast track authority. As the President said, it is vital, absolutely vital, that we continue to lead, that we continue -- continue to focus on our export performance and to ensure that this country gets its fair share of global trade.

With that, let me introduce Gene Sperling.

MR. SPERLING: I'll tell you what. Probably, since everybody is a little pressed, why don't Secretary Daley and Dan, Charlene, why don't we just take Q&A now, and I think anything -- I could say I can fit into some Q&A somewhere.

Q Question for Secretary Daley. Just before the President and the Vice President were announcing their support for this fast track authority, representatives of the major labor unions were across the street, protesting all of this, saying it's a betrayal, and that they are going to do everything they possibly can to fight this fast track legislative authority. How do you feel about going head to head with such close political allies as the American labor movement who sees this as a betrayal?

SECRETARY DALEY: Well, obviously, the President feels very strongly about many issues and is in agreement with the labor movement on so many issues, and he is in agreement, as he stated today, with the fact that labor issues are important not only in this country and to this administration, which has proven it time and time again over the last four and a half years, but in many world forums. So it is obviously uncomfortable to not be in agreement with some of your allies and strong friends, but there will be plenty of opportunities as we move forward to be back together in unison on so many issues.

Q Well, if you think that this case is so clear-cut, why do you think it's become such a hot button issue for labor leaders?

SECRETARY DALEY: Well, trade issues have always been hot button issues for organized labor, and that's a position that labor has had for many, many years.

Q Is there a way to finesse this situation such that you can include some sort of protection for workers in the fast track legislation itself? Or would that muddy the waters to the point that it's unusable?

MR. SPERLING: I think the President -- first of all, obviously, open markets has been, as the President said today, one of his three pillars of his economic strategy, so that's something he believes in. He believes it increases innovation, competition, higher-wage jobs and that's been the strategy. When we do confront opening markets, we do so with the goal of lowering tariffs and non-trade barriers because, as Charlene said, that almost always advantages us as the most competitive country in the world.

But we also aim as part of our goal to increase labor standards and the environment. And one of the points that we've -- as we've gone through consultations and we've talked, is that there are several ways to promote this agenda. One issue would be what you can do within the trade agreement. The second issue is what you could do through side agreements under executive authority. A third area is things in the international labor core -- issues, things that have been worked on that Charlene has fought hard for and had unprecedented victories in over the last three years. There's also initiatives like the sweatshop initiative that we have. And then there are a variety of things, people we've spoken to who have talked about what can be done domestically in terms of improving or training or adjustment programs.

So the President is firm that anything he does will further opening markets, environment and labor. There are different ways to go about that, but the overall thrust of anything he does in opening markets will further all three of these objectives.

Q You don't see it, then, for the specific question of whether fast track legislation would be written in such a way to include, mention, provide for the concerns of the workers in the environment? You don't see that happening in the fast track legislation itself?

MR. SPERLING: Well, we're going to put out our legislation next week. I mean, I think we're not going to -- you know, I said, we've had consultations with people. We want to have a chance among ourselves to talk about what's been said. Obviously, anything we put forward has to be capable of carrying a strong bipartisan support and we have to look at how we best promote our aims and how we best deal with political reality in getting a bipartisan majority.

Q You were in charge of NAFTA. You became the czar of NAFTA. You joined the administration to fight for NAFTA. It was a very tough and uphill fight. How do you compare the time, then, with this fight to get fast track?

SECRETARY DALEY: Well, in some ways we are obviously in a much stronger position when you look at the economy. when you look at the success that this administration has had. In 1993, you had a very difficult budget battle in the summer, very difficult to win for the President, where he laid out his economic strategy. And then to come back in the fall with a NAFTA battle was very difficult. Obviously, right now, as the President has stated, this economy is extremely strong.

Politically, you have many of the similarities. You have the same sort of split politically in both parties, and you do have a different make-up, obviously, from a leadership perspective on the Hill. And the make up of both caucuses are a little different than they were in 1993. But there are probably more similarities. It's very difficult, as it was in 1993, but I do believe we will be successful this year, as the President was in 1993.

Q You spend a lot of discussion with the phrase "trade related" measures in labor and environment. This was wording that I think -- first put out in 1995, when you were first trying to

get fast track through, and it's come back in Mr. Archer's lingo in the past few days. Can somebody define what "trade related" measures for environment and labor mean?

MR. SPERLING: I mean, I think there are those of us here who could. Will we right now? Do you want to?

AMBASSADOR BARSHEFSKY: The only thing that I would say is that if you look at trade agreements over time you see that they are much broader in scope than they were previously, and that they encompass concepts that might not have been encompassed even 10 or 15 years ago. The Uruguay Round, for example, calls for the establishment of a committee on trade and the environment. That would have been almost unthinkable even 10 years ago. It calls for a review of the intersection between labor and worker rights issues and trade. Again, that's something that might have been unthinkable even five years ago.

So we see a progression as you look at trade agreements over time where issues with respect to the intersection of trade and labor, or trade and the environment have been broached. I think that obviously provides us some guidance.

I think the key is -- and I'd like to make a comment on Gene's answer before -- I know the temptation is very much to look at a piece of legislation and to try and parse it through as though the end goal were the legislation. The end goal for the administration is can the President keep our exports rolling out the door -- make it here, sell it there. Can he at the same time promote and expand labor principles, particularly labor rights, as they are viewed -- core labor standards. Can he help promote and ensure sustainable and responsible environmental development. Those are the goals.

There is no legislation we would put forward under which he could not pursue vigorously each of those goals. Let's keep our eye on the ball. The key, the critical element here is the ability of the United States to move forward on all three fronts simultaneously.

Q What is the rationale for not including specific protections for labor and the environment inside the core agreement? What's the rationale for not doing it? Why do you have to put it as a side agreement?

AMBASSADOR BARSHEFSKY: We're not commenting now on what we're putting in the agreement or what we're not putting in the agreement.

All I'm suggesting is the matrix looks something like this: There are three goals. Gene has laid out three or four or five means of achieving or enhancing those goals -- the means being what's in the bill, what are supplemental agreements, what do you do in international fora, and under that heading, multilateral fora, and what do we do regionally in the FTAA, in APEC, what do we do in the OECD, what do we do in the ILO, what do we do in UNCTAD. Then individual initiatives that the administration and our business community and labor unions work on, like the sweatshop initiative. So there are a variety of means to pursue the aims that are so important to the President and so important to the country, and that's the critical aspect here.

Q How can you sell open trade, free trade at a time with rising trade deficits, particularly with China and Japan? And Japan -- there are so many problems between the United States on the trade front, especially with a much-touted 1995 agreement on car trade -- how are you going to do that at this time when there seems to be so many troubles on that front?

AMBASSADOR BARSHEFSKY: We know that trade deficits are the function of many things, principally macroeconomic and not principally trade policy related, to the extent -- and we have always said this -- to the extent portions of trade deficits are attributable to trade barriers. We need to identify those barriers and to bring them down.

In the case of Japan we have concluded 30 market opening agreements. Exports under those agreements are about triple the rate of our export growth to Japan overall. With respect to autos, there are two issues. One is vehicles, one is auto parts. Our auto parts trade is actually looking fairly strong. It's on the vehicle side where a combination of factors, including a shift in exchange rates, has dampened somewhat our exports to Japan and has increased Japanese exports to the United States.

We will have a review of the auto agreement with Japan in early October, looking particularly for Japan to continue the process of deregulation in its own economy that will provide us more benefits. But the key here -- again, let's keep our eye on the ball -- the key here is our export performance, our export performance. That's what shifts the locus of job creation to higher-paying jobs. That is what provides tremendous opportunity for our workers at high wages. And our export performance has been unparalleled.

Q If you have been able to reach those agreements without fast track, why do you need fast track to -- basically, you've been very successful without fast track up to now.

AMBASSADOR BARSHEFSKY: Agreements -- the President, as you know, has executive authority, constitutional authority to negotiate with foreign parties. And most of the agreements that we have done have been agreements that break down foreign barriers in a particular sector, not requiring the United States to take any action on its own. But in the case of three agreements in particular, and then the agreements that I've already outlined, the United States would have to take legislative action. The three agreements we did conclude where fast track was necessary were the conclusion of the Uruguay Round, the NAFTA, and the information technology agreement. And fast track was necessary because we were reducing tariffs and because we were making additional U.S. law changes.

As we look at the future agenda, the entirety of the WTO agenda will require further movement on tariffs, as well as some movement on U.S. law changes, fast track would again be necessary. Similarly on ITA-2 with respect to tariff reductions.

MR. SPERLING: I just want to add, just to make it a little more specific -- without the fast track and Uruguay Round, the pre-Uruguay tariff -- weighted tariff for Thailand was 41 percent. Now it's 26 percent. So we're talking over the last four years whether products made in the United States would be subject to that much higher of a tariff. For Korea, 16.2 percent to 7.7; Singapore

16.2 percent before Uruguay, 1.3 percent now -- to the degree that increased exports have been part of an economic strategy that has helped strengthen this economy, and this is a period where we've had a significant drop in unemployment, a historic job creation, so while there are many challenges with change and many people, even in the best of times, who struggle -- to the extent you've had a strong economic strategy and exports have been part, to the degree that that is obviously helped by having lower tariffs, those would not exist. All of the differences mentioned here would not exist but for the fast track authority there. So you can look forward, but you can also look back at the lower tariffs our exports have faced that would not exist today were it not for the President having fast track authority.

Q Why don't we have a bill yet? What's the hold-up?

MR. SPERLING: There's nothing complicated here. After the budget, which I think was signed on August 5th, we -- and then the line item veto I think was taken care of around the middle of August -- we started doing consultations on the Hill. As we did them, as we talked to people, it was very clear to us that it would be more helpful in getting bipartisan support, more helpful in creating a tone and an atmosphere of inclusiveness if we took a few more days to consult and to hear more people out.

I can tell you firsthand there is a fundamental difference between going to a meeting in which you say, we've already made every decision and we're just here to tell you what we're going to do, and a meeting where you come and say, we've held up things a bit because we want to get your input before we make final decisions. And everything you learn working in the White House and dealing with □,

Congress is that you err on the side of inclusiveness and consultation and I will tell you, on any bill, on any piece of legislation, at any time, if there's a choice between meeting a self-imposed or press-imposed deadline on a particular bill and doing the necessary consultation that allows you to include more people's thoughts and ideas and get more support, I'll choose the latter every time.

Q When will there be --

MR. SPERLING: I think most of the consultations that we wanted to have and consider, we have or have scheduled, so I think we're certainly aiming for next week.

Q Gene, how likely is it that the legislation is going to change between now and then? Is the President eager to try to make fine-tuning changes that would appeal to Democrats, to labor environment?

MR. SPERLING: Again, you'll see the legislation when we put it out next week.

Thank you.

END

3:50 P.M. EDT

Message Sent

To: _____

Julia R. Green
Laura D. Schwartz
Lori E. Abrams
Jeannetta P. Allen
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie @ OVP@EOP
Robin J. Bachman
Kyle M. Baker
Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Lanny A. Breuer
Patrick E. Briggs
Robin J. Bachman
Laura Capps
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
Steven A. Cohen
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Anna E. Cushing
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
James A. Dorskind
Jennifer D. Dudley
Daniel W. Burkhardt
Diane Ikemiyashiro
Dorian V. Weaver
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen C. Fahle
Karen E. Finney
Carmen B. Fowler
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines
Michael A. Gill @ OVP@EOP
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Donald Goldberg
Richard Hayes
Russell W. Horwitz
Maureen A. Hudson
Thomas D. Janenda
david t. johnson
Leanne I. Johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julia R. Green
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Joshua A. King
Nicholas B. Kirkhorn

Catherine T. Kitchen
Sarah S. Freeman
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP
Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
G N. Lattimore
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis
Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Tanya E. Martin
Doris O. Matsui
Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Estela Mendoza
R. Scott Michaud
Elisa Millsap
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.
Sean P. Maloney
Steven J. Naplan
Elizabeth R. Newman
Neera Tanden
Jonathan Orszag
Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerali
Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Jonathan Prince
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner
Victoria Radd
Nelson Reyneri
Jonathan P. Robell
Sharonlyn A. Rosier
Charles F. Ruff
Virginia N. Rustique
Evan Ryan
G. Timothy Saunders
Judithanne V. Scourfield
Brooks Scoville
Ruby Shamir
Douglas S. Sheorn
June Shih
David Shipley
Robert M. Shireman
Jake Siewert
Joshua Silverman
Brian D. Smith
Craig T. Smith
Richard Socarides
Douglas B. Sosnik
Aviva Steinberg
Todd Stern

Darby E. Stott
Michael J. Sullivan
Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP @ OVP
Tracy F. Sisser
Sylvia M. Mathews
Lisa Tamagni
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp@eop
terri tingen
Barry J. Toiv
Serena C. Torrey
June G. Turner
Dag Vega
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp@eop
Michael Waldman
Angelina Walker @ ovp@eop
Lowell A. Weiss
Woyneab M. Wondwossen
Debra S. Wood
William H. White Jr.
COGDELL_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOME_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOW_T @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BALDERSTON_A @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
DICKEY_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRAY_W @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
HAAS_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
MOFFETT_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
STUMPF_D @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
TCSmith @ dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
glynnm @ panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY
73030.21 @ compuserve.com@INET@LNGTWY
INFOMGT @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Russell W. Horwitz@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-SEP-1997 12:21:00.00

SUBJECT: Gene wanted some changes made to talking points. Can you please

TO: Robert D. Kyle (Robert D. Kyle@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lael Brainard (Lael Brainard@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

CC: MITSLER_E (MITSLER_E@AI@CD) (NSC)
READ:22-SEP-1997 12:26:17.48

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 22-SEP-1997 12:18:00

TALKING POINTS FOR CALLS TO
HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE MEMBERS

WHAT IS FAST TRACK?

Fast Track is about negotiating authority, not the actual substance of what is negotiated.

Every President for the last 25 years has had this power -- it is a traditional authority. President Clinton, like every President since Ford, should continue to have this power. Overall, the President is committed to pursuing three objectives: (1) to break down unfair foreign trade barriers and create good American jobs; (2) to promote and advance worker rights; and (3) to promote responsible environmental protections.

There will be plenty of opportunities to address specific concerns regarding labor and environment in the actual negotiating process:

Worker Issues. The bill allows for worker issues to be dealt with in the WTO ensuring a permanent forum for addressing these issues.

Child Labor. For the first time ever, the bill includes a specific reference to child labor.

Environment. For the first time ever in a fast track bill, this objective also includes a specific provision on the environment;

** Discreet Set of Labor/Environment Issues in Trade Agreement. This bill includes a discreet set of labor/environmental provisions □&directly related to trade□8 to be brought back to Congress under fast track authority. This is but one of many tools the President can use to advance his goals.

Side Agreements. The President has extensive executive authority to reach labor/environmental agreements with countries. These agreements do not require congressional approval. We have already committed to conclude companion labor/environment agreements in future trade agreements where appropriate, and Chile has already agreed to enter such agreements.

Other International Forums. The Clinton Administration has done more than any other to press countries to improve labor and environmental protection -- and we will continue to do so, whether through the ILO, the WTO, the UN, or

international financial institutions. We should be concerned about improving conditions in all countries, not just in free trade partners.

Trade Agreement. This bill permits labor/environmental provisions directly related to trade to be brought back to Congress under fast track authority. This is but one of many tools the President can use to advance his goals.

Other Initiatives. The Administration has been aggressively promoting core labor standards and environmental protection abroad through initiatives not necessarily related to trade negotiations. For example, the sweatshop initiative brings together labor unions, businesses and others to end exploitable labor practices and improve working conditions, both here and abroad. Companies have already pledged to accept external monitoring of their labor practices.

Other New Provisions.

Agriculture. The bill contains a specific negotiating objective on agriculture as requested by many Democrats. It provides a series of measures designed to achieve fairer and more open conditions of agricultural trade, including: reducing or eliminating tariffs and subsidies that hurt U.S. agricultural exports and market opportunities; addressing other unjustified barriers to such exports; and strengthening the international rules covering unfair foreign practices that distort world agricultural markets.

Better Consultations with Congress. The bill contains entirely new provisions requiring unprecedented consultations with Congress, as to both the trade agreement and any labor/environmental side agreement. Provisions include: (1) a requirement that the Administration inform Congress of its negotiating objectives for a specific agreement before negotiations begin; (2) a requirement that the Administration consult before signing a trade agreement about any parallel agreements, such as labor and environmental side agreements.

THIS BILL IS THE BEST CHANCE WE HAVE TO ADVANCE OUR SHARED PRIORITIES -- AND TO DO SO IN A WAY THAT CAN PASS A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS. IT WILL BE GOOD FOR ALL AMERICANS.

Exports have been responsible for more than one-third of growth in the last five years.

Inflation is the lowest it's been a generation

Unemployment is below at 4.9%

13 million new jobs have been created -- and a lot of that progress is due to trade.

And since 95% of the world's consumers live outside the US, future growth, more than ever, is dependent on our ability to open new markets for US goods and services.

Because the President didn't have fast track authority, Latin American countries have already signed 20 trade agreements over the last four years -- all without us. We can talk all we want about leveling the playing field -- but meanwhile everyone else is busy doing just that.

YOUR ISSUES AND CONCERNS ARE IMPORTANT, AND THE BILL WE PROPOSED AFTER EXTENSIVE CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS IS THE BEST WAY TO ADVANCE THESE CONCERNS.

If we negotiate a trade agreement with a country like Chile, we have more leverage to also sign side agreements on labor and the environment. If we don't get a general agreement to start with, we can forget about the separate agreements.

This President is committed to the same goals as you regarding labor and

environment -- he's already done more than any other Administration in history to improve protections in these areas. Beside, Congress still retains the ultimate power to vote down any treaty that doesn't satisfy your concerns.

THIS ADMINISTRATION REMAINS COMMITTED TO ENSURE THAT THOSE WHO BENEFIT LESS FROM TRADE ARE NOT LEFT BEHIND.

We have a comprehensive program, including EITC and Pell Grants, trade adjustment assistance, minimum wage and tax cuts for community colleges -- to help working people in this time of change.

The legislation allows Congress to expand trade adjustment assistance as part of implementation of any trade agreement

Backing away from this legislation won't create jobs or clean up the environment. The opportunity here greatly outweighs the risks.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Peter O'Keefe (CN=Peter O'Keefe/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-SEP-1997 14:04:15.00

SUBJECT:

TO: RWB (RWB @ OHMAIL.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MFBerman (MFBerman @ MSN.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: EBlackccia (EBlackccia @ aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ALBondurant (ALBondurant @ verner.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: grover.bynum (grover.bynum @ mail.sprint.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cahn (cahn @ co.xerox.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bcarr (bcarr @ mail.idt.net [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lchambers (lchambers @ chambersinc.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ken.cole (ken.cole @ alliedsignal.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jhd (jhd @ dc01101.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mitchell_delk (mitchell_delk @ freddiemac.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lnusgmb.czddl (lnusgmb.czddl @ gmeds.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dutkogroup (dutkogroup @ aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: english.pepper (english.pepper @ bsc.bls.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mike_ferrell (mike_ferrell @ mbaa.org [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: richard.goodstein (richard.goodstein @ bfi.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fgraefe (fgraefe @ baker-hostetler.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: usfmd8jb (usfmd8jb @ ibm.mail.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hannett (hannett @ capalliance.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rhealy (rhealy @ arco.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David T. Johnson (CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: peter_kelly (peter_kelly @ bm.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: abkcr (abkcr @ aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: weldon_latham (weldon_latham @ shawpittman.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: llevinson (llevinson @ vernor.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rgll (rgll @ chrysler.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cmanatt (cmanatt @ manatt.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tmccracken (tmccracken @ nsbu.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: michael.mcshane (michael.mcshane @ trw.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: national (national @ newbo.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pod (pod @ oh-mail.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: croneil (croneil @ vais.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: scott-pasterick (scott-pasterick @ bm.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rplatt (rplatt @ mwe.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DBARR (DBARR @ MorganStanley.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CBennett (CBennett @ Pfizer.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LBickwit (LBickwit @ milchev.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Timothy.Boggs (Timothy.Boggs @ TWI.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: betty.bowers (betty.bowers @ fluordaniel.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: billc100 (billc100 @ erols.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mecandon (mecandon @ aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ptca (ptca @ chevron.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mchampion (mchampion @ pccmail.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: betty (betty @ tsbbs02.pnet.com [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ddavies (ddavies @ aba.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dennistj (dennistj @ sce.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tdowney (tdowney @ downey-chandler.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: deckhart (deckhart @ arterhadden.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pequale (pequale @ iiaa.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mdfranks (mdfranks @ cbs.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ggould (ggould @ dcoffice.gte.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mgreen (mgreen @ psa.com [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: verner (verner @ verner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: harmon (harmon @ ms.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jeffrey.hirshberg (jeffrey.hirshberg @ ey.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tjolly (tjolly @ jollyrissler.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pknight (pknight @ wkltflaw.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jkuitwaard (jkuitwaard @ realtors.org [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mleggett (mleggett @ vnet.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mlewan (mlewan @ apcoassoc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: marcassoc (marcassoc @ pipeline.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: smaury (smaury @ brtable.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bob_mcgee (bob_mcgee @ oxy.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rneel (rneel @ usta.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pnelson (pnelson @ obriencalio.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ksosssa (ksosssa @ prodigy.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pnc (pnc @ clark.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lnusgmb.pzd72y (lnusgmb.pzd72y @ gmeds.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jplebani (jplebani @ arterhadden.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-OCT-1997 09:35:37.00

SUBJECT: Revised draft of VP Radio Address on Fast Track

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

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

TO: KYLE_R (KYLE_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OPD)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Antony J. Blinken (CN=Antony J. Blinken/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE
RADIO ADDRESS ON FAST TRACK
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1997

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 turn back from the challenges and opportunities 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 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 13 million new jobs. Less than 5% unemployment. Just yesterday, we learned that the economy has grown at 4% over the past year. Fully half that growth comes from exports. To keep creating high-wage jobs, we must reach the billions of 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, or close down a single sweatshop, or 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 free 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 Bush, President Carter 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. The President and I are grateful for their support. And we are also 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 with 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. Together, we must seize it.

Thank you for listening.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-OCT-1997 11:53:51.14

SUBJECT: 1997-10/31 EMBARGOED VP RADIO ADDRESS TO NATION

TO: Darby E. Stott (Darby E. Stott@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan C. Moloney (MOLONEY_M) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan Murchinson (MURCHINSON_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (NEWMAN_E) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Roger V. Salazar (SALAZA_R) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard Socarides (SOCARIDES_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addr
READ:NOT READ

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
READ:31-OCT-1997 13:43:06.96

TO: William H. White, Jr. (William H. White Jr.@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
see attached.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:31-OCT-1997 11:53:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD
MORE

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
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

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

pleased that former secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce, and former U.S. Trade Representatives of both parties have also joined our call.

□

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

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

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-OCT-1997 13:17:35.90

SUBJECT: remarks at Tropical Shipping Warehouse

TO: Darby E. Stott (Darby E. Stott@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan C. Moloney (MOLONEY_M) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan Murchinson (MURCHINSON_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (NEWMAN_E) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Roger V. Salazar (SALAZA_R) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard Socarides (SOCARIDES_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addr
READ:NOT READ

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
READ:31-OCT-1997 14:38:58.51

TO: William H. White, Jr. (William H. White Jr.@eop@lngtwy@eopmrX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
see attached
===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:31-OCT-1997 13:14:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD

MORE

#

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
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.

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

#

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.

□

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN

MORE

#

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 if -- they can understand 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.)

TOP ODD

- \p -

BOTTOM ODD

MORE

#

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

□
TOP ODD

- \p -

BOTTOM ALL

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

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Eric S. Rubin (RUBIN_E) (NSC)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-DEC-1997 12:51:25.47

SUBJECT: EU FACT SHEET #1--not for release yet

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (Elizabeth R. Newman@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

I am sending you the two fact sheets now but there is still the possibility of changes, so please do not release yet. Plus the meeting has not broken. I will let you know when they are OK and bring over 75 copies of each before the 2pm briefing. Thanks.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 5-DEC-1997 12:50:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Eric S. Rubin

TEXT:

COMMENT

AUTHOR : Peter S. Hinz

OPERATOR : Eric S. Rubin

COMMENT :

PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_ROMAN

TOP ODD

- \p -

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

BOTTOM ODD

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

TOP EVEN
- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN

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.

#

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY (Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGT

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-DEC-1997 15:01:56.00

SUBJECT: Fact Sheet: New Transatlantic Agenda

TO: Steven J. Naplan@eop (Steven J. Naplan@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Ronnel@EOP (Steven J. Ronnel@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Sullivan@EOP (Michael J. Sullivan@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 5-DEC-1997 14:49:00

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.

#

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Eric S. Rubin (RUBIN_E) (NSC)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-DEC-1997 10:06:24.15

SUBJECT: Human Rights Fact Sheet in final--ready to go

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (Elizabeth R. Newman@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

CC: Nanda Chitre (CHITRE_N) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

CC: Glen M. Weiner (WEINER_G) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

This is approved by Sandy Berger for distribution

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 9-DEC-1997 10:04:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Eric S. Rubin

TEXT:

COMMENT

AUTHOR : Eric P. Schwartz

OPERATOR : ERIC RUBIN

COMMENT :

PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_ROMAN

TOP ODD

\p

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

December 9, 1997

FACT SHEET

U.S. EFFORTS TO PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY

Summary: The Clinton Administration works to promote human rights and democracy because they are integral to American values and because a world in which governments respect the rule of law will be freer, safer, and more prosperous. In the 50th anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, our challenge is to promote the universality of human rights and seek to ensure their implementation around the globe.

In Haiti and Bosnia, U.S.

□

-led international efforts have put an end to the most egregious of abuses, and we continue to provide vital

support to build democratic institutions. We are promoting conflict resolution, human rights monitoring, accountability and building institutions of justice in Central Africa. In China, we continue to press vigorously for progress on prisoner releases, religious freedom and the rule of law. And throughout central Europe and the former Soviet Union, we are contributing substantial resources to build successful democratic transitions.

Bilateral U.S. Government Efforts

Funding and Programs: In addition to our diplomatic advocacy, we devote some \$400 million per year to democracy assistance and human rights programs implemented by the Agency for International Development (AID), as well as more than \$40 million for the National Endowment for Democracy and other publicly supported efforts to support human rights and democracy activities overseas. The United States Information Agency (USIA) also works to strengthen the culture of democracy worldwide, both as a contributor to the free flow of information and ideas and by activities designed to sustain the democratic dialogue across national boundaries. USIA spends more than \$100 million per year on democracy and human rights promotion programs.

Increased reporting and advocacy: We have expanded our annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, and have substantially increased our reporting and advocacy on religious freedom issues. Last year, the Administration established an Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad, which has helped already to raise the prominence and the profile of this critical issue.

TOP EVEN

\p

Support for Democratic Transitions: Through a wide range of programs, AID has promoted peaceful democratic transitions ? for example, through support of training and exchange programs for the new Palestinian National Council; independent judiciary and professional law enforcement authorities in Central Africa; and a free media in Bosnia. Many of these projects are funded through the AID Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI), established by the Clinton Administration in 1993. We intend to expand OTI efforts over the next two years.

Support for Local NGOs: From the Commission on Protection of Women and Children in Mali, to the Kiev Press Club in Ukraine, to the Legal Assistance Centers of Namibia, we are keeping faith with those who share a commitment to human rights and are working to promote those values within their own societies.

Supporting Accountability: Through our support for truth commissions in Guatemala, El Salvador and South Africa, we promote the accountability and justice that is proving so necessary for political reconciliation in post

□
-conflict societies.

Supporting the rights of the disenfranchised: Through our ?No Sweat? initiative, the Administration, corporations and NGOs are developing voluntary ethical codes of conduct to prevent the importation of products made by child labor, to end sweatshop conditions both in the U.S. and abroad, and to ensure that women and children share equally the basic rights they have been denied in so many parts of the world.

Practicing domestically what we preach abroad: We recognized that human rights issues do not begin at the water's edge. As we have urged other governments to provide assistance and protection to refugees, we have maintained our commitment as the world's leader in refugee resettlement. For example, we expect to increase our resettlement of Bosnians from 22,000 this year to as many as 26,000 next year. We have also taken measures to provide long

□

-term relief

for Central Americans who fled here as refugees; and we took quick action to rescue some 6500 Kurdish refugees from northern Iraq last year.

Support for International Human Rights Institutions:

UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR): We led the effort to create the new Office of the UNHCHR, and have provided critical support, such as for human rights monitoring programs in Rwanda, Burundi, and Cambodia, and for assistance to victims of torture around the world. In 1997, we provided UNHCHR with \$4 million and we will increase our support next year.

International Tribunals: We are the leading supporter of the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and

Rwanda, providing both financial and personnel support. In 1998, we will increase our support for the tribunals.

Permanent Court: In 1995, President Clinton announced U.S. support for a Permanent International Criminal Court, and we are committed to the establishment of a Court with broad

□

-based support before the end of the Century.

Treaties: We have moved forward on several international human rights treaties, including the Convention Against Torture (implementing legislation enacted in 1994), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism (ratified in 1994), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (Administration's consent package submitted to the Senate in 1994 and still pending there), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (signed in 1995).

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Eric S. Rubin (RUBIN_E) (NSC)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-DEC-1997 10:08:42.29

SUBJECT: Human Rights Fact Sheet FYI--approved for release by NSC

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

CC: Steven A. Cohen (Steven A. Cohen@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

CC: Julie E. Mason (Julie E. Mason@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

CC: Karen Finney (Karen E. Finney@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 9-DEC-1997 10:04:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Eric S. Rubin

ATT SUBJECT: Human Rights Fact Sheet in final--ready to go

ATT TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (Elizabeth R. Newman@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

ATT CC: Nanda Chitre (CHITRE_N)

ATT CC: Glen M. Weiner (WEINER_G)

TEXT:

This is approved by Sandy Berger for distribution

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 9-DEC-1997 10:04:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Eric S. Rubin

TEXT:

COMMENT

AUTHOR : Eric P. Schwartz

OPERATOR : ERIC RUBIN

COMMENT :

PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_ROMAN

TOP ODD

\p

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
December 9, 1997

FACT SHEET

U.S. EFFORTS TO PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY

Summary: The Clinton Administration works to promote human rights and democracy because they are integral to American values and because a world in which governments respect the rule of law will be freer, safer, and more prosperous. In the 50th anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, our challenge is to promote the universality of human rights and seek to ensure their implementation around the globe.

In Haiti and Bosnia, U.S.

□

-led international efforts have put an end to the most egregious of abuses, and we continue to provide vital support to build democratic institutions. We are promoting conflict resolution, human rights monitoring, accountability and building institutions of justice in Central Africa. In China, we continue to press vigorously for progress on prisoner releases, religious freedom and the rule of law. And throughout central Europe and the former Soviet Union, we are contributing substantial resources to build successful democratic transitions.

Bilateral U.S. Government Efforts

Funding and Programs: In addition to our diplomatic advocacy, we devote some \$400 million per year to democracy assistance and human rights programs implemented by the Agency for International Development (AID), as well as more than \$40 million for the National Endowment for Democracy and other publicly supported efforts to support human rights and democracy activities overseas. The United States Information Agency (USIA) also works to strengthen the culture of democracy worldwide, both as a contributor to the free flow of information and ideas and by activities designed to sustain the democratic dialogue across national boundaries. USIA spends more than \$100 million per year on democracy and human rights promotion programs.

Increased reporting and advocacy: We have expanded our annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, and have substantially increased our reporting and advocacy on religious freedom issues. Last year, the Administration established an Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad, which has helped already to raise the prominence and the profile of this critical issue.

TOP EVEN

\p

Support for Democratic Transitions: Through a wide range of programs, AID has promoted peaceful democratic transitions ? for example, through support of training and exchange programs for the new Palestinian National Council; independent judiciary and professional law enforcement authorities in Central Africa; and a free media in Bosnia. Many of these projects are funded through the

AID Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI), established by the Clinton Administration in 1993. We intend to expand OTI efforts over the next two years.

Support for Local NGOs: From the Commission on Protection of Women and Children in Mali, to the Kiev Press Club in Ukraine, to the Legal Assistance Centers of Namibia, we are keeping faith with those who share a commitment to human rights and are working to promote those values within their own societies.

Supporting Accountability: Through our support for truth commissions in Guatemala, El Salvador and South Africa, we promote the accountability and justice that is proving so necessary for political reconciliation in post

□

-conflict societies.

Supporting the rights of the disenfranchised: Through our "No Sweat" initiative, the Administration, corporations and NGOs are developing voluntary ethical codes of conduct to prevent the importation of products made by child labor, to end sweatshop conditions both in the U.S. and abroad, and to ensure that women and children share equally the basic rights they have been denied in so many parts of the world.

Practicing domestically what we preach abroad: We recognized that human rights issues do not begin at the water's edge. As we have urged other governments to provide assistance and protection to refugees, we have maintained our commitment as the world's leader in refugee resettlement. For example, we expect to increase our resettlement of Bosnians from 22,000 this year to as many as 26,000 next year. We have also taken measures to provide long

□

-term relief

for Central Americans who fled here as refugees; and we took quick action to rescue some 6500 Kurdish refugees from northern Iraq last year.

Support for International Human Rights Institutions:

UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR): We led the effort to create the new Office of the UNHCHR, and have provided critical support, such as for human rights monitoring programs in Rwanda, Burundi, and Cambodia, and for assistance to victims of torture around the world. In 1997, we provided UNHCHR with \$4 million and we will increase our support next year.

International Tribunals: We are the leading supporter of the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and

Rwanda, providing both financial and personnel support. In 1998, we will increase our support for the tribunals.

Permanent Court: In 1995, President Clinton announced U.S. support for a Permanent International Criminal Court, and we are committed to the establishment of a Court with broad

□

-based support before the end of the Century.

Treaties: We have moved forward on several international human rights treaties, including the Convention Against Torture (implementing legislation enacted in 1994), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism (ratified in 1994), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (Administration's consent package submitted to the

Senate in 1994 and still pending there), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (signed in 1995).

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-DEC-1997 16:06:00.00

SUBJECT: Fact Sheets: US Efforts to promote Human Rights and Democracy

TO: 1=US (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955
READ:NOT READ

TO: 62955104 (62955104@eln.attmail.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: 73030.21 (73030.21@compuserve.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: BARBUSCHAK_K (BARBUSCHAK_K@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:10-DEC-1997 07:34:12.23

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

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

TO: INFOMGT (INFOMGT@A1@CD) (SYS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: JOHNSON_WC (JOHNSON_WC@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:10-DEC-1997 08:47:22.33

TO: LIZIK_C (LIZIK_C@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ: 9-DEC-1997 21:49:32.03

TO: WOZNIAK_N (WOZNIAK_N@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ: 9-DEC-1997 16:07:55.45

TO: backup (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: newsdesk (newsdesk@usnewswire.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: usia01 (usia01@access.digex.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: usnwire (usnwire@access.digex.com@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: wh-outbox-distr (wh-outbox-distr@clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GRAY_W (GRAY_W@A1@CD) (NSC)

READ: 9-DEC-1997 16:22:32.93

TO: NAPLAN_S
READ:NOT READ

(NAPLAN_S@A1@CD) (NSC)

TO: WEINER_R
READ:NOT READ

(WEINER_R@A1@CD) (DON)

TO: GRIBBEN_J
READ: 9-DEC-1997 16:56:02.14

(GRIBBEN_J@A1@CD) (OMB)

TO: RILEY_R
READ:NOT READ

(RILEY_R@A1@CD) (OA)

TO: RONNEL_S
READ:NOT READ

(RONNEL_S@A1@CD) (WHO)

TO: tnewell
READ:NOT READ

(tnewell@ostp.eop.gov@INET)

TO: HEMMIG_M
READ:NOT READ

(HEMMIG_M@A1@CD) (WHO)

TO: Julie_green
READ:NOT READ

(Julie_green@ed.gov@INET)

TO: bonney
READ:NOT READ

(bonney@dnc.democrats.org@INET)

TO: Christine A. Stanek
READ:NOT READ

(Christine A. Stanek@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Lori E. Abrams
READ:NOT READ

(Lori E. Abrams@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Laura K. Capps
READ:NOT READ

(Laura K. Capps@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Steven A. Cohen
READ:NOT READ

(Steven A. Cohen@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Anne M. Edwards
READ:NOT READ

(Anne M. Edwards@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Rahm I. Emanuel
READ:NOT READ

(Rahm I. Emanuel@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Karen E. Finney
READ:NOT READ

(Karen E. Finney@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Ben A. Freeland
READ:NOT READ

(Ben A. Freeland@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines
READ:NOT READ

(Jeremy M. Gaines@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jason S. Goldberg
READ:NOT READ

(Jason S. Goldberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: James T. Heimbach

(James T. Heimbach@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Russell W. Horwitz
READ:NOT READ

(Russell W. Horwitz@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: David E. Kalbaugh
READ:NOT READ

(David E. Kalbaugh@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Joshua A. King
READ:NOT READ

(Joshua A. King@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Peter R. Orszag
READ:NOT READ

(Peter R. Orszag@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Gordon Li
READ:NOT READ

(Gordon Li@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Julie E. Mason
READ:NOT READ

(Julie E. Mason@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Doris O. Matsui
READ:NOT READ

(Doris O. Matsui@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Elisa Millsap
READ:NOT READ

(Elisa Millsap@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Cheryl D. Mills
READ:NOT READ

(Cheryl D. Mills@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: G. Timothy Saunders
READ:NOT READ

(G. Timothy Saunders@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Laura D. Schwartz
READ:NOT READ

(Laura D. Schwartz@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Douglas S. Sheorn
READ:NOT READ

(Douglas S. Sheorn@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Joshua Silverman
READ:NOT READ

(Joshua Silverman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik
READ:NOT READ

(Douglas B. Sosnik@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Todd Stern
READ:NOT READ

(Todd Stern@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Barry J. Toiv
READ:NOT READ

(Barry J. Toiv@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Michael Waldman
READ:NOT READ

(Michael Waldman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Christopher F. Walker
READ:NOT READ

(Christopher F. Walker@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Dorian V. Weaver
READ:NOT READ

(Dorian V. Weaver@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen

(Catherine T. Kitchen@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Lori L. Anderson (Lori L. Anderson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Michael W. Williams (Michael W. Williams@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Suzanne Dale (Suzanne Dale@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard Socarides (Richard Socarides@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (Barbara D. Woolley@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Darby E. Stott (Darby E. Stott@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jake Siewert (Jake Siewert@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno (Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sara M. Latham (Sara M. Latham@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carole A. Parmelee (Carole A. Parmelee@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Andrew J. Mayock (Andrew J. Mayock@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (Beverly J. Barnes@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Megan C. Moloney (Megan C. Moloney@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan Murchinson (Jonathan Murchinson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (Joseph P. Lockhart@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Laura S. Marcus (Laura S. Marcus@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Virginia N. Rustique (Virginia N. Rustique@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (Thomas D. Janenda@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Terri J. Tingen (Terri J. Tingen@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jennifer D. Dudley (Jennifer D. Dudley@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian D. Smith (Brian D. Smith@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (Leanne A. Shimabukuro@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Stacey L. Rubin (Stacey L. Rubin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Tracy S. Olmstead (Tracy S. Olmstead@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kim B. Widdess (Kim B. Widdess@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lawrence J. Haas (Lawrence J. Haas@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Roger V. Salazar (Roger V. Salazar@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jordan Tamagni (Jordan Tamagni@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Serena C. Torrey (Serena C. Torrey@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kevin S. Moran (Kevin S. Moran@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ashley L. Raines (Ashley L. Raines@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter A. Weissman (Peter A. Weissman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas J. Band (Douglas J. Band@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Edwin R. Thomas III (Edwin R. Thomas III@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sherman A. Williams (Sherman A. Williams@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: William W. McCathran (William W. McCathran@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Julia M. Payne (Julia M. Payne@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robin J. Bachman (Robin J. Bachman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ruby Shamir (Ruby Shamir@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Katherine Hubbard (Katherine Hubbard@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nicole R. Rabner (Nicole R. Rabner@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: June Shih (June Shih@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elisabeth Steele (Elisabeth Steele@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brooks E. Scoville (Brooks E. Scoville@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Estela Mendoza (Estela Mendoza@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Neera Tanden (Neera Tanden@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr. (Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kyle M. Baker (Kyle M. Baker@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anna E. Cushing (Anna E. Cushing@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Diane Ikemiyashiro (Diane Ikemiyashiro@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Leanne I. Johnson (Leanne I. Johnson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sarah S. Knight (Sarah S. Knight@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sharolyn A. Rosier (Sharolyn A. Rosier@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (Tracy F. Sisser@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (Woyneab M. Wondwossen@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen (Jeannetta P. Allen@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield (Judithanne V. Scourfield@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMR
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (Patrick E. Briggs@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Debra S. Wood (Debra S. Wood@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (Daniel W. Burkhardt@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (Maureen A. Hudson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lana Dickey (Lana Dickey@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (Carmen B. Fowler@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan Orszag (Jonathan Orszag@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lynn G. Cutler (Lynn G. Cutler@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nelson Reyneri (Nelson Reyneri@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julianne B. Corbett (Julianne B. Corbett@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Eleanor S. Parker (Eleanor S. Parker@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Whitney S. Staley (Whitney S. Staley@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sheelah A. Feinberg (Sheelah A. Feinberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Walker F. Bass (Walker F. Bass@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Virginia Apuzzo (Virginia Apuzzo@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Glen M. Weiner (Glen M. Weiner@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael V. Terrell (Michael V. Terrell@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elliot J. Diringner (Elliot J. Diringner@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Kara Gerhardt (Kara Gerhardt@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nanda Chitre (Nanda Chitre@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Amy W. Tobe (Amy W. Tobe@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa M. Murray (Melissa M. Murray@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David S. Beaubaire (David S. Beaubaire@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lisa J. Levin (Lisa J. Levin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Phillip Caplan (Phillip Caplan@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 9-DEC-1997 15:55:00

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release December 9, 1997

FACT SHEET

U.S. EFFORTS TO PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY

Summary: The Clinton Administration works to promote human rights and democracy because they are integral to American values and because a world in which governments respect the rule of law will be freer, safer, and more prosperous. In the 50th anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, our challenge is to promote the universality of human rights and seek to ensure their implementation around the globe.

In Haiti and Bosnia, U.S.-led international efforts have put an end to the most egregious of abuses, and we continue to provide vital support to build democratic institutions. We are promoting conflict resolution, human rights monitoring, accountability and building institutions of justice in Central Africa. In China, we continue to press vigorously for progress on prisoner releases, religious freedom and the rule of law. And throughout central Europe and the former Soviet Union, we are contributing substantial resources to build successful democratic transitions.

Bilateral U.S. Government Efforts

Funding and Programs: In addition to our diplomatic advocacy, we devote some \$400 million per year to democracy assistance and human rights programs implemented by the Agency for International Development (AID), as well as more than \$40 million for the National Endowment for Democracy and other publicly supported efforts to support human rights and democracy activities overseas.

The United States Information Agency (USIA) also works to strengthen the culture of democracy worldwide, both as a contributor to the free flow of information and ideas and by activities designed to sustain the democratic dialogue across national boundaries. USIA spends more than \$100 million per year on democracy and human rights promotion programs.

Increased reporting and advocacy: We have expanded our annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, and have substantially increased our reporting and advocacy on religious freedom issues. Last year, the Administration established an Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad, which has helped already to raise the prominence and the profile of this critical issue.

Support for Democratic Transitions: Through a wide range of programs, AID has promoted peaceful democratic transitions () for example, through support of training and exchange programs for the new Palestinian National Council; independent judiciary and professional law enforcement authorities in Central Africa; and a free media in Bosnia. Many of these projects are funded through the AID Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI), established by the Clinton Administration in 1993. We intend to expand OTI efforts over the next two years.

Support for Local NGOs: From the Commission on Protection of Women and Children in Mali, to the Kiev Press Club in Ukraine, to the Legal Assistance Centers of Namibia, we are keeping faith with those who share a commitment to human rights and are working to promote those values within their own societies.

Supporting Accountability: Through our support for truth commissions in Guatemala, El Salvador and South Africa, we promote the accountability and justice that is proving so necessary for political reconciliation in post-conflict societies.

Supporting the rights of the disenfranchised: Through our "No Sweat" initiative, the Administration, corporations and NGOs are developing voluntary ethical codes of conduct to prevent the importation of products made by child labor, to end sweatshop conditions both in the U.S. and abroad, and to ensure that women and children share equally the basic rights they have been denied in so many parts of the world.

Practicing domestically what we preach abroad: We recognized that human rights issues do not begin at the water's edge. As we have urged other governments to provide assistance and protection to refugees, we have maintained our commitment as the world's leader in refugee resettlement () for example, we expect to increase our resettlement of Bosnians from 22,000 this year to as many as 26,000 next year. We have also taken measures to provide long-term relief for Central Americans who fled here as refugees; and we took quick action to rescue some 6500 Kurdish refugees from northern Iraq last year.

Support for International Human Rights Institutions:

UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR): We led the effort to create the new Office of the UNHCHR, and have provided critical support, such as for human rights monitoring programs in Rwanda, Burundi, and Cambodia, and for assistance to victims of torture around the world. In 1997, we provided UNHCHR with \$4 million and we will increase our support next year.

International Tribunals: We are the leading supporter of the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, providing both financial and personnel support. In 1998, we will increase our support for the tribunals.

Permanent Court: In 1995, President Clinton announced U.S. support for a Permanent International Criminal Court, and we are committed to the establishment of a Court with broad-based support before the end of the Century.

Treaties: We have moved forward on several international human rights treaties, including the Convention Against Torture (implementing legislation enacted in 1994), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism (ratified in 1994), the Convention on the Elimination of All

Forms of Discrimination Against Women (Administration's consent package submitted to the Senate in 1994 and still pending there), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (signed in 1995).

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1997 12:25:28.62

SUBJECT: December 10 NSC Press Guidance

TO: Lori L. Anderson (Lori L. Anderson@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Lori --

This was sent through Situation Room to Joe Lockhart.

It was faxed to NYC Press Office, as well.

Hard copy on its way to Mike.

Here is an electronic version.

Thanks,

Natalie

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:10-DEC-1997 12:23:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Natalie S. Wozniak

TEXT:

COMMENT

AUTHOR : Amy F. Pedersen

OPERATOR : Natalie S. Wozkiak

COMMENT :

PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_ROMAN

TOP ODD

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

December 10, 1997

Yeltsin's Health

Bosnia

PLO Office

MEPP

Iran

Iraq

Democratic Republic of Congo

Human Rights Day

Lee Verdict

Africa Trip

Kyoto Conference

Northern Ireland

Nigeria

Korea

TOP ODD

YELTSIN'S HEALTH

December 10, 1997

Regret that President Yeltsin is not feeling well.

President and Mrs. Clinton send their best wishes for a speedy recovery.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

If asked about seriousness of Yeltsin's illness: We have no additional information to what you have seen in press reports; Yeltsin has made many visits abroad and public appearances recently.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

TOP EVEN

BOSNIA

December 9, 1997

NO_BREAKBralo/War Criminals Operation

Background: We have talked to Pomfret about the Bralo case. Essentially, Bralo changed his mind in the period when SFOR was checking with ICTY as to whether he was on the sealed indictment list. Recommend deferring to DoD on specifics of Bralo case. We continue to press the Parties to live up to their obligation to turn over war criminals. The 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. Last summer's SFOR operation to detain war criminals in Prijedor conformed to this mandate and demonstrated effective cooperation with the ICTY. Any indicted war criminal would be subject to detention in these circumstances.

(If pressed, cannot comment on possible future operations.)

NO_BREAKRepublika Srpska Assembly Elections

The provisional results announced by the OSCE over the weekend

are good news.

Karadzic's SDS party no longer has a monopoly over the assembly. This is a significant set

□

-back for the Pale hard

□

-liners.

The Bosnian Serb people are clearly fed up with the corruption and obstruction of Dayton which denies ordinary Bosnian Serbs the fruits of peace.

The trendlines in elections since Dayton are clear: step by step, voters are choosing a measure of democratic pluralism. This is a welcome step toward lasting peace.

Appeals must be settled before the results are final. We expect the new multi

□

-party assembly to meet in the coming weeks and

begin work on forming a new government.

NATO Defense Ministerial/Bosnia

NO_BREAK

Secretary Cohen met with his NATO counterparts in Brussels last week 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.

Iranian Influence

NO_BREAK

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.

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.

Are you taking sides? Has the SFOR mandate changed?

NO_BREAK

We are for the active, consistent implementation of Dayton. That doesn't mean just trying to just defuse disputes between those who want to cooperate 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. In addition to gaining in the RS assembly elections, 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

NO_BREAK

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.

□

PEACE PROCESS: PLO OFFICE WAIVER
December 9, 1997

Q: What signal is the President trying to send by allowing the PLO office in Washington to reopen? Is it a reward for the Palestinians? Is it a rebuke to the Israeli Prime Minister?

A: This decision only restores the status of the Palestinian office to that it had prior to August, a status to which neither Israel nor the Congress objected. It will facilitate our ability to have a dialogue with Palestinian negotiators on the peace process, which is a top priority for both Israel and the US. (In other words, it will allow us to deal as directly with the Palestinians as Israel deals with them).

It is not intended as a reward to the Palestinians. It should certainly not be seen as any kind of rebuke to Israel.

There is no political significance on the timing. The Foreign Operations appropriation act, which provided for the authority to issue this waiver, only became law on November 26. That is why the action was taken at this time.

Q: Isn't it a bad idea to upgrade the status of the Palestinians the day before a vote in the United Nations General Assembly about treating the PLO like a state in the UN context.

A: The two issues are completely separate. We are allowing the Palestinian office to reopen with exactly the same status it had before August. There has been no upgrade of its status. It is not an Embassy and it does not represent a State.

This is in sharp contrast to our position on the resolution being considered by the General Assembly. We oppose granting the Palestinian delegation with the privileges of a UN member state first, because this is inconsistent with the UN's established practice and creates a bad precedent; and second, because it is inconsistent with the Peace Process parties' obligations to avoid actions that tend to prejudice permanent status issues, which includes the status of the eventual Palestinian entity.

Q: Why did the President waive restrictions on the operation of a

PLO office in Washington?

A: A fundamental and overarching foreign policy and national security goal of the United States is to obtain a just, lasting and comprehensive peace between Israel and its neighbors. An Israeli

□

-Palestinian
peace is critical in that regard. The President has waived the

operation of Section 1003 of P.L. #100

□

-204 for six months because it is a serious impediment to the United States playing an effective role in achieving that objective.

Section 1003 of P.L.

#100

□

-204 interferes with ability of PLO officials to travel to the United States for negotiations with Israel or carry out contacts with US officials. Moreover, the PLO office serves to facilitate contacts and to enhance the confidence of Palestinians in their relationship with the United States. Maintaining the kinds of ongoing relations with the PLO that are subject to Section 1003 has important symbolic effects in our effort to broker a peaceful Middle East settlement. This relationship is of particular importance now, as the United States seeks to help Israelis and Palestinians reach agreement on the implementation of the Interim Agreement and launch negotiations on permanent status.

The PLO office in Washington is not and never has been an Embassy. The United States has never accorded the PLO office any of the immunities or privileges of a diplomatic mission. This waiver would not in any way change these practices and the office would resume operations under the same guidelines that have applied since its opening in 1994.

Q: How can the President do this when the PLO isn't doing everything it can to crack down on terrorism?

A: We have made clear to the Palestinians that security cooperation is the sine qua non for movement on the peace process.

We have communicated this view at the highest levels.

We have seen some progress in security cooperation with Israel.

IF PRESSED (on whether the office was opened on the basis of PLO compliance with its commitments?):

The legislation under which the President exercised this waiver (Section 539(d) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, FY 1998), does not link the waiver to PLO compliance with its commitments.

IF PRESSED (on whether the Administration would certify that the PLO is in compliance with its commitments):

We don't answer hypotheticals.

□

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

December 9, 1997

Q: Is the President acting like Bush and Baker toward Netanyahu?

A: No.
The President and

his foreign policy team are engaged in an intensive and urgent effort to make progress in the Middle East peace process. This requires us to have an intensive dialogue with the Israelis, Palestinians and other parties. As part of that process, we state clearly where we disagree with the parties and where we believe they must do more. We conduct that dialogue with Israel in a private and diplomatic manner, not through pressure or hostile commentary in the press.

The President is committed to the success of the peace process, because he believes, together with Prime Minister Netanyahu and the majority of the Israeli public, that it is in Israel's best interest.

Q: What did Secretary Albright accomplish in Paris and Geneva?

A: The Secretary had useful and substantive discussions with both Netanyahu and Arafat. She characterized them as among the most substantive she has had.

She stressed the responsibility of both parties to take bold steps and urgently move forward the agreed four

□
-point agenda.

She will meet with both of them again in Europe December 17/18. Venue and exact timing still to be worked out.

Q: What is the US view of a five

□
-month testing period? for the Palestinians, as the Israelis have put it, before a further redeployment?

A: The Secretary had serious and detailed discussions with both Netanyahu and Arafat on the interrelated issues that will go into the decision on further redeployments: these include quality; quantity; timing; and security issues. We see serious work being done on the Israeli side to determine how these issues come into play in making a serious and credible FRD.

As the Secretary noted in her press conference Saturday, Prime Minister Netanyahu did not raise the specific idea of a five

□
-month delay in his meeting with her on Friday.

□
Q: Did Secretary Albright give Netanyahu a deadline of December 17 to present a plan for redeployment?

A: The Secretary has continually stressed with both Netanyahu and Arafat the urgent need for rapid and serious movement on the four point agenda (security; redeployment; timeout; and beginning permanent status talks).

She will meet them again next week to follow up on the specific issues discussed.

(IF PRESSED): She

did not set deadlines for either party.

□

IRAN

December 10, 1997

Q: How do we view the
OIC Conference in Tehran?

Background: The
member states of the Organization of the Islamic Conference will
convene at meetings, including a Summit, in Tehran December 6

□

-11.

A: The U.S. has long
had an excellent relationship with the OIC and its members and
supports its role in articulating the concerns of the
international Muslim Community.

We await the
conference's communique. We share many common objectives with
OIC member states, and hope that the communique reaffirms these
objectives. Of course, in the final analysis, we will judge the
results not just by the words but by the deeds of the OIC's
members, especially the host Iran.

The OIC is not
monolithic: we should expect a multiplicity of views, including
those that we don't agree with.

Q: Do we or don't we
want to change the nature of the Iranian regime?

A: We have no quarrel
with the Iranian people or their choice of an Islamic government.

Our problem is with
that government's behavior: support for terrorism, violent
opposition to the middle east peace process, and pursuit of WMD.
It is this behavior that we seek to change in Iran.

Q: Have we changed our
policy on dialogue?

A: No. We have long
said that we are open to dialogue with the Iranian government, as
long as that dialogue is with an authorized representative of the
Iranian government and both sides are we are prepared to
acknowledge it publicly.

We will raise those
three behaviors, and we would expect Iran to raise issues of
concern to it.

Many allies and
close friends have from time to time offered assistance in
starting this dialogue. We appreciate those offers. But any
real U.S.

□

-Iran dialogue is going to have to be between our two countries directly, given the importance of the issues and the need for clarity.

(If asked) We do not currently have such a dialogue.

□

IRAQ

December 8, 1997

Q: Is Iraq accepting or not accepting the extension of oil

□

-for

□

-food arrangement?

A: It appears that Iraq has accepted the terms for extending the food

□

-for

□

-oil

arrangement, but still will not sell oil its protests over delays in food and medicine supplies under the accord have been addressed.

Hard to know where the Iraqis are on this issue day to day.

A government interested in its people's well

□

-being would not dither like this.

□

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

December 8, 1997

Q: Can you give us an update on the UN investigative team?

A: The Embassy in Kinshasa reports that the advance team in Mbandaka appears to be experiencing no difficulties. As of 11 a.m., Monday, 12/8, Kinshasa time, the local UN human rights commission office confirmed that the rest of the team would be leaving for Mbandaka within the next few hours.

Q: What is your reaction to President Kabila's incarceration of opposition members? Have we protested these detentions?

A: Our Embassy has confirmed a press report that Congolese police broke up opposition political meetings last week and arrested the participants.

When the Kabila Government came to power in May, it announced a temporary ban on political party activities, which remains in effect. In recent

public statements, Kabila has indicated that the ban will be lifted following adoption of a new constitution, scheduled for the end of 1998.

We have made it clear to the Congolese Government on numerous occasions that the elections promised for 1999 require an early end to the ban on party activities.

□

HUMAN RIGHTS DAY
December 10, 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 participated in an evening reception on December 9 sponsored by the US/UN Mission at the Museum of Jewish Heritage in New York. He gave brief remarks. The event was attended by prominent governmental and nongovernmental figures involved in the promotion and protection of human rights.

On December 10, FLOTUS gave a keynote speech at a UN

□

-hosted event
aimed at officially launching the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The event began at 10 a.m. in the ECOSOC chamber at the UN and includes governmental and nongovernmental representatives as well as the media.

□

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

December 9, 1997

FACT SHEET

U.S. Efforts to Promote Human Rights and Democracy

Summary: The Clinton Administration works to promote human rights and democracy because they are integral to American values and because a world in which governments respect the rule of law will be freer, safer, and more prosperous. In the 50th anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, our challenge is to promote the universality of human rights and seek to ensure their implementation around the globe.

In Haiti and Bosnia, U.S.

□

-led international efforts have put an end to the most egregious of abuses, and we continue to provide vital support to build democratic institutions. We are promoting conflict resolution, human rights monitoring, accountability and building institutions of justice in Central Africa. In China, we continue to press vigorously for progress on prisoner releases, religious freedom and the rule of law. And throughout central Europe and the former Soviet Union, we are contributing substantial resources to build successful democratic transitions.

Bilateral U.S. Government Efforts

Funding and Programs: In addition to our diplomatic advocacy, we devote some \$400 million per year to democracy assistance and human rights programs implemented by the Agency for International Development (AID), as well as more than \$40 million for the National Endowment for Democracy and other publicly supported efforts to support human rights and democracy activities overseas. The United States Information Agency (USIA) also works to strengthen the culture of democracy worldwide, both as a contributor to the free flow of information and ideas and by activities designed to sustain the democratic dialogue across national boundaries. USIA spends more than \$100 million per year on democracy and human rights promotion programs.

Increased reporting and advocacy: We have expanded our annual

Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, and have substantially increased our reporting and advocacy on religious freedom issues. Last year, the Administration established an Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad, which has helped already to raise the prominence and the profile of this critical issue.

Support for Democratic Transitions: Through a wide range of programs, AID has promoted peaceful democratic transitions -- for example, through support of training and exchange programs for the new Palestinian National Council; independent judiciary and professional law enforcement authorities in Central Africa; and a free media in Bosnia. Many of these projects are funded through the AID Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI), established by the Clinton Administration in 1993. We intend to expand OTI efforts over the next two years.

Support for Local NGOs: From the Commission on Protection of Women and Children in Mali, to the Kiev Press Club in Ukraine, to the Legal Assistance Centers of Namibia, we are keeping faith with those who share a commitment to human rights and are working to promote those values within their own societies.

Supporting Accountability: Through our support for truth commissions in Guatemala, El Salvador and South Africa, we promote the accountability and justice that is proving so necessary for political reconciliation in post

□

-conflict societies.

Supporting the rights of the disenfranchised: Through our "No Sweat" initiative, the Administration, corporations and NGOs are developing voluntary ethical codes of conduct to prevent the importation of products made by child labor, to end sweatshop conditions both in the U.S. and abroad, and to ensure that women and children share equally the basic rights they have been denied in so many parts of the world.

Practicing domestically what we preach abroad: We recognized that human rights issues do not begin at the water's edge. As we have urged other governments to provide assistance and protection

to refugees, we have maintained our commitment as the world's leader in refugee resettlement -- for example, we expect to increase our resettlement of Bosnians from 22,000 this year to as many as 26,000 next year. We have also taken measures to provide long

□

-term relief for Central Americans who fled here as refugees; and we took quick action to rescue some 6500 Kurdish refugees from northern Iraq last year.

Support for International Human Rights Institutions:

UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR): We led the effort to create the new Office of the UNHCHR, and have provided critical support, such as for human rights monitoring programs in Rwanda, Burundi, and Cambodia, and for assistance to victims of torture around the world. In 1997, we provided UNHCHR with \$4 million and we will increase our support next year.

International Tribunals: We are the leading supporter of the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, providing both financial and personnel support. In 1998, we will increase our support for the tribunals.

Permanent Court: In 1995, President Clinton announced U.S. support for a Permanent International Criminal Court, and we are committed to the establishment of a Court with broad

□

-based support before the end of the Century.

Treaties: We have moved forward on several international human rights treaties, including the Convention Against Torture (implementing legislation enacted in 1994), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism (ratified in 1994), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (Administration's consent package submitted to the Senate in 1994 and still pending there), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (signed in 1995).

#

□

PETER LEE CASE
December 8, 1997

Background: Peter Lee, an employee of TRW, Inc., has been charged in a U.S. district court with one count of passing classified information to a foreign national in 1985 and one count of making a false claim in a questionnaire following a foreign trip earlier this year. The U.S. District Attorney for Central California has issued a press release announcing that Mr. Lee entered guilty pleas before District Judge Terry Hatter today.

Q: Have we talked with the Chinese about this? Especially during the recent Summit?

A: This is essentially a law enforcement matter at this time. It was under investigation until the information was filed on Friday and not a matter for diplomatic communication.

Q: Will you be talking to the Chinese about it shortly?

A: Given the fact that this is still a law enforcement matter, it is premature to speculate on the timing and nature of any diplomatic communication.

Q: Is this case in any way related to the Chinese efforts to influence U.S. elections?

A: That is a matter for the Justice Department.

Q: In light of this case, how can we go forward with our China agenda?

A: In any instance like this, wherein classified information is unlawfully communicated, we will take it seriously.

Where our differences with China involve law enforcement matters, we will use all available legal tools to deal with them firmly and as well as communicating our concerns forcefully to the Chinese government.

Q: How would you assess the damage to US national security from this case?

A: The FBI is still in the process of making that assessment.

Q: How many more cases involving Chinese attempts to obtain classified information are under investigation?

A: That is a law enforcement matter on which I am not going to comment.

□

Q: How would you characterize Chinese acquisition efforts against the US?

A: While I would note that the FBI, as well as others charged with protecting the nation's security, take very seriously their responsibilities to prevent the loss of classified and national defense information, it would be inappropriate to comment on matters directly related to ongoing law enforcement matters.

□

AFRICA TRIP
December 10, 1997

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT'S AFRICA TRIP

Q: What kind of aid package did the Secretary announce the U.S. was going to give to the Great Lakes Region in her speech to the OAU in Addis Ababa on December 9?

A: The Secretary announced that the U.S. will contribute \$10 million to the World Bank trust fund that the friends of the Democratic Republic of the Congo have pledged to establish. This fund will be used by the international community to support reconstruction projects that reflect Congolese priorities.

She also noted that we are working to make \$30 million available to support national

initiatives in the Great Lakes region to train court and policy officials, re

□

-build legal machinery where it has fallen into disrepair, and assist programs that promote reconciliation and healing after conflict.

Q: What did the Secretary say about the reaction of the international community to the Rwanda genocide in 1994?

A: The Secretary stated that the international community should have been more active in the early stages of the atrocities in Rwanda in 1994 and called them what they were ? genocide.

POTUS TRIP TO AFRICA

Q: When is the President going to Africa? Where will the President go? Will Secretary Albright be announcing anything on this during her trip?

A: The President has committed to go to Africa during this term and has said he would like to go sometime in 1998.

No specific dates or itineraries have yet been set.

We will, of course, wait until we have a better idea on timing and places he will go to before any announcements are made.

□

KYOTO CONFERENCE December 9, 1997

Q: Did the President talk with Prime Minister Hashimoto today?

A: Yes, they spoke for about 10 minutes. President and Prime Minister spoke about the need to redouble efforts to reach agreement in Kyoto with only 22 hours to go before the end of the conference.

Affirmed that U.S. and Japanese positions were in step with one another and agreed to work to secure EU agreement on key points, including targets, differentiation, joint implementation and developing country participation.

President and Prime Minister agreed to continue to work together to make Kyoto a success.

(from Sandy Kristoff, NSC)

Q: What did the Vice President accomplish through his trip?

A: Vice President Gore

went to Kyoto with the full backing of the President to demonstrate the Administration's absolute commitment to the issue of global warming.

While the Vice President reaffirmed the U.S. proposal, working with our negotiating team in Kyoto, he encouraged greater flexibility within the negotiating process in working through these complex issues.

(from Jonathan Spalter, OVP)

Q: What can you say about the status of negotiations now?

A: Our negotiating team is full engaged. I'm not going to comment further while the negotiations continue.

□

NORTHERN IRELAND

December 8, 1997

PEACE PROCESS

Q: Meeting with Hume?

A: The President met with Northern Ireland political leader John Hume this morning. They had an excellent discussion of the Belfast peace talks under Senator Mitchell's chairmanship. Hume thanked the President for his continued support for economic initiatives, coordinated by Special Advisor Jim Lyons, noting that these help the people of Northern Ireland find common ground in jobs and prosperity. The President was very encouraged by last week's development that the parties would meet in a small group format to begin focussing on key issues. The President expressed his strong appreciation for the role that Hume continues to play in helping the Northern Ireland peace process move forward.

Q: U.S. position on the peace 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 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 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: With the President's meeting with John Hume today, we have seen representatives of the major parties to the talks, including Gerry Adams, David Trimble and Gary McMichael. 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.

□
(IF ASKED) NIGERIA: YAR?ADUA DEATH
December 9, 1997

Q: What do you know about the death in Nigeria of General Shehu Musa Yar? Adua?

A: Our Embassy office in Abuja has confirmed press reports that General Yar? Adua died in detention in the early morning hours of December 9 and was buried at about midday, in accordance with Islamic custom. The Embassy will be sending us more details as soon as they can be determined.

Q: What background can you give us about General Yar? Adua?

A: General Yar? Adua had been imprisoned for coup plotting since March of 1995. His death sentence had been commuted to 25 years imprisonment following strong pressure from the international community.

□
KOREA
December 9, 1997

Q: Is it true that we're going to pay North Korea more than \$1 million to the right to collect remains?

A: Last week, we reached agreement with North Korea to conduct five joint recovery operations in 1998 for the remains of American soldiers who died in North Korea. That is up from three joint recovery

operations this year.

We also agreed to new procedures that will maximize time in the field searching for remains.

In addition, we expect to be able to make two visits to the North Korean war archives, up from one this year.

We expect to pay North Korea \$672,000 in 1998 to cover the cost of the recovery operations. When added to what we paid in 1996 and 1997, the total payments for recovery operations over three years will be over \$1 million.

-- The increased payment in 1998 will reflect the increased amount of time spent in the country. Payment for fuel, transportation and other support will be made at the same rate as in the past. We believe that payments are a reasonable reimbursement for the services that North Korea provides.

We were not able to secure access to U.S. deserters in North Korea.

The Republic of Korea continues to support our efforts to recover the remains of soldiers who fell in battle.

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====