

**NLWJC - KAGAN**

**EMAILS RECEIVED**

**ARMS - BOX 047 - FOLDER -003**

**[03/17/1999]**

# Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

## Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Christopher Jennings to Elena Kagan. Re: Statement by the President (1 page)	03/17/1999	P6/b(6)

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
Automated Records Management System [Email]  
OPD ([Kagan])  
OA/Box Number: 250000

### FOLDER TITLE:

[03/17/1999]

2009-1006-F

vz119

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]  
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]  
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]  
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]  
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]  
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]  
  
C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.  
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).  
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Andrea Kane ( CN=Andrea Kane/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 09:05:56.00

SUBJECT: TANF Rule Release

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

TO: Courtney O. Gregoire ( CN=Courtney O. Gregoire/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: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

What do you think about inviting a small bipartisan group of Govs to participate in release of TANF rule? Possible candidates might be: Thompson, Engler, Carper, O'Bannon, Whitman. We're going to discuss general roll-out strategies with HHS today, but wanted to get your general reaction on this.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth R. Newman ( CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 09:15:32.00

SUBJECT: guidance today

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro ( CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Joe is briefing early today . Please have guidance in on time. Thanks

Medicare

PBOR

Gun Lawsuits and Legislation - Barr, Schumer, Boxer

Medical Marijuana

Police Brutality

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Charles J. Payson ( CN=Charles J. Payson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 09:22:13.00

SUBJECT: Long Term Scheduling Meeting Thursday

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

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

TO: Glyn T. Davies ( CN=Glyn T. Davies/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neal Lane ( CN=Neal Lane/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [ OSTP ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George T. Frampton ( CN=George T. Frampton/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Katharine Button ( CN=Katharine Button/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: Courtney O. Gregoire ( CN=Courtney O. Gregoire/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr ( CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey T. Haynes ( CN=Audrey T. Haynes/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Patricia Solis-Doyle ( CN=Patricia Solis-Doyle/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: KERRICK\_D ( KERRICK\_D @ A1 @ CD @ VAXGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] ) (NSC)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Betty J. Fountain ( CN=Betty J. Fountain/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [ OSTP ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Sean P. O'Shea ( CN=Sean P. O'Shea/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: Carolyn T. Wu ( CN=Carolyn T. Wu/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman ( CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan ( CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

Charles J. Payson ( CN=Charles J. Payson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

There will be a Long Term Planning/ Scheduling Meeting on  
Thursday at 5 pm in the Roosevelt Ro

Please let me know if you cannot make it. Thanks!

The manifest for this meeting is as follows:

Ann Lewis  
Douglas Sosnik  
Nancy Hernreich  
Phillip Caplan  
Maria Echaveste  
Patricia Solis-Doyle  
Stephanie Streett  
Capricia Marshall  
Jeffrey Forbes  
Todd Stern  
Jennifer Palmieri  
Jonathan Kaplan  
Stacie Spector  
Lisa Berg  
Minyon Moore  
Steve Ricchetti  
Audrey Haynes  
Gene Sperling  
Karen Tramontano  
John Podesta  
Thurgood Marshall Jr  
Michael Waldman  
Elena Kagan  
Bruce Reed  
Melanne Verveer  
Mickey Ibarra  
Lawrence Stein  
Joseph Lockhart  
Robert Johnson  
Ron Klain  
Pat Ewing  
Monica Dixon

George Frampton  
Sylvia Mathews  
Neal Lane  
Glyn Davies  
Don Kerrick  
Mary Beth Cahill  
Loretta Ucelli

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Devorah R. Adler ( CN=Devorah R. Adler/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 09:56:07.00

SUBJECT: Re: guidance today

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

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

CC: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Q: When is the President going to unveil his plan?

A: The President has made no decision on any final policy, nor has he decided on a specific timetable for unveiling his proposal. However, he will send it to Capitol Hill early enough to ensure that the Congress has the opportunity to pass it this year.

Q: What will be in this proposal?

A: Consistent with the principles the President laid out earlier this year, his proposal will include a provision to dedicate surplus dollars to strengthen the financial status of the program and to prevent excessive increases in out of pocket costs for beneficiaries or harmful provider payment reductions to strengthen the Medicare program's financial state. In addition, it will no doubt include a meaningful prescription drug benefit and a number of provisions that modernize the program and make it more competitive. These provisions were highlighted as important elements within the principles the President outlined earlier this year. No further details are, or will be available, until the President unveils his proposal.

Q: You've indicated that the President wants to modernize the program and make it more competitive. Does that mean that his proposal will include a premium support mechanism?

A: Not necessarily. That is one possible option, but the President has made no final determination in this area. As he indicated yesterday, he would want to make certain that such an approach would not impose significant cost barriers to beneficiaries wishing to remain in the traditional fee for service program.

Q: Senator Kerrey, one of the few Democrats to vote for the Commission's recommendations, was particularly critical of the President's insistence on the use of the surplus. He also disagreed with the President's stated concerns about the Commission's recommendation to increase the age of eligibility to 67. How do you respond?

A: These are issues where we clearly disagree. Every independent Medicare expert has recognized that the program needs an independent infusion of financing to ensure the financial health of the program for any length of time. We believe that using the surplus is a much better course of action than a payroll tax increase. The alternatives to new

revenue are excessive cuts in provider reimbursement or benefits. The President strongly believes that raising the eligibilty age to 67 without a viable policy that insures the number of the uninsured does not increase is unwarranted and ill-advised. There are already over 3 million, uninsured people just under age 65, and this is the most rapidly growing age group of the uninsured. Without Medicare or some accessible, affordable alternative, many of the 65 to 67 year olds who would have Medicare would become -- or remain -- uninsured.

Q: Last night, a number of the members of the Commission expressed resentment that the President preempted the Commission's vote in his statement today by acting as though their work had been completed even before the final vote had been taken. How do you respond?

A: The President wanted to acknowledge the work of the Commission on the day it was to make its final vote. He certainly explicitly acknowledged in his statement that the vote had not taken place. In addition, Senator Breau and Congressman Thomas had made clear that the recommendations of the Commission were likely to fall short of the votes necessary to report to Congress. Moreover, the President was highly complimentary of the work of the Commission and in fact, indicated that it had made important contributions that he hoped could lead to eventual consensus.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 10:22:53.00

SUBJECT: 3/17 draft of ed-flex letter

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Here's a slightly revised version of your draft. We need to put it into rapid clearance today. Podesta hasn't given final sign-off yet, but wants us to have it ready to go.

DRAFT PRESIDENTIAL LETTER TO THE ED-FLEX CONFEREES

Dear

I am deeply concerned by the action taken by the Senate in its version of the Ed-Flex bill, S.280, to undermine the bipartisan commitment the Congress and I made last fall to help the nation's schools begin hiring 100,000 teachers to reduce class size in the early grades.

As parents and teachers across America understand, smaller classes can make a profound difference for our children. Studies show that teachers in smaller classes give more personal attention to students and spend less time on discipline; as a result, students in these classes learn more and get a stronger foundation in the basics. Across the country, students in smaller classes outperform their peers in larger classes. And reduced class size makes the greatest difference for minority and disadvantaged students.

The Senate's action would allow local school districts to opt out of class size reduction altogether by shifting the \$1.2 billion appropriated for new teacher hiring into special education. It is divisive and wrong to pit one group of students against another in this way. Both class size education and special education programs make unique contributions to helping students achieve high standards and deserve our strong support.

The extension of the Ed-Flex authority permits States to waive certain Federal laws when doing so can help them raise educational achievement -- a concept that has strong bipartisan support. The Conference should not imperil that support with an amendment that undermines our previous commitment on reducing class size.

If the Congress sends me a bill that includes the Senate provision to undermine Class Size funding, I will veto it.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 10:36:03.00

SUBJECT:

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

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

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

TEXT:

PBOR Q&A

----- Forwarded by Christopher C. Jennings/OPD/EOP on  
03/17/99 10:22 AM -----

Devorah R. Adler  
03/17/99 10:13:32 AM  
Record Type: Record

To: Christopher C. Jennings/OPD/EOP  
cc:  
Subject:

Q: What is the President's response to the Patients Bill of Rights legislation that will be marked up by the Senate Labor Committee this Wednesday?

A: We have not seen the details of the legislation Senator Jeffords intends to mark up this Wednesday. All indications are that it will come up far short of what is necessary to meet the needs of patients in a rapidly changing health care system. We understand that it will not cover tens of millions of Americans; that it will not have a standard for medical necessity that will ensure that HMOs cannot make arbitrary coverage decisions; and it will have a wholly inadequate enforcement mechanism to ensure that patient rights are real. This helps explain why every major patient, doctor, and nurse advocacy organization has concluded that the Chairman's mark is flawed and falls far short of what is needed to protect patients.

Senator Kennedy and the rest of the Committee Democrats are planning on offering amendments that, if passed, would make this legislation acceptable to the President. It is our hope that Senator Jeffords and the rest of the Committee works towards passing a strong, comprehensive, and bipartisan Patients Bill of Rights that the President can sign. Today represents the first test of this new Congress to see if it is serious about patient protections. (This is the first Committee mark-up on the Patients' Bill of Rights in this Congress). The President is urging that the Committee to do everything it can to pass this test with flying colors.





**Legislation on Gun Lawsuits  
March 17, 1999**

**Q: What is your response to Representative Barr's NRA-supported legislation to block lawsuits that cities have filed against the gun manufacturers? Do you have a position on legislation proposed by Senator Boxer which give cities the right to sue gun manufacturers and distributors? And do you have a position on the bill introduced by Senator Schumer yesterday which would regulate the sale of guns on the Internet?**

A: The Barr legislation is an attempt by the gun lobby to avoid the very serious issues about gun trafficking and gun safety raised by the cities' lawsuits. We are watching these suits closely, and will do all we can to resist efforts that would prevent the cities from presenting their evidence. Similarly, we would be supportive of efforts such as Senator Boxer's that specifically allow cities to put such evidence before the courts.

While we have not yet had a chance to review the Schumer legislation, the President does have a policy of no background check, no handgun. That is why among our top firearms-related priorities for the year are to extend the Brady waiting period, and to ensure background checks at gun shows. We will review the Schumer legislation with this position in mind.

At the same time, of course, we will continue to press forward on our own efforts to stop gun trafficking, ban violent juveniles from buying guns, and promote gun safety. We will not -- and we hope individual states and cities will not -- back down to the gun lobby on these issues.

**Medical Marijuana Study**  
**March 17, 1999**

**Q. Today, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) is releasing its study on medical marijuana. Can you tell us what it says and whether you will adopt its recommendations?**

**A:** Earlier this morning, IOM released its report on medical marijuana. The ONDCP Director McCaffrey asked for the study in January 1997, and we have been awaiting the report for some time. IOM was asked to conduct a review of the scientific evidence to assess the potential health risks and benefits of marijuana. The report contains six specific recommendations that address:

- Continued research into the physiological effects of cannabinoids (marijuana components);
- Clinical trials of cannabinoid drugs for symptom management;
- Evaluation of the psychological effects of cannabinoids in clinical trials;
- Studies of individual health risks in smoking marijuana;
- Clinical trials of marijuana use under limited circumstances for medical purposes; and
- Short-term use of smoked marijuana under strict conditions for patients with debilitating symptoms.

While we will carefully review the findings and recommendations of the report, we would note that the IOM stresses the need for more research into the effects of using marijuana. In particular, IOM emphasized in its report that smoked marijuana is a crude drug delivery system that delivers a significant number of harmful substances, and that research may yield alternative delivery systems of cannabinoids that are safer and more reliable for some conditions.

More generally, however, our primary focus in this area must be to prevent youth use of marijuana by ensuring that youth know about this drug's dangers. We will continue our youth drug prevention efforts, including the Anti-Drug Media campaign, and continue to send the clear message to kids that drugs are wrong, dangerous, and can kill you.

**Police Integrity Radio Address  
Questions and Answers  
March 13, 1999**

**Q: What more can you tell us about the policies you are announcing today?**

A: The policies announced today will be contained in the President's 21st Century Policing Initiative, which will soon be sent to the Congress as part of a larger crime bill. They are:

**(1) Integrity and ethics training.** Currently, the COPS Office provides about \$40 million to assist in the training of state and local law enforcement, including \$24 million for some 30 Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPIs). The President's crime bill will provide an increase of \$20 million so that all our RCPIs will be able to provide police integrity and ethics training. Currently, only two of the centers specialize in this crucial training.

**(2) Education assistance for police.** The President's crime bill will authorize a new \$20 million scholarship program for current state and local police officers. This will provide needed assistance to officers already on the force, who are seeking to advance their education and skills. The crime bill also will extend the Police Corps program, which offers college scholarships in exchange for service in law enforcement.

**(3) Improved minority recruitment.** The President's bill will provide a \$1 million increase for targeted police recruitment and outreach efforts. Last year, we provided \$1 million for innovative recruitment strategies to community organizations in New York, Los Angeles, and Memphis. The grant to New York, for example, involves a partnership between East Brooklyn Congregations and CUNY/John Jay College where they are developing a police magnet high school for youth, as well as evening programs for adults in the largely Hispanic and African American neighborhoods of East Brooklyn, New York.

**(4) More citizen police academies.** The President's crime bill will also propose \$5 million to establish more citizen police academies around the country. In addition to instructing residents on important police procedures, these academies can also help to teach residents problem-solving skills that will help them address their local crime problems. The citizen academies are part of an overall effort within the President's new policing initiative to engage all sectors of the community to come together to fight crime.

All of the policies announced today are fully funded in our FY 2000 budget.

**Q: New York City has hired thousands of officers with COPS funds. As a result, they've put more police on their streets who in turn have engaged in more**

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

**aggressive policing tactics. In view of the Diallo shooting, how can you say that your COPS initiative is part of the solution to police brutality and misconduct?**

- A: Many cities have hired hundreds of law enforcement officers through COPS and have not had similar problems. And the community policing strategies that this Administration has encouraged have resulted in reduced community complaints against law enforcement officials. For instance, large cities such as San Diego and Boston have significantly increased the size of their police forces through COPS while increasing citizen satisfaction with the police. Another good example is in nearby Prince George's County. In P.G. county, they have increased their police force and even, substantially increased traffic and investigative stops, while dramatically decreasing citizen complaints: excessive force complaints are down by half, and officer/citizen contacts that result in citizen injury are down by 70 percent compared to 1995.

**Q: The President announced that the Attorney General would be convening a series of meetings with law enforcement and community leaders. Who will be involved in these meetings and what do you expect will come out of these meetings?**

- A: The meetings will bring together police chiefs, representatives of rank and file police officers, and experts on police practices, along with civil rights and other community leaders who know the concerns of the community regarding police misconduct. The purpose is to discuss the best practices for preventing misconduct and excessive use of force, develop recommendations for additional actions, and build greater trust between the police and the communities they serve.

**Q: The tragic shooting death of Amadou Diallo by members of the New York Police Department has focused the nation's attention on the problem of police brutality. Is the federal government investigating that matter?**

- A: The FBI, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York and the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division have been working closely and actively with the Bronx District Attorney's Office on the investigation. Further questions about the federal government's role in these investigations should be directed to the Justice Department.

**Q: Is the Justice Department investigating the entire New York Police Department?**

- A: After the incident involving the beating of Abner Louima, the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, Zachary Carter, began a preliminary inquiry to determine whether the Justice Department should invoke its pattern or practice authority against the New York Police Department. This inquiry is ongoing, and the Department has had discussions with the United States Attorneys for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York concerning the appropriate scope of the inquiry in light of the issues raised by

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

the Diallo shooting.

**Q: What is the Justice Department's pattern or practice authority?**

A: Under the President's 1994 Crime Act, the Justice Department has the authority to file civil suits against police departments that engage in a pattern of police misconduct. Using that authority, the Department is currently investigating several law enforcement agencies across the country. Those investigations may result in court orders or settlements requiring police departments to change the way they operate -- so the problems of the past are not the problems of the future.

**Q: Is that what the Justice Department is doing with the New Jersey State Police?**

A: Yes. The Justice Department is actively reviewing the New Jersey State Police to determine whether state troopers have engaged in a pattern or practice of discriminatory traffic stops.

**Q: What can the Justice Department do against individual police officers who engage in misconduct?**

A: The Justice Department has the authority under criminal law to prosecute law enforcement officers who engage in misconduct, including the use of excessive force. At any given time, the Justice Department investigates several hundred allegations of criminal police misconduct around the country. Since 1993, the Justice Department has criminally prosecuted more than 300 law enforcement officers who have engaged in police misconduct, resulting in over 200 convictions.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Devorah R. Adler ( CN=Devorah R. Adler/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 10:43:12.00

SUBJECT: here you go

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I apologize about the mix-up -- here it is with your edits.

Devorah

---

Q: What is the President's response to the Patients' Bill of Rights legislation that will be marked up by the Senate Labor Committee this Wednesday?

A: We have not seen the details of the legislation Senator Jeffords intends to mark up this Wednesday, but all indications are that it will fall far short of what is necessary to meet the needs of patients in a rapidly changing health care system. We understand that it will not cover tens of millions of Americans; that it will not have a standard to prevent HMOs from making arbitrary coverage decisions; and that it will have a wholly inadequate mechanism to enforce patients' rights. This helps explain why every major patient, doctor, and nurse advocacy organization has concluded that the Chairman's mark is flawed and falls far short of what is needed to protect patients.

Senator Kennedy and the rest of the Committee Democrats are planning on offering amendments that, if passed, would make this legislation acceptable to the President. It is our hope that Senator Jeffords and the rest of the Committee works towards passing a strong, comprehensive, and bipartisan Patients Bill of Rights that the President can sign. Today represents the first test of this new Congress to see if it is serious about patient protections. (This is the first Committee mark-up on the Patients' Bill of Rights in this Congress). The President is urging that the Committee to do everything it can to pass this test with flying colors.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 10:54:01.00

SUBJECT: EDITS TO Draft Senate Supplemental SAP

TO: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: J. Eric Gould ( CN=J. Eric Gould/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cathy R. Mays ( CN=Cathy R. Mays/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:

Courtney -- please make sure Elena or Bruce review these and get the changes to Kate Donovan by noon today.

TANF

C \$350 million of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds deferred until FY 2002, which could force States to reduce their own critical investments in their critical programs and reduce services and benefits to poor families who are trying to make the transition from welfare to work.

Tobacco

C A provision that would completely relinquish the Federal taxpayers' share of the Medicaid-related claims in the comprehensive State tobacco settlement without any commitment whatsoever by the States to use these funds to stop youth smoking. Federal taxpayers paid a significant share -- the majority in most cases -- 57 percent of Medicaid smoking-related expenditures. The Administration believes that the States should retain these funds and make a commitment that the Federal share of the settlement's proceeds will be spent on shared national and State priorities: to reduce youth smoking, protect tobacco farmers, improve public health, and assist children. promote public

health and children's programs, and assist affected rural communities.

----- Forwarded by Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP on 03/17/99  
10:31 AM -----

Bruce N. Reed  
03/17/99 09:54:32 AM  
Record Type: Record

To: Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP  
cc:  
Subject: Need Clearance: Draft Senate Supplemental SAP

----- Forwarded by Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP on 03/17/99  
09:44 AM -----

Kate P. Donovan  
03/16/99 08:48:47 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
Subject: Need Clearance: Draft Senate Supplemental SAP

Please review the draft SAP for S. 544, the Senate Supplemental Appropriations bill. The position is "senior advisors veto recommendation." It is possible that the Senate will take up the bill Wednesday evening or Thursday morning. We aim to release the SAP tomorrow (Wed. 3/17) afternoon. Please provide comments/clearance by noon tomorrow. Thank you.

S. 544 -- EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1999 (Sponsor: Stevens (R), Alaska)

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on S. 544, a bill making FY 1999 emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters and for foreign assistance, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The bill as reported by the Committee provides \$1.89 billion in urgently needed funding to assist in Central America's recovery from recent natural disasters, to provide resources to promote stability in Jordan, and to fund the emergency needs of farmers and ranchers in the United States.

The Administration appreciates the Senate Committee's prompt action to ensure that urgently needed funding is provided quickly. Providing essential assistance to victims of natural disasters and helping our farmers at home with vital financing clearly fall in the category of needs that are urgent, unanticipated, and essential -- that is, emergency requirements. Therefore, they clearly deserve to be funded quickly, fully, and without requiring offsets that could force unacceptable reductions in important programs. In addition, it is essential that this bill remain free of extraneous provisions that could slow its progress.

Unfortunately, the Committee bill includes a number of such provisions.

Were the bill to be presented to the President with the Senate Committee's proposed offsets and several objectionable riders discussed below, the President's senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill. We urge you not to take actions that could result in gridlock and delay, and that would be detrimental both to our allies abroad and our citizens at home in their time of need.

#### Emergency Relief for Central America

The bill provides \$977 million for Central America, \$21 million more than the President's request. The President's request for International Assistance Programs, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Justice would provide essential emergency disaster assistance in the wake of Hurricane Mitch, which inflicted severe damage on several Central American nations. The package also provides aid to the Caribbean nations struck by Hurricane Georges, including Haiti and the Dominican Republic. The Administration commends the Committee for its prompt action in approving the President's request.

Regrettably, the Majority Leadership of the Senate has decided that these funds must be offset. Hurricane Mitch, the worst natural disaster in the history of the Western hemisphere, left more than 9,000 dead and drove millions from their homes. Serious economic dislocation has resulted from the destruction of schools, hospitals, businesses, farms, and roads. Together, Hurricanes Mitch and Georges have caused \$10 billion in damages. The President's Central America package is urgent, unanticipated, and essential and should be funded as an emergency request.

Funds must be provided swiftly to prevent the spread of disease and to buy seed and plant crops in the fast-approaching Spring planting season, thereby providing food and jobs to many communities, and to demonstrate to Central Americans that they can find jobs and security in their own recovering economies. Much of the rural road system farmers and small merchants depend on for their livelihoods was destroyed. Water and sanitation systems have been disrupted, which can result in disease. Economic destruction and dislocation threaten to undermine the region's achievements of the past decade, as these nations have made tremendous strides toward settling conflicts, strengthening democracy, promoting human rights, opening economies and alleviating poverty. Emergency assistance for reconstruction aid will ensure that their transformation continues and will deter illegal migration by assuring that Central Americans have cause to view their own futures in the region with hope.

#### Jordan

The Administration appreciates the Committee's providing the full \$100 million for Jordan, fully funding the FY 1999 request. These funds will provide financial support to help promote stability in Jordan and the region during the period of transition subsequent to King Hussein's death. While the Administration appreciates the full funding of the FY 1999 request, we are disappointed that the \$200 million requested in advance appropriations for FYs 2000 and 2001 has not been provided. In the context of promoting peace in the Middle East, the Administration will continue to press for these advance appropriations.

#### Department of Agriculture

The Committee bill provides \$308 million in emergency funds for the

Department of Agriculture (USDA), \$156 million above the President's request. The Administration appreciates the Committee's support for the President's request for emergency farm loans and administrative costs. This additional loan authority would provide vitally needed financing for the Nation's farmers in light of the significant increase in demand for USDA loans, due to projected continuing low commodity and livestock prices. The Administration is reviewing the other farm-sector funds included in the Committee bill.

#### Offsets

The President has proposed that this package of essential emergency disaster assistance be funded consistent with the budget rules that apply to emergency spending. Regrettably, the Majority Leadership has decided that the funds for Central American disaster aid must be offset. The proposed offsets would result in unacceptable reductions in funding in areas of crucial importance to Americans, including: disaster relief funds in response to Hurricane Georges and other domestic disasters; funds for anti-terrorism to protect U.S. citizens at our embassies overseas; funds to fight the war on drugs; and, with less than 300 days before December 31, 1999, funds to solve the Y2K problem.

Some examples of the reductions that would result from the Committee's action include the following:

C \$75 million from anti-terrorism programs to protect our citizens at our embassies and facilities abroad;

C \$65 million in disaster relief, which would deprive FEMA, SBA, and other agencies of resources they need to continue their work in response to domestic disasters in Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, North and South Carolina, North and South Dakota, West Virginia, Texas, California, Maryland, Virginia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Alaska and most other States ;

C \$33 million in drug war programs of the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Coast Guard, the Customs Service, and other agencies;

C \$113 million in Y2K funding for domestic Federal Government agencies, which could harm systems needing further computer conversion adjustments;

C \$25 million in INS citizenship and immigration programs and \$40 million in enforcement and border affairs, which would have negative consequences on INS's immigration benefit programs, ongoing investigations, and land border inspection operations;

C \$16 million from the Department of Energy to execute crucial nonproliferation activities with the Russian Federation and private Western companies to reduce the availability of weapons-grade uranium;

C \$43 million for International Organizations and Peacekeeping that would increase U.N. arrears and would jeopardize the ability of the United States to respond to increased or new requirements for international peacekeeping operations;

C \$100 million from revised inflation assumptions for domestic, non-defense programs, which could result in cuts in inflation-sensitive programs such as WIC and other essential programs;

C \$60 million from the Global Environmental Facility and \$10 million from

the EPA climate change program that develops the technology needed for a fuel efficient, less polluting vehicle;

C \$350 million of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds deferred until FY 2002, which could force States to reduce their own investments in their critical programs and reduce services and benefits to poor families who are trying to make the transition from welfare to work.

#### Objectionable riders

Unfortunately, the Committee bill includes a number of strongly objectionable provisions, including the following:

C A provision that would completely relinquish the Federal taxpayers' share of the Medicaid-related claims in the comprehensive State tobacco settlement without any commitment whatsoever by the States to use these funds to stop youth smoking. Federal taxpayers paid a significant share -- the majority in most cases -- of Medicaid smoking-related expenditures. The Administration believes that the States should retain these funds and make a commitment that the Federal share of the settlement's proceeds will be spent on shared national and State priorities: to reduce youth smoking, promote public health and children's programs, and assist affected rural communities.

C A provision that would extend the current moratorium on publishing a final Interior Department rule revising the method by which crude oil from Federal leases is valued for purposes of calculating Federal royalties. The existing FY 1999 rider imposed an eight-month moratorium (until June 1, 1999) and was the outcome of negotiations with the Congress at the end of the last session. This provision would cost the Treasury about \$15 million in FY 1999.

C A provision that would extend the current moratorium on publishing a final Interior Department rule concerning surface management and reclamation requirements at hardrock mine sites on Federal lands. The existing FY 1999 rider imposed a moratorium on publishing the final rule until September 30, 1999, and requires a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study by July 31, 1999, examining the need for the new rule. The provision in this bill would prohibit publishing the final rule until after a minimum 120-day comment period following the completion of the NAS study. Therefore, the earliest the rule could be published would be December 1999. The new rule is needed to update the existing 1980 regulation to take into account changes in mining practices and technology since then. Interior issued for comment and review a proposed hardrock mining rule in February 1999. This rule-making process should not be delayed further.

C A provision that would prevent the Secretary of the Interior from implementing a recent reorganization of Interior's Office of Special Trustee for American Indians (OST) for the remainder of FY 1999. The Secretary took the step of reorganizing this office to address deficiencies in day-to-day management of OST's field operations. In order for the Administration's efforts to reform management of tribal and individual Indian trust funds to succeed, this reorganization needs to remain in effect.

#### Other Issues

C On March 10, 1999, the President transmitted a request for \$15 million

in additional supplemental funding for the Department of the Interior to support the requirements of the Cobell v. Babbitt class-action lawsuit alleging mismanagement of individual Indian money accounts. These additional funds would allow the Department to conduct critical activities, including court-ordered document production and statistical sampling needed this year in defense of the suit. This request is fully offset from other Interior appropriation accounts.

C The Administration objects to a provision that would transfer \$100 million from the Department of Agriculture's Wildfire Management Operations -- primarily firefighting funding -- to its Knutson-Vandenberg Fund (K-V Fund), which funds reforestation and timber stand management and improvement on national forest lands. A transfer of this magnitude is unnecessary and inappropriate. Transferring the funds from the appropriated fire operations account would likely require that available Forest Service emergency contingency funds be used to fight fires in FY 1999, even if FY 1999 is a normal fire year. Should a significant fire season occur and the contingency funds be exhausted, the Forest Service would have to transfer funds back from the K-V Fund.

C The Administration would like to work with the Committee to respond to their concerns about the implementation of the Community Development Block Grant disaster relief program.

Message Sent

To:

---

John Podesta/WHO/EOP  
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP  
Sally Katzen/OPD/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Martha Foley/WHO/EOP  
Ron Klain/OVP @ OVP  
Joshua Gotbaum/OMB/EOP  
Wesley P. Warren/CEQ/EOP  
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP  
Todd Stern/WHO/EOP  
G. E. DeSeve/OMB/EOP  
Michelle Peterson/WHO/EOP  
Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP  
Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP  
George T. Frampton/CEQ/EOP  
Miles M. Lackey/NSC/EOP  
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP  
John A. Koskinen/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP

Message Copied

To:

---

Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Jessica L. Gibson/WHO/EOP  
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Shannon Mason/OPD/EOP  
Charles Konigsberg/OMB/EOP  
Elizabeth Gore/OMB/EOP  
Lisa Zweig/OMB/EOP

Charles R. Marr/OPD/EOP  
Judy Jablow/CEQ/EOP  
Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OPD/EOP  
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP  
Robert L. Nabors/OMB/EOP  
Victoria A. Wachino/OMB/EOP  
Rosemary Evans/OMB/EOP  
Ingrid M. Schroeder/OMB/EOP  
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP  
Mark J. Tavlarides/NSC/EOP  
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP  
Lisa M. Kountoupes/WHO/EOP  
Janet B. Abrams/WHO/EOP  
John A. Gribben/WHO/EOP  
Sandra Yamin/OMB/EOP



**STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON  
THE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS  
March 17, 1999**

Today, the Congress is beginning its first mark up on patients' rights legislation. I am pleased that we are moving forward this issue that is critical to assuring Americans high quality health care. Unfortunately, the Chairman's mark appears to fall far short of providing patients with the protections they need.

First, the current legislation only applies these rights to those in self-insured plans. This approach leaves 100 million Americans without the guarantee of critical protections. While these Americans may be protected by state laws, not one state has passed all of these protections. Moreover, as many as thirty states have not passed continuity of care protections to assure that patients do not have to change doctors in the middle of a critical treatment such as cancer or a pregnancy and more than twenty have not passed any type of provisions giving patients access to specialists. Patients should not be left vulnerable by a patchwork of protections. We need strong Federal legislation to assure all health plans provide patients these important rights.

Moreover, the Chairman's mark also leaves out many of the most fundamental protections. For example, it does not have an adequate enforcement mechanism to assure patients are compensated when they are injured or die as a result of a health plans' decisions; it does not assure patients access to specialists, such as oncologists or heart specialists; and it leaves out continuity of care protections. **That is why every major patient, doctor, and nurse advocacy organization has concluded that the Chairman's mark is simply inadequate.**

**Today represents the first test of this new Congress to see if it is serious about providing Americans with a strong enforceable patients' bill of rights to assure high quality health care. I urge the Committee to do everything it can to pass this test and give Americans the protections they need.**



## MEDICARE

**Q: When is the President going to unveil the Medicare reform plan that he said yesterday he would submit to Congress?**

**A: The President is determined to work with the Congress in a bipartisan way to enact Medicare reform legislation this year. While he has not decided on a specific date for submitting his proposal, he will send it to Capitol Hill early enough to ensure that the Congress has the opportunity to pass it this year.**

**Q: What will be in this proposal?**

**A: The President has been very consistent about the principles he believes must guide any Medicare reform legislation this year. His own proposal will certainly follow these principles:**

**A) It will include a provision to dedicate surplus dollars to the program. This will:**

**1) strengthen the program's financing and extend the life of the trust fund;  
and**

**2) prevent excessive increases in out-of-pocket costs for beneficiaries or excessive reductions in payments to providers.**

**B) It will include a meaningful prescription drug benefit.**

**C) It will include a number of provisions to modernize the program and make it more competitive.**

**We won't have further details for you until the President unveils his proposal.**

**Q: You've indicated that the President wants to modernize the program and make it more competitive. Does that mean that his proposal will include a premium support mechanism?**

**A: The President believes that the premium support mechanism in Senator Breaux's proposal was deficient because it had the potential to lead to excessive premium increases in the traditional fee-for-service program. The President is committed to introducing greater competition into the Medicare program, but his proposal will do this without imposing significant cost barriers to beneficiaries wishing to remain in the fee-for-service program.**

**Q: Senator Kerrey, a Democrat who voted for the Commission's recommendations, was critical of the President's insistence on the use of the surplus. He also disagreed with the President's concerns about increasing the age of eligibility to 67. How do**

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

**you respond?**

**A: We clearly disagree with Senator Kerrey on these issues.**

**First, on the issue of the surplus, every independent Medicare expert has recognized that the program needs additional revenues to ensure the long-term financial health of the program: the only alternatives to new revenues are excessive cuts in benefits or provider reimbursements. And using the surplus is a far better way to obtain additional revenues than increasing the payroll tax.**

**As to the eligibility age issue, the President opposes raising the age to 67 without a viable policy to prevent the number of uninsured from increasing.** There are now over 3 million uninsured people just between the ages of 55 and 65: they are the most rapidly growing group of the uninsured. Without Medicare or some accessible, affordable alternative, many 65 to 67 year-olds would be uninsured as well.

**Q: Last night, a number of the members of the Commission complained that the President preempted the Commission's vote by making a statement before their final vote. How do you respond?**

**A:** The President made his statement after Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas had made public remarks on what the Commission would do. The President wanted to respond to the Breaux-Thomas proposal as soon as it was final. He was in no way expressing disrespect for the Commission's work; to the contrary, he believes that the Commission performed a very valuable service, which he will attempt to build on.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 12:00:44.00

SUBJECT: Re: INS Q& A

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

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

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

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

CC: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT: '  
Irene:

I don't think our q/a should say that we had 1,000 border patrol agents in the budget, but decided to knock them out. That only adds to Gregg's suspicions that we/the White House may have sacrificed border patrol for COPS -- and gives easy cover to INS. Instead, we should affirmatively make the point, as you do, that we have dramatically increased border patrol; that we need new technologies, etc.; and -- as Doris included in her testimony -- that nearly 40% of the border patrol has less than 2-3 years on the force (check this). This last point is important because it plays into all of the integrity and ethics issues. Experience shows that law enforcement agencies that staff up to quickly, short-cut training and screening, or have too many inexperienced officers are bound to have problems.

Jose'

Irene Bueno  
03/17/99 10:58:16 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP, Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP  
cc:  
Subject: INS Q& A

FYI

----- Forwarded by Irene Bueno/OPD/EOP on 03/17/99 11:00  
AM -----

Irene Bueno  
03/17/99 10:54:06 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OPD/EOP, Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
cc:  
Subject: INS Q& A

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

TEXT:  
Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D14]MAIL442812389.036 to ASCII,  
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504370040000010A02010000000205000000E80E000000020000787F0ABB1E902A56BC183E  
2F709003C77CC678D759F9BB902C01526B8E23677AF17AAF36DFCD015E32F37839C2603DCE058E  
7583875A0162BE96AA29A51DED1A1F626040C0FAA0F492F43197E5341043A7933B1AC65421B8F8  
4378A6B8BC18C0A97887F2FBBAF37C236D745335E45DA529F69CCA677FA468A261184498810791  
FD36F88FDE055452EC1B305DD34997A22E356B8B909E25CB284E75037E1BC6E7531B1FEE3FAA2B  
000D28F43562AE99B4EB2A630288945BCB2C41415EA716C4605D7B90EDEA99E3E7033D73BA89C1  
583C6BAAABF2C5473AAEAE91E92E4E1CCE5D4A9D44F4E4B4B8192C348512BDD7865DACCFA15CA5  
2C95C59C111D4961B6CB415185AC620F15890B9E7E35EB95FDDC12B4446062C1D52248B7569051  
0E00571550E03CA2E209F17CD8D676A0CDF914C34F9A29B55DC82E9968A0FD7BE3E8480568AC04  
58EDD936F8D8B9CE86FB639B233D18A7FD2D6CF7B9625FCA12375E534607B0B441B3F4E1D1D619  
D18B49A1EB0CE1C4CE91D40122E8A76EFF279F22DB5A71C61B7B85853EA34890C627660DB1363E  
DA6EB07A452E6464A374087D7043B4FE4E5689E3117317DFD6DA991075ABDA5F9AE6C4D1F6CD79  
5C58F9E5151ABEE26866C84F78CCB3CEF9B7FAF482BE8CBA81C7A498AAC6CE50DD26DDFABA7DDE  
3A2804091802000900000000000000000000000000000823010000000B0100007E020000005501000000  
4E0000008903000009250100000006000000D70300000B300200000028000000DD030000087701  
00000040000000050400000834010000001400000045040000080201000000F00000059040000  
08050100000008000000680400000984C006F00630061006C0020004800500020004C00610073  
0072004A006500740020003500500020006F006E0020004C005000540031000000000000000000  
000000000000000000000000057494E53504F4F4C0000000000C800C8002C012C012C012C01C800  
C800300  
000  
000  
0000000000B0100002800C8196810480D000011090000005A000B010000103600540069006D0065  
00730020004E0065007700200052006F006D0061006E00200052006500670075006C0061007200  
000000000000000000001000200580201000000040028000000000000000000000000000000000  
00011202002400A1000000A1000000A0000005802010017005902010002005A02010044005B02  
010017005C02020017005D02010044005E02010045005F02010002006002010044006102010002  
00C4784826000000000000000000000000D40008337C007800000200006102000003010004  
0002000000DD0A10008301040003000200211000DDDD0B0B00030000040B00DDF1025702F19BF1  
035702F1F1005702F19B9CF1015702F1CC513AF1005702F19BF1015702F1804973807468658043  
6C696E746F6E8041646D696E697374726174696F6E80646976657274696E67806D6F6E65798074

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

Q: Is the Clinton Administration diverting money that should go to hire more 1,000 Border Patrol to expand the local cops-on-the-street program?

A: INS did request funding for more than 1,000 Border Patrol for FY 2000. However, as part of the budget process and review of the various options with the INS, it was determined that it is wiser to assimilate and train the current historic high levels of border patrol agents and to target additional funding to expand critical technology and invests in infrastructure to support Border Patrol enforcement efforts.

Currently, the U.S. Border Patrol has nearly 9,000 agents. This historic level has doubled since FY 1993 and is 28 percent higher than President Clinton's goal of 7,000 agents by the year 2000. The FY 2000 budget expands critical technology and invests in infrastructure to support Border Patrol enforcement efforts. For example,

- INS will deploy 176 Remote Video Surveillance Systems, a force-multiplying technology which provides the capability for monitoring the border from remote sites; and
- more than \$70 million is included for Border patrol and detention construction projects, including 20 new or upgraded Border Patrol stations.

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

For FY 2000, the Clinton Administration has requested \$4.27 billion, an 8 percent increase over the FY 1999 funding levels. The budget would add a total of 306 new staff positions, which allows INS to grow to 31,240 positions by the end of FY 2000.

The INS budget for FY 2000 continues to support the immigration goals and strategies that the Administration and the agency have effectively pursued over the last several years. At the same time, the FY 2000 budget marks a year of consolidation, as INS focusing on managing the resources gained during an period of unprecedented growth for the agency.

The thrust of the FY 200

Border Patrol growth has ... less than two years

Measured growth is wiser



**PATIENTS BILL OF RIGHTS**  
**March 17, 1999**

**Q: What is the President's response to the Patients' Bill of Rights legislation that will be marked up by the Senate Labor Committee this Wednesday?**

A: Today represents the first test of this new Congress to see if it is serious about patient protections. The President is urging that the Committee take the steps it needs to take to pass this test.

Unfortunately, while we have not seen the details of the legislation Senator Jeffords intends to mark up today, all indications are that it will fall far short of passing the test of seriousness when it comes to meeting the needs of patients in a rapidly changing health care system. We understand that the Chairman's plan:

1. leaves tens of millions of Americans without protections because they will not be covered by the legislation;
2. does not have a standard to prevent HMOs from making arbitrary coverage decisions; and
3. has a wholly inadequate mechanism for enforcing patients' rights.

This helps explain why every major patient, doctor, and nurse advocacy organization has concluded that Chairman Jeffords' proposal is flawed and will not adequately protect patients.

**Senator Kennedy and the rest of the Committee Democrats are planning on offering amendments that, if passed, would make this legislation acceptable to the President by addressing these issues.** It is our hope that Senator Jeffords and the rest of the Committee will work toward passing a strong, comprehensive, and bipartisan Patients Bill of Rights that the President can sign.



**STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON  
THE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS  
March 17, 1999**

Today, the Congress is beginning its first mark up on patients' rights legislation. I am pleased that we are moving forward this issue that is critical to assuring Americans high quality health care.

Unfortunately, the Chairman's mark appears to fall far short of providing patients with the protections they need. Because it only applies these rights to those in self-insured plans, it leaves 100 million Americans in insured plans without the guarantee of critical protections.

While states have the authority to pass patient protections for these plans, not one has passed all of these protections. For example, dozens of states have not passed access to specialist provisions or continuity of care protections to assure that patients do not have to change doctors in the middle of a critical treatment such as cancer or a pregnancy.

Patients should not be left vulnerable by a patchwork of protections. Tens of millions of Americans should not be held hostage to the hope that their state may pass bills on all these protections. We need strong Federal legislation to assure all health plans provide patients these important rights.

Moreover, the Chairman's mark leaves out many of the most fundamental protections. For example, it does not have an adequate enforcement mechanism to assure patients are compensated when they are injured or die as a result of a health plans' decisions; it does not assure patients access to specialists, such as oncologists or heart specialists; and it leaves out continuity of care protections. **That is why every major patient, doctor, and nurse advocacy organization has concluded that the Chairman's mark is simply inadequate.**

**Today represents the first test of this new Congress to see if it is serious about providing Americans with a strong enforceable patients' bill of rights to assure high quality health care. I urge the Committee to do everything it can to pass this test and give Americans the protections they need.**

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 13:01:04.00

SUBJECT: Update on Message Schedule

TO: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/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: Devorah R. Adler ( CN=Devorah R. Adler/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Tanya E. Martin ( CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro ( CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: J. Eric Gould ( CN=J. Eric Gould/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Essence P. Washington ( CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith ( CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi ( CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

This is an update as of this morning's short term message meeting. Please note that there are several changes.

Also note Crime events on March 20 and April 1, and possible Health Care events on March 26 and April 9.

Thursday, March 18

NO MESSAGE EVENT  
Rabin Center Event (5pm)  
Radio & TV Correspondents' Dinner

Friday, March 19

Possible Press Conference

Saturday, March 20

Live Radio Address  
Topic: Gun Directive  
Location: Oval Office

Monday, March 22

NO MESSAGE EVENT

Tuesday, March 23

Address AFSCME Biennial Convention  
(Tentative Topic: Budget Cuts)

Wednesday, March 24

Ron Brown Awards Ceremony  
(Possible venue to talk about

Census)

Thursday, March 25

Consumer Financial Right to Know

Event

(rescheduled from Thursday, Mar.

18)

Travel to Cincinnati and Las Vegas

Friday, March 26

Travel to Las Vegas and Los Angeles

Tape Radio Address

Las Vegas, NV

NOTE: There was interest in

talking about the

Nursing Home bill -- possibl

President sign the bill

and then tape the radio

address on

that topic.

Saturday, March 27

Travel to Sacramento, CA  
Speech to CA State Party

Monday, March 29

No Message Event

Tuesday, March 30  
Trustees Report

Release 1998 Social Security

Wednesday, March 31

USA Accounts Event

Thursday, April 1

Unveil 21st Century Crime Bill  
Location: TBD  
NOTE: This event has been moved  
March 31

from Wed.,

Friday, April 2  
Constituency Groups

Hate Crimes Meeting with

Tape Radio Address  
Topic: TBD

Monday, April 5

Easter Egg Roll

Tuesday, April 6  
Travel (T)

Possible 2 Stop Agriculture Tour

Wednesday, April 7

Equal Pay Event  
Location: TBD

Thursday, April 8  
Rongji of China

Official Visit of Premier Zhu

Friday, April 9  
Event (T)

Patients' Bill of Rights

Tape Radio Address  
Topic: TBD



**STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON  
THE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS  
March 17, 1999**

Today, the Congress is beginning its first mark up on patients' rights legislation. I am pleased that we are moving forward this issue that is critical to assuring Americans high quality health care. Unfortunately, the Chairman's mark appears to fall far short of providing patients with the protections they need. Because it only applies these rights to those in self-insured plans, it leaves 100 million Americans in insured plans without the guarantee of critical protections.

While states have the authority to pass patient protections for these plans, not one has passed all of these protections. For example, dozens of states have not passed access to specialist provisions or continuity of care protections to assure that patients do not have to change doctors in the middle of a critical treatment such as cancer or a pregnancy. Tens of millions of Americans should not be held hostage to the hope that their state may pass bills on all these protections. We need strong Federal legislation to assure all health plans provide patients these important rights.

Moreover, the Chairman's mark leaves out many of the most fundamental protections. For example, it does not have an adequate enforcement mechanism to assure patients are compensated when they are injured or die as a result of a health plans' decisions; it does not assure patients access to specialists, such as oncologists or heart specialists; and it leaves out continuity of care protections. **That is why every major patient, doctor, and nurse advocacy organization has concluded that the Chairman's mark is simply inadequate.**

**Today represents the first test of this new Congress to see if it is serious about providing Americans with a strong enforceable patients' bill of rights to assure high quality health care. I urge the Committee to do everything it can to pass this test and give Americans the protections they need.**

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 13:56:50.00

SUBJECT: FAA scheduling request

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:

Do you want me to submit this request?

----- Forwarded by Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP on 03/17/99

01:00 PM -----

Mary L. Smith

03/16/99 07:29:24 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP

cc: Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP, Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP

Subject: FAA scheduling request

Here is the scheduling request for the President to announce the award of contracts to manufacture more than 150 new FAA-certified explosive detection devices for installation at airports throughout the United States. While this is part of an ongoing effort to strengthen airport security since the Gore Commission report came out in 1996, neither the WH nor DOT has ever done an event on it. Are you OK with submitting this? Let me know, Mary

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D83]MAIL47207338K.036 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043BC040000010A020100000002050000002318000000020000600C41F6AC39F505C2F683
25D21963D3D4A9CEFA8C7A6FD4869B786678F5B1B443C8FDB5E0DD9F57EB925F56228E1FFE4AF5
FD37E63B5308D44D96120A504DD505141EBDDCCEBA1E95FD9DF4A7A81C67299F252191F0CD3DE7
3E9B12404566BA4D721110B0F54BC713D4B8EA1A2AD99CAA904C442C431640121C3763A0F9FAF7
20A584FA852DDD1E5A00C0585A19FF4C992229B0B46DF6F5AC9DCED440A30DA58852F488F9B51E
F8E9D49878D8BD56AF47EA67EFFF288404E97FE316FF8A6ED486665D7A5C16FA60A7E65D5C6D46
9DF0E7C9108DF770E0347B9F72BD341D556CE07CCD7A788D081A3898ADE72E8EB63F3CF4763EFD
F5A38C522BC3A92EBDA541B79CC57BDA142E381FD4311C384AE8D5E0176D85C81E8E92F4A5FDE8
846E39913F191825EB764F2F6AFC71D7C93348F97189013C8059F0814E2D2D1C239A64E14407F5
DC8F906E1F40227F915C83F5081A8318AD2B7BFEAF2656E8FA373AD7A0E34BD44D09A3C37829D

Schedule Proposal

3-11-99

---

ACCEPT

REJECT

PENDING

---

TO: Stephanie Streett

FROM: Bruce Reed

REQUEST: For the President to announce the award of contracts to manufacture more than 150 new FAA-certified explosive detection devices for installation at airports throughout the United States.

PURPOSE: To amplify the President's commitment to airport security and to help combat terrorism in our Nation.

BACKGROUND: In 1996, the White House Commission on Aviation Safety, led by Vice President Gore, recommended that the FAA purchase innovative security equipment to help insure the safety of the flying public. This announcement would be the purchase of 21 FAA-certified explosives detection systems and 135 trace explosives detection devices, which add to the multi-year deployment of innovative security equipment recommended by the Commission. In FY99, FAA has \$100 million to continue this deployment, and the President requested \$100 million in his FY2000 budget.

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: None.

DATE AND TIME: March or early April

BRIEFING TIME: 10 minutes.

DURATION: 30 minutes.

LOCATION: Roosevelt Room.

PARTICIPANTS: The Vice President  
Secretary Rodney Slater  
FAA Administrator Jane Garvey  
Senators Lautenberg and Boxer and others  
Airline CEO's, equipment manufacturers, and members

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

of the aviation and airport industry.

OUTLINE OF EVENTS: Remarks by participants.

REMARKS REQUIRED: To be provided by speechwriting.

MEDIA COVERAGE: Open press.

FIRST LADY'S ATTENDANCE: No.

VICE PRESIDENT'S ATTENDANCE: Yes.

SECOND LADY'S ATTENDANCE: No.

RECOMMENDED BY: As indicated above.

CONTACT: Karen Kullman 6-5165.

ORIGIN OF PROPOSAL: Domestic Policy Council.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 14:12:53.00

SUBJECT: Long Term Scheduling Meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI -- In preparation for tomorrow's 5pm long term planning meeting, I am planning to meet with Bruce around 2pm tomorrow to go over the running list of event ideas I have from the staff.



SCHEDULING PROPOSAL

TODAY'S DATE: 3/17/99

---

\_\_\_\_\_ACCEPT

\_\_\_\_\_REGRET

\_\_\_\_\_PENDING

---

TO: Stephanie Streett  
Assistant to the President  
Director of Presidential Scheduling

FROM: Bruce Reed  
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy and  
Director of the Domestic Policy Council

Mary Beth Cahill  
Assistant to the President and Director of Public Liaison

REQUEST: Speak to national, 2,000 person Welfare to Work  
Convention sponsored by the Welfare to Work Partnership

PURPOSE: This is an opportunity to highlight the success of welfare  
reform on the third anniversary of the new law and to  
encourage critical efforts to ensure the success of welfare  
reform in the nation's largest cities. Announcements will  
be identified (could include new numbers regarding the  
decline in the welfare rolls and how many recipients are  
working).

BACKGROUND: Since the President launched the Welfare to Work  
Partnership at the White House in May 1997, it has grown  
from 100 companies to over 10,000 and these businesses  
have hired over 410,000 individuals from the welfare rolls  
-- exceeding the challenges set by the President.

In February 1998, the Partnership launched the *CityLink*  
initiative to bring together businesses, government officials,  
and community organizations to help people move from  
welfare to work in 30 cities with high poverty rates and  
large concentrations of welfare recipients, including  
Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, New  
Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C.  
This initiative is an important part of the President's efforts  
to ensure welfare reform works in the nation's largest cities

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

(as are his budget proposals for an additional \$1 billion for the Welfare to Work program, and additional funds for welfare to work housing vouchers and transportation).

In August 1999, the Partnership will hold a national convention in Chicago, hosted by Mayor Daley, called "Welfare to Work: A Nation Unites". Delegations of businesses, service providers and public officials from the 30 *CityLink* communities will share best practices to meet the welfare reform challenge in their community, participate in workshops and seminars, and work together to plan for the next phase of welfare reform.

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: The President launched the Partnership at the White House in May 1997 and held a first anniversary event here a year later. He has also participated in events in St. Louis and Kansas City in August 1997 and November 1997. The Chicago event will be in lieu of a May 1999 anniversary event.

In both 1997 and 1998 the President did welfare reform events in August to mark the anniversary of his signing welfare reform into law (the 1997 event was with the Partnership, the 1998 one was not). Both generated significant press coverage and greatly influenced accounts of the effect of the new law.

DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, August 3, 1999  
(Convention will be held Monday - Wednesday, August 2-4, 1999)

BRIEFING TIME: 30 minutes

DURATION: 2 hours

LOCATION: Navy Pier, Chicago, IL

PARTICIPANTS: Delegations from CityLink communities.  
Businesses, service providers, state and local officials.  
Welfare to work success stories.

REMARKS REQUIRED: Yes.

OUTLINE OF EVENTS: The President would address a town hall with over 2,000 businesses, community leaders, and welfare to work

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

success stories and then moderate a town hall highlighting businesses and individual success stories. The program would open with remarks by United Airlines CEO Jerry Greenwald and Governors Carper and Thompson.

Optional: The President could attend a closed morning breakfast session with CEOs on the Partnership Board and elected officials.

MEDIA COVERAGE: Open.

FIRST LADY'S ATTENDANCE: N/A

VICE PRESIDENT'S ATTENDANCE: Yes, if possible.

SECOND LADY'S ATTENDANCE: N/A

RECOMMENDED BY: Bruce Reed  
Cynthia Rice

CONTACT: Karin Kullman  
X61732

ORIGIN OF THE PROPOSAL: Eli Segal  
Welfare to Work Partnership

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tracy Pakulniewicz ( CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 14:40:09.00

SUBJECT: 5:45 pm Mtg TODAY

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

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

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

TO: Mary E. Cahill ( CN=Mary E. Cahill/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: Jonathan A. Kaplan ( CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Charles M. Brain ( CN=Charles M. Brain/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: WHITE\_W ( WHITE\_W @ A1 @ CD @ VAXGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] ) (OMB)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

CC: Joshua S. Gottheimer ( CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Dominique L. Cano ( CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Loretta M. Ucelli ( CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Joseph D. Ratner ( CN=Joseph D. Ratner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Carolyn T. Wu ( CN=Carolyn T. Wu/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

Sosnik/Ucelli will be hosting a meeting today at 5:45 pm in Loretta's Office to discuss Budget Message Amplification.

PLEASE BE PROMPT - as some folks have commitments at 6:15 pm.



**Q: Any comment on the Republican budget plan?**

**I welcome discussion about budget increases for education but need to know many more details about this proposal. Clearly, any funds for education must address critical national priorities, be targeted to students most in need, and be held accountable for results. The President has outlined clear priorities for education funding within his balanced budget plan -- including after school programs, reducing class size, helping disadvantaged students, and preparing students to go to college. Any talk of additional funds for education must include the details of where and how it would be spent.**

We have a number of concerns about the Senate budget plan, primarily that it does nothing to strengthen the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust fund -- and that it will lead to deep cuts in domestic priorities -- like investments in the environment, law enforcement, health care, and children.

- o **The Republican budget plan does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security**, and in fact calls for reconciliation legislation to preclude the President's proposed transfers of surplus funds to the Social Security Trust Funds.

*By contrast, the Social Security actuaries have estimated that the President's plan will extend solvency of the Trust Funds to 2055.*

- o **The Republican budget plan does nothing to extend the solvency of Medicare, and chooses instead to cut taxes by nearly \$800 billion over the next ten years.**

*By contrast, the President's plan would extend the solvency of Medicare to 2020, and provides targeted tax relief.*

- o **The Republican plan calls for drastic cuts in domestic programs.** The Domenici mark calls for a reduction in total Non-Defense Discretionary (NDD) spending from \$266 billion in FY1999 to \$246 billion in FY2000, or an average cut of 7.5 percent in all NDD programs.

- o **If you accept that the proposal protects the additional areas it claims it does, it would require a cut of 12.2 percent to all other Federal programs.**

- o **Discretionary cuts of 12.2 percent could seriously impact:**

MEANWHILE: basic programs that Americans rely on. 12% cut below funding in 1999 are severe and punishing cuts. This is not a tenable program.

**Q: But doesn't their lock-box save money for Social Security?**

**A:** It is true that Republicans are racing to catch up with the President on Social Security, but they still have a ways to go. Just last year, Republicans were determined to use the Social Security surplus for a tax cut. They originally proposed a trillion dollar tax cut and House Republicans eventually passed a \$80 billion five year tax cut in late September at a time when the only surplus was the Social Security surplus (on-budget deficit of \$137 billion). Unfortunately, their plan still has some serious shortcomings:

Automated Records Management System

Hex-Dump Conversion

- X **It fails to extend the solvency of Social Security by even one day.** Contrastingly, according to Social Security=s independent actuary, President Clinton=s plan extends Social Security solvency 23 years until 2055.
  
- X **It continues to ignore Medicare.** Just a year ago, Chairman Domenici said, *AWe should save Medicare first.*≡ President Clinton=s plan allocates 15 percent of the surplus over 15 years or \$686 billion to Medicare and extends its solvency until 2020. **The Republican budget outline, however, does not include a specific allocation for Medicare and does not extend its solvency by one day.**
  
- X **The amount of debt reduction in the Republican plan is a mystery.** On the one hand, the Republicans are saying that they are going to reduce the debt by the amount of the Social Security surplus. On the other hand, they always include a caveat that opens the door to use those funds to finance Republican privatization of Social Security plans, leaving open the question of whether they are setting aside the surplus for debt reduction or privatization.
  
- X **The Republican plan would lead to dramatic cuts in key priorities, and it is hard to see how the numbers can add up.** Republicans dedicate all of the on-budget surplus for a tax cut targeted away for the middle class, while also proposing to boost defense spending. This will not only leave nothing for Medicare but also will lead to dramatic cuts in education, the environment, research, and law enforcement.



**Q: Any comment on the Republican budget plan?**

**I welcome discussion about budget increases for education but need to know many more details about this proposal. Clearly, any funds for education must address critical national priorities, be targeted to students most in need, and be held accountable for results. The President has outlined clear priorities for education funding within his balanced budget plan -- including after school programs, reducing class size, helping disadvantaged students, and preparing students to go to college. Any talk of additional funds for education must include the details of where and how it would be spent.**

We have a number of concerns about the Senate budget plan, primarily that it does nothing to strengthen the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust fund -- and that it will lead to deep cuts in domestic priorities -- like investments in the environment, law enforcement, health care, and children.

- o **The Republican budget plan does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security**, and in fact calls for reconciliation legislation to preclude the President's proposed transfers of surplus funds to the Social Security Trust Funds.

*By contrast, the Social Security actuaries have estimated that the President's plan will extend solvency of the Trust Funds to 2055.*

- o **The Republican budget plan does nothing to extend the solvency of Medicare, and chooses instead to cut taxes by nearly \$800 billion over the next ten years.**

*By contrast, the President's plan would extend the solvency of Medicare to 2020, and provides targeted tax relief.*

- o **The Republican plan calls for drastic cuts in domestic programs.** The Domenici mark calls for a reduction in total Non-Defense Discretionary (NDD) spending from \$266 billion in FY1999 to \$246 billion in FY2000, or an average cut of 7.5 percent in all NDD programs.
- o **If you accept that the proposal protects the additional areas it claims it does, it would require a cut of 12.2 percent to all other Federal programs.**
- o **Discretionary cuts of 12.2 percent could seriously impact:**

MEANWHILE: basic programs that Americans rely on. 12% cut below funding in 1999 are severe and punishing cuts. This is not a tenable program.

**Q: But doesn't their lock-box save money for Social Security?**

**A:** It is true that Republicans are racing to catch up with the President on Social Security, but they still have a ways to go. Just last year, Republicans were determined to use the Social Security surplus for a tax cut. They originally proposed a trillion dollar tax cut and House Republicans eventually passed a \$80 billion five year tax cut in late September at a time when the only surplus was the Social Security surplus (on-budget deficit of \$137 billion). Unfortunately, their plan still has some serious shortcomings:

Automated Records Management System

Hex-Dump Conversion

- X **It fails to extend the solvency of Social Security by even one day.** Contrastingly, according to Social Security's independent actuary, President Clinton's plan extends Social Security solvency 23 years until 2055.
  
- X **It continues to ignore Medicare.** Just a year ago, Chairman Domenici said, *AWe should save Medicare first.*≡ President Clinton's plan allocates 15 percent of the surplus over 15 years or \$686 billion to Medicare and extends its solvency until 2020. **The Republican budget outline, however, does not include a specific allocation for Medicare and does not extend its solvency by one day.**
  
- X **The amount of debt reduction in the Republican plan is a mystery.** On the one hand, the Republicans are saying that they are going to reduce the debt by the amount of the Social Security surplus. On the other hand, they always include a caveat that opens the door to use those funds to finance Republican privatization of Social Security plans, leaving open the question of whether they are setting aside the surplus for debt reduction or privatization.
  
- X **The Republican plan would lead to dramatic cuts in key priorities, and it is hard to see how the numbers can add up.** Republicans dedicate all of the on-budget surplus for a tax cut targeted away for the middle class, while also proposing to boost defense spending. This will not only leave nothing for Medicare but also will lead to dramatic cuts in education, the environment, research, and law enforcement.



**Q: Any comment on the Republican budget plan?**

**I welcome discussion about budget increases for education but need to know many more details about this proposal. Clearly, any funds for education must address critical national priorities, be targeted to students most in need, and be held accountable for results. The President has outlined clear priorities for education funding within his balanced budget plan -- including after school programs, reducing class size, helping disadvantaged students, and preparing students to go to college. Any talk of additional funds for education must include the details of where and how it would be spent.**

We have a number of concerns about the Senate budget plan, primarily that it does nothing to strengthen the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust fund -- and that it will lead to deep cuts in domestic priorities -- like investments in the environment, law enforcement, health care, and children.

- o **The Republican budget plan does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security**, and in fact calls for reconciliation legislation to preclude the President=s proposed transfers of surplus funds to the Social Security Trust Funds.

*By contrast, the Social Security actuaries have estimated that the President=s plan will extend solvency of the Trust Funds to 2055.*

- o **The Republican budget plan does nothing to extend the solvency of Medicare, and chooses instead to cut taxes by nearly \$800 billion over the next ten years.**

*By contrast, the President=s plan would extend the solvency of Medicare to 2020, and provides targeted tax relief.*

- o **The Republican plan calls for drastic cuts in domestic programs.** The Domenici mark calls for a reduction in total Non-Defense Discretionary (NDD) spending from \$266 billion in FY1999 to \$246 billion in FY2000, or an average cut of 7.5 percent in all NDD programs.

- o **If you accept that the proposal protects the additional areas it claims it does, it would require a cut of 12.2 percent to all other Federal programs.**

- o **Discretionary cuts of 12.2 percent could seriously impact:**

MEANWHILE: basic programs that Americans rely on. 12% cut below funding in 1999 are severe and punishing cuts. This is not a tenable program.

**Q: But doesn=t their lock-box save money for Social Security?**

**A:** It is true that Republicans are racing to catch up with the President on Social Security, but they still have a ways to go. Just last year, Republicans were determined to use the Social Security surplus for a tax cut. They originally proposed a trillion dollar tax cut and House Republicans eventually passed a \$80 billion five year tax cut in late September at a time when the only surplus was the Social Security surplus (on-budget deficit of \$137 billion). Unfortunately, their plan still has some serious shortcomings:

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

- X **It fails to extend the solvency of Social Security by even one day.** Contrastingly, according to Social Security=s independent actuary, President Clinton=s plan extends Social Security solvency 23 years until 2055.
- X **It continues to ignore Medicare.** Just a year ago, Chairman Domenici said, *AWe should save Medicare first.*≡ President Clinton=s plan allocates 15 percent of the surplus over 15 years or \$686 billion to Medicare and extends its solvency until 2020. **The Republican budget outline, however, does not include a specific allocation for Medicare and does not extend its solvency by one day.**
- X **The amount of debt reduction in the Republican plan is a mystery.** On the one hand, the Republicans are saying that they are going to reduce the debt by the amount of the Social Security surplus. On the other hand, they always include a caveat that opens the door to use those funds to finance Republican privatization of Social Security plans, leaving open the question of whether they are setting aside the surplus for debt reduction or privatization.
- X **The Republican plan would lead to dramatic cuts in key priorities, and it is hard to see how the numbers can add up.** Republicans dedicate all of the on-budget surplus for a tax cut targeted away for the middle class, while also proposing to boost defense spending. This will not only leave nothing for Medicare but also will lead to dramatic cuts in education, the environment, research, and law enforcement.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tracy Pakulniewicz ( CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 16:56:21.00

SUBJECT: PBOR

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stacie Spector ( CN=Stacie Spector/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Loretta M. Ucelli ( CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Heather M. Riley ( CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dominique L. Cano ( CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Loretta Ucelli would like to hold a meeting tomorrow, March 18 at 11:00 am in her office to discuss the Patients Bill of Rights, what the Hill is doing , what they want from us & and common goals.

Please let me know if you will be able to make it.

Thank you.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Leanne A. Shimabukuro ( CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 17:18:56.00

SUBJECT: press conference Q&A

TO: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Courtney O. Gregoire ( CN=Courtney O. Gregoire/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP on  
03/17/99 05:20 PM -----

Leanne A. Shimabukuro  
03/17/99 01:45:16 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP  
cc:  
Subject: press conference Q&A -- due to Laura/Paul at 3:00pm

Requested Q&A attached. Minor changes from most recent versions.

- 1. Gun lawsuits/legislation Q&A
- 2. Police Integrity Q&A

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D92]MAIL497211489.036 to ASCII,  
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504370040000010A02010000000205000000360C00000002000032A030820D0BA703D1E7F5  
4B4DC9120434A29786623F957C43506FC9651253D183E0038D84DBF95A59727021603DC09280E0  
5B702D8E596789ABA8D6697DD59DFD8789A4CFB190A33A1546977D89E207EBDD5E18DB78CCC10D  
AEA6D56B0413C4A677D6C0D28FC4ACD9A55EA4302535B7A90911BC9C70F9BE436A4449651F2986  
ADC91847D87976848F86A54D5D48D570CA1FB3B5D7C921B3B061D9F0690682D87BAD77D2B5CBAB

**Legislation on Gun Lawsuits  
March 19, 1999**

**Q: What is your response to Representative Barr's NRA-supported legislation to block lawsuits that cities have filed against the gun manufacturers? Do you have a position on legislation proposed by Senator Boxer to give cities the right to sue gun manufacturers and distributors? And do you have a position on the bill introduced by Senator Schumer yesterday which would regulate the sale of guns on the Internet?**

A: The Barr legislation is an attempt by the gun lobby to avoid the very serious issues about gun trafficking and gun safety raised by the cities' lawsuits. We are watching these suits closely, and will do all we can to resist efforts that would prevent the cities from presenting their evidence. Similarly, we are supportive of efforts such as Senator Boxer's that specifically allow cities to put such evidence before the courts.

While we are still reviewing Senator Schumer's legislation, my policy continues to be: no background check, no handgun. That is why some of my top firearms-related priorities for the year are to extend the Brady waiting period and to ensure background checks at gun shows. We will review the Schumer legislation with this position in mind.

At the same time, of course, I will continue to press forward on our other efforts to stop gun trafficking, ban violent juveniles from buying guns, and promote gun safety. I will not -- and I hope individual states and cities will not -- back down to the gun lobby on these issues.

**Police Integrity**  
**March 19, 1999**

**Q: Recently, there have been a number of stories on police brutality and misconduct, and a lack of citizen trust in law enforcement. What do you propose to do about this?**

A: Last weekend, I devoted my weekly radio address to announce a number of steps I will take to help strengthen police integrity and to build greater trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. The policies I announced will be part of my 21st Century Policing Initiative contained in the crime bill which I will soon send to the Congress. They include:

**(1) \$20 million increase for integrity and ethics training.** My crime bill will provide an increase of \$20 million so that all 30 of our Regional Community Policing Institutes will be able to provide police integrity and ethics training. Currently, only two of the centers specialize in this crucial training.

**(2) \$20 million to promote the best educated police force possible.** My crime bill will authorize a new \$20 million scholarship program for current state and local police officers who are seeking to advance their education and skills. The crime bill also will extend the Police Corps program, which offers college scholarships in exchange for service in law enforcement.

**(3) \$2 million for improved minority recruitment.** As we work to better educate and train our police, we must also do more to make sure police departments reflect the communities they serve. My crime bill will provide a \$1 million increase for targeted police recruitment and outreach efforts such as police magnet high schools for youth, and partnerships with local colleges.

**(4) \$ 5 million to expand citizen police academies.** My crime bill will also propose \$5 million to establish more citizen police academies, which help to instruct residents on important police procedures -- and also help to strengthen the bond between law enforcement officers and their communities.

**Q: The tragic shooting death of Amadou Diallo by members of the New York Police Department has focused the nation's attention on the problem of police brutality. Is the federal government investigating that matter?**

A: The FBI, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York and the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division have been working closely and actively with the Bronx District Attorney's Office on the investigation. Further questions about the federal government's role in these investigations should be directed to the Justice

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

Department.

**Q: What can the Justice Department do against individual police officers who engage in misconduct?**

A: The Justice Department has the authority under criminal law to prosecute law enforcement officers who engage in misconduct, including the use of excessive force. At any given time, the Justice Department investigates several hundred allegations of criminal police misconduct around the country. Since 1993, the Justice Department has criminally prosecuted more than 300 law enforcement officers who have engaged in police misconduct, resulting in over 200 convictions.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith ( CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 18:00:46.00

SUBJECT: Speaking about FY2000 Native American budget

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: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Lynn Cutler asked me to speak about the FY2000 budget initiatives for Native Americans at the DNC American Indian Advisory Council meeting on Friday at 10am. Would you have a problem with me doing that? Let me know, Mary

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 18:06:04.00

SUBJECT: PBOR

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I left word for Chris that either he or Sarah should go to this, rather than us (and I told Loretta the same).

----- Forwarded by Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP on 03/17/99

06:01 PM -----

Tracy Pakulniewicz

03/17/99 04:55:15 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

Subject: PBOR

Loretta Ucelli would like to hold a meeting tomorrow, March 18 at 11:00 am in her office to discuss the Patients Bill of Rights, what the Hill is doing , what they want from us & and common goals.

Please let me know if you will be able to make it.

Thank you.

Message Sent

To: \_\_\_\_\_

Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP

Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP

Charles M. Brain/WHO/EOP

Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP

Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP

Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP

Stacie Spector/WHO/EOP

Message Copied

To: \_\_\_\_\_

Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP

Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP

Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP

Loretta M. Ucelli/WHO/EOP

Christopher C. Jennings/OPD/EOP



March 20, 1999

**MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY  
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

**SUBJECT:                   Deterring and Reducing Illegal Gun Crime**

Since the start of our Administration, we have developed and implemented a number of effective national strategies to reduce crime: we have helped over 11,000 communities hire and redeploy more than 92,000 local law enforcement officers; we have prevented more than a quarter of a million illegal handgun sales through Brady background checks; and we have developed a coordinated attack on the illegal sources of crime guns. Additionally, through the leadership and dedicated efforts of state and local police and prosecutors, Mayors, U.S. Attorneys, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF), and other community leaders, dozens of smart, tough, crime-fighting strategies have been put in place throughout the country.

During this period, the nation's crime rate has dropped by more than 20 percent, and crime committed with guns has dropped 27 percent. In certain communities, where federal, state, and local law enforcement have been able to work together with other community leaders, violent crime rates have been reduced dramatically. In Boston, Massachusetts, for example, when law enforcement and community leaders worked together to reduce violence by youth gangs, they were able to reduce the number of homicides among youth by 70 percent in just two years. In Minneapolis, Minnesota, through unique public and private partnerships, effective law enforcement and prevention efforts have reduced homicides by 30 percent, and summer homicides by 75 percent. And in Richmond, Virginia, effective, coordinated law enforcement has brought the homicide rate down dramatically.

But the number of people being killed with firearms remains unacceptably high: more than 14,000 people were murdered with guns in our nation in 1997. We must redouble our efforts to deter and further reduce gun crime -- and work to make every neighborhood and community free of serious gun crime.

I therefore direct you to develop an integrated firearms violence reduction strategy that draws on the proven measures and other innovative approaches being demonstrated by communities throughout the country. Because we know that gun violence issues in each community differ, and that no single program or strategy will be right for every community, your strategy should be based on close consultation with the U.S. Attorneys and ATF Division Directors/Special Agents in Charge, as well as state and local law enforcement, officials, and other leaders. You should consider the special needs of local communities and strike an appropriate balance between federal and state law enforcement. I ask that your strategy specifically consider the following elements:

- (1) Intensive investigation and prosecution of significant firearms violations, including

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

illegal possession, use, and trafficking of guns;

(2) Comprehensive crime gun tracing, analysis and mapping, expanded use of ballistics identification technology, and coordinated use of crime gun information to identify illegal gun markets, gun “hot spots,” and illegal gun traffickers;

(3) Coordinated law and regulatory enforcement efforts to ensure strict compliance with all applicable laws by federally-licensed gun dealers and prospective gun purchasers;

(4) Targeted deterrence of violent offenders through improved coordination with probation and parole officials; and

(5) Innovative strategies to work more closely with the community to search for and seize more crime guns, to better identify gun criminals, to remove weapons illegally in the hands of juveniles, and to increase the public’s knowledge of their community’s gun-related crime and violence problem.

Finally, as you develop this strategy, I ask that you make recommendations on how best to allocate federal resources to support the goals of the strategy.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Edward W. Correia ( CN=Edward W. Correia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 18:16:29.00

SUBJECT: Single Sex Education and Admissions

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Chuck wants White House staff, DOJ and ED to meet to discuss our enforcement policy positions in the areas of single sex education and college admissions standards. Any thoughts before we convene these meetings?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith ( CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 19:28:55.00

SUBJECT: Re: Speaking about FY2000 Native American budget

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

thanks

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tracy Pakulniewicz ( CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 19:56:19.00

SUBJECT: PBOR - Meeting Time Change

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CC: Alejandro G. Cabrera ( CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Eli G. Attie ( CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Loretta M. Ucelli ( CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Heather M. Riley ( CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dawn L. Smalls ( CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mindy E. Myers ( CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dominique L. Cano ( CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

This meeting will now take place at 3:00 pm. Please let me know if there are any conflicts.

Thank you.

Loretta Ucelli would like to hold a meeting tomorrow, March 18 at 11:00 am in her office to discuss the Patients Bill of Rights, what the Hill is doing , what they want from us & and common goals.

Please let me know if you will be able to make it.

Thank you.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tracy Pakulniewicz ( CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 20:08:07.00

SUBJECT: Radio Address Meeting

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

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan ( CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CC: Joshua S. Gottheimer ( CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Heather M. Riley ( CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Loretta M. Ucelli ( CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:

Loretta will be hosting a Radion Address Meeting - tomorrow, March 18, at 1:00 p.m. in her office.

Thanks!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Heather M. Riley ( CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 20:11:34.00

SUBJECT: patients bill of rights -- from toiv

TO: Amy Weiss ( CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti ( CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Debate Opens Over HMO Rights

By LAURA MECKLER Associated Press Writer  
WASHINGTON (AP) -- Partisan differences over how far Congress should go to protect patient rights were on full display Wednesday as the year's debate began in earnest over regulating HMOs and other managed health care plans. Democrats were sure to lose on every major point as deliberations began Wednesday in the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pension Committee. The panel was expected to approve a GOP-backed bill as soon as Thursday. President Clinton said the GOP bill ``falls far short'' of what's needed. ``Today represents the first test of whether this new Congress is serious about providing Americans with a strong enforceable patients' bill of rights to assure quality health care,'' Clinton said in a statement. ``I urge the committee to do everything it can to pass this test and give Americans the health care protections they need.''

looking past  
win on the floor

good indication of  
floor when the

protections,  
payments,  
prohibition of  
rules'' that prevent  
patients.

million Americans  
plans.  
covered by state  
many of the same

another 75 million  
health plans -- in a  
to take disputes  
outside the

all of the bill's

hostage to the hope  
providing these protections, ''

rights ought to  
insurance. ''

rights to sue their

But Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., was already  
the committee vote, promising reporters: ``We'll  
of the Senate. ''

Indeed, the committee's deliberations were a  
the arguments likely to be heard on the Senate  
legislation is considered this spring.

The GOP bill would offer a grab bag of popular  
including the right to reasonable emergency room  
direct access to gynecologists for women and  
much-maligned, but virtually nonexistent ``gag  
doctors from discussing all options with their

But those protections would be given only to 48  
covered by federally regulated health insurance  
Republicans noted that other patients are  
regulations, and numerous states have adopted  
provisions.

At the same time, the GOP bill would cover  
people -- all Americans in employer-sponsored  
key provision that would give patients the right  
over payments to an independent group of experts  
health plan.

Democrats say all Americans should be covered by  
provisions.

``Millions of Americans should not be held  
that their state might pass legislation  
Clinton said.

Sen. Christopher Dodd, D-Conn., agreed: ``Your  
be guaranteed no matter where you get your

The Democrats also want to give people new

plans to pay for  
necessary'' care.

that more  
GOP bill would

Americans the protections  
and that we can

health plans over bad decisions and to require  
what doctors determine to be ``medically

Committee Chairman Jim Jeffords, R-Vt., argued  
lawsuits are not needed and emphasized that the  
add hardly anything to health insurance premiums.

``Our goal,'' Jeffords said, ``is to give  
they want and need in a package they can afford  
enact.''

□#AP-NY-03-17-99 1830EST

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Christopher Jennings to Elena Kagan. Re: Statement by the President (1 page)	03/17/1999	P6/b(6)

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
Automated Records Management System [Email]  
OPD ([Kagan])  
OA/Box Number: 250000

### FOLDER TITLE:

[03/17/1999]

2009-1006-F

vz119

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tanya E. Martin ( CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-MAR-1999 22:54:37.00

SUBJECT: AP -- House vote on Ed-Flex

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

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

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

TEXT:  
House Roll Call Vote on Education

By The Associated Press

The 330-90 roll call Thursday by which the House voted  
to give states more freedom in spending federal education funds.

Voting yes were 112 Democrats, 217 Republicans and 1  
independent.

Voting no were 90 Democrats.

X denotes those not voting.

There is 1 vacancy in the 435-member House.

ALABAMA

Republicans Aderholt, Y; Bachus, Y; Callahan, Y;  
Everett, Y; Riley, Y.

Democrats Cramer, Y; Hilliard, N. ALASKA

Republicans Young, Y. ARIZONA

Republicans Hayworth, Y; Kolbe, Y; Salmon, Y; Shadegg,  
Y; Stump,

Y.

Democrats Pastor, N. ARKANSAS

Republicans Dickey, Y; Hutchinson, Y.

Democrats Berry, Y; Snyder, Y. CALIFORNIA

Republicans Bilbray, X; Bono, Y; Calvert, Y; Campbell,  
Y; Cox, Y;  
Herger, Y; Horn,  
Miller, Gary, Y;  
Cunningham, Y; Doolittle, Y; Dreier, Y; Gallegly, Y;  
Y; Hunter, Y; Kuykendall, Y; Lewis, Y; McKeon, Y;

Ose, Y; Packard, Y; Pombo, Y; Radanovich, Y; Rogan, Y;  
Rohrabacher, Y; Royce, Y; Thomas, Y.

Democrats Becerra, X; Berman, N; Brown, Y; Capps, X;  
Condit, Y;  
Dixon, N; Dooley, Y; Eshoo, Y; Farr, Y; Filner, N;  
Lantos, Y; Lee, N;  
Lofgren, Y; Martinez, X; Matsui, Y;  
Millender-McDonald, N; Miller,  
George, N; Napolitano, Y; Pelosi, N; Roybal-Allard, N;  
Sanchez, N;  
Sherman, Y; Stark, N; Tauscher, Y; Thompson, Y;  
Waters, N;  
Waxman, N; Woolsey, N. COLORADO

Republicans Hefley, Y; McInnis, Y; Schaffer, Y;  
Tancredo, Y.

Democrats DeGette, Y; Udall, Y. CONNECTICUT

Republicans Johnson, Y; Shays, Y.

Democrats DeLauro, Y; Gejdenson, Y; Larson, Y;  
Maloney, Y.

DELAWARE

Republicans Castle, Y. FLORIDA

Republicans Bilirakis, Y; Canady, Y; Diaz-Balart, Y;  
Foley, Y; Fowler,  
Y; Goss, Y; McCollum, Y; Mica, Y; Miller, X;  
Ros-Lehtinen, Y;  
Scarborough, Y; Shaw, Y; Stearns, Y; Weldon, Y; Young,  
Y.

Democrats Boyd, Y; Brown, N; Davis, Y; Deutsch, Y;  
Hastings, N;  
Meek, N; Thurman, N; Wexler, Y. GEORGIA

Republicans Barr, Y; Chambliss, Y; Collins, Y; Deal,  
Y; Isakson, Y;  
Kingston, Y; Linder, Y; Norwood, Y.

Democrats Bishop, Y; Lewis, N; McKinney, N. HAWAII

Democrats Abercrombie, N; Mink, N. IDAHO

Republicans Chenoweth, Y; Simpson, Y. ILLINOIS

Republicans Biggert, Y; Crane, Y; Ewing, Y; Hastert,  
Y; Hyde, Y;  
LaHood, Y; Manzullo, Y; Porter, Y; Shimkus, Y; Weller,  
Y.

Democrats Blagojevich, Y; Costello, N; Davis, N;  
Evans, Y; Gutierrez,  
Y; Jackson, N; Lipinski, Y; Phelps, Y; Rush, N;  
Schakowsky, N.

INDIANA

McIntosh, Y; Pease, Y; Republicans Burton, Y; Buyer, Y; Hostettler, Y; Souder, Y.

IOWA Democrats Carson, N; Hill, Y; Roemer, Y; Visclosky, N.

Republicans Ganske, Y; Latham, Y; Leach, Y; Nussle, Y.

Democrats Boswell, Y. KANSAS

Republicans Moran, Y; Ryun, Y; Tiahrt, Y.

Democrats Moore, Y. KENTUCKY

Y; Whitfield, Republicans Fletcher, Y; Lewis, Y; Northup, Y; Rogers, Y.

Democrats Lucas, Y. LOUISIANA

Y. Republicans Baker, Y; Cooksey, Y; McCrery, X; Tauzin, Y.

Democrats Jefferson, N; John, X. MAINE

Democrats Allen, Y; Baldacci, Y. MARYLAND

Morella, Y. Republicans Bartlett, Y; Ehrlich, Y; Gilchrest, Y;

Democrats Cardin, Y; Cummings, N; Hoyer, Y; Wynn, Y. MASSACHUSETTS

Tierney, Democrats Capuano, N; Delahunt, X; Frank, N; Markey, N; McGovern, N; Meehan, N; Moakley, N; Neal, N; Olver, N;

N. MICHIGAN

Knollenberg, Y; Smith, Republicans Camp, Y; Ehlers, Y; Hoekstra, Y; Y; Upton, Y.

N; Kildee, N; Democrats Barcia, Y; Bonior, N; Conyers, N; Dingell, Kilpatrick, N; Levin, N; Rivers, N; Stabenow, Y;

Stupak, N. MINNESOTA

Republicans Gutknecht, Y; Ramstad, Y.

Y; Sabo, Y; Democrats Luther, Y; Minge, X; Oberstar, N; Peterson, Vento, N. MISSISSIPPI

Republicans Pickering, Y; Wicker, Y.

Democrats Shows, Y; Taylor, Y; Thompson, N. MISSOURI

Republicans Blunt, Y; Emerson, Y; Hulshof, Y; Talent,

Y.

N; Skelton, Y.

Democrats Clay, N; Danner, Y; Gephardt, Y; McCarthy,  
MONTANA

Republicans Hill, Y. NEBRASKA

Republicans Barrett, Y; Bereuter, Y; Terry, Y. NEVADA

Republicans Gibbons, Y.

Democrats Berkley, Y. NEW HAMPSHIRE

Republicans Bass, Y; Sununu, Y. NEW JERSEY

Republicans Franks, Y; Frelinghuysen, Y; LoBiondo, Y;

Roukema, Y;

Saxton, Y; Smith, X.

Democrats Andrews, Y; Holt, N; Menendez, N; Pallone,

N; Pascrell, Y;

Payne, N; Rothman, Y. NEW MEXICO

Republicans Skeen, Y; Wilson, Y.

Democrats Udall, Y. NEW YORK

Republicans Boehlert, Y; Forbes, Y; Fossella, Y;

Gilman, Y; Houghton,

Y; Kelly, Y; King, Y; Lazio, Y; McHugh, Y; Quinn, Y;

Reynolds, Y;

Sweeney, Y; Walsh, Y.

Democrats Ackerman, N; Crowley, N; Engel, N; Hinchey,

N; LaFalce,

N; Lowey, N; Maloney, Y; McCarthy, Y; McNulty, Y;

Meeks, N;

Nadler, N; Owens, N; Rangel, N; Serrano, N; Slaughter,

Y; Towns, N;

Velazquez, N; Weiner, Y. NORTH CAROLINA

Republicans Ballenger, Y; Burr, Y; Coble, Y; Hayes, Y;

Jones, Y;

Myrick, Y; Taylor, Y.

Democrats Clayton, N; Etheridge, Y; McIntyre, Y;

Price, Y; Watt, N.

NORTH DAKOTA

Democrats Pomeroy, Y. OHIO

Republicans Boehner, Y; Chabot, Y; Gillmor, Y; Hobson,

Y; Kasich, Y;

LaTourette, Y; Ney, Y; Oxley, Y; Portman, Y; Pryce, Y;

Regula, Y.

Democrats Brown, N; Hall, Y; Jones, N; Kaptur, N;

Kucinich, N;

Sawyer, N; Strickland, Y; Traficant, Y. OKLAHOMA

Y; Watkins, Y; Republicans Coburn, Y; Istook, Y; Largent, Y; Lucas,  
 Watts, Y. OREGON  
 Republicans Walden, Y.  
 Democrats Blumenauer, Y; DeFazio, N; Hooley, Y; Wu, Y.  
 PENNSYLVANIA  
 Greenwood, Y; Republicans English, Y; Gekas, Y; Goodling, Y;  
 Toomey, Y; Weldon, Peterson, Y; Pitts, Y; Sherwood, Y; Shuster, Y;  
 Y.  
 Democrats Borski, N; Brady, N; Coyne, N; Doyle, Y;  
 Fattah, X; Hoeffel, Y; Holden, Y; Kanjorski, Y; Klink, Y;  
 Mascara, Y; Murtha, Y.  
 RHODE ISLAND  
 Democrats Kennedy, N; Weygand, Y. SOUTH CAROLINA  
 Y. Republicans DeMint, Y; Graham, Y; Sanford, Y; Spence,  
 Democrats Clyburn, N; Spratt, Y. SOUTH DAKOTA  
 Republicans Thune, Y. TENNESSEE  
 Republicans Bryant, Y; Duncan, Y; Hilleary, Y;  
 Jenkins, Y; Wamp, Y.  
 TEXAS  
 Democrats Clement, Y; Ford, Y; Gordon, Y; Tanner, Y.  
 Y; Brady, Y; Republicans Archer, Y; Armey, Y; Barton, Y; Bonilla,  
 Paul, Y; Combest, Y; DeLay, Y; Granger, Y; Johnson, Sam, Y;  
 Sessions, Y; Smith, Y; Thornberry, Y.  
 X; Gonzalez, Y; Democrats Bentsen, Y; Doggett, Y; Edwards, Y; Frost,  
 Johnson, E. B., N; Green, Y; Hall, Y; Hinojosa, Y; Jackson-Lee, N;  
 Y; Stenholm, Lampson, Y; Ortiz, Y; Reyes, X; Rodriguez, Y; Sandlin,  
 Y; Turner, Y. UTAH  
 Republicans Cannon, Y; Cook, Y; Hansen, Y. VERMONT  
 Others Sanders, Y. VIRGINIA  
 Goodlatte, Y; Wolf, Y. Republicans Bateman, Y; Bliley, Y; Davis, Y;  
 Democrats Boucher, Y; Goode, Y; Moran, Y; Pickett, Y;  
 Scott, N;

Sisisky, Y. WASHINGTON

Nethercutt, Y. Republicans Dunn, Y; Hastings, X; Metcalf, Y;

Smith, Y. Democrats Baird, Y; Dicks, Y; Inslee, Y; McDermott, N;

WEST VIRGINIA

Democrats Mollohan, Y; Rahall, Y; Wise, Y. WISCONSIN

Sensenbrenner, Y. Republicans Green, Y; Petri, Y; Ryan, Y;

Obey, N. Democrats Baldwin, Y; Barrett, N; Kind, Y; Kleczka, Y;

WYOMING

Republicans Cubin, Y.