

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 005 - FOLDER -002

[03/05/1997]

BRUCE REED

**Daily Schedule for
Wednesday
March 5, 1997**

- 9:00 Staff Meeting
(Room 211)**
**10:00 Briefing
(Oval Dining)**
**10:15 Crime Event
(Oval)**
- 11:00 FL/NC Trip
Message Mtg
(Baer's office)**
- 12:45 Premeet (Erskine)
1:00 Prebrief (Oval)
1:10 Education Standards
(Cabinet Room)**
- 3:00 NS Summit Mtg
(Room 180)**
-

POTUS

- 10:00 Briefing
10:15 Crime Ann(Oval)
10:45 Hold (McCurry)
1:00 Briefing (Oval)
1:10 Ed Standards
(Cabinet Room)**
- 2:15 Phone/Office Time
5:15 Briefing
5:45 Congressional Mtg
(Residence)
Evening off-**RON WH****

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. (CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 10:25:17.00

SUBJECT: Issues For Prince

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

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here are the range of issues that we have played some role in over the last four years:

Aging/Seniors
Veterans
Telecommunications
Transportation (No one is working on High Speed Rail, and the first line will open up from Boston to Washington in 1999)
Children and Families
Infrastructure
Indians
Gaming
Agriculture
Corporate Responsibility
Defense Conversion
Disabilities
Housing (I assume Jose will handle, but Jonathan knows Cuomo well.)
Small Business
Space/NASA
Science & Technology

I think the most interesting of these are Small Business, Transportation, Telecom, Space/science, infrastructure, and corporate responsibility. We also desperately need someone to work on aging and veterans issues. Aging can be interesting if you include entitlement reform, which is a huge issue, and one in which we should be active.

I definitely am interested in handling environmental issues and would like to keep that as well as political reform. However, I am obviously flexible. One other issue we could give Jonathan is our Liaison to NPR and the REGO effort. I have to admit I haven't done much on that this year and would be willing to give that up if Jonathan is interested.

Let me know what you both think.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 11:18:31.00

SUBJECT: Attendees for meeting with Erskine

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Attached fyi is a draft list of attendees for the Erskine-Powell service summit meeting.

The meeting today (now at 4:30) is with Sylvia and various White House offices to go over where we are on this. I am getting with Steve on agenda.

----- Forwarded by Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP on 03/05/97
11:19 AM -----

Katherine Hubbard
03/05/97 11:16:38 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP

cc: Stephen B. Silverman/WHO/EOP

Subject: Attendees for meeting with Erskine

Here is Steve's list (after speaking with Shapiro) for the Erskine meeting. Please let us know if it is OK. We will forward -- with your comments -- to Sylvia and Vicki.

Bowles, Powell, Cisneros, Chambers, Goodwin, Shapiro, Wofford, Little, Reed, Silverman, Fortuna, Mathews, Marion Hurd (Points of Light Foundation and President of the United Way.

What do you think about Deaver and Dachs? Please advise. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 11:27:58.00

SUBJECT: Reviewing Administration welfare language in budget bill

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

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Lyn A. Hogan (CN=Lyn A. Hogan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI -- Lyn, Diana, and I are going to make a concerted effort to review all welfare materials OMB is planning to send to the Hill as part of the balanced budget bill. We will pull together all those issues for which we need your guidance (hopefully not many by now) and consult you all at once.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tracey E. Thornton (CN=Tracey E. Thornton/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 11:28:57.00

SUBJECT: Joint Aborton Hearing Next Week

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

TO: Pauline M. Abernathy (CN=Pauline M. Abernathy/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John P. Hart (CN=John P. Hart/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: FOLEY_M (FOLEY_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: William P. Marshall (CN=William P. Marshall/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

CC: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Elisa Millsap (CN=Elisa Millsap/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hatch and Hyde have scheduled a joint Judiciary hearing on "Partial-birth" for next tuesday at 9:30. They've tentatively set-up two panels : advocates and medical types. This is a complete sneak attack. The R's sent letters to groups like NARAL and Planned Parenthood asking them to testify and also asking them to product and "public documents" they diseminated about the procedure.

Kennedy's staff wants us to provide the CDC numbers on abortions. Leahy's staff has gone back to Hatch's folks making "process" arguments about how unfair and uniliteral this thing has been.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 11:31:36.00

SUBJECT: agenda for today at 4:30

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (CN=Stephen B. Silverman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is a proposed agenda for our meeting today at 4:30 on the service summit. We should give this some thought, so we don't alarm people too much or too little. What do you think?

1. Problems with structure/communication we are having and possible solutions

- Powell meeting
- comments on task force names
- key person at Corp?
- more emphasis on service/Americorps

2. Our involvement in summit

- President
- other principals
- cabinet

3. Pre-summit event possibilities

- HS service scholarships
- Federal commitment

Invited are Sylvia, Baer, Kamarck, Matsui, Hale, Brophy, McHugh, Hawley, and counsel's office.

Criticisms that Disability Appointees May Raise:

- Welfare Reform -- The group would have preferred that the President not sign the welfare bill. They are concerned that disabled recipients are not exempt from or given special assistance in meeting the work requirements. People with severe disabilities are not subject to welfare reform because they are eligible for SSI. Therefore, the group is more concerned about those with mild or moderate disabilities. Some estimate that a very high proportion of AFDC recipients have some form of disability. Also, the group is also concerned about parents of children with disabilities being forced to work even though they can't afford child care.

The Administration is working with states on these issues, and encouraging them to provide the more expensive child care disabled children often require. Also, the law prohibits states from cutting off assistance to parents of children under 6 who can't find appropriate child care.

- Children's SSI -- Because of tremendous growth in the children's SSI program and media reports that children were faking mental problems to get benefits, Congress proposed block granting and sweeping cuts to this program. The Administration successfully fought off these cuts, but eventually agreed to significant cuts. The Social Security Administration just issued regulations that will cut 135,000 children from the program. The appointees are disappointed in two things: that we did not fight these cuts harder, and that our regulations did not take a more liberal approach in issuing the regulations.

We can take credit for defeating Republican plans to block grant children's SSI. As to SSA's recent regulation, SSA did not believe that a more liberal interpretation was legally possible.

- Medicaid -- The appointees are concerned that our per capita cap proposal could disadvantage people with disabilities, especially people with severe developmental disabilities, because their costs are far higher than average. Our proposal does address this problem by including a separate cap for the disabled. However, it is possible that a per capita cap would lead states to be reluctant to add services for very expensive long term care needs.

In addition, the appointees are disappointed that we have not been able to move forward on a proposal for Medicaid "personal assistance" services. Many people with disabilities need assistance with activities of daily living, such as getting bathed and dressed, in order to work or live in the community, but health plans do not tend to pay for this service because it is not considered medical. (Many states have Medicaid "waiver" programs that provide these services, but the number of participants is capped.) The Administration's health care reform proposal (which was strongly supported by the disability community) would have partially addressed this issue by creating a new block grant. The appointees feel that it is time to move ahead on this issue again. However, OMB has major concerns about the cost implications. The President has made very

sympathetic statements about the need for this program in public forums.

A radical advocacy group called ADAPT is pushing this issue. The Administration has agreed to a meeting on this issue and others with the President and a range of external disability advocates, including ADAPT.

- Special Education/“Individuals with Disabilities Education Act” -- **Budget:** The appointees are disappointed that our FY1998 budget includes “only” a 4% increase for special education spending. However, IDEA funding increased by an astounding 25% in the FY1997 budget, so we felt that a 4% increase was appropriate for this year. (Members of Congress pushed through the 25% increase, not the Administration, but we can take credit for signing it.)

Reauthorization: IDEA is also up for reauthorization, and Senator Lott is leading a collaborative process that the Administration is participating in to come to an agreement on a bill. IDEA is extremely important to this community, especially to parents of children of disabilities. IDEA includes civil rights protections that ensure that children with disabilities have the right to attend school -- something they did not have before IDEA was passed 20 years ago. In fact, Judy Heumann, the Administration’s most prominent political appointee with a disability, was excluded from public schools for many years, prior to IDEA.

The Administration has been extremely supportive of the disability community’s position on IDEA. School boards and the unions view IDEA as an “unfunded mandate” that is a major drain on school budgets. They point out that federal funds support only 7-8% of the costs of special education, even though the original legislation foresaw federal payments covering 40% of costs. We have fought the “unfunded mandate” interpretation in a number of settings, instead stressing that IDEA is a civil rights law that shouldn’t be weakened or tampered with.

Discipline: The most contentious current IDEA issue is when and how schools can discipline students with disabilities. Critics charge that IDEA allows a double standard for students with disabilities by making it almost impossible for schools to remove them from the classroom or school, even if they are disruptive or violent. Parents respond that schools have long used the discipline issue as a smokescreen to try to remove these children just because they are different or harder to educate.

The Administration supports modest and sensible measures to ensure that schools can maintain order, but we have totally supported the disability community on this issue -- even to the point of allowing Secretary Riley to oppose a measure to expel disabled students who bring guns to school.

- Immigrants -- Disabled legal immigrants lose SSI benefits under welfare reform. We have proposed to ameliorate this, as part of our welfare “fix” package, by allowing legal immigrants who become disabled after entering the country to continue to receive SSI.

The appointees are concerned about whether we are committed to this proposal. They may also be concerned that we left out those who were disabled upon entry to the U.S.

Appointees may also be concerned about a regulation that the INS will issue shortly to waive the English and civics testing requirements of the naturalization process for legal immigrants with certain severe disabilities. They are concerned both that it has taken the INS over two years to issue these regulations, and that the final regs will not waive the oath of citizenship. An advocacy group is suing us over this regulation.

We can point out that our proposed welfare fix package would address much of this problem by exempting legal immigrants disabled after entering the U.S. from the SSI cuts. However, the INS says the law does not allow them to waive the oath of citizenship. (We have not commented on whether we would waive it if we could.)

- Employment -- Estimates are that half to two-thirds of people with disabilities are unemployed. The community argues that many unemployed people with disabilities want to work, but they face many barriers. The ADA is starting to improve this picture marginally, but there is a long way to go.

The appointees have two concerns. First, as reflected in their draft executive order, they believe this problem is not viewed as a national priority by the Administration. They point to the fact that the Bureau of Labor Statistics collects this unemployment statistic on a very occasional basis. Second, they believe that the current federal Social Security system often acts as a disincentive to work. People on SSI or SSDI benefits who want to work face the loss of Medicaid or Medicare, as well as cash benefits.

We should point to our new initiative in the President's 1998 budget that addresses the second issue (see attached description). We can also agree to consider the draft executive order. However, potential solutions to the "disincentives" of the current Social Security system could be very expensive. (Note this week's GAO report and House hearing alleging that the SSI program is out of control because, among other concerns, SSA fails to drop people from the program quickly enough when they go back to work.)

- Housing -- The appointees may be concerned that the Administration has not been more proactive in enforcing housing civil rights laws. Also, they oppose past HUD efforts to segregate people with disabilities or require them to accept services as a condition for housing assistance (i.e., residential programs for the mentally ill or drug addicted). An advocacy group is suing HUD on all these issues.

Secretary Cisneros reached out to groups very extensively on these issues and recently established an Office of Disability Policy in the Secretary's office that is staffed by a trusted appointee with a disability. He gets a lot of credit for this, but Secretary Cuomo is more of an unknown quantity to them.

- Transportation -- The concern here is probably that we should not weaken or delay the

requirements of the ADA for accessible transit systems, and that we should make funds available to assist transit systems with compliance. We have been pretty strong on this issue. State and local governments tend to view these requirements as unfunded mandates, but we have argued that as a civil rights law the ADA can't be defined as an unfunded mandate. The appointees give us credit for eliminating problematic "unfunded mandate" language in a report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations last year.

Information about the Appointees:

As the Chief of Staff knows, the appointees with disabilities have a number of sensitivities about language and behavior pertaining to people with disabilities. They are leaders in the emerging civil rights movement for this community, and see this movement as being perhaps 20 years behind African Americans or women in terms of the degree of understanding and sensitivity of the non-disabled community. They believe that denigrating language and behavior is still widely tolerated in our society. In their view, disability is a natural part of life and people with disabilities should be viewed positively, rather than as victims, courageous, or pitied.

The term "people with disabilities" is preferred to "handicapped" or even "the disabled." They often say that, in the spirit of "putting people first," you should look first at the person rather than the disability. People "use" a wheelchair rather than "are in" a wheelchair -- or worse yet, "are confined to" a wheelchair. In general, you should not offer assistance with a basic task such as opening a door or getting seated unless the person appears unable to do so on his or her own.

The Administration's most prominent appointee with a disability is probably Judy Heumann, who is Assistant Secretary at Education in charge of special education and vocational rehabilitation. She played a major role in the development of the independent living movement, which champions people with disabilities living in the community and with their families, and has helped many people leave nursing homes. (The community is very much opposed to nursing homes, viewing them as rarely or never appropriate for people with disabilities.) She is a very constructive internal advocate.

Bob Williams, who is Commissioner of the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD), part of HHS, speaks with a voice machine. When he wishes to speak, he often makes a noise and begins punching into the machine. The etiquette is that other conversations should continue until the artificial voice begins to speak, and then wait until the thought is expressed. Bob is a very thoughtful individual who has also been a leader in the disability movement.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, which governs special education) are viewed as virtually sacred by the community. The Administration has been extremely strong in supporting these laws. In 1994, the community was very fearful that the Republican takeover of Congress would lead to attempts to weaken these laws. The threat never materialized into proposed legislation, but the community believes it must be ever-vigilant in defending these laws.

DISCUSSION DRAFT -- DO NOT CITE OR RELEASE

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. ___

Protection of Children from Environmental Health and Safety Hazards

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*) and other federal laws for the protection of the public from environmental health and safety hazards, I hereby order as follows:

Section 1. Policy.

1-101. Each Federal agency shall make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children.

1-102. Each Federal agency shall ensure that it considers, and that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address, disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health or safety hazards, to the fullest extent appropriate and consistent with the agency's mission and applicable law.

1-103. Each Federal agency should recognize, and contribute to the development of, the growing body of scientific knowledge demonstrating that children may suffer disproportionate risk from environmental health and safety hazards. These risks arise because: children's neurological, immunological, digestive and other bodily systems are still developing; children eat more food, drink more fluids, and breathe more air in proportion to their body weight than adults; children have activity and exposure patterns that are significantly different from those assumed for adults (e.g., greater hand-to-mouth contact, more frequent ingestion of non-food items); children's size and weight may diminish their protection from standard safety features; and children are less able to respond to warnings or otherwise protect themselves from risk.

1-104. Each independent regulatory agency is encouraged to participate in the implementation of this Executive order and comply with its provisions.

Section 2. Definitions. The following definitions shall apply to this order.

2-201. Federal agency means any authority of the United States that is an agency under 44 U.S.C. 3502(1). For purposes of this order, military departments, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 102, are covered under the auspices of the Department of Defense.

2-202. Independent regulatory agency means an agency defined as an

independent regulatory agencies as defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(10).

2-203. Covered regulatory action means any substantive regulatory action initiated after the date of this Executive order that is likely to result in a rule that may:

- (a) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; and
- (b) Concern an environmental health or safety hazard or risk that may disproportionately affect children.

2-204. Environmental health and safety risks means a risk to health or safety that is attributable to: industrial or agricultural chemicals; physical agents (e.g. heat, radiation); by-products of combustion or industrial processes; foods and nutrients; prescription drugs; activity patterns; lifestyle choices and substance abuse; and social and economic factors.

Section 3. Task Force on Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children

3-301. There is hereby established the Task Force on Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children, to further the purposes of this Executive order.

3-302. The Task Force will report to the President in consultation with the Domestic Policy Council, the National Science and Technology Council, and the Council on Environmental Quality.

3-303. Membership. The Task Force shall comprise the:

- (a) Secretary of Health and Human Services who shall serve as a Chair of the Council;
- (b) Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency who shall serve as a Chair of the Council;
- (c) Secretary of Education;
- (d) Chair of the Consumer Product Safety Commission;
- (e) Secretary of Labor;
- (f) Attorney General;
- (g) Secretary of Energy;

- (h) Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;
- (I) Secretary of Agriculture;
- (j) Secretary of Transportation;
- (k) Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration;
- (l) Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;
- (m) Director of the National Institutes of Health;
- (n) Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality;
- (o) Director of the Office of Management and Budget;
- (p) [[Assistant to the President for Economic Policy;]]
- (q) Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy;
- (r) Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy;
- (s) Such other officials of Executive departments and agencies as the President may, from time to time, designate.

3-303. Functions. The Task Force on Health and Safety Risks to Children shall, to the extent permitted by law, develop a coordinated Federal strategy for Children's Health and Safety, to include at least the following elements:

- (a) Statements of principles, general policy, and targeted annual priorities to guide the federal approach to achieving the goals of this Order.
- (b) A coordinated research agenda for the federal government, including steps to implement the plan for the consolidated research database developed pursuant to section 4 of this order, and for a cross-cutting budget that reflects investments of Task Force members to accomplish this research.
- © Recommendations for appropriate partnerships among federal, state, and local governments and the private, academic, and non-profit sectors.
- (d) Proposals to enhance public outreach and communication to assist families in evaluating risks to infants and children and in making informed consumer choices;
- (e) An identification of high-priority initiatives for the federal government to

undertake in advancing protection of children's health, safety, and environment.

- (f) A statement regarding the desirability of new legislation to fulfill or promote the purposes of this Executive Order.

3-304. The Task Force shall annually prepare a report on research, data, or other information that would enhance our ability to understand, analyze, and respond to environmental health and safety risks to children. For purposes of this report, every Federal agency shall identify and specifically describe for the Task Force all data needs that have arisen in the course of the agency's programs and activities, including regulatory and enforcement actions. The Task Force shall incorporate agency submissions into its report and ensure that this report is publicly available and widely disseminated. The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and the National Science and Technology Committee shall ensure that this report is fully considered in establishing research priorities.

3-308. The Task Force shall exist for a period of four years from the first meeting. At least six months prior to the expiration of that period, the member agencies shall assess the need for continuation of the Task Force or its functions, and make appropriate recommendations to the President.

Section 4. Research Coordination and Integration

4-401. Within six months of the date of this order, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and the National Science and Technology Committee shall present to the IWG a proposed plan for establishing, maintaining, and keeping current a consolidated research data base that lists and describes all research conducted or funded by the Federal government that is related to adverse health effects in children and infants resulting from exposure to environmental health, or safety hazards. This plan shall include recommendations to ensure that the activities of the IWG and other requirements of this Executive order are fully integrated with, and not duplicative of, other current or planned initiatives with respect to children's health and safety.

4-402. The proposed plan shall promote the submission of information on academic and other private research for inclusion in the data base.

4-403. The plan shall include provisions to ensure that the consolidated research data base is available to the public to the extent permitted by law, to the scientific and academic communities, and to all Federal agencies.

Section 5. Agency environmental health, or safety regulations.

5-501. For each covered regulatory action submitted to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) for review, each Federal agency shall provide to OIRA the following information developed as part of the agency's decisionmaking process (unless prohibited by law):

- (a) An evaluation of the effects of the covered regulatory action on children;
- (b) An assessment of potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives to the covered regulatory action that have been identified by the agency or the public and that may more effectively mitigate or reduce risks to children; and
- © An explanation of why the covered regulatory action is preferable to the identified potential alternative(s).

5-502. In emergency situations or when an agency is obligated by law to act more quickly than normal review procedures allow, the agency shall comply with the provisions of this section to the extent practicable. For those covered regulatory actions that are governed by a court-imposed or statutory deadline, the agency shall, to the extent practicable, schedule rulemaking proceedings so as to permit sufficient time for completing the analysis required by this section.

5-503. The analysis required by this section may be included as part of any other required analysis, and shall be made part of the administrative record for the covered regulatory action or otherwise made available to the public.

Section 6. General Provisions.

6-601. This order is intended only for internal management of the Executive Branch. This order is not intended, and should not be construed to create any right, benefit, or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or its employees. This order shall not be construed to create any right to judicial review involving the compliance or noncompliance with this order by the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any other person.

6-602. Federal agencies should implement this order consistent with, and to the extent permitted by, existing law.

6-603. This order supersedes and revokes Executive order 12606 of September 2, 1987.

6-604. This order shall be effective immediately and shall continue to be in

effect until revoked.

The White House
_____, 1997

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Patricia F. Lewis (CN=Patricia F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 13:27:42.00

SUBJECT: Notes from meeting

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Pauline M. Abernathy (CN=Pauline M. Abernathy/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Please let me know if I missed something.

Notes from 3/5 conference meeting and follow up:

- Title: "White House Conference on Early Childhood Development and Learning:
What new research on the brain tells us about our youngest children"
Nicole to get final approval.

- Overall goal for event: We talked about the conference as a way to get information and resources out to anyone who works with parents or young children. It will emphasize the ways in which the federal government can play a key role in helping strengthen families, as well as highlighting what the rest of us can do.

- Announcement: Marsha will take the lead on seeing if the President and First Lady on Monday can do an Oval Office announcement of a new executive order and the date for the event. In planning for this, we need to be able to say something about what will come out of it. (We'll have tapes and materials for parents, website, etc.)

- Panels: Nicole and Pauline will have options by Monday of various ways in which parents' questions can be posed to panelists.

- Press preparations: We agreed to identify 10 stories by April 1 that illustrate the research being done (most often with federal support) and how it's being put to use in programs across the country. Pauline and Nicole will provide the initial list.

- Press lists: Pauline and Nicole will get lists from groups they're talking with.

- Invitations: We'll identify possible magazine editors/publishers as

guests. Nicole has examples of articles parenting pubs have run and will circulate copies.

- Sponsors: Nicole will schedule a meeting with Pat Butler. Pat and Marsha will talk about magazines. We also need to check with counsel's office about using sponsors.

- Materials: The aim will be to produce, post-conference, a video tape, an audio, a printed report to include Mrs. Clinton's remarks, synopses of information presented, resource guide and an action sheet for parents.

- Regional events: Pat will continue to talk with Kris and Laura Schwartz about moving forward with agencies on setting up regional watch events.

- Next meeting: We will meet again Friday. Time TBD

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 13:34:16.00

SUBJECT: follow-up

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I think you are checking with Counsel's office on various questions surrounding the upcoming brain conference (until approval of new name, I feel loyalty-driven to call it that!). I was keeping track of our questions, which may well be the same as yours:

1. Can we call it a "WH Conf"?
2. Can an outside group sponsor parts of it ? (Sat. feed, lunch, reception)
3. Can the agencies pay for the up-linking and/or the down-linking of the satellite?

FYI, we are tentative for the meeting with Pat Butler, VP of the Wash Post Company, at 4pm on Friday (Ann, Melanne, you & whomever else it makes sense to have -- although I think this one should be small.)

WELFARE REFORM IN MICHIGAN

Over the last four years, welfare rolls have declined dramatically in Michigan and child support collections have increased. Between January 1993 and November 1996, the number of people on welfare in Michigan decreased by 30 percent or 208,274 people; nationwide, the welfare caseload declined by 18 percent or nearly 2.5 million people. Michigan's percentage reduction ranks 16th among the states (Wisconsin's 44 percent decline is largest). Michigan increased child support collections by \$165 million, or 21.2 percent, from fiscal year 1992 to fiscal year 1996. At the same time, the state doubled the number of paternities established, from 29,087 to 60,827.

In the state there is a great political battle over credit for the lower welfare caseloads. According to staff of Speaker Hertell, Assembly Democrats think the good economy, for which they think the President is greatly responsible, is the primary reason for the caseload decline. (Michigan's unemployment rate, 7.0 percent in 1993, fell to 4.2 percent in November 1996.)

Democrats re-took the Assembly last fall and their major welfare-to-work proposal this session is a state earned income tax credit. The measure proposed by Rep. John F. Freeman of Royal Oak, would allow a family of four who claims a \$2,400 EITC on their federal income tax return to claim a \$240 tax credit on their state return. The measure was reported out of the committee on Wednesday, February 26th and is expected to pass the Assembly (but may not pass the Republican-controlled Senate). State Democrats think praise from the President could give this proposal legs.

The one thing Governor Engler and the state Democrats can agree upon is "Project Zero", a demonstration project in six sites around the state which provides intensive social services (child care, education, transportation, job placement) with the goal of achieving 100% employment. In January 1997, 54% of welfare recipients at these sites were working. In this pilot, welfare recipients receive intensive case management (including home visits if they don't attend work). The state spends extra funds for staff, child care, and transportation at these sites and the Governor's budget proposes to expand it to an additional six sites. The President could use Project Zero as way of arguing that as we move people off welfare into work and insist they take responsibility for their own lives, we must ensure their child is cared for, that they don't lose their health care, and they can get to their jobs. Child care spending in Michigan has increased 300% since 1991, Governor Engler's staff say.

Michigan is best known not for Project Zero but the tough new welfare rules imposed under President Clinton's reform-minded waiver policy. In both October 1994 and June 1996, President Clinton granted waivers to expand Michigan's "To Strengthen Michigan Families" program. The program encourages work and responsibility by:

- Cutting grants by 25 percent for those who refuse to work or go to school and eliminating assistance for those who refuse to cooperate for 12 months;
- Requiring minor teen parents to live in approved, adult-supervised settings and attend school as conditions of eligibility.
- Revoking drivers' licenses of parents who don't pay child support or don't allow the other parent visitation rights.

While Michigan's program allows them to subsidize jobs for welfare recipients, it is not a widely used option.

There is strong evidence that Michigan's program has been successful state-wide. In January, 31 percent of welfare recipients had earnings averaging \$466 a month. A June 1996 evaluation of the To Stengthen Michigan Families program conducted by Abt Associates found that welfare recipients randomly assigned to the program had earnings 11% higher than those assigned to a control group, half the impact of the GAIN program in California.

Michigan will continue its welfare reform program, with some minor changes, under the new welfare law. The state plans to use its own dollars to provide assistance to all adults who comply with program rules (despite the five year limit on use of federal funds). The governor's staff says the state provides cash assistance (using block grant dollars) and Medicaid to those legal immigrants in the U.S. before August 22, 1996 and who were eligible for AFDC or Medicaid. They do not use block grant dollars to provide cash assistance to SSI or food stamp recipients cut off because of the welfare law meaningly, generally, that poor families with kids will get cash assistance and other disabled individuals and other adults will not. Legal immigrants who arrive in the U.S. after August 22, 1996 will be banned from assistance for five years as required by the federal welfare law and then will be eligible. Currently, in Michigan some legal immigrants banned from SSI may be eligible for a state-funded disability program. The Governor's budget would prevent this, banning legal immigrants cut off of SSI from the state disability program. He needs legislation to accomplish this, and Democrats plan to fight him every step of the way. Because of this brewing battle, it may be best not to praise Michigan's immigration policy but simply to simply say the welfare bill's ban is unworthy of a great nation of immigrants.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 14:43:13.00

SUBJECT: Service summit meeting today

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Attached is what Steve Silverman thinks we should do at the summit meeting today. He thinks it should be more of a "bring everyone up to speed" meeting rather than a strategy meeting. He has even invited Wofford. I hope this will be productive and the focus will be clear, especially with Sylvia there. I will talk to him. I think he envisions these as regular meetings, perhaps weekly.

----- Forwarded by Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP on 03/05/97
02:01 PM -----

Stephen B. Silverman
03/05/97 01:24:13 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP
cc: Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP
Subject: Re: agenda for today at 4:30

Sounds pretty good. You might be opening it up a bit too much with having this group think about solutions for dealing with management issues, so I would strike that from beginning. Also, I would have us do an Overview, progress thus far, to start. Also, what paper should we give out. Potus announcement? Maybe Harris should bring over 15 packets to give out.

For what it's worth, here's our take on the agenda. it's probably more basic in some ways, but I don't assume that these folks have focussed that much. Take of it what you will.

Also, we're reaching out to get Harris here.

Attendees: Mathews, Reed, Fortuna, Silverman, Smith for Kamarck, Hale, Brophy, Hawley, Press. Maybe: Matsui, Verveer, Whalen, Eli Attie
Can't attend: Baer, Glynn, McHugh

1. Overview
2. Goals and Objectives for WH
3. Structure
4. Principals Involvement
5. State Delegations
6. Commitments
7. Post Summit Task Forces
8. Assignments

Comments on Draft Executive Order on Employment of People with Disabilities

- Would establish a goal of parity in the employment rate between people with and without people with disabilities by the year 2006, including an interim goal of “a 3 percent annual increase in the employment rate” of people with disabilities.

It is not clear whether parity is an achievable goal. And the annual improvement expected appears quite ambitious. We should discuss with the NEC.

- Calls on federal agencies to “eliminate employment barriers to persons with disabilities, such as discrimination and inadequate access to health care....”

It is not clear that federal agencies are in a position to accomplish this without vastly increased resources.

- Sets a target that 11% of the federal workforce shall be persons with disabilities.

This must be considered in light of existing policies on targets for federal hiring.

- Would extend the Department of Defense’s Computer/Electronics Accommodations Program (“CAP”) to the civilian agencies, with funding for the expansion to be “sought within” DOD budget.

CAP is an excellent program that provides Defense employees with disabilities with the latest in computer equipment to allow them to do their jobs. The program has a showroom for equipment and serves as a central purchasing point so that federal purchasing power is maximized. Since funding for the program is centralized, individual departments do not have to bear the costs of a very expensive piece of computer equipment for an employee. Last year, the DPC recommended to OMB that we expand CAP to all federal agencies, but the change was not funded in the budget.

- In an otherwise innocuous section on encouraging small business and micro-enterprise among people with disabilities, the draft refers to using “the full buying power of the Federal government” to put people to work.

We would have to consider this in the context of current policy on federal purchases.

- Gives a one-year deadline for Labor and Commerce to develop a monthly measurement of the unemployment rate of people with disabilities.

We would have to investigate how achievable this suggestion is, and budget implications.

Suggested Talking Point: Thank you for all the hard work you have put into this package. As you can imagine, the specific points in the draft raise a number of budget and economic issues that we will want to discuss with you. We assume we should work with the President’s Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities as we pursue these issues further.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 15:13:16.00

SUBJECT: We might try to get our hands on the whole briefing paper

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

for Erskine's meeting with civil rights leaders on Friday. Public liaison is coordinating, OMB is contributing, etc. I think it includes a broad array of civil rights issues. I picture this being at your level to get us into the loop --assuming we have time to be.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Patrick M. Steel (CN=Patrick M. Steel/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 15:40:18.00

SUBJECT: National PTA Conf.

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

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

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

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

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

CC: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As you may know, the National PTA conference which the President has addressed in the past is being held in DC next week. I have gotten a number of call from Arnie Fege, the PTA's Washington Rep inquiring as to whether or not the President will speak. Did anyone ever send in a request for the President to speak at this conference?

Please advise. I would like to call Arnie to formally regret.

Patrick Steel

PRIVATIZATION OF FEDERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

I. OVERVIEW & ISSUES

This paper has been prepared jointly by staff from the Departments of Agriculture (Food and Consumer Service), Health and Human Services (Health Care Financing Administration and Administration for Children and Families), Labor (Employment and Training Administration), and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). The Federal agencies have been meeting recently to discuss the general background and issues surrounding privatization initiatives that are under review within the Departments and to explore options for making final decisions and responding to States. Decisions made here will set the precedents for proposals around the country.

Policy Issues: To what extent should the States be permitted to transfer the responsibility for eligibility determination for Federal public assistance programs to the private sector through competitively bid contracts?

Legal Issues: May the Merit System of Personnel Administration requirements, applicable in different ways in each statute, be waived to allow States to enter into contract agreements?

II. BACKGROUND

There is increasing interest among the State welfare agencies in transferring the administration of public assistance programs to the private sector through competitively bid contracts. This interest stems in part from the efforts of the Federal and State governments to test new methods to reduce costs, to improve program services and to increase self-sufficiency among program recipients.

Contracting or privatizing certain functions of the public assistance programs is not new, e.g. backroom data processing. What is new is the possibility of contracting with private entities to perform functions that have historically been the responsibility of the public sector, such as conducting the determination of eligibility and certification for public assistance programs like the Federal Food Stamp Program and Medicaid. While the new welfare law explicitly permits States to privatize TANF administration and service provision, no other major Federal public assistance program has such broad latitude¹. Other programs became part of this issue because typically eligibility for AFDC (now TANF), Food Stamps and Medicaid and a host of other programs has been determined by a common process and worker.

III. THERE ARE CURRENT PROPOSALS BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATION

¹ Note that eligibility for \$6 billion in Pell Grants and \$25 billion in student loans is routinely determined largely by non-Federal, non-public entities.

***REQUIRING DECISIONS ABOUT THE EXTENT TO WHICH PRIVATIZATION
SHOULD BE PERMITTED***

A. Texas Integrated Enrollment Services (TIES)

TIES is a statewide privatization initiative of the Texas Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) and the Texas Council on Competitive Government (CCG) in support of a State law enacted in 1995. Under TIES, the certification and eligibility determinations for most public assistance programs, including the Food Stamp, Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), TANF and Medicaid programs, would be contracted to the private and/or public sectors through competitive bids.

USDA has determined the TIES proposal would require a waiver of the merit system requirements under the Food Stamp Act. HCFA is still reviewing the extent to which merit system requirements must be waived. The Federal agencies and the State of Texas have been negotiating the conditions for releasing a Request for Offers (RFO) for TIES since May 1996. With the exception of a final decision about the merit system provisions contained in the RFO, and the role of the single State agency, all other issues have been resolved with regard to the draft RFO.

Texas was expecting final approval of the RFO in January to be able to release the RFO by the end of the month. Two consortia have been developed with the intention of bidding on the RFO. One consortium is composed of the Texas Workforce Commission, International Business Machines Corporation and Lockheed Martin Corporation. The other consortium consists of the Texas Department of Human Services, Electronic Data Systems Corporation and the Unisys Corporation. Arthur Anderson has also indicated an interest in the proposal but has not aligned itself with a State agency.

Wisconsin Works (W-2)

Under the W-2 proposal, the State is contracting on a competitive basis with public or private agencies for certification actions such as gathering client eligibility information, conducting eligibility interviews and data input. The State, presuming the Department of Agriculture's approval of its waiver request of the merit system requirements for the Food Stamp Program, released its Request for Proposals (RFP). While the State can issue the RFP without USDA's approval, they will need to hear back from USDA in order to award the contract. State officials have advised that the contract process has been completed for one County (with over 60 percent of the State caseload) without the inclusion of the Food Stamp Program. Contracts have been awarded to six private, non-profit agencies.

C. Employment Services -- One-Stop Grant

Legislation enacted in the State of Texas, effective September 1, 1996, provides for the delivery of labor exchange services that are authorized under the Wagner-Peyser Act and currently delivered by State employment security agencies by local workforce development boards and private, non-governmental providers. Thus far, Texas has not considered contracting out the delivery of unemployment insurance services. The Department of Labor has urged Texas to delay implementation until the Department's review is completed.

In addition, the State of Massachusetts, with the Department of Labor's approval of a 1994? grant to implement a competitive One-Stop Career Center system throughout the State, has awarded contracts to private-for-profit entities to deliver labor exchange services in several local areas under that grant. Other States such as Montana, Utah, Pennsylvania, and Iowa are on the threshold of requesting similar approval.

IV. ORGANIZED LABOR RESPONSE

The Departments of Agriculture and Health and Human Services have received numerous letters from employee unions about the TIES proposal, including the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) and the Service Employees International Union. The unions assert that a waiver of the merit system would result in a decline of client services, including access to program benefits and client confidentiality. The Department of Agriculture received over 1,000 letters from employees in Wisconsin objecting to the W-2 project.

In the case of the Texas workforce development legislation, the Department of Labor has received a letter from the AFL-CIO questioning the legality of privatizing employment services.

In the Massachusetts One Stamp project, the State AFL-CIO concurred in the proposal but current implementation problems are raising new concerns.

V. THE TEXAS SITUATION

A. Food Stamp Program--Certification and Other Program Requirements

The Food Stamp Act requires certification, i.e., the application and the components of the eligibility determination process, to be completed by merit system employees. Certification, however, is not defined in statute. As supported by legislative history to the Act, current regulations specify that the required interview be conducted by merit system employees. Given the complexity and discretion that may be required in the food stamp certification process, the food stamp interview is crucial to accurate

determinations of eligibility and benefit level. It is through the food stamp interview that the worker solicits most household information, determines the necessity for additional verification or resolution of questionable information, and ascertains the need for appropriate policy decisions. It is also the applicant household's opportunity to have face-to-face contact with a public employee. Volunteers and other non-merit employees may assist an applicant household in other actions related to certification but may not conduct the food stamp interview or certify a household.

During recent debate on welfare reform legislation, Congressional conferees reinserted the merit system provisions in the Food Stamp Act that a previous Senate bill had deleted.

B. Medicaid--Certification and Other Program Requirements

Similar to Food Stamps, the entire application process, from taking an application to making the final eligibility determination, is performed almost entirely by employees of the State agency responsible for administering the Medicaid program. Under Medicaid law, States are required to establish or designate a single State agency to administer their Medicaid program and determine Medicaid eligibility. Moreover, the Medicaid statute requires that the State agency responsible for Medicaid not delegate authority to "exercise administrative discretion in the administration or supervision of the plan" to non-government entities. The regulations implementing that part of the statute also require that other agencies which perform services for the State agency "must not have the authority to ... substitute their judgement for that of the Medicaid agency with respect to the application of policies, rules, and regulations issued by the Medicaid agency."

Unlike Food Stamps, the Social Security Act also provides for "outstationing", which allows the State to use private sector employees to perform some of the eligibility process at locations other than State TANF offices for certain groups of applicants. Outstationing was incorporated into the law to increase program access when the law was amended to substantially broaden the categories of eligible individuals.

States have the option of staffing outstation locations with State employees or non-State employees (e.g., contractors or volunteers), or a combination of both. Because outstationing can involve the use of non-State employees to perform certain eligibility-related functions, Medicaid regulations--but not the law--specify which functions can be performed by non-State employees and which must be performed by State workers.

Non-State employees staffing outstation locations can perform "initial processing" which includes: (1) taking applications; (2) assisting applicants in completing the application; (3) providing information and referrals; (4) obtaining required documentation; (5) assuring that information contained in the application is complete; and (6) conducting

any necessary interviews.

Non-State employees are specifically precluded from: (1) evaluating the information contained in the application and supporting documentation; and (2) making a determination of eligibility or ineligibility. Actual evaluations and determinations can be made at the outstation location or at a State Medicaid agency office, but they must be made by a State employee authorized to make eligibility determinations for the State Medicaid agency.

C. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

Section 104 of the Block Grant for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) specifically allows States to "administer and provide services" under titles I and II of the welfare reform legislation through contracts with charitable, religious or private organizations. Therefore, there are no prohibitions to privatization initiatives, such as TIES, related to merit personnel provisions for TANF. Most States have procedures where one generic worker may accept a joint application for food stamp, TANF and Medicaid benefits. If a household is determined eligible for TANF, they are automatically eligible for Food Stamps and Medicaid. Therefore if a State choose to administer the TANF program with a private contractor, large portions of Food Stamp and Medicaid eligibility could effectively also be privatized.

D. Waiver Authority to Conduct Demonstration Projects

The Food Stamp and Social Security Acts provide the two Departments with the authority to waive most statutory requirements to allow the States to conduct demonstration projects. However, because its authority for the Merit System of Personnel Management was transferred from USDA to OPM under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970, USDA would need to obtain concurrence from OPM prior to approving any demonstration project that would waive the Merit System of Personnel Management. However, HHS believes they would not need OPM's concurrence for such a waiver.

E. Intergovernmental Personnel Act

For decades, a Merit System of Personnel Administration was routinely established for many Federal-State grant-in-aid programs as now codified within the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) because it was presumed by Congress that services would be provided directly by State or local employees who were acting in lieu of Federal employees. The IPA is not a genuine statute; its provisions only come into play when another law or regulation invokes it.

While the IPA is silent on whether States or local governments may contract for services, the law does provide for maximum flexibility within the requirements for merit principles in the administration of grant-in-aid programs by grantees. However, as the roles of government and the relationships between the State and the Federal government continue to evolve, a determination must be made as to whether new ways of doing business can be carried out under existing laws, or whether change in those laws is required. While government contracting with the private sector for commercial products and services is not new, the Texas proposal raises the possibility of contracting with private entities to perform functions that have historically been the responsibility of the public sector. The proposal, as currently drafted, would require a waiver by OPM of current statutory and regulatory provisions related to the Merit System of Personnel Administration provision of the IPA.

Aspects of the current proposals under review by Federal agencies appear to conflict with the general requirements of the IPA, but as noted above, the key issue is defining precisely what aspects of program processes are in fact covered by the IPA. Although OPM has not consulted with their General Counsel for a legal opinion, OPM is confident that it does not have authority to waive any provisions of the statute. In fact, OPM counsels have consistently held that OPM does not have authority to waive its own regulations, unless such waiver is specifically provided for in the applicable statute. The Administration could elect to seek legislative change if the determination of what processes are covered presents the need.

This leads us back, then, to examining the Texas proposal and shredding out what is "inherently governmental" for these programs at issue and must therefore be performed by merit system employees, and what is commercial and can therefore be contracted out. The OPM General Counsel has relied on OMB Circular A-76 to define what is and is not an inherently governmental function for programs whose statute relies upon IPA coverage. Included in the definition of governmental functions are "those activities which require either the exercise of discretion in applying Governmental authority or the use of value judgment in making decisions for the Government. ... Governmental functions normally fall into two categories: (1) The Act of governing;....(2) Monetary transactions and entitlements...." It would appear that some contracting is appropriate but wholesale contracting of Food Stamp and Medicaid eligibility may raise questions of consistency with the intention of Congress to ensure that administration of these programs be conducted by employees covered by a merit system of personnel administration.

G. Options for Texas TIES

1. Allow the State to fully privatize its eligibility process, requiring only that the State itself certify the determination. Under Medicaid, implementing this option would essentially involve an administrative decision, and possibly publishing a Federal

Register Notice announcing the decision. For the Food Stamp program, this option would involve approving a waiver of the Merit System of Personnel Administration. It would also require use of the Food Stamp Program's statutory demonstration authority, with the necessary approval of waivers of the Merit System of Personnel Administration by OPM. The Agriculture Department's waiver authority for demonstrations is intended to test innovations and is not intended to approve long-term operational alternatives such as those proposed by Texas. The majority of the 15,000 employees would be at risk of losing at least their State merit systems protections and possibly their jobs.

Approval of this option would result in additional objections from employee unions and advocacy groups that believe State employees will treat welfare recipients more fairly than contractors. It would be supported by States, the National Governors Association and private corporations which have formed alliances with public agencies to respond to the RFO.

2. Require the State to perform all eligibility functions, including intake, processing, and making and certifying the actual determination. This option would effectively deny the State's request to privatize its eligibility process. Even though this is the most restrictive option, it may be the most legally supportable option for the Medicaid program, based on a restrictive reading of statutory and regulatory requirements involving proper and efficient administration of the program. An argument can be made that outstationing establishes a precedent for permitting at least some privatization. However, a legal counter argument could be made that the Medicaid statute restricts non-government eligibility activities to specific eligibility groups and situations and, thus, is not applicable to the TIES proposal.

For the Food Stamp Program, this option would mean denial of a waiver of the Merit System of Personnel Administration. This option also would require the State to continue to be responsible for the Food Stamp interview and determinations of eligibility and benefit level. It is also important to note that during the recent debate on welfare reform legislation, Congressional Conferees reinstated the merit system provisions in the Food Stamp Act that a previous Senate bill had deleted.

The Federal agencies would receive serious objections from the State and private corporations. Also, a denial may be viewed as inconsistent with the Administration's support for allowing the private sector to be more involved in the administration of public assistance programs.

3. Approve an information system project as a stand alone effort. This option would allow the State to replace its outdated information systems with a new integrated system. Once completed, the TANF program could be administered through a private contractor using the new integrated information system, while eligibility for the Food Stamp and Medicaid programs could be handled by State employees. This approach would demonstrate the merits of privatization in these types of programs and not require a waiver of the other program rules.

This approach would require the State to fund the system development effort as it is being developed. Under the approach outlined in the RFO, the winning vendor would pay for the system development costs and then recoup its costs through administrative fees charged to the State once the system was operational. This option may satisfy the vendor community by reducing the risks associated with the up-front costs of developing the large system and still allow a significant privatization effort associated with TANF and other State programs. If information sharing rules can be resolved, the State may be able to satisfy its cost saving goals.

4. Allow the State to privatize its eligibility process to the same degree that privatization is permitted under the Medicaid outstationing process. This option would allow the State to privatize the application, interview, and information gathering/verification process, but require the State to do and certify the actual eligibility determination. For the Food Stamp Program, this option would require a redefinition of "certification". The Food Stamp statute requires certification to be completed by merit system employees, while the Medicaid statute allows non-State out stationed personnel to perform some elements of the application process. States want to reinterpret the laws so that compliance could be achieved through the automated processing of data by computers which are programmed under State agency direction to make eligibility and benefit decisions.

A middle ground could preserve more government involvement in a complex eligibility determination process that requires judgment. The Federal agencies could revise regulations (Food Stamp Program) or publish an appropriate Notice in the Federal Register (Medicaid) to require government review of applications and interview results before eligibility for benefits is determined (a process comparable to the Medicaid outstations, or supervisory reviews currently used by many State agencies in the Food Stamp Program). However, this option may not allow the States to make privatization initiatives financially worthwhile. The agencies do not have an estimate of how many State jobs would be at stake under this option.

5. Approve small-scale demonstration projects. The Departments support privatization initiatives that may result in improved services and/or administrative costs savings. However, both Departments have concerns about statewide initiatives that have not been proven to be effective and may seriously affect program access to low-income households. For instance, TIES is a Statewide initiative in a State that issues annually approximately 10 percent of food stamp benefits issued nationwide. The Department of Agriculture further believes it would be imprudent to eliminate the interview from merit employees on a statewide basis without further testing.

A demonstration limited to a small number of counties, for say 3 years, may be supportable by the advocacy groups. Private corporations may object or lose interest in small-scale demonstration projects or they could see it as the way to prove the

benefits to all programs for contracting out on a larger scale. It is unclear how the unions and other States would react to such a compromise. It is estimated that an evaluation of a Food Stamp and Medicaid demonstration would cost at least \$1 million.

VI RELATIONSHIP TO THE TEXAS EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AND OTHER ES PROPOSALS

The issue of whether an entity other than the SESA may deliver basic labor exchange and unemployment insurance services has been raised in the context of Employment and Training (ETA) sponsored initiatives to build new State workforce development systems utilizing One-Stop Career Centers. This system building at the local level involves the delivery of labor exchange services under the Wagner-Peyser Act and may involve the unemployment insurance program for payment of benefits under the Social Security Act (SSA). Basic labor exchange and unemployment insurance services are funded through a dedicated employer tax, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA).

As noted, this Administration has already permitted Massachusetts to privatize its employment services, office by office, through competitive bidding.

Unemployment Insurance - Contracting out of benefit eligibility determination and tax functions raise different conceptual issues. Arguably these functions involve much more use of value judgments in Government decision making than ES. However, it may be permissible to contract out those data gathering functions that can be broken out in an effective, cost-efficient manner, without deterioration of services to claimants and employers.

The Texas proposal is largely limited to Food Stamps and Medicaid, however, policy makers should be aware that a decision for these programs may well set precedent for other public assistance programs such as Foster Care and Child Care.

The merit system requirements remain in effect for the Title IV-E of the SSA (Foster Care). Historically, ACF has offered the State agencies administering the foster care program the option of contracting to private, non-profits for such administrative activities such as licensing, recruitment, supervision and training. ACF is currently in the process of reviewing the foster care statutory language to determine what effect, if any, the merit system standards may have on a State's ability to contract out certain administrative activities in the private sector.

VII Related Issues

Job Protection -- Successorship

As stated above, one of the most significant concerns of organized labor is the risk State employees face under privatization. Thousands of State eligibility workers could

lose their jobs if private employees are hired to replace them. Typically, the Federal Government has taken an interest in economy and efficiency, and recognizes benefits from the fact that a carryover workforce will minimize disruption to the delivery of services during any period of transition and provide the advantages of an experienced and trained workforce.

The Clinton Administration has a clear position with regard to employees working under Federal service contracts. In October 1994, the President signed E.O. 12933 "Non-Displacement of Qualified Workers Under Certain Contracts". The E.O. protects workers under Federal contracts from being displaced when a successor contract is awarded, by assuring them the right of first refusal to employment under the new contract in positions for which they are qualified.

It is unclear whether such protections could be required of a State seeking to privatize Food Stamp and Medicaid eligibility workers. However, wherever possible -- especially under a waiver -- the programs could establish a requirement similar to the EO. These non-displacement protections would require successor contracts to offer those employees (other than managerial and supervisory employees) whose employment would be terminated as a result of the new contract, a right of first refusal to employment under the contract in positions for which they are qualified. No employment openings could be filled under the contract until such right of first refusal has been provided. This option has not yet been explored with the program agencies.

Entitlement Guarantee

One of the Administration's key principles during the Congressional budget battles of 1995 and 1996 was that Medicaid beneficiaries should retain a legally enforceable right to Medicaid. HCFA believes this principle could be compromised by allowing private contractors to make eligibility determinations. HCFA staff suggest making decisions about the eligibility of needy people for health care is one of the most fundamental functions of government. Giving so basic a function to the private sector raises questions about what role government legitimately serves in assuring the protection of the most vulnerable among us.

Confidentiality

As a result of negotiations between the State of Texas and Department of Agriculture, the RFO was revised to include language ensuring that the contractor would adhere to the confidentiality provisions under the Food Stamp Act and that applicants and recipients would have the right to fully understand how information would be used in determining eligibility. The RFO currently includes language specifying that the use or disclosure of information about applicants or clients during the screening and referral

DRAFT

and the eligibility determination and enrollment processes shall be restricted to purposes directly connected with the administration of assistance programs. Information supplied for the purpose of determining eligibility may not be made available to other programs in TIES without the consent of the client. Bidders must demonstrate how clients will be advised of their right to confidentiality and how their concurrence would be obtained.

While these revisions ensure compliance with the Food Stamp and Social Security Acts, the Departments continue to have concerns that wide-scale privatization and potential loss of merit system protections may undermine the client confidentiality. Merit Personnel systems have historically established incentives for maintaining the integrity of public assistance programs. It is uncertain how privatization would influence the relationship between case workers and clients.

Conflict of Interests in Policy

It should not be assumed that a public employee would be more interested in operating public assistance programs better than a private employee on the basis of his or her status as a merit employee. However, private employees hired to carry out the TIES system may be affected negatively if the contractor does not realize a profit. The profit incentive raises numerous questions regarding the effect such wide-scale privatization would have on employees who are responsible for the determination of eligibility as well as the effect on overall client services. For instance, the TIES RFO proposes to use client surveys to measure the contractor's performance. Will the interest in maintaining client satisfaction increase a caseworker's incentive to approve benefits, even if questionable information about the applicant's eligibility exists? Would profit incentives alter the current incentives out stationed non-merit employees have for their role in the Medicaid certification process?

Also, a conflict of interest may be created by the increased flexibility provided to the States through the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. While the State of Texas retains the authority to establish program policy decisions, the State may come under heavy influence by the contractor to approve policies that assist the contractor in containing costs, possibly at the expense of client services.

State/Contractor Program Responsibilities

Under the proposed TIES RFO, the State maintains responsibility for developing program policy, conducting Quality Control (QC) reviews and fair hearings. The TIES contractor is responsible for implementing program policy. The TIES system, therefore, adds an additional level to the current bureaucratic structure. The FCS and the State of Texas have negotiated revisions to the RFO to clarify Federal/State and State/Contractor relationships. However, the Departments continue to have serious

concerns about the increased complexity of the certification process under a Statewide privatization initiative and whether any resulting barriers to participation would be created as a result of these split relationships. These relationships may become even further complicated if the responsibility for the certification process becomes split between State and contract employees.

Risk of Loss

The draft TIES RFO specifies the financial incentives for good performance and fiscal penalties for poor performance. One financial penalty to the contractor is the liability of QC sanctions. The Department and State of Texas have negotiated additional language that clarifies that the Federal Government will continue to hold the State liable for the QC sanctions and that the Federal and State governments would be responsible for negotiating the resolution of any Federal QC liability.

The Departments have concerns that the contractor may have more interest in cost savings and less interest in resulting QC liabilities. Should a contractor experience a financial loss due to a QC liability, the potential for litigation between the State and contractor would appear to be great. The Departments also share concerns about the potential of increased litigation between the State and contractor if the certification process becomes a joint responsibility between State and private contract employees. The Departments have concerns about how these potential conflicts would affect the ongoing operations of the Food Stamp and Medicaid Programs throughout the State.

Payment Arrangements

The contract as described in the Request for Offer (RFO) draft provides for a cost incentive formula for payment to the supplier. The proposal being contemplated is a Fixed Price Incentive Fee/Performance Fee contract based on a 60/40 share ratio cost incentive formula for the State and the Supplier. Payment to the selected supplier will be monthly at 80% of the negotiated billing amount. The State will review the supplier's cost and performance for every three-month period throughout the term of the contract. In the event the supplier's incurred costs in any given three-month period are less than the total costs contained within the negotiated billing amounts for the same period, the supplier will earn and be paid an additional fee in an amount equal to 40% of the cost underrun of the three-month period.

Conversely, if the supplier-incurred costs are over the total costs contained within the negotiated billing amounts for the three-month period, the supplier's fee for that period will be reduced by an amount to equal 60% of the cost overrun for that period. In either case, every three months, the supplier will be paid all costs not paid against the three monthly billings plus fees adjusted up or down to reflect its increase or decrease resulting from the application of the 60/40 share ratio formula, subject to an absolute price ceiling of 110% of the total contract price for the three-month period. In no event

shall the supplier be paid , for any given three-month period, a total amount greater than the ceiling price established for that period.

In addition to the above cost incentive, the State will negotiate a portion of the total fees available for performance incentives. This will be done on a quarterly basis and the award determination is unilateral and not subject to dispute by the Supplier.

Because Medicaid and Food Stamps pay for the actual cost to the State programs of acquiring this system, the above payment arrangement would be eligible for Federal Financial Participation (FFP).

Potential Financial Conflicts of Interest

Under CFR 45 Part 74 in Subpart E, section 74.81 (Prohibition against profit) no HHS funds may be paid as profit to any recipient even if the recipient is a commercial organization, and HHS feels that this could be cited as a basis for limiting the payments in the above described situation to the costs of the State governmental agency.

The RFO may permit a situation that could give rise to a potential conflict of interest. The terms of the RFO are such that it permits a potential supplier to be a State governmental agency. In this situation (where the supplier is a State governmental agency) the State shall propose an interagency contract with the supplier in accordance with the Interagency Cooperation Act, Chapter 771, Texas Government Code. In otherwords, the State would not pay the contractor for services to be performed by the subcontracting State agency. Rather, the State will pay the supplier/sub-State agency directly.

This scenario could result in payments to the supplier/sub-State agency in an amount that would be in excess of what had been paid when the State was performing the same functions. Consequently, the payments made could be in excess of the cost of providing the services. This may create an opportunity for intergovernmental transfers (IGTs) which could return a portion of the State's payment to the sub-State agency back to the State to be re-used for the State's share of the match for additional Medicaid expenditures.

According to CFR 45 Part 74 in Subpart E, section 74.81(Prohibition against profit) no HHS funds may be paid as profit to any recipient even if the recipient is a commercial organization. Profit is any amount in excess of allowable direct and indirect costs. This could be cited as a basis for limiting the payments in the above described situation to the costs of the State governmental agency.

Document: TEXCOMB1.WPD
Disk: m:\ept
2/26/97

FY 1998 BUDGET Q&A
February 1997

Q: YOUR MEDICARE PLAN SCORES \$82 BILLION INSTEAD OF \$100 BILLION OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS. WILL YOU SUBMIT ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS TO ACHIEVE \$100 BILLION SCORING OFF OF THE CBO BASELINE?

A:

- We believe that the track record of our actuaries on estimates over the last five years validates our position that our Medicare plan will achieve \$100 billion in savings. Our estimates for the balanced budget are based on conservative, time-proven projections that have been more accurate than CBO for 4 straight years.

Q: HAVING SAID THAT, WILL YOU SUBMIT ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS TO ACHIEVE \$100 BILLION SO YOU CAN BACKUP YOUR CLAIM THAT YOU WILL MEET THE REPUBLICANS HALFWAY?

A:

- Again, we believe our numbers do that now. Our technical analysts will continue to work with CBO to see if further clarifications of our current policy will close the gap on scorable savings. It is premature to speculate about what, if any, revisions will be necessary until that process is complete.

Q: YOU HAVE INCLUDED A HOME HEALTH CARE TRANSFER GIMMICK IN THE BUDGET. HOW CAN YOU POSSIBLY DEFEND IT?

A:

- Let's be clear: our savings of \$138 billion in Medicare over 6 years (\$100 billion over 5 years) does *not* include the home health care transfer from Part A to Part B of the program. The \$138 billion is the net reduction of Medicare spending relative to the budget baseline -- and thus is the amount by which our Medicare changes contribute to deficit reduction. The transfer does not contribute to the \$252 net deficit reduction in our package.
- The policy you mentioned was in our budget last year, and it was in the House Republican budget in 1995 that every Republican in the House voted for.
- Shifting long-term home health visits (other than the first 100 visits following a hospitalization) away from Part A of the Medicare program makes sense because home health care has increasingly become a chronic care benefit not linked to hospitalization. It was also the established policy prior to the 1980s. And it protects the Medicare Trust Fund until 2007, while not imposing harmful cuts on hospitals or other priorities, or excessive burdens on beneficiaries.

[Background: Originally designed as a post-acute care benefit for beneficiaries who had been hospitalized, home health care has increasingly become a chronic care benefit, not linked to hospitalization. Our proposal restores the original split of home health care benefits so that the first 100 home health visits following a 3-day hospitalization would be reimbursed by Part A and all other visits -- including those not following hospitalization -- would be reimbursed by Part B.]

Q: FOLLOW: IF THE HOME HEALTH TRANSFER IS NOT A GIMMICK, THEN WHY DON'T YOU INCLUDE IT AS PART OF THE PART B PREMIUM?

A:

- We have always been concerned about out-of-pocket costs for Medicare beneficiaries. Older Americans spend, on average, 20 percent of their income on health care and three-fourths have incomes lower than \$25,000. We have to be careful that as we reform the Medicare program, we do not place undue burden on lower-income seniors.

Q. WHY ARE YOU MANAGED CARE CUTS SO DEEP? AREN'T THESE CUTS GOING TO DISCOURAGE BENEFICIARIES FROM GOING INTO MANAGED CARE AND FORCE PLANS TO CUT BACK ON BENEFITS?

A.

- There is no reason to believe that these modest cuts will cause managed care plans to have to cut back in benefits, nor will they hurt plans with large numbers of managed care enrollees. The Medicare Trust Fund is actually losing money on the increasing numbers of beneficiaries enrolling in managed care.
- Every credible study has confirmed that we are significantly overpaying Medicare managed care (Congressional Budget Office analysis, the General Accounting Office, the Prospective Payment Review Commission study, and the Mathematica Research Study done for the Health Care Financing Administration). In fact, these experts claim that we overcompensate managed care far beyond what our proposal suggests.
- Finally, our proposal does not even implement this reform until 2000, giving managed care plans more than enough time to prepare for this change.

Q. YOUR MEDICARE PROPOSAL CONTAINS MOSTLY CUTS ON PROVIDERS AND MANAGED CARE. DON'T YOU THINK WE NEED REAL STRUCTURAL MEDICARE REFORM?

- A.
- Absolutely. My budget takes important steps to modernize Medicare and bring it into the 21st century through a number of structural reforms including
 - *Establishing new private plans* -- including Preferred Provider Organizations and Provider Sponsored Organizations -- available to seniors and people with disabilities.
 - *Establishing market-oriented purchasing for Medicare* including the new prospective payment systems for home health care, nursing home care, and outpatient hospital services, as well as competitive bidding authority and the use of centers of excellence to improve quality and cut back on costs.
 - *Adding new Medigap protections* to make it possible for beneficiaries to switch back from a managed care plan to traditional Medicare without being underwritten by insurers for private supplemental insurance coverage. This should encourage more beneficiaries to opt for managed care because it addresses the fear that such a choice would lock them in forever.

Q. *DO YOU SUPPORT THE MEDICARE COMMISSION PROPOSED BY SENATORS ROTH AND MOYNIHAN?*

- A.
- First, I want to praise Chairman Roth and Ranking Member Moynihan for

working together -- on a bipartisan basis -- to propose the creation of a commission to address the long-term financing issues that face Medicare. Their efforts reflect a bipartisan spirit which we believe is critical to ensure the success of any process designed to address this important issue.

- No one is more committed than I am to seeking a bipartisan process to find long term solutions to Medicare. But my more immediate focus is reaching a bipartisan agreement on a balanced budget that extends the life of the Medicare Trust Fund in the near term. We have an historic opportunity to balance the budget. We should not let it pass.
- As I have repeatedly said, we will need a bipartisan process to address the long-term financing issues facing Medicare, and I look forward to working with both parties to develop the best possible process.

Q. DOESN'T YOUR BUDGET CREATE \$60 BILLION IN NEW ENTITLEMENTS?

- A.
- No. My budget actually *saves* \$121 billion in entitlement spending over the next 5 years.
 - We are proposing some new additions to our health care programs, but they are aimed at reducing the number of uninsured Americans and are *not* open-ended entitlements. For example:

-- Our program to provide health insurance for workers between jobs is capped. The program is structured as a grants program to States. While there are provisions to help States that have unanticipated increases in unemployment, there is an overall Federal cap on spending that cannot be breached. Moreover, the program is sunsetted after 4 years.

-- There are no new entitlements in children's health as well. The children's health initiative provides States with grants that, by law, will not exceed \$750 million in each year.

- We are also proposing some changes to the welfare reform legislation that was enacted last year, but our purpose is to fix unnecessary and damaging provisions in that legislation -- involving legal immigrants and Food Stamp recipients. We do not view these changes as new spending or new entitlements.
- It is ironic that we are sometimes criticized for phasing out new proposals -- such as school construction -- and simultaneously for creating permanent new mandatory spending programs. Our phase-outs are designed to allow an evaluation of how well the new programs are working -- and we have been careful to avoid creating permanent new entitlements without knowing the effects.

Q. WHY ARE YOU CUTTING THE MEDICAID AND MEDICARE PROGRAMS IN ORDER TO MAKE INVESTMENTS IN CHILDREN'S HEALTH?

- A. • We believe that we can constrain Medicare and Medicaid growth while still preserving the guarantee of high quality care for the millions of Americans who depend on these programs. Cost-effective approaches to expanding coverage, in the context of a balanced budget, should be a high-priority investment for this nation.

Q. WHY IS THE ADMINISTRATION ACTING SO HAPHAZARDLY ON QUALITY ISSUES. FIRST IT WAS DRIVE-THROUGH-DELIVERIES, THEN MASTECTOMIES, NOW GAG RULES. DO YOU HAVE A STRATEGY IN THIS AREA?

- A. • Yes, we do have a strategy. We believe that we have taken some important steps in areas where there have been troubling reports about the lack of high-quality medicine. When there are egregious examples of bureaucratic interference with the practice of high-quality medicine, we will not hesitate to act. However, I have announced plans to create an Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry. That panel, which will be named shortly, will help us to develop a broader framework on how we should address concerns about quality in a more comprehensive manner.

Q. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF YOUR QUALITY COMMISSION?

- A. • I expect to make an announcement about the members and charge of this commission sometime in March.

Q. DO YOU SUPPORT THE KENNEDY-DINGELL BILL ON CONSUMER RIGHTS?

- A. • We just received the bill and have not yet had time to review the details. However, we believe that Congressman Dingell and Senator Kennedy are making an important contribution to the discussion about quality. We look forward to working with them as well as other Democrats and Republicans on this important issue.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 17:22:09.00

SUBJECT: SUMMARY

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Just to summarize what I have from you already in the book....(should i take any out? should any be updated?)..

Campaign Finance

Abortion (you are updating)

Welfare-to-Work

Food Stamps

Benefits to Illegal Immigrants (should Warnath update?)

Fix Legislative Proposals

Education Standards

Hope this helps.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Patricia F. Lewis (CN=Patricia F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 17:59:16.00

SUBJECT: Goal for conference

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

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

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

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

TO: Pauline M. Abernathy (CN=Pauline M. Abernathy/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

Ann suggests that the overall conference goal better mirror the title , so that it is more how new research can and should be used to ensure that children have the very best start in life from the first days, and how we can get this information to parents and everyone else involved in raising our children.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Stuart M. Schear (CN=Stuart M. Schear/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 19:01:22.00

SUBJECT: WEEKEND TV OUTLOOOK

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

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

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

TO: Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno (CN=Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: MAPLE_D (MAPLE_D @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (DON)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: MCHUGH_L (MCHUGH_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: JENNINGS_C (JENNINGS_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: GOLDBERG_JS (GOLDBERG_JS @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Heidi Kukis (CN=Heidi Kukis/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell (CN=Joseph W. Cerrell/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ: UNKNOWN

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

TO: Peter G. Umhofer (CN=Peter G. Umhofer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ: UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ: UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich (CN=Nancy V. Hernreich/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Gribben (CN=John A. Gribben/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig T. Smith (CN=Craig T. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: REED_B (REED_B @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MAYS_C (MAYS_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JOLIN_M (JOLIN_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HAAS_L (HAAS_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JOHNSON_DT (JOHNSON_DT @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (NSC)

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally J. Aman (CN=Sally J. Aman/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Molly Varney (CN=Molly Varney/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terri J. Tingen (CN=Terri J. Tingen/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria A. Schaefer (CN=Victoria A. Schaefer/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rica F. Rodman (CN=Rica F. Rodman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta (CN=John Podesta/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ: UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kathryn O. Higgins (CN=Kathryn O. Higgins/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lawrence J. Haas (CN=Lawrence J. Haas/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ: UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Rahm I. Emanuel (CN=Rahm I. Emanuel/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ: UNKNOWN

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

TO: Sandra L. Bublick Max (CN=Sandra L. Bublick Max/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ: UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:
===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT: [ATTACH.D28]MAIL413586368.016 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043FF030000010A020100000002050000005317000000020000D518A0969FD39440D0133E
84C2368C8605142B349267EC882303CE4EC643727A630A7F53AA30A6FE164EFEA2E339F000A010

MARCH 5, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO MIKE MCCURRY AND DON BAER
FROM STUART SCHEAR
SUBJECT WEEKEND TELEVISION OUTLOOK

FRIDAY MARCH 7

WASHINGTON WEEK IN REVIEW

Topic TBD
Guest TBD

LARRY KING LIVE (CNN)

Topic White House Issues
Guest Erskine Bowles
Comment Wolf Blitzer is guest host

SATURDAY MARCH 8

EVANS & NOVAK (CNN)

Topic TBD
Guest TBD

INSIDE POLITICS WEEKEND (CNN)

Topic TBD
Guest TBD

SUNDAY MARCH 9

FOX NEWS SUNDAY (FOX)

Topic Campaign Finance Issues
Guest Request for DNC Chair Romer & RNC Chair Nicholson

Roundtable TBD

FACE THE NATION (CBS)

Topic Lake Nomination & Other Issues

Guest Sen. Shelby & Sen. Kerrey
Comment Bob Schieffer & Gloria Borger

THIS WEEK (ABC)

Topic White House Issues
Guest Erskine Bowles

Topic TBD
Guest TBD

Roundtable TBD

MEET (NBC)

Topic Foreign Affairs
Guest Request for Secy. Cohen

Topic WH Legal Issues
Guest Request for WH Official

Comment Tim Russert with TBD

LATE EDITION (CNN)

Topic The Mideast
Guest Pres. Mubarak

Topic Mideast, UN
Guest Request for Ambassador Richardson

Roundtable Frank Sesno with Ralph Begleiter

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Stuart M. Schear@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 19:10:00.00

SUBJECT: WEEKEND TV OUTLOOK

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

TO: JOHNSON_DT (JOHNSON_DT@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ: 6-MAR-1997 07:22:37.96

TO: BURKE_D (BURKE_D@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HAAS_L (HAAS_L@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ: 5-MAR-1997 19:20:15.52

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

TO: JOLIN_M (JOLIN_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ: 6-MAR-1997 09:38:53.23

TO: KAGAN_E (KAGAN_E@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MAYS_C (MAYS_C@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MCHUGH_L (MCHUGH_L@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ: 5-MAR-1997 19:11:52.70

TO: REED_B (REED_B@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WARREN_M (WARREN_M@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GREEN_MG (GREEN_MG@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MAPLE_D (MAPLE_D@A1@CD) (DON)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael D. McCurry (Michael D. McCurry@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Eli G. Attie (Eli G. Attie@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Donald A. Baer (Donald A. Baer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David S. Beaubaire (David S. Beaubaire@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Sandra L. Bublick Max (Sandra L. Bublick Max@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Holly D. Carver (Holly D. Carver@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michelle Crisci (Michelle Crisci@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lanny J. Davis (Lanny J. Davis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rahm I. Emanuel (Rahm I. Emanuel@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Paul K. Engskov (Paul K. Engskov@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen E. Finney (Karen E. Finney@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (Jeremy M. Gaines@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary E. Glynn (Mary E. Glynn@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Adam W. Goldberg (Adam W. Goldberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julia R. Green (Julia R. Green@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: John A. Gribben (John A. Gribben@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich (Nancy V. Hernreich@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kathryn O. Higgins (Kathryn O. Higgins@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: John L. Hilley (John L. Hilley@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen L. Hancox (Karen L. Hancox@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary A. Dixon (Mary A. Dixon@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elena Kagan (Elena Kagan@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Angus S. King (Angus S. King@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karin Kullman (Karin Kullman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: G N. Lattimore (G N. Lattimore@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patricia F. Lewis (Patricia F. Lewis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peggy A. Lewis (Peggy A. Lewis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Gordon Li (Gordon Li@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julie E. Mason (Julie E. Mason@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (Sylvia M. Mathews@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: April K. Mellody (April K. Mellody@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne E. McGuire (Anne E. McGuire@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (Cheryl D. Mills@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Elizabeth A. Myers (Elizabeth A. Myers@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: John Podesta (John Podesta@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen A. Popp (Karen A. Popp@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Victoria Radd (Victoria Radd@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bruce N. Reed (Bruce N. Reed@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rica F. Rodman (Rica F. Rodman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Steven J. Ronnel (Steven J. Ronnel@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Victoria A. Schaefer (Victoria A. Schaefer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Stuart M. Schear (Stuart M. Schear@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (Laura D. Schwartz@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Wendy Smith (Wendy Smith@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (Douglas B. Sosnik@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: John O. Sutton (John O. Sutton@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Virginia M. Terzano (Virginia M. Terzano@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

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

TO: June G. Turner (June G. Turner@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter G. Umhofer (Peter G. Umhofer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Molly Varney (Molly Varney@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Sally J. Aman (Sally J. Aman@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell (Joseph W. Cerrell@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ron Klain (Ron Klain@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Heidi Kukis (Heidi Kukis@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Virginia M. Terzano (Virginia M. Terzano@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (Lorraine A. Voles@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Kathleen M. McKiernan (Kathleen M. McKiernan@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Jessica R. Arons (Jessica R. Arons@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

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

TO: Ann F. Lewis (Ann F. Lewis@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Todd Stern (Todd Stern@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kathleen M. Wallman (Kathleen M. Wallman@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Odetta S. Walker (Odetta S. Walker@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christopher J. Lavery (Christopher J. Lavery@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Craig T. Smith (Craig T. Smith@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

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

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

TO: Jonathan Murchinson (Jonathan Murchinson@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 5-MAR-1997 19:03:00

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 5-MAR-1997 19:10:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

The following attachments were included with this message:

TYPE : FILE
NAME : 030597.WPD

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

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 5-MAR-1997 19:10:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT SUBJECT: 030597

TEXT:

Unable to convert OA\$SHARA699:ZWSVREDCL.WPC to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043FF030000010A020100000002050000005317000000020000D518A0969FD39440D0133E
84C2368C8605142B349267EC882303CE4EC643727A630A7F53AA30A6FE164EFEA2E339F000A010
3A647FBFB60A38B1058D8D5BCD0BC77E5E8723F45F14FB12B582103F6B15FED074D674C7DC8A3A
A47EA45901980878D8D7EA604F6163BA7E0F33FF8BC4E6AC244410A3CD5AE1C41DE544BE9AF74B
B6B70B22A126F27571A78442F2E53F1032613DB8DC3F19BF46FE7FF9817FD304C11337B9E03086
1432C0F208E94643C5F888445DAA7E4ABE3E8347AF70026BDD9974EFAB86D59A4F123717BC7392
EA9ED8186951E42664C2406B8DBA8EFFBE4C934FD80C1911C29D8C577BE45DD7FC72CC2698B933
1E4F14A13C78C183524D202963CF713FD7044C769C16566AA3BC637361D4782D7AAB097C3A5485
5CD6387D552CA8BEF91DCD74AE1E9BF1B0A525B5437812729973EE888CA71C615A44207EEEDA
6BAA6188C8E9511D39F6166FE9B6AF6ED5A737943CC34733ACBC4E817DC4F383B1E0B4632873CF
7DD2A7E6FD04DBE1350A7E5ABF9329D94B3A6BFE4DB63221ED9163C07DDFDAEDCB3315784B8B6A
F56D83D7E197BEF3441D8FEC9F4EEC4DBDAE3713ECA120360FAB890C7250F84BF7449E6BFF8B83
CA4F091E79C1AF0531AD02C6304AC9A135DF2A96366B6069E6992576BC4A3235EBBD290C75474E
BF4DD578D602000900
06000000AC02000008020100000010000000B2020000086E01000000AD000000C20200000B3002
000000340000006F03000008050100000008000000A303000008770100000040000000AB030000
08340100000014000000EB0300003C00FE15361058070000013900000060002815000010160043
006F0075007200690065007200
00000100AB003C00FE15361058070000013900000060002815000010160043006F007500720069
0065007200
00
00
36105807000000041140C900B9603712FB01580240010000000400280000000C0000000000000
0000000000000000112A4542400A100000A100000D3050C0000010000000C00D30100040002
000000A00000035060100020036062E0065813706010002003806010045003906020002003A06
020002003B06010045003C06010002003D0602005B003E0602005B005A54582100000000000000
0000000000000000DD0A1000830105000300A454211000DDD3050C0000010000000C00D3DD0B
0B00030000040B00DDF1023606F19BF1033606F1F1003606F1F1022D06F19BF1032D06F1F10136
06F1F20CF2E0110C000000008070C00E0E0110C000000060090C00E0E0110C00000000B80B0C
00E0E0110C00000000100E0C00E04D4152434880352CF1002D06F19BF1012D06F18031393937D0
041500000B00090001B0040000000001201500D0CC4D454D4F52414E44554D80544F804D494B45
804D43435552525980414E4480444F4E8042414552CC46524F4D8080808080808080808080535455
41525480534348454152CC5355424A45435480808080808080805745454B454E4480F1002D06F19C
F1012D06F154454C45564953494F4E804F55544C4F4F4BF1002D06F19BF1012D06F1CC84848484
8484F30CF384
84
1500D0CCF20EF2F20CF246524944415980F1002D06F19CF1012D06F14D415243488037F1002D06
F19BF1012D06F1D0041500000B00090001180B6806070001201500D0CCF30CF357415348494E47
544F4E805745454B80494E80524556494557F20CF2D0041500000B00090001F80C480809000120
1500D0F30EF3F30CF3CCF20CF2F20EF2CFF30EF3F30CF3546F706963E0110C000000060090C00
E0E0110C00000000B80B0C00E0F1002D06F19CF1012D06F1544244F1002D06F19BF1012D06F1D0
041500000B00090001780FC80A0C0001201500D04775657374E0110C000000060090C00E0E011

MARCH 5, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO MIKE MCCURRY AND DON BAER
FROM STUART SCHEAR
SUBJECT WEEKEND TELEVISION OUTLOOK

FRIDAY MARCH 7

WASHINGTON WEEK IN REVIEW

Topic TBD
Guest TBD

LARRY KING LIVE (CNN)

Topic White House Issues
Guest Erskine Bowles
Comment Wolf Blitzer is guest host

SATURDAY MARCH 8

EVANS & NOVAK (CNN)

Topic TBD
Guest TBD

INSIDE POLITICS WEEKEND (CNN)

Topic TBD
Guest TBD

SUNDAY MARCH 9

FOX NEWS SUNDAY (FOX)

Topic Campaign Finance Issues
Guest Request for DNC Chair Romer & RNC Chair Nicholson

Roundtable TBD

FACE THE NATION (CBS)

Topic Lake Nomination & Other Issues

Guest Sen. Shelby & Sen. Kerrey
Comment Bob Schieffer & Gloria Borger

THIS WEEK (ABC)

Topic White House Issues
Guest Erskine Bowles

Topic TBD
Guest TBD

Roundtable TBD

MEET (NBC)

Topic Foreign Affairs
Guest Request for Secy. Cohen

Topic WH Legal Issues
Guest Request for WH Official

Comment Tim Russert with TBD

LATE EDITION (CNN)

Topic The Mideast
Guest Pres. Mubarak

Topic Mideast, UN
Guest Request for Ambassador Richardson

Roundtable Frank Sesno with Ralph Begleiter

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: William R. Kincaid (CN=William R. Kincaid/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 19:14:10.00

SUBJECT: Directive

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

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

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christa Robinson (CN=Christa Robinson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Below is the revised version of the President's directive. Christa has taken this to Staff Secretary for clearance.

March 6, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR THE:
SECRETARY OF EDUCATION
DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SUBJECT: Preparing Students to Meet National Standards of Excellence in
Eighth Grade Math and Improving Math and Science Education

Since the early 1980's, U.S. elementary and secondary school students have begun taking tougher courses, and we are starting to see the results. National Assessment of Educational Progress scores have improved in math and science, with gains in mathematics equal to at least one grade level. On the SAT, average math scores are at their highest in 25 years, even as the number and diversity of test-takers have increased. However, the eighth-grade results of the 41-Nation Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS), released this fall, show that the U.S. is below average in math and just above average in science. That isn't acceptable; in this technology-rich information era, our students need to perform much better in both subjects, but especially in math, if they are to excel at higher level math and science courses that are the gateway to college and to citizenship, productive employment, and lifelong learning.

The first step in raising achievement is lifting expectations and setting high standards for what students should know and be able to do. TIMSS, our National Assessment of Educational Progress, and the standards developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics give us a solid framework to build on. Last month, to help parents and teachers learn who needs help, what changes in teaching to make, and which schools need to improve, I asked the Secretary of Education to develop a voluntary national test for individual eighth-grade students based on widely-accepted, challenging national standards in mathematics. The national test will be available to states and local school districts to give to their students in the spring of 1999, and will measure whether students have reached a high level of mathematics proficiency.

The primary responsibility for achieving high standards rests with students, teachers, parents, and schools in local communities across America. However, it is imperative that we work to ensure that federal resources support student success as well. We must ensure that federal programs, research, and human resources are used as effectively as possible to help improve teaching and learning.

Therefore, I direct the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation, together with other agencies identified in cooperation with the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Domestic Policy Council, to develop an action strategy for using key federal resources to assist states and local school systems prepare students to meet challenging math standards in eighth grade, and for involving the mathematics, scientific, and technical communities in support of these efforts.

The action strategy should include recommendations for the use of federal resources to help states, local school districts and schools to improve teaching, upgrade curriculum, integrate technology and high-quality instructional materials into the classroom, as well as motivate students and help them understand how math concepts are applied in the real world. The strategy should identify significant federal programs, activities, and partnerships available to improve teaching and learning, ensure that these resources are appropriately focused on helping students reach challenging math standards, and determine how these resources can best support state and local reforms. In developing this strategy, the inter-agency group should review the current status of improvements in math education, and identify and address critical areas of need, drawing on research and input from educators and professional organizations.

Because teaching and learning in math and science are so integrally related, and because success in both subjects is vitally important in this information era, the working group should also review how federal resources and partnerships with other organizations can help improve student achievement in science.

The working group should make its recommendations and submit its action strategy to me within 90 days.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

cc: ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR DOMESTIC POLICY
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 19:27:29.00

SUBJECT: Qs&As

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

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

TO: Russell W. Horwitz (CN=Russell W. Horwitz/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI:

I sent the briefing book in to Staff Secretary, with a note to Phil Caplan that...

Sperling will provide CBO and CPI Qs&As.

Kagan will provide abortion Qs&As.

Voles/Terzano will provide VP Qs&As (GT - they don;t expect until COB tomorrow).

Can you please make sure you email me a copy or give me a hard copy of the Qs&As? Thanks.

New Firearms Initiatives

Q. *What does your Child Safety Lock Directive do?*

Firearms claim the lives of too many of our children. My directive requires all Federal Agencies to provide a child safety lock and proper instructions with every handgun issued to a Federal law enforcement agent. This Directive will help prevent gun accidents and children's access to guns.

My Anti-Gang legislation that I sent to Congress would further expand use of child safety locks by requiring all Federal Firearms dealers to provide a child safety lock with every handgun they sell. Until Congress makes child safety locks the law of the land, we must do everything we can to prevent unauthorized firearms use by our young people.

The Directive would take the first step in that direction by making this a universally-adopted safety policy for all Federal law enforcement agents.

Q. *How would you restrict gun sales to noncitizens?*

Federal law requires that legal aliens live in a state for at least 90 days before they are allowed to purchase a handgun. But the application to buy a gun fails to ask how long an applicant has lived at his or her current address.

As a first step to reduce illegal handgun purchases by noncitizens, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms will immediately require applicants to certify that they have been residents for at least 90 days in the state where they are trying to buy a gun.

But this isn't enough. I also support the Kennedy-Durbin/Schumer legislation which prohibits foreign visitors to the United States from purchasing and possessing firearms.

Q. *What would you do about "cop killer" bullets?*

Criminals should not have access to handgun ammunition that can pierce bullet-proof vests worn by law enforcement officers. While current law establishes limits on ammunition based on specific materials from which it is made, it does not address the problem of excessively powerful ammunition based on its performance.

Once again, I will send legislation to Congress banning "Cop Killer" bullets. My legislation directs the Secretary of the Treasury to promulgate regulations to prohibit the manufacture, importation, and distribution of handgun ammunition that can pierce standard bullet-proof vests. We need a simple test and a straightforward ban. These bullets have one purpose only-- to kill police officers. They have no place on our streets.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: William R. Kincaid (CN=William R. Kincaid/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 20:27:21.00

SUBJECT: Michigan Package

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Below are the following items:

1. One pager on announcement items for Michigan--press office will reformat
2. Final draft directive submitted to Staff Secretary.
3. Bullets on possible results of the directive.

Please let Mike or me know if you have any questions. I'm at 6-2857.

Thanks.

Continuing Progress Toward Raising Standards and Improving Reading and Math

DRAFT March 6, 1997

MICHIGAN SECOND STATE TO ACCEPT CHALLENGE ON NATIONAL STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE IN MATH AND SCIENCE.

Last month, in his State of the Union address, President Clinton challenged states and school districts to participate in a new, voluntary national test for individual students in fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade students mathematics to be administered beginning in the spring of 1999. Today, Governor Engler will announce that Michigan intends to participate in the new national tests. This makes Michigan the second state, after Maryland, to make this commitment.

FOCUSING FEDERAL RESOURCES ON HELPING STATES AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS IMPROVE MATH EDUCATION

Today the President is directing the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation, working with other agencies, to develop an

action strategy for using federal resources and involving the math, scientific, and technical communities in helping states and school districts prepare students to meet challenging standards in eighth grade math, as well as raise achievement in science. The action strategy, to be completed within 90 days, will include recommendations for the use of federal resources to help states, local school districts and schools to improve teaching, upgrade curriculum, integrate technology and high-quality instructional materials into the classroom, as well as motivate students and help them understand how math concepts are applied in the real world.

TECHNOLOGY GRANT AWARDED TO MICHIGAN

The President also announced today that the U.S. Department of Education is awarding Michigan \$8.6 million under the President's Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Under the award, funds will go to local schools to help teachers gain training in the use of technology, and also help fund software and hardware, as well as Internet access, to help students connect with the information superhighway and learn to high standards.

MORE COMMITMENTS TO AMERICA READS

In a sign of progress on his America Reads initiative, the President also announced today that 16 colleges and universities in Michigan had committed more than 1500 work study students to serve as reading tutors over the next 5 years.

March 6, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR THE:

SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SUBJECT: Preparing Students to Meet National Standards of Excellence in Eighth Grade Math and Improving Math and Science Education

Since the early 1980's, U.S. elementary and secondary school students have begun taking tougher courses, and we are starting to see the results. National Assessment of Educational Progress scores have improved in math and science, with gains in mathematics equal to at least one grade level. On the SAT, average math scores are at their highest in 25 years, even as the number and diversity of test-takers have increased. However, the eighth-grade results of the 41-Nation Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS), released this fall, show that the U.S. is below average in math and just above average in science. That isn't acceptable; in this technology-rich information era, our students need to perform much better in both subjects, but especially in math, if they are to excel at higher level math and science courses that are the gateway to college and to citizenship, productive employment, and lifelong learning.

The first step in raising achievement is lifting expectations and setting high standards for what students should know and be able to do. TIMSS, our National Assessment of Educational Progress, and the standards developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics give us a solid framework to build on. Last month, to help parents and teachers learn who needs help, what changes in teaching to make, and which schools need to improve, I asked the Secretary of Education to develop a voluntary

national test for individual eighth-grade students based on widely-accepted, challenging national standards in mathematics. The national test will be available to states and local school districts to give to their students in the spring of 1999, and will measure whether students have reached a high level of mathematics proficiency.

The primary responsibility for achieving high standards rests with students, teachers, parents, and schools in local communities across America. However, it is imperative that we work to ensure that federal resources support student success as well. We must ensure that federal programs, research, and human resources are used as effectively as possible to help improve teaching and learning.

Therefore, I direct the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation, together with other agencies identified in cooperation with the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Domestic Policy Council, to develop an action strategy for using key federal resources to assist states and local school systems prepare students to meet challenging math standards in eighth grade, and for involving the mathematics, scientific, and technical communities in support of these efforts.

The action strategy should include recommendations for the use of federal resources to help states, local school districts and schools to improve teaching, upgrade curriculum, integrate technology and high-quality instructional materials into the classroom, as well as motivate students and help them understand how math concepts are applied in the real world. The strategy should identify significant federal programs, activities, and partnerships available to improve teaching and learning, ensure that these resources are appropriately focused on helping students reach challenging math standards, and determine how these resources can best support state and local reforms. In developing this strategy, the inter-agency group should review the current status of improvements in math education, and identify and address critical areas of need, drawing on research and input from educators and professional organizations.

Because teaching and learning in math and science are so integrally related, and because success in both subjects is vitally important in this information era, the working group should also review how federal resources and partnerships with other organizations can help improve student achievement in science.

The working group should make its recommendations and submit its action strategy to me within 90 days.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

cc: ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR DOMESTIC POLICY
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

DRAFT -- March 5, 1997

HOW THE ACTION STRATEGY WILL HELP IMPROVE MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

The working group led by the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation (NSF) will identify and recommend key strategies for

coordinating federal resources to help states and school districts upgrade teaching and learning in math, as well as in science. For example, the working group could recommend...

Easy Access to Resources for Teaching to High Standards:

An easy-access joint Department of Education -- NSF Internet site where teachers could go to get challenging, classroom-tested instructional units or materials that are linked to national standards.

Spreading the Word on Best Practices:

A strategy for producing and disseminating products (such as videos and CD-ROMs that compare classroom teaching approaches in the U.S., Germany and Japan) that states and local school systems could use to compare their instructional practices with those used in high-performing countries and outstanding districts in the U.S.

Preparing Teachers for World-Class Teaching and Learning:

A plan for using Department of Education and NSF programs to foster closer collaboration among school districts, colleges of education, and math and science faculties to incorporate the insights of TIMSS and ensure that teachers graduating from pre-service programs are prepared to excel in real classrooms.

Textbooks that Challenge Students to High Math Achievement:

A privately-funded, nationwide competition for the development of a high-quality middle school math textbook that embodies the high standards of the national exam.

A Public Service Campaign Linking Academic Performance With Work Success:

A highly visible, nationwide public service campaign that would help parents and children understand the real-world importance of basic and advanced math and science skills for success in the 21st Century economy.

Creating a New Partnership for Math and Science Learning

A new partnership among federal agencies, laboratories, higher education, and community organizations to promote greater involvement of professionals with strong math and science backgrounds in consulting with teachers to help students and parents understand the real-world applications of what students are learning.

Fostering Community Schools that Promote Math Excellence

Develop principles for new community schools focusing on math instruction geared to high standards, with after-school, weekend and summer programs to enrich classroom learning, strong parental involvement, and ongoing opportunities for teachers to stay abreast of the latest developments in their field.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alice E. Shuffield (CN=Alice E. Shuffield/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 20:46:30.00

SUBJECT: OMB Legislative Report -- March 5, 1997

TO: Anne H. Lewis (CN=Anne H. Lewis/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Jill M. Pizzuto (CN=Jill M. Pizzuto/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew M. Schoenbach (CN=Andrew M. Schoenbach/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward A. Brigham (CN=Edward A. Brigham/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francis S. Redburn (CN=Francis S. Redburn/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Richard J. Turman (CN=Richard J. Turman/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_P (SMITH_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Keith J. Fontenot (CN=Keith J. Fontenot/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jack D. Fellows (CN=Jack D. Fellows/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rodney G. Bent (CN=Rodney G. Bent/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Steven D. Aitken (CN=Steven D. Aitken/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Roger L. McClung (CN=Roger L. McClung/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toni S. Husted (CN=Toni S. Husted/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HOGAN_L (HOGAN_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Jo Siclari (CN=Mary Jo Siclari/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WILLIAMS_MA (WILLIAMS_MA @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: VELLENGA_T (VELLENGA_T @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WARREN_W (WARREN_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (CEQ)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas C. Jensen (CN=Thomas C. Jensen/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Kate P. Donovan (CN=Kate P. Donovan/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Ananias Blocker III (CN=Ananias Blocker III/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: SCHAEFER_V (SCHAEFER_V @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James B. Kazel (CN=James B. Kazel/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Fairweather (CN=Robert S. Fairweather/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert J. Nassif (CN=Robert J. Nassif/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: ANGELL_J (ANGELL_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Himler (CN=Janet Himler/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Hancox (CN=Karen L. Hancox/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: REED_B (REED_B @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nancy L. Brandel (CN=Nancy L. Brandel/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WALKER_A (WALKER_A @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MORAN_K (MORAN_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WHITE_B (WHITE_B @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip R. Dame (CN=Philip R. Dame/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stacey L. Rubin (CN=Stacey L. Rubin/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WEINSTEIN_D (WEINSTEIN_D @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elyse H. Fitter (CN=Elyse H. Fitter/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert J. Pellicci (CN=Robert J. Pellicci/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: COOK_MY (COOK_MY @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [OMB]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BROWN_JA (BROWN_JA @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ingrid M. Schroeder (CN=Ingrid M. Schroeder/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GIBBONS_M (GIBBONS_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: PANERALI_K (PANERALI_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: PETERSON_RK (PETERSON_RK @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James J. Jukes (CN=James J. Jukes/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: FOLEY_M (FOLEY_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lara L. Roholt (CN=Lara L. Roholt/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Bernard H. Martin (CN=Bernard H. Martin/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Bruce D. Long (CN=Bruce D. Long/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ellen J. Balis (CN=Ellen J. Balis/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah L. Shaw (CN=Deborah L. Shaw/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard P. Emery Jr. (CN=Richard P. Emery Jr./OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert B. Rideout (CN=Robert B. Rideout/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SCHWARTZ_K (SCHWARTZ_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Janet L. Graves (CN=Janet L. Graves/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Jill M. Blickstein (CN=Jill M. Blickstein/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph J. Minarik (CN=Joseph J. Minarik/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Kenneth S. Apfel (CN=Kenneth S. Apfel/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ADAMS_G (ADAMS_G @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert G. Damus (CN=Robert G. Damus/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles E. Kieffer (CN=Charles E. Kieffer/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jacob J. Lew (CN=Jacob J. Lew/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael W. Williams (CN=Michael W. Williams/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia E. Romani (CN=Patricia E. Romani/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice E. Shuffield (CN=Alice E. Shuffield/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward M. Rea (CN=Edward M. Rea/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Harry G. Meyers (CN=Harry G. Meyers/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David J. Haun (CN=David J. Haun/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Louisa Koch (CN=Louisa Koch/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert M. Shireman (CN=Robert M. Shireman/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Larry R. Matlack (CN=Larry R. Matlack/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gary L. Bennethum (CN=Gary L. Bennethum/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce K. Sasser (CN=Bruce K. Sasser/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_BD (SMITH_BD @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [OMB]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Dotson (CN=Robert S. Dotson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eugene M. Ebner (CN=Eugene M. Ebner/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Russell W. Horwitz (CN=Russell W. Horwitz/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher R. Ulrich (CN=Christopher R. Ulrich/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Justine F. Rodriguez (CN=Justine F. Rodriguez/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GOLDBERG_JS (GOLDBERG_JS @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DENTON_M (DENTON_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (CEQ)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: OLIVER_A (OLIVER_A @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [OMB]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: LEVIN_P (LEVIN_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Richard A. Mertens (CN=Richard A. Mertens/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SCHWARTZ_N (SCHWARTZ_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: MCKIERNAN_K (MCKIERNAN_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Gribben (CN=John A. Gribben/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet E. Irwin (CN=Janet E. Irwin/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melinda D. Haskins (CN=Melinda D. Haskins/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: DONNELLY_RE (DONNELLY_RE @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Dainel C. Tate (CN=Dainel C. Tate/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Shelley N. Fidler (CN=Shelley N. Fidler/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: SILVERMAN_S (SILVERMAN_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GREEN_M (GREEN_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: WALKER_C (WALKER_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Phebe N. Vickers (CN=Phebe N. Vickers/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: PALMIERI_J (PALMIERI_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Annette E. Rooney (CN=Annette E. Rooney/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison C. Perkins (CN=Alison C. Perkins/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna M. Briatico (CN=Anna M. Briatico/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Constance J. Bowers (CN=Constance J. Bowers/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Weinberg (CN=Jeffrey A. Weinberg/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JONES_RE (JONES_RE @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [OMB]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Steven J. Kelman (CN=Steven J. Kelman/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet R. Forsgren (CN=Janet R. Forsgren/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James C. Murr (CN=James C. Murr/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap (CN=Elisa Millsap/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel M. Tangherlini (CN=Daniel M. Tangherlini/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Fitzpatrick (CN=Michael A. Fitzpatrick/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce W. McConnell (CN=Bruce W. McConnell/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa M. Kountoupes (CN=Lisa M. Kountoupes/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alicia K. Kolaian (CN=Alicia K. Kolaian/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susanne D. Lind (CN=Susanne D. Lind/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert E. Barker (CN=Robert E. Barker/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip A. DuSault (CN=Philip A. DuSault/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry T. Clendenin (CN=Barry T. Clendenin/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ronald M. Cogswell (CN=Ronald M. Cogswell/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alan B. Rhinesmith (CN=Alan B. Rhinesmith/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah F. Kramer (CN=Deborah F. Kramer/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_CM (SMITH_CM @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William A. Halter (CN=William A. Halter/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HAAS_L (HAAS_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nancy A. Min (CN=Nancy A. Min/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: T J. Glauthier (CN=T J. Glauthier/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry B. Anderson (CN=Barry B. Anderson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca R. Culberson (CN=Rebecca R. Culberson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Koskinen (CN=John A. Koskinen/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: RAINES_F (RAINES_F @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

TO: DIRECTOR FRANK RAINES
DEPUTY DIRECTOR JACK LEW
DEPUTY DIRECTOR JOHN KOSKINEN

FROM: OMB LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

DATE: MARCH 5, 1997

SUBJECT: LEGISLATIVE REPORT

This morning, CBO Director June O'Neill testified before the Senate Budget Committee. During the hearing, the Committee addressed backloading, exceeding the caps, economic assumptions, new initiatives, tax cuts and the trigger.

UPCOMING HEARINGS:

Thursday, March 6th

House Judiciary Committee, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee
-- Administrator Sally Katzen will testify on the Congressional Review Act, which facilitates congressional oversight of agency rule making.
(10:30 am, Rayburn 2237)

House Budget Committee -- June O'Neill will testify on CBO's analysis of the President's Budget. (11:00 am, Cannon 210)

Tuesday, March 11th

Senate Budget Committee -- Possible hearing on the Coalition Budget (10:00 am)

House Budget Committee -- Secretary Rubin will testify on the Administration's Budget.
(1:00 pm, Cannon 210)

Wednesday, March 12th

Joint House/Senate Budget Committee -- Possible hearing with the National Governors on Medicaid. (10:00 am)

CONGRESS TODAY (3/4):

SENATE

The Senate adopted the nomination of Charlene Barshefsky to be the US Trade Representative by a vote of 99 to 1. (Senator Allard, R-CO, cast the opposing vote.) During consideration of her nomination, the Senate passed the waiver S.J.Res. 5, regarding Barshefsky's previous work with Canadian timber interests, by a vote of 98-2. (Senators Lott and Allard cast the opposing votes.) During consideration of the Resolution, the

Senate tabled Hollings amendment, regarding the President's authority to carry out trade agreements, by a vote of 84 to 16.

[SAP sent, 3/4/97: Administration strongly supports enactment of the S.J.Res. 5, but strongly opposes the Hollings amendment]

HOUSE

The House considered the following bills, under suspension of the rules (The House approved a UC agreement to consider suspensions on Wednesday):

Passed (460-0, 2 present) H.Con.Res. 17, Congratulating the people of Guatemala on establishing a peace process

Passed (417-3, 3 present) H.Con. Res. 18, Congratulating the People of Nicaragua on their democratic elections

Passed (Voice vote) S.Con.Res. 4, Commending Warren Christopher for his service as Secretary of State

The House also adopted (295-125) H.Con.Res.31 , Sense of the Congress regarding the 10 Commandments Case in Alabama, a vote that was postponed from Tuesday's session.

CONGRESS TOMORROW (3/6):

SENATE

Convene at 12 noon for morning business until 1:30 pm. The Senate may then take up Presidential nominations ready for action (Pena the most likely candidate).

HOUSE

Convene at 10:00 am. Consider the following bill, under suspension of the rules (The House approved a UC agreement in order to consider a suspension on Thursday): H.R. 513, DC Council Contract Reform Act, which would exempt certain government contracts from review by the DC Council
[No SAP]

CONGRESS -- LONG-TERM SCHEDULE

SENATE

The Senate schedule for Friday is yet to be announced.

March 22 - April 6
Easter Recess

HOUSE:

Friday, March 7th
No Votes

March 22 - April 7
Easter Recess

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Alice E. Shuffield@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-MAR-1997 20:53:00.00

SUBJECT: OMB Legislative Report -- March 5, 1997

TO: RAINES_F (RAINES_F@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ADAMS_G (ADAMS_G@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HAAS_L (HAAS_L@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ: 6-MAR-1997 08:28:41.25

TO: SMITH_CM (SMITH_CM@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SCHWARTZ_K (SCHWARTZ_K@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: FOLEY_M (FOLEY_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ: 6-MAR-1997 09:03:01.11

TO: PETERSON_RK (PETERSON_RK@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: PANERALI_K (PANERALI_K@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HOLSTEIN_E (HOLSTEIN_E@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GIBBONS_M (GIBBONS_M@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: JONES_RE (JONES_RE@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: BROWN_JA (BROWN_JA@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: COOK_MY (COOK_MY@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WEINSTEIN_D (WEINSTEIN_D@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WEINSTEIN_P (WEINSTEIN_P@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: PALMIERI_J (PALMIERI_J@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ: 6-MAR-1997 12:09:23.68

TO: WHITE_B (WHITE_B@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MORAN_K (MORAN_K@A1@CD) (WHO)

READ:NOT READ

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

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

TO: GREEN_M (GREEN_M@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: REED_B (REED_B@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

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

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

TO: SCHAEFER_V (SCHAEFER_V@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ: 6-MAR-1997 08:05:59.10

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

TO: SCHWARTZ_N (SCHWARTZ_N@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ: 6-MAR-1997 09:29:57.68

TO: SPERLING_G (SPERLING_G@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: ABERNATHY_P (ABERNATHY_P@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: OLIVER_A (OLIVER_A@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WARREN_M (WARREN_M@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ABRAMSON_K (ABRAMSON_K@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: DENTON_M (DENTON_M@A1@CD) (CEQ)
READ: 6-MAR-1997 10:44:06.04

TO: WARREN_W (WARREN_W@A1@CD) (CEQ)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: VELLENGA_T (VELLENGA_T@A1@CD) (WHO)

READ:NOT READ

TO: WILLIAMS_MA
READ:NOT READ

(WILLIAMS_MA@A1@CD) (WHO)

TO: HOGAN_L
READ:NOT READ

(HOGAN_L@A1@CD) (OPD)

TO: SMITH_BD
READ:NOT READ

(SMITH_BD@A1@CD) (OMB)

TO: SMITH_P
READ:NOT READ

(SMITH_P@A1@CD) (OMB)

TO: Jacob J. Lew
READ:NOT READ

(Jacob J. Lew@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: John A. Koskinen
READ:NOT READ

(John A. Koskinen@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Charles E. Kieffer
READ:NOT READ

(Charles E. Kieffer@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Rebecca R. Culberson
READ:NOT READ

(Rebecca R. Culberson@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Robert G. Damus
READ:NOT READ

(Robert G. Damus@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Barry B. Anderson
READ:NOT READ

(Barry B. Anderson@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: T J. Glauthier
READ:NOT READ

(T J. Glauthier@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Kenneth S. Apfel
READ:NOT READ

(Kenneth S. Apfel@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Nancy A. Min
READ:NOT READ

(Nancy A. Min@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Sally Katzen
READ:NOT READ

(Sally Katzen@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Joseph J. Minarik
READ:NOT READ

(Joseph J. Minarik@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: William A. Halter
READ:NOT READ

(William A. Halter@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jill M. Blickstein
READ:NOT READ

(Jill M. Blickstein@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi
READ:NOT READ

(Sarah A. Bianchi@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Deborah F. Kramer
READ:NOT READ

(Deborah F. Kramer@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Janet L. Graves

(Janet L. Graves@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Alan B. Rhinesmith (Alan B. Rhinesmith@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kathleen Peroff (Kathleen Peroff@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ronald M. Cogswell (Ronald M. Cogswell@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry T. Clendenin (Barry T. Clendenin@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert B. Rideout (Robert B. Rideout@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Philip A. DuSault (Philip A. DuSault@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard P. Emery Jr. (Richard P. Emery Jr.@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert E. Barker (Robert E. Barker@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Deborah L. Shaw (Deborah L. Shaw@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Susanne D. Lind (Susanne D. Lind@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ellen J. Balis (Ellen J. Balis@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alicia K. Kolaian (Alicia K. Kolaian@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bruce D. Long (Bruce D. Long@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lisa M. Kountoupes (Lisa M. Kountoupes@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Charles Konigsberg (Charles Konigsberg@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bruce W. McConnell (Bruce W. McConnell@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bernard H. Martin (Bernard H. Martin@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael A. Fitzpatrick (Michael A. Fitzpatrick@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Scott Quehl (Scott Quehl@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Daniel M. Tangherlini (Daniel M. Tangherlini@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Lara L. Roholt (Lara L. Roholt@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elisa Millsap (Elisa Millsap@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ann M. Cattalini (Ann M. Cattalini@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: James T. Heimbach (James T. Heimbach@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: James C. Murr (James C. Murr@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: James J. Jukes (James J. Jukes@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Janet R. Forsgren (Janet R. Forsgren@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Steven J. Kelman (Steven J. Kelman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ingrid M. Schroeder (Ingrid M. Schroeder@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeffrey A. Weinberg (Jeffrey A. Weinberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Constance J. Bowers (Constance J. Bowers@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anna M. Briatico (Anna M. Briatico@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert J. Pellicci (Robert J. Pellicci@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alison C. Perkins (Alison C. Perkins@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elyse H. Fitter (Elyse H. Fitter@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Annette E. Rooney (Annette E. Rooney@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Philip R. Dame (Philip R. Dame@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Phebe N. Vickers (Phebe N. Vickers@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barbara Chow (Barbara Chow@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Todd Stern (Todd Stern@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nancy L. Brandel (Nancy L. Brandel@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth M. Toohy (Elizabeth M. Toohy@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (Douglas B. Sosnik@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen L. Hancox (Karen L. Hancox@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Shelley N. Fidler (Shelley N. Fidler@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Janet Himler (Janet Himler@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dainel C. Tate (Dainel C. Tate@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anita Chellaraj (Anita Chellaraj@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nicholas B. Kirkhorn (Nicholas B. Kirkhorn@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lucia A. Wyman (Lucia A. Wyman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alphonse J. Maldon (Alphonse J. Maldon@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert J. Nassif (Robert J. Nassif@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melinda D. Haskins (Melinda D. Haskins@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert S. Fairweather (Robert S. Fairweather@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Janet E. Irwin (Janet E. Irwin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: James B. Kazel (James B. Kazel@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: John A. Gribben (John A. Gribben@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: April K. Mellody (April K. Mellody@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary E. Glynn (Mary E. Glynn@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark A. Weatherly (Mark A. Weatherly@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ananias Blocker III (Ananias Blocker III@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard A. Mertens (Richard A. Mertens@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ben A. Freeland (Ben A. Freeland@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter G. Jacoby (Peter G. Jacoby@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kate P. Donovan (Kate P. Donovan@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Angus S. King (Angus S. King@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Thomas C. Jensen (Thomas C. Jensen@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Justine F. Rodriguez (Justine F. Rodriguez@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julie E. Mason (Julie E. Mason@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary Jo Siclari (Mary Jo Siclari@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Alice E. Shuffield (Alice E. Shuffield@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Toni S. Hustead (Toni S. Hustead@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christopher R. Ulrich (Christopher R. Ulrich@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Roger L. McClung (Roger L. McClung@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Russell W. Horwitz (Russell W. Horwitz@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elena Kagan (Elena Kagan@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Eugene M. Ebner (Eugene M. Ebner@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Steven D. Aitken (Steven D. Aitken@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert S. Dotson (Robert S. Dotson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David H. Morrison (David H. Morrison@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rodney G. Bent (Rodney G. Bent@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bruce K. Sasser (Bruce K. Sasser@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jack D. Fellows (Jack D. Fellows@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Gary L. Bennethum (Gary L. Bennethum@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Keith J. Fontenot (Keith J. Fontenot@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Larry R. Matlack (Larry R. Matlack@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert M. Shireman (Robert M. Shireman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard J. Turman (Richard J. Turman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Louisa Koch (Louisa Koch@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David E. Tornquist (David E. Tornquist@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David J. Haun (David J. Haun@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Francis S. Redburn (Francis S. Redburn@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Harry G. Meyers (Harry G. Meyers@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Edward A. Brigham (Edward A. Brigham@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Edward M. Rea (Edward M. Rea@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Andrew M. Schoenbach (Andrew M. Schoenbach@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jill M. Pizzuto (Jill M. Pizzuto@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patricia E. Romani (Patricia E. Romani@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa Green (Melissa Green@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

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

TO: Anne H. Lewis (Anne H. Lewis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 5-MAR-1997 20:44:00

TO: DIRECTOR FRANK RAINES
DEPUTY DIRECTOR JACK LEW
DEPUTY DIRECTOR JOHN KOSKINEN

FROM: OMB LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

DATE: MARCH 5, 1997

SUBJECT: LEGISLATIVE REPORT

This morning, CBO Director June O'Neill testified before the Senate Budget Committee. During the hearing, the Committee addressed backloading, exceeding the caps, economic assumptions, new initiatives, tax cuts and the trigger.

UPCOMING HEARINGS:

Thursday, March 6th

House Judiciary Committee, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee -- Administrator Sally Katzen will testify on the Congressional Review Act, which facilitates congressional oversight of agency rule making. (10:30 am, Rayburn 2237)

House Budget Committee -- June O'Neill will testify on CBO's analysis of the President's Budget. (11:00 am, Cannon 210)

Tuesday, March 11th

Senate Budget Committee -- Possible hearing on the Coalition Budget (10:00 am)

House Budget Committee -- Secretary Rubin will testify on the Administration's Budget.

(1:00 pm, Cannon 210)

Wednesday, March 12th

Joint House/Senate Budget Committee -- Possible hearing with the National Governors on Medicaid. (10:00 am)

CONGRESS TODAY (3/4):

SENATE

The Senate adopted the nomination of Charlene Barshefsky to be the US Trade Representative by a vote of 99 to 1. (Senator Allard, R-CO, cast the opposing vote.) During consideration of her nomination, the Senate passed the waiver S.J.Res. 5, regarding Barshefsky's previous work with Canadian timber interests, by a vote of 98-2. (Senators Lott and Allard cast the opposing votes.) During consideration of the Resolution, the Senate tabled Hollings

amendment, regarding the President's authority to carry out trade agreements, by a vote of 84 to 16.

[SAP sent, 3/4/97: Administration strongly supports enactment of the S.J.Res. 5, but strongly opposes the Hollings amendment]

HOUSE

The House considered the following bills, under suspension of the rules (The House approved a UC agreement to consider suspensions on Wednesday):

Passed (460-0, 2 present) H.Con.Res. 17, Congratulating the people of Guatemala on establishing a peace process

Passed (417-3, 3 present) H.Con. Res. 18, Congratulating the People of Nicaragua on their democratic elections

Passed (Voice vote) S.Con.Res. 4, Commending Warren Christopher for his service as Secretary of State

The House also adopted (295-125) H.Con.Res.31 , Sense of the Congress regarding the 10 Commandments Case in Alabama, a vote that was postponed from Tuesday's session.

CONGRESS TOMORROW (3/6):

SENATE

Convene at 12 noon for morning business until 1:30 pm. The Senate may then take up Presidential nominations ready for action (Pena the most likely candidate).

HOUSE

Convene at 10:00 am. Consider the following bill, under suspension of the rules (The House approved a UC agreement in order to consider a suspension on Thursday): H.R. 513, DC Council Contract Reform Act, which would exempt certain government contracts from review by the DC Council
[No SAP]

CONGRESS -- LONG-TERM SCHEDULE

SENATE

The Senate schedule for Friday is yet to be announced.

March 22 - April 6
Easter Recess

HOUSE:

Friday, March 7th
No Votes

March 22 - April 7
Easter Recess