I.36

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PHIL CAPLAN
SEAN MALONEY

As you know, the directive on modified or "sporterized" assault weapons is ready except for one outstanding issue, as outlined in the attached Rahm/Bruce Reed memo. They seek a decision on whether the directive should temporarily suspend existing importation permits in addition to pending and future permits.

Background. ATF estimates that about 600,000 sporterized weapons can be imported under existing permits, including about 175,000 under a permit that ATF staff approved last week. (ATF approved the permit in the face of an informal departmental directive not to act on pending applications until the scope of this directive was determined.) Pending applications will permit importation of another million weapons. Everyone agrees your directive should (a) require Treasury to reexamine and, if necessary, modify the importation criteria to keep non-sporting weapons out; and (b) temporarily suspend the approval of all pending and future applications. The issue is whether to suspend also the permits ATF has already granted.

Options. You have three options: (1) suspend action only on pending and future permits; (2) suspend pending and future permits; require Treasury to monitor importation levels and criminal use of the weapons; and authorize Treasury to suspend existing permits during the review period if warranted; or (3) suspend pending, future and existing permits.

Views. There is no real support for Option 1. *Chuck Ruff and DOJ* support Option 2. They believe an existing-permit suspension (Option 3) would not survive in court -- there is not a sufficient factual basis for upholding such an action as there was in 1989 when a court last addressed this issue. Furthermore, they believe such a loss could cripple efforts to modify the importation criteria. *Rahm and Bruce* are comfortable with either Option 2 or Option 3. They note Option 3 looks stronger but may well result in a quick loss in court; Option 2 could be subject to criticism as "weaker" but may well hold up best over time. *Secretary Rubin* supports Option 3.

____ Option 1 ____ Option 2 ____ Option 3

I.37

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
11-12-97

'97 NOV 4 PM6:3

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

copied
Ruff
Reed
Emanuel
COS

November 4, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: CHARLES F.C. RUFF
BRUCE REED
RAHM EMANUEL

SUBJECT: "Sporterized" Assault Weapons Directive

This memorandum is in response to questions you raised concerning the options described in our memorandum of October 30 concerning the importation of "sporterized" assault weapons. Under Option 2, Treasury would suspend action on all pending applications and future permits but not suspend existing permits pending its full review of the sporting purposes criteria. As part of this approach, Treasury would review the importation and criminal use of sporterized weapons and suspend existing permits if the evidence so warranted. You asked how long it would take for Treasury to conduct this interim review and make such a decision.

We have been informed by attorneys at Treasury and ATF that the plan for the review process is still being written. The plan is expected to have 3 separate tracks running simultaneously, the first two of which could be completed within 5 to 10 weeks. The first track would involve gathering and analyzing law enforcement statistics and other information relating to the use of the imported weapons in criminal activity. These "tracing" figures and other anecdotal information could support, depending on their quality, the immediate suspension of existing permits.

The second track would focus on a technical analysis of the weapons, comparing them to other acceptable sporting rifles. This analysis would include reviewing the existing sporting purposes criteria and its application to the weapons at issue. This process is also estimated to take 5 to 10 weeks and could uncover new facts that would warrant immediate suspension of the existing permits.

The final track, which is expected to take 120 days, will focus on the actual purpose and use for which these weapons are acquired. This process will include a nationwide survey of the buyers and users of these weapons. This track offers the best chance for acquiring information supporting modification of the sporting purposes test to prohibit the importation of these weapons.

Treasury and ATF attorneys also noted that if there is a drastic increase in the numbers of weapons actually being imported through existing permits during the 120 day period, in conjunction with favorable facts gathered from any of the review tracks, our claim that sufficient circumstances exist to warrant the suspension of existing permits would be substantially stronger.

In sum, it is unlikely that the review process will uncover additional facts supporting the suspension of existing permits in less than 5 weeks. Based upon our conversations with the attorneys at Treasury and ATF, we believe a more accurate estimate is 10 weeks, but that the entire 120 day review may be necessary. And, as the Treasury and ATF attorneys emphasize, even the full 120 day review may not uncover sufficient additional information that would justify changing the sporting purposes test or suspending any existing permits.

Finally, our respective recommendations, as set forth in the attached October 30 memorandum, have not changed as a result of this additional information.

Copied. Reed Echaveste cc

Background on White House Conf. on Hate Crimes

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 6, 1997

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN 11-7-97

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRUCE REED
MARIA ECHAVESTE

SUBJECT: WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HATE CRIMES

On November 10, you will host the White House Conference on Hate Crimes at George Washington University. This memorandum outlines the structure of the conference, as well as the policy initiatives that we recommend you announce there.

Purpose and Structure of the Conference

The White House Conference on Hate Crimes is designed to call national attention to the problem of hate crimes and to highlight effective law enforcement and educational strategies to address this problem.

Breakfast in the East Room. The Conference will begin with a breakfast in the East Room for the approximately 350 participants. The Attorney General will introduce you, and you will make brief welcoming remarks.

Morning Session. The morning session will begin with welcoming remarks by Stephen Trachtenberg, President of George Washington University. The Vice-President will then speak briefly. The following people will introduce you and the Vice President:

- Chuenee Sampson, student, Duke University, North Carolina. As an African-American high school student in Crown Heights, NY, Ms. Sampson became a peer trainer with the Anti-Defamation League ("ADL"). She helped start the *Students Against Violence Everywhere* ("SAVE") while in high school. Ms. Sampson continues to work with children in low-income areas.

- William Johnson, retired police officer, Boston Police Department. Mr. Johnson has worked extensively in the hate crimes unit in Boston, and recently won an award for his involvement.

During your remarks, you will announce several new law enforcement and prevention initiatives, including a proposal to expand the principal federal hate crimes statute. These

initiatives are detailed later in this memorandum.

Following your remarks, you will moderate a panel discussion with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, and seven other participants. Each of the seven participants listed below will give brief opening remarks:

- Peter Berendt, Principal, Mamaroneck Avenue Elementary School, Mamaroneck, New York. Following a series of hate crimes in the community, Mr. Berendt convened the *E Pluribus Committee* to address the diversity issues facing the school community. His school currently is engaged in a comprehensive diversity awareness program.

- Tammie Schnitzer, Billings, Montana. Ms. Schnitzer is a Jewish women who was the victim of an anti-Semitic hate crime in Billings, Montana. In response, Ms. Schnitzer successfully encouraged Jews and non-Jews alike to display menorahs in the windows of their homes. Ms. Schnitzer's efforts were the subject of a television movie, *Not in This Town*.

- Hon. Sheila Kuehl, President Pro Tempore, California State Assembly. Ms. Kuehl is the first openly gay or lesbian member of the California State Assembly and the author of legislation to prohibit discrimination against gay and lesbian students in California public schools. Ms. Kuehl also has been an outspoken advocate condemning violence against women.

- Raymond Delos Reyes, sophomore, Franklin High School, Seattle, Washington. Mr. Reyes has worked with the ADL's Children of the Dreams program and is a member of a peer mediation training program at his high school.

- Samuel Billy Kyles, Pastor, Monumental Baptist Church, Memphis, Tennessee. Mr. Kyles is an outspoken advocate of civil rights and plays an important role in the religious community's efforts to erase hate crimes. Mr. Kyles is a member of Ecumenical Minister's Task Force. He also was a close friend of Dr. Martin Luther King and was with Dr. King during the last hours of his life.

- Arturo Venegas, Jr., Chief of Police, Sacramento Police Department. Mr. Venegas helped to develop the Sacramento Police Department's model program to deal with hate crimes in the community.

- Grant Woods, Arizona Attorney General. Mr. Woods was a strong advocate for one of the first and strongest hate crime bills in the country and was the most visible Republican proponent of the Martin Luther King Holiday.

Afternoon Session. The afternoon session will consist of seven breakout sessions of approximately fifty participants each. Each of these sessions will address a different aspect of

the hate crimes issue and will be moderated by a Cabinet Secretary or senior government official. The topics and moderators of the breakout sessions are:

1. Hate Crimes in Schools (K-12): Prevention and Response (Secretary Riley);
2. Hate Crimes on Campus: Prevention and Response (Franklin Raines);
3. Law Enforcement Response to Hate Crimes (Attorney General Reno);
4. Understanding the Problem: Improving Hate Crime Statistics (Deputy Attorney General Holder);
5. Hate Crimes in Public and Private Housing (Secretary Cuomo);
6. Community Responses to Hate Crimes (Secretary Glickman); and
7. Counteracting Organized Hate (Secretary Slater).

Following the breakout sessions, the Attorney General will host a panel, consisting of the six other moderators of the breakout groups. This panel discussion will highlight the issues and ideas that surfaced during the breakout sessions. Following the panel discussion, the Attorney General will make concluding remarks.

Satellite Sites. People at approximately 45 satellite sites across the country will view your remarks and the morning panel discussion. The satellite hosts have planned customized programs for the afternoon to complement the morning program. Some members of your Race Advisory Board are participating in the programs occurring at the satellite sites.

Policy Announcements to be Made at the Conference

We recommend that you make the following policy announcements, which focus on the expansion of the federal hate crimes legislation, the improvement of law enforcement mechanisms to fight hate crimes, and the dissemination of educational materials on this issue.

Legislation. You can announce the Administration's support for legislation to expand the principal federal hate crimes statute. The law currently prohibits hate crimes only on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. Your proposed amendment would extend the law to prohibit hate crimes based on gender, sexual orientation, and disability. (To satisfy constitutional concerns, the law would require proof of interstate commerce in this new class of cases.) Senator Kennedy and Senator Spector are expected to introduce this legislation shortly after the Conference.

There is some concern that extension of the statute to gender-motivated hate crimes--which might lead to the inclusion of all rapes and sexual assaults--would greatly expand the number of cases requiring investigation by federal agents. In order to address this concern, the Administration supports several limiting principles that would reduce the number of cases actually investigated and prosecuted by the federal government. Guidance to federal investigators and prosecutors, for example, might suggest investigation and prosecution of gender-motivated hate crimes only in cases that appear to involve the most egregious evidence of

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
11-7-97

gender-based bias. In addition to rebutting charges that the proposed amendment would lead to the federalization of much "ordinary" crime, such guidance also would greatly reduce the cost associated with federal enforcement. (Given the low probability that this amendment will pass this year -- as well as a fair degree of confidence that, if necessary, DOJ can enforce it with existing resources -- DOJ is not requesting any funds in 1999 to implement this legislation.)

Enforcement. We also recommend that you announce a package of law enforcement proposals, including:

- Creation of a Network of Local Hate Crime Working Groups. Under this proposal, each U.S. Attorney would either establish a local hate crime working group in his or her district, or if such a body already exists, actively participate in the group. These working groups--essentially federal-state-local partnerships-- would include representation from the U.S. Attorney's office, the FBI, state and local law enforcement, state and local prosecutors' offices, and advocacy groups. In addition to addressing law enforcement strategies, the groups would seek to educate the public about hate crimes. A National Hate Crimes Working Group, located at the Main Justice, would coordinate the work of all the working groups across the country. As part of this coordinating function, the National Hate Crimes Working Group would distribute, on an ongoing basis, information on promising practices.

- Additional FBI Agents for Hate Crimes Enforcement. This proposal involves assigning over 40 FBI agents and prosecutors to the task of hate crimes enforcement. OMB and Justice are currently discussing whether Justice needs additional monetary resources to effect this policy. (The cost of the agents and prosecutors is approximately $4 million; DOJ has asked for about $13 million in FY99 for hate crimes/civil rights activities.) We plan to try to avoid this budgetary issue by simply saying that the amount of additional resources required, if any, will be settled in the normal budget process.

- Hate Crimes Training for Law Enforcement. DOJ has developed a model law enforcement training curriculum on hate crimes that can be incorporated into programs at local and state law enforcement training centers. This curriculum includes three course segments -- one for law enforcement officers, one for investigators, and one for others in the law enforcement field. You can direct DOJ to make this curriculum available for use across the country in 30 days.

- Make 'em Pay Initiative. HUD has developed an initiative to assist victims of hate crimes and discrimination in housing to seek monetary damages from the perpetrators. HUD has created a unit that will bring civil suits on behalf of residents of public and private housing who have suffered hate crimes and other discrimination. This initiative will require no new money.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
11-7-97

- Improved Reporting of Hate Crimes Statistics. The National Crime Victimization Survey is an annual survey conducted by the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics to measure levels of crime through a national sampling of victims of crime. At present, it does not include questions about hate crimes. Beginning in 1998, the Department of Justice will include questions related to hate crime in NCVS. The survey will inquire whether the victim believes the incident was bias-motivated and why. (The Government currently does attempt to gather hate crimes statistics, but by a notably less effective mechanism.) Expanded questioning regarding hate crimes will also be a part of a pilot project to take place next spring to improve the NCVS.

Education. You can also announce two new educational initiatives. First, the Departments of Justice and Education have proposed a manual for educators on preventing youth hate crime that encourages schools to confront hate-motivated behavior among students; promotes development of comprehensive, programmatic responses to prejudice and violence; and makes educators aware of resources that can be used for this purpose. The Departments intend to send this resource guide to every school in the country. Second, the Department of Justice has created a new website, "Hateful Acts Hurt Kids," addressing prejudice, discrimination, and related issues in an interactive, graphic format designed for children in kindergarten through fifth grade, as well as their parents and teachers. This site will be available for viewing at the Conference.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 13, 1999

21st CENTURY POLICING INITIATIVE ANNOUNCEMENT

DATE:	January 14, 1999
LOCATION:	Alexandria Police Department
BRIEFING TIME:	10:00am - 10:25am
EVENT TIME:	11:05am - 11:50am
FROM:	Bruce Reed

I. PURPOSE

To announce the inclusion in the FY 2000 budget of nearly $1.3 billion for a new 21st Century Policing Initiative. The new 21st Century Policing Initiative builds on your successful COPS program by continuing to help communities hire, redeploy, and retain police officers; providing law enforcement with the latest crime-fighting technologies; and targeting funds to engage the entire community in preventing and fighting crime -- including community leaders, prosecutors, probation and parole officers, school officials, and faith-based organizations.

You will also release new crime statistics from the Justice Department showing that crime rates will continue to drop significantly in 1998.

II. BACKGROUND

As you know, your COPS Initiative has helped to fund over 92,000 community policing officers through awards of over $5.3 billion to police and sheriff's departments across the nation. Over 11,300 state and local law enforcement agencies receive COPS funds -- more than half of the nation's policing agencies, serving nearly 90 percent of the American public. In addition, COPS has helped train over 21,000 law enforcement officers and community members, and funded programs to combat youth firearms violence, gangs, and domestic and school violence. Without new funds, however, the COPS program would be phased out this year, shortly after meeting its goal of helping communities put 100,000 more police on the street.

Your FY 2000 budget proposes nearly $1.3 billion -- and $6.375 billion over five years -- for a new 21st Century Policing Initiative to build on the successful COPS program. Specifically, the Initiative proposes:

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 5, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM Bruce Reed
Charles Ruff

RE: Police Brutality

We wanted to update you on our discussions regarding Hugh Price's letter to you on the issue of police brutality. Mr. Ruff met with Mr. Price, who believes -- along with many of the other civil rights advocates -- that you need to speak to this issue as soon as possible. Attached is a follow-up letter from Mr. Price suggesting some approaches to dealing with the issue. Key White House and Justice Department staff share this sense of urgency, and we also generally agree that it is important for you to focus on the constructive steps the Administration has taken and will take to root out police brutality and strengthen the bond between police officers and the communities they serve. Accordingly, we recommend the following:

(1) Use your next radio address to bring together a group of civil rights advocates, mayors, police chiefs, and rank-and-file law enforcement organizations;

(2) Ask these leaders to work with you to make sure that the criminal justice system serves the needs of all Americans, and to make the system both fairer and more effective;

(3) Discuss new provisions to be included in your 21st Century Crime Bill that will help accomplish this, such as more and better police training, early warning systems to detect problem police, better educated police forces, improved efforts to recruit minorities, and a long-term commitment to strengthen community policing efforts across the country; and

(4) Direct the Attorney General to convene a meeting of representatives of the interested groups to examine ways of addressing the problem, identify cities that have had success, and recommend actions that the Administration can take.

Attached please find a brief description of initial proposals some of which you may want to consider supporting in such a radio address. Although these require further development -- and we have not yet consulted with any of the affected groups -- we thought you might be interested in our initial recommendations.

Police Abuse and Misconduct
Policy Announcements

1. Increase funding for police integrity and ethics training. Currently, the federal government invests only a limited amount of funds to promote police integrity and to keep officers from turning to misconduct or abuse. With community policing helping to decentralize the management of police, this training becomes increasingly important. However, of the approximately 25 regional training centers funded by the Justice Department's COPS Office, only 2 specialize in this important area. By increasing the percentage of funds in the COPS program that can be used for training, we can make police integrity and ethics the priority it should be in all 25 of the federally-funded regional training centers.

2. Develop early warning systems to detect abuse and misconduct. Studies show that many of the police officers who engage in serious misconduct and abuse tend to be the source of a disproportionate number of complaints. Local police departments can and should do more to implement early warning systems that allow them to identify and discipline problem police officers sooner. Funds could be authorized to help police departments put such early warning systems into place.

3. Develop a national system to track serious misconduct and abuse. The federal government could establish a national database that tracks police officers who are found guilty of serious misconduct or abuse. State, local and federal law enforcement agencies would then be required to consult this database when screening prospective recruits. Such a database would help ensure that rogue cops who are disciplined or let go in one jurisdiction are not simply re-employed by another law enforcement agency.

4. Enhance police recruitment of minorities. Former New York Police Commissioner William Bratton has recommended that police department diversify and improve their workforce by aggressively recruiting and educating minority candidates. He has proposed offering 12-to-14 year-olds summer jobs and training, establishing public safety high schools, and continuing to pay for the education of police cadets in the City College system. The Police Corps and/or COPS program could easily be amended to support such long-term minority recruitment efforts.

5. Raise police force education levels. A fundamental reform in policing that is supported by both police management and labor is an overall increase in the education level of America's police. Our budget this year already includes $20 million for such scholarships.

6. Establish citizen police academies. In some cities, police departments offer a version of their police academy training to citizens and community advocates. The goal of this training is two-fold: (1) for police department to better understand the concerns of its citizens; and (2) for citizens to better understand how police make important decisions, such as when and how to use force, when to stop a motorist, etc. Support for such academies could be specifically authorized by the COPS program.

7. Promote tough enforcement of our civil rights laws. Tough enforcement of our civil rights laws must be a central element of any plan against police misconduct and abuse. Our budget includes an increase of more than $1 million dollars (and 10 new attorneys) just for this purpose.

8. Complete the transition to community policing. Over the long term, the most important thing we can do to affirmatively strengthen the bond between police and the people they serve is to renew the COPS program, which has helped to sow the seeds of change in thousands of law enforcement agencies throughout the country. If COPS is not renewed this year, or if it is replaced with a block grant, the federal government will lose the leverage it has gained over the past 5 years in helping to promote changes in law enforcement at the local level.

attach to police brutality memo

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, INC.
Office of the President
120 Wall Street, 8th Fl.
New York, NY 10005
(212) 558-5336 or 37
(212) 344-5188 (Fax#)

FAX: PLEASE DELIVER

To: Charles Ruff Esq From: Hugh B. Price
Fax: 202-456-6279 Date: 3-4-99
Phone: Pages (including cover sheet): 6
Re: CC:

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply ☐ Please Recycle

Comments:
Please pass on to the President.

Thank you.

Any problems with transmission, please contact one of the above numbers.

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

Chairman
JONATHAN S. LINEN

Senior Vice Chairman
CHARLES M. COLLINS

Vice Chairman
BERNARD F. BLACK, JR.
KENNETH D. LEWIS

Secretary
MARTHA M. MITCHELL

Treasurer
WILLIAM M. LEWIS, JR.

President & CEO
HUGH B. PRICE

Board of Trustees
MICHAEL S. ALEXANDER
SHAWN M. BARNEY
STANLEY BEAL RIVLIN
DONALD F. BOWERSOX
LEIGH C. BRENNAN
WILLARD W. BRITTAIN
GLENN M. BROOKS
ALMA ARRINGTON BROWN
THELMA SCOTT BRUNSON
RONALD W. BURKLE
PHILIP J. CARROLL
LEONARD S. COFFMAN, JR.
MICHAEL J. CRITELLI
GAIL DRAKE
EDWARD F. ENGELMAN
DANIELLE V. FAIRW, ESQ.
PATRICK A. FINNEY
ELINOR J. FRADON
SAMUEL GREENAM, JR.
JOHN E. HELEWICZ
BARBARA CLOTTON HILL
KEITH F. HUNTER
ELIZABETH V. HUNTER
MAE C. JEMISON, M.D.
C. ROBERT KIDDER
JIM KING
BENJAMIN LOPATY
ARTHUR C. MARTINEZ
CAROL A. MASON
WILLIAM G. MAYS
THOMAS E. MCKINNON
JAMES F. OPPENHEIMER
JONATHAN OSLER
REV. DR. W. FRANKLIN RICHARDSON
DIANE STEVENS ROBINSON
CYRUS S. ROBINSON
IVAN SPIEGEL
CANDACE N. SMITH
BILL STEPHENS
LOUISA STRATHOUSE
PAUL TAGLIABUE
ROBERT D. TAYLOR
DALE TRUMBLE, JR., ED.D.
CARMEN L. WRIGHT-LEWIS

Honorary Trustees
H. ANTHONY BURNS
COY G. ELLIOTT
DAVID T. KEARNS
THEODORE W. KHEEL
ROBERT C. LARSON

March 4, 1999

VIA FAX

President William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Let me begin by thanking you again for hearing our collective call for you to get more deeply and visibly engaged in the vexing issue of police brutality and abuse. The issue is definitely touching a nerve in minority communities and, if I may say so, the press conference we convened last week has struck a chord with our constituencies.

At your suggestion, I have since met with Ben Johnson, Eric Holder and, just this week, Charles Ruff. All of the discussions have been extremely cordial and candid. Once Charles and I got past comparing notes on our mutual affection for baseball and the Cleveland Indians of days gone by, we proceeded to have a very productive conversation about the issues, considerations and options.

Our concerns about police behavior and practice fall basically into two categories. What might be called Category #1 encompasses those all-too-frequent instances of inappropriate force and brutality that occasionally escalate into fatalities at the hands of police. These cases – Diallo, Grimmett, Louima and King – often capture headline coverage. But there are lower profile encounters that involve unwarranted use of force as well.

Category #2 covers the use by police of what might be called "dragnet" techniques that sweep up thousands of innocent people and trivial offenders along with the admittedly bad actors. With the relaxation of civil liberties protection has come a sharp rise in the use of these methods.

I speak, of course, of racial profiling on New Jersey's highways and accosting Latino-American residents of Chandler, Arizona who've

120 WALL STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10005 (212) 558-5300 FAX: (212) 544-5332

done nothing wrong. Over the last two years alone, the street crimes police unit in New York City has stopped and frisked 45,000 people and released 35,000 of them uncharged because the policemen "mistakenly" thought they were carrying weapons.

The demonstrations, the angry exchanges on talk radio stations and the remarks by leaders at our press conference indicate clearly that minorities are fed up with the brutal behavior of police and rapidly losing patience with the way these dragnet tactics are deployed. Since the abuses are spread all across the country and cut across ethnic groups, this is a national problem that demands presidential visibility, leadership and action.

If I may, let me suggest a couple of options for how you might proceed from here. One approach entails a public event; the other, a private conversation. The two are not mutually exclusive.

Scenario #1: The National Urban League joins with several other respected organizations in co-convening a serious working conference on these issues. The working title might be something like "Police and the Protected: Building Trust and Promoting Collaboration." The two-day conference would be by invitation only.

The opening sessions could focus on identifying and documenting the major sources of tension that undermine trust and collaboration. That done, we'd swing quickly into a purposeful and constructive examination of what can be done to ameliorate the tensions without undermining the quest for public safety.

I would envision presentations of several case studies that are examined, critiqued and culled for lessons. We would ask police chiefs, mayors and scholars who have implemented or studied these successful practices to make the presentations.

Some presentations would focus on cities that have successfully curbed police brutality without undercutting their crime reduction efforts. Other case studies might

concentrate on cities that have achieved reductions without resorting to dragnet techniques or that manage to utilize them in ways that avoid ensnaring excessive numbers of innocent people. The enclosed Op Ed article from this Wednesday's *New York Times* is right on point.

The lessons would be widely publicized and form the basis for recommended guidelines for local use. We would ask C-SPAN to cover the conference and try to secure additional media coverage as well.

We would look to you to bless this conference publicly by delivering a keynote speech when it opens or during the course of the meeting. Later on, if you find the final recommendations to be constructive and workable, you could officially receive our report from the conference and instruct the Justice Department to transform them into "best practice" guidelines:

1. that are distributed widely to police chiefs and commissioners, the media and general public;

2. that organizations like the U.S. Conference of Mayors, International Association of Chiefs of Police and others are strongly encouraged to embrace; and

3. that are used as fodder for a major address on this topic and other speeches that you deliver.

As to co-sponsors, I would envision groups like the NAACP, National Council of La Raza, National Conference of Communities and Justice, National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, and National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives.

Scenario #2: An alternative or perhaps even complementary approach is for you to invite a small cross-section a leaders from various relevant sectors to come to the White House for a private conversation. Once the

primary sources of tension are summarized, the principle point of this meeting is to enable you to explore many of the same issues and solutions that I suggested under the first scenario.

In other words, what are the best practices for ameliorating the kinds of problems that fall under Category #1? Law enforcement officials from communities that have beaten down crime without trampling on civil liberties would discuss how they've gone about it.

The conversation could equip you to utilize your bully pulpit more effectively and to provide guidance to the Justice Department about what more it can do. This meeting could set the stage for subsequent activities, including a White House summit and/or the conference described in the first scenario.

Recommended guests for this type of gathering might include the leaders of the same civil rights and community organizations that I cited above as potential co-sponsors. To this list I would add Congressman John Conyers and Ed Lewis, the publisher of *Essence*, both of whom care deeply about this issue.

From the public sector, I would see inviting thoughtful leaders like Mayor Lee Brown, as well as mayors and police chiefs from cities like Boston, Charleston and San Diego that seem to have figured out how public safety and civil liberties can peacefully co-exist.

I dashed this off in something of a hurry. Additional thoughts may come to us in the days ahead or during the course of further conversations with your staff.

As I said at the outset, we stand ready to work with you and your Administration to find more effective ways to ameliorate the police-community tensions that impede – and indeed imperil – our nation's ability to become One America.

Sincerely,

Hugh

Hugh B. Price
President

cc. Charles Ruff, Esq.
Ben Johnson

I.41

Copied
Podesta
Echaveste
Reed/JC/LS
Cerda
Lew

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
4-21-99

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 20, 1999

Bureau - Nat. Guard
Auto Union - Ch. w/Pres.
Auto Workers

'99 APR 21 AM9:02

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed
Jose Cerda III

SUBJECT: Policy Response to School Shootings

Here are some actions and legislative initiatives the Administration can undertake when the response to the Littleton shootings inevitably turns to questions of federal policy:

1. **Announce Grants for 600 School Resource Officers.** Anytime this week or next, you can announce Justice Department grants under the COPS program to help local school districts hire some 600 police officers to work in schools. These will be the first such officers awarded under the program you announced at the White House Conference on School Safety in October, where we pledged to provide funds for up to 2,000 police officers in schools in FY99. You could also announce that schools and communities have until June 1 to apply for nearly $100 million in Safe Schools grants to 50 cities that put together comprehensive school safety strategies -- another initiative you unveiled at the School Safety Conference.

2. **Announce Legislation to Reform and Reauthorize Safe and Drug-Free Schools.** Anytime this week or next, you can unveil our Safe and Drug-Free Schools legislation that will be included as part of the ESEA reauthorization. This proposal formally authorizes $12 million a year for our FEMA-like emergency response teams; requires participating schools to adopt comprehensive school safety plans; and renews the requirement that schools adopt "Zero Tolerance" policies for guns. It also reforms the overall program to require competitive funding at both the state and federal level. As details emerge from the Littleton shooting, we will review this proposal to see whether any additional provisions are appropriate -- such as increased funding for guidance counselors for troubled kids; gun violence education programs; and alternative schools for disruptive and expelled students.

3. **Announce Tough New Gun Legislation.** Sometime next week -- and just days before the NRA's national convention takes place in Denver (April 30 through May 2) -- you can unveil a Youth Gun Crime Enforcement Act that includes gun initiatives you have already announced (cracking down on gun shows and gun trafficking, extending the Brady waiting period, increasing prosecution of gun crimes, tougher gun penalties, and a new provision to ban the importation of large-capacity magazines), as well as several new or previously unnoticed provisions targeted at juvenile gun violence:

- Amending the juvenile handgun ban to include semiautomatic assault rifles manufactured before the assault weapons ban went into place. Currently, an 18-year-old can legally possess rifles, including assault rifles manufactured before Sept. 13, 1994. This provision, from Rep. McCarthy's bill, would generally ban the possession of such assault rifles until the age of 21.

- Increasing the penalty for youth handgun or assault weapon possession to a felony. Under current law, this offense is a misdemeanor, punishable by mandatory probation. As a result, federal prosecutors have brought few of these cases.

- Increasing the penalty for giving or selling a handgun or assault weapon to a juvenile for use in a violent crime. This provision from our juvenile crime bill would establish a mandatory minimum penalty of 3 years, but maintain the current maximum of 10 years.

- Holding adults criminally responsible for giving juveniles access to certain firearms. You called for this in the wake of the Jonesboro shootings, but we have never before submitted our own proposal. Justice has signed off on a version to create a federal felony that is narrowly tailored to target the most egregious cases of parental recklessness.

- Expanding our Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative. Our program to trace juvenile gun crimes is currently in place in 27 cities. Our FY 2000 budget includes a total of $45 million, which will enable us to increase that number to 37. We could add Rep. McCarthy's proposal to double the number of cities to 75 by 2003.

- Juvenile Brady: This proposal from our juvenile crime bill would ban the possession of handguns by violent juveniles when they turn 21.

- Child Safety Locks: This proposal, also from our original juvenile crime bill, would require federal gun dealers to issue triggerlocks with every gun sold.

I.4

Copied
Reed
Cerda
Podesta

4-21-99

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 20, 1999

'99 APR 21 AM 9:01

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed
Jose Cerda III

SUBJECT: Rep. Carolyn McCarthy's Gun Legislation

Rep. McCarthy has introduced omnibus gun legislation, much of which we can probably support. As noted below, a few provisions of her bill involving federal regulation of gun manufacturing and safety may be more controversial and less likely to be enacted than your existing proposals in those areas.

As we outline in a separate memo on potential policy responses to the Littleton shootings, we were already finishing up a comprehensive gun bill for you to announce as part of your 21st Century crime initiative. We will incorporate as many of Rep. McCarthy's provisions as possible, as well as any other solid proposals that may emerge as we learn the facts of this case.

The provisions in Rep. McCarthy's bill that most directly affect juveniles are:

- Expanding our Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative to 75 cities by 2003. This program is currently in place in 27 cities. Our FY 2000 budget would increase that number to 37. Her bill also authorizes grants for additional ATF and law enforcement personnel to combat illegal gun trafficking, which we also fund in our FY 2000 budget.

- Amending the juvenile handgun ban to include semiautomatic assault rifles manufactured before the assault weapons ban went into place. Currently, an 18-year-old can legally possess rifles, including assault rifles manufactured before Sept. 13, 1994. This provision would generally ban the possession of such assault rifles until the age of 21. As part of your crime bill, we also plan to reintroduce a provision that would make a violation of this statute a felony offense. Since existing law only provides for mandatory probation, federal prosecutors have been reluctant to bring any of these cases.

- Increasing the penalty for giving or selling a handgun or assault weapon to a juvenile for use in a violent crime. Her bill would increase the maximum penalty for this offense from the current 10 years to 20 years. In our crime bill, we planned to reintroduce the provision from your juvenile crime bill that would establish a mandatory minimum penalty of 3 years, but would maintain the current maximum of 10 years.

- Creating criminal penalties for adults who give juveniles access to certain firearms. This is similar to Durbin's "Child Access Prevention" (CAP) legislation, which we supported in principle in the wake of the Jonesboro shootings. Our crime bill will include a narrowly tailored version of this provision, which reflects Justice's concerns that a federal CAP statute should only target the most egregious cases of parental recklessness, and accordingly should be a felony offense with a stiffer penalty. The McCarthy and Durbin legislation, on the other hand, would simply make it a federal misdemeanor offense for adults to allow negligent access to firearms.

- Creating a $50 million grant program for children's gun violence prevention education in schools. This would authorize grants to local education agencies to work with law enforcement to educate children about preventing gun violence. We will look at whether we can incorporate this kind of education into our Safe and Drug-Free Schools proposal.

Rep. McCarthy's bill includes three other provisions that the Administration could conceivably support, but which are more controversial and less likely to be enacted than your own proposals in these areas:

- Prohibiting the manufacture and importation of "unsafe guns". The legislation would give Treasury broad regulatory authority to ensure that guns are designed to be child-proof or that they include safety devices that make them so. Our child triggerlock legislation requires federal gun dealers to provide a child safety-locking device with every gun sold, but does not seek any new regulatory authority over how guns or gun-safety devices are made.

- Requiring a Consumer Products Safety Commission study on handgun safety. The legislation would authorize up to $1.5 million for a CPSC review of how to prevent the unauthorized use or discharge of handguns by children. ATF would be in a better position to conduct such a study, since the CPSC is currently prohibited from studying any firearms issues and there is little support in Congress for giving them this authority.

- Establishing a CDC program to maintain a children's firearm-related injury surveillance system. The legislation would give CDC authority to award $5 million a year in grants to state and local governments to establish comprehensive data bases on the nature of gun-related injuries to youths under the age of 21 in their communities. Your existing youth gun crime tracing initiative is already spurring communities to gather much of this data in ways more likely to reduce gun violence.

REMARKS ON COMPREHENSIVE GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

DATE:	Tuesday, April 27, 1999
LOCATION:	Presidential Hall
BRIEFING TIME:	12:15pm - 12:35pm
EVENT TIME:	12:40pm - 1:35pm
FROM:	Bruce Reed

I. PURPOSE

To announce new legislation to strengthen federal firearms laws and make it more difficult for kids and criminals to have access to guns and explosives; and to display congressional support for such legislation.

II. BACKGROUND

Your proposed bill will include new proposals to: (1) raise the age of the youth handgun ban from 18 to 21 years of age; (2) ban the juvenile possession of semi-automatic assault rifles; (3) halt the importation of large capacity ammunition magazines; (4) require Brady background checks for the purchase of explosives; (5) help law enforcement trace more crime guns to their source; and (6) authorize repeat inspections to crack down on gun dealers involved in illegal gun trafficking. Your package represents the most comprehensive gun legislation any Administration has put forward in 30 years. This legislation will also include proposals that you have previously supported, including closing the gun show loophole on Brady background checks and creating a mandatory Brady waiting period.

BUILDING ON THE SUCCESS OF THE BRADY LAW. Since taking effect in 1994, the Brady Law has prevented over a quarter of a million felons, fugitives, stalkers, and other prohibited purchasers from buying handguns. In November 1998, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) took effect, allowing access to a fuller set of records that law enforcement officials can use to conduct checks of all prospective gun purchases -- not just for handguns. To date, NICS has conducted over 3.4 million background checks on gun purchasers, and the FBI has stopped over 36,000 illegal gun sales. Your legislation will propose strengthening the Brady Law by:

* **Extending the Brady Law's requirements to purchases of explosives.** Under current law, no Brady background check is required to buy explosives. Your bill will help cut off easy access to explosives by requiring Brady background checks before the sale of explosives, and by extending the same prohibitions in our gun

I.44

05-3-99

'99 APR 28 PM8:23

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

copied
Reed
Podesta

April 28, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed

SUBJECT: Long-Term Strategy on Littleton Aftermath

Doug, Karen, Loretta, and I have met with several White House offices, including the Vice President's and the First Lady's, to develop options for what the Administration can do to advance the national debate in the wake of the Littleton tragedy. These options are designed to 1) let the healing continue in Colorado and elsewhere; 2) help launch a serious national conversation on violence, the media, responsibility, and community; and 3) build pressure on Congress to seriously consider our gun and safe schools legislation.

1. **Presidential Visit to Littleton:** As you know, we are trying to determine by week's end when you can travel to Littleton, either to deliver the Columbine commencement on May 22 or to meet with families and the community in some other fashion.

2. **White House Summit on Violence and the Media:** There is growing interest in a White House summit to launch the "national conversation" on the culture of violence that you and the First Lady spoke of last week. The Vice President's office has suggested a series of actions over the next five months, culminating with a National Town Hall on School Safety and Parental Involvement in September. Senators Lieberman and McCain (along with Reps. Markey and Burton) wrote today asking you to convene "an emergency summit meeting at the White House with the leaders of the entertainment industry."

It might make sense to do both. The Vice President's proposal would help reassure parents and students when school resumes in the fall, and would give us time over the summer to develop a truly interactive day of dialogue which, unlike a typical White House summit, would attempt to involve communities and middle and high schools across the country via the Internet and cable. But we should also consider convening a smaller, more immediate meeting in mid-May, because we risk losing some of the urgency of this debate if we wait until the fall. One option would be to summon entertainment, media, and Internet leaders to the White House for a three-hour meeting, without the usual break-outs and run-up that accompany a typical summit. (That also would enable you to challenge the entertainment industry before your trip to Los Angeles on May 15.)

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
5-3-99

The Vice President has lined up some good announcements to make next week -- including an agreement with major internet service providers to provide a single, standardized, one-click menu that would enable parents to filter or block access to inappropriate material, and review a list of Web sites their children had recently visited.

3. Katie Couric Interview: If you're ready to commit to a summit, you could announce it in a Today show interview with Katie Couric that would air Friday. This is also a good chance to repeat your message about the culture of violence and the urgent need for legislation on guns.

4. Counterscheduling on Guns: Your impassioned speech yesterday about the gun culture led all three networks. Already, spokesmen for the gun industry have signaled that they're prepared to accept your proposals on gun shows and trigger locks. We should look for every opportunity to maintain the pressure on this issue. The Secret Service probably would not allow you to visit a gun show, but perhaps we could visit a community where a gun show is going on. Or you might take your case to a reasonable sportsmen's group -- ideally in an unexpected place like Boise or Las Vegas on your upcoming western swing.

Good idea

5. Safe Schools Legislation: Sometime in the next ten days, you should announce your safe schools bill, which will include increased funding for counselors, mandatory counseling for young people who bring guns to school, expanded character education, alternative placements for disruptive youth, and so on. This legislation can be ready anytime: for example, you could do a safe schools event with Lee Brown on your trip to Houston May 7th.

6. White House Conference on Mental Health: This conference on June 7th will attract even more attention in the wake of Littleton. We will make sure that it places a strong emphasis on youth and violence. At the First Lady's suggestion, we are exploring the possibility of requiring insurers to provide greater parity in mental health coverage for young people.

7. Address to Parents: At some point, you should find a venue to speak directly to parents about their responsibilities, as well as about the challenges they face in finding more time to be with their families and getting more involved in their children's lives. We have a couple of announcements we have been saving: a Council of Economic Advisers report on the time crunch for working families, and the formal announcement of our parental discrimination bill.

Not bad

8. High School Commencement Outside Colorado: Some people have suggested that in addition to the Columbine commencement, you do a commencement to reassure students and parents at another typical, all-American high school (such as Squirrel Hill in Pittsburgh).

Not sure

9. Town Hall with Young People: As you saw at T.C. Williams High School, young people are eager to talk about this issue, and we need to keep listening. The Vice President is doing a town hall on MSNBC tonight; Nightline did one last week; CNN has another tomorrow. We will encourage Cabinet members and other principals to keep doing these. You should let us know if you would like to do one yourself.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 11, 1999

UNVEILING OF THE 21ST CENTURY CRIME LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY ACT

DATE:	May 12, 1999
LOCATION:	Rose Garden
BRIEFING TIME:	12:15pm – 12:40pm
MEET & GREET:	12:40pm – 12:50pm
EVENT TIME:	12:55pm – 1:55pm
FROM:	Bruce Reed

I. PURPOSE

To announce that the Administration has reached its goal of helping communities to hire and redeploy 100,000 police officers and to propose new crime legislation.

II. BACKGROUND

Today, you will announce that your COPS program has achieved an important milestone by helping communities to hire or redeploy 100,000 police officers across the nation. Additionally, you will propose new legislation -- the 21st Century Law Enforcement and Public Safety Act -- that builds on the successful 1994 Crime Act, which has helped to cut the crime rate dramatically across the nation. This new legislation will renew the Justice Department's COPS program and include new provisions to reduce juvenile and drug crime, protect crime victims, and combat international crime and terrorism.

- **Helping fund 100,000 community-oriented police.** You will announce grants of more than $95 million for 526 communities to hire approximately 1,500 new police officers. With these new grants, the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) office will have provided 11,300 cities with $5.9 billion to help hire and redeploy more than 100,000 police officers across the country -- fulfilling the your 1992 pledge to do so.

- **Building on what works.** You also will propose new legislation -- the 21st Century Law Enforcement and Public Safety Act -- that builds on the successful programs enacted as part of the 1994 Crime Act. Your new legislation will:

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
5-18-99

Copied
Reed
Tanden
Podesta

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
May 14, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed
Neera Tanden

RE: Ratings Systems for Different Media

This memorandum provides you with information on the ratings system for media, ranging from movies to software.

Movies: All films are rated by a division of the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA). In 1968, the MPAA adopted the Voluntary Movie Ratings System, which advises audiences about the age-appropriateness of films and limits minors' access to films with adult themes. The ratings board is currently composed of eleven members, all employed by MPAA. The Voluntary Ratings System currently provides for five ratings categories: G, PG, PG-13, R and NC-17 (see attached list). The rationale for a particular movie rating is provided in movie ads on the Internet and in newspapers, but not in ads on television. For example, on the Internet, a parents' rating guide is available that describes what aspect of the movie -- e.g., strong language, sexuality, or horror violence -- earned the film its rating.

Movie Advertising and Trailers: All movie advertising is approved or disapproved by the Motion Picture Association of America. The same set of standards that govern movies themselves also applies to advertising for movies that appears in magazines, newspapers, billboards, radio, and television. A different, stricter set of standards governs movie trailers. Trailers are approved for either general audience release ("G" / "PG") or for restricted audience release ("R"). "G" / "PG"-rated trailers are for movies that have been rated either "G," "PG," "PG-13," "R," or "NC-17" by the MPAA. Restricted trailers can play in a theatre only if it is playing an "R," or "NC-17"-rated feature. The approval or disapproval of trailers is based on their suitability for viewing by children. "G" / "PG"-rated trailers cannot show any nudity or drugs, and can only show mild depictions of violence. "R"-rated trailers are less restrictive and can display some depictions of nudity and drugs, as well as some violence (though the act of pointing a gun to a character's head is prohibited).

Television: In 1997, ABC, CBS and most cable networks agreed to display age-based ratings on all television programs except news, sports and unedited movies on premium movie channels. The original ratings system indicated only whether a program was age-appropriate; the system was later modified to include information on whether a program contains violence, sexual content, or explicit language (see attached list). In 1998, the Federal Communications

Commission (FCC) approved the current ratings standards for the V-Chip and ruled that manufacturers have until July 1, 1999 to have the V-Chip installed in 13-inch or larger televisions and until January 1, 2000 for remaining televisions. Parents will be able to program the V-Chip to block programming according to the ratings system (see attached ratings).

Premium Cable Television: In June 1994, four premium cable networks -- Cinemax, HBO, The Movie Channel, and Showtime -- initiated a jointly-developed content advisory system that provides descriptive advisories. This voluntary system was established to provide viewers with information about programming containing violence, sex, and offensive language. Executives in the networks' programming departments are responsible for evaluating the programs. This content advisory system includes descriptive codes, such as "MV" for Mild Violence, "RP" for Rape, "GL" for Graphic Language, and "N" for Nudity (see attached ratings).

Sound Recordings: Record companies voluntarily label some newly released sound recordings with a sticker stating "Parental Advisory: Explicit Lyrics." The label does not further describe the content of the recordings; it does not indicate for example whether the lyrics are explicitly violent, sexual, or profane. The recording industry labeling system is wholly voluntary on the part of record companies, with no oversight or enforcement capability by the RIAA. There are no penalties for not placing the advisory sticker on music products that are explicit, and there are no industry guidelines to determine which music products should be labeled.

Interactive Electronics Games: Two major classification systems for interactive electronic entertainment have been created -- the Interactive Digital Software Association (IDSA) for computer software and the Recreational Software Advisory Council (RSAC) for game devices, such as Nintendo and Seiga. IDSA established the Entertainment Software Ratings Board (ESRB) as a ratings body for computer software titles. The ESRB classification system has five ratings categories: Early Childhood (EC), Everyone (E), Teen (T), Mature (M), and Adults Only (A). Accompanying these classification labels on title packaging are content descriptors relevant to each category. These descriptors provide consumers with additional content information and in many instances indicate the level of violence or sexual content of the title. Among the descriptors used are the following: Realistic Violence, Realistic Blood, Strong Sexual Content, Use of Tobacco and Alcohol, Mature Sexual Themes.

The Recreational Software Advisory Council Ratings System is the product of a coalition of software companies organized as the Computer Game Ratings Working Group in order to implement a ratings system for game devices. The ratings system developed by the RSAC is based on a five-part classification scale ranging from titles suitable for all audiences to those considered extreme in violent or sexual content and language. The ratings are Level 0, Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4. For example, titles considered to have extreme content (Level 4) may contain wanton or gratuitous violence, torture or rape, provocative frontal nudity or explicit sexual activity and graphic language. The RSAC system is based on self-disclosure by the company producing the game.

Online: Unlike other media, a ratings system for the Internet need not be universally applied. In order to protect children from potentially objectionable areas of the Internet, parents can use a

blocking technology to block out all materials that are unrated. Several Internet access providers have already added such parental control technologies to their services. America Online, CompuServe, and Prodigy, for instance, all have systems enabling parents to prevent children from gaining access to any parts of the Internet that the server has not found to be suitable for children. In addition, both Microsoft and Netscape, which together control 97 percent of the web browser market, have implemented a technology in their browsers that allows parents to block material that they deem to be inappropriate. Finally, numerous other technologies are being developed and promoted to enable parents to monitor their children's online activities, set time limits for their children's access online, or let children exchange e-mails only with people on a preapproved list.

Movies Ratings System

G for "General Audiences. All ages admitted."
PG for "Parental Guidance Suggested. Some material may not be suitable for children."
PG-13 for "Parents Strongly Cautioned. Some material may be inappropriate for children under 13."
R for "Restricted. Under 17 requires accompanying parent or adult guardian."
NC-17 for "No children 17 and under admitted."

Movie Advertising and Trailers:

G/PG: for general audiences. May be displayed before any movie.
R: for restricted audiences. May only be displayed by audiences viewing R- or NC-17-rated movies.

Premium Cable Television

MV for Mild Violence
V for Violence
GV for Graphic Violence
RP for Rape
AL for Adult Language
GL for Graphic Language
BN for Brief Nudity
N for Nudity
AC for Adult Content
SC for Strong Sexual Content

TV Ratings System

The following categories apply to programs designed solely for children:

TVY All Children. This program is designed to be appropriate for all children, including children from ages 2 - 6. This program is not expected to frighten younger children.

TVY7 Directed to Older Children. This program is designed for children age 7 and above who have acquired the developmental skills needed to distinguish between make-believe and reality. Themes and elements in this program may include mild fantasy violence or comedic violence, or may frighten children under the age of 7. Programs containing fantasy violence that is somewhat more intense or combative are designated **TV-Y7-FV**.

The following categories apply to programs designed for a broader audience.

TVG General Audience. Most parents would find this program suitable for all ages. It contains little or no violence, no strong language, and little or no sexual dialogue or situations.

TVPG Parental Guidance Suggested. This program contains material that parents may find unsuitable for younger children and the program may contain one or more of the following: moderate violence (V), some sexual situations (S), infrequent coarse language (L), or some suggestive dialogue (D).

TV14 Parents Strongly Cautioned. This program contains some material that many parents would find unsuitable for children under 14 years of age and may contain one or more of the following: intense violence (V), intense sexual situations (S), strong coarse language (L), or intensely suggestive dialogue (D).

TVMA Mature Audience Only. This program is specifically designed to be viewed by adults and therefore may be unsuitable for children under 17. This program contains one or more of the following: graphic violence (V), explicit sexual activity (S), or crude indecent language (L).

Interactive Electronics Games

Entertainment Software Ratings Board

Early Childhood - Titles rated "Early Childhood (EC)" have content suitable for children ages three and older and do not contain any material that parents would find inappropriate.

Everyone - Titles rated "Everyone (E)" have content suitable for persons ages six and older. These titles may contain minimal violence, some comic mischief (for example, slapstick comedy), or some crude language.

Teen - Titles rated "Teen (T)" have content suitable for persons ages 13 and older. Titles in this category may contain violent content, mild or strong language, and/or suggestive themes.

Mature - Titles rated "Mature (M)" have content suitable for persons ages 17 and older. These products may include more intense violence or language than products in the Teen category. In addition, these titles may include mature sexual themes.

Adults Only - Titles rated "Adults Only (AO)" have content suitable only for adults. These products may include graphic depictions of sex and/or violence.

Recreational Software Advisory Council

LEVEL FOUR

Violence Rating Descriptor: Rape, or wanton, gratuitous violence

Nudity Rating Descriptor: Frontal nudity, amounting to provocative display

Sex Rating Descriptor: Explicit sexual acts or sex crimes

Language Rating Descriptor: Crude, vulgar language or extreme hate speech.

LEVEL THREE

Violence Rating Descriptor: Aggressive violence or death to humans

Nudity Rating Descriptor: Frontal nudity

Sex Rating Descriptor: Non-explicit sex acts

Language Rating Descriptor: Strong language or hate speech

LEVEL TWO

Violence Rating Descriptor: Destruction of realistic objects

Nudity Rating Descriptor: Partial nudity

Sex Rating Descriptor: Clothed sexual touching

Language Rating Descriptor: Moderate expletives or profanity

LEVEL ONE

Violence Rating Descriptor: Injury to human being

Nudity Rating Descriptor: Revealing attire

Sex Rating Descriptor: Passionate kissing

Language Rating Descriptor: Mild expletives

LEVEL ZERO

Violence Rating Descriptor: None of the above, or sports related

Nudity Rating Descriptor: None of the above

Sex Rating Descriptor: None of the above, or innocent kissing, romance

Language Rating Descriptor: None of the above

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 26, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed

SUBJECT: National Campaign on Youth Violence

This memo outlines our strategy for getting the national campaign up and running, and for taking additional steps to build on the success of the youth violence summit.

I. Organization

Over the last two weeks, we have had several discussions with Eli Segal and Sarah Brown to review their experiences with the Welfare-to-Work Partnership and the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, and work through the mechanics and structure of this new campaign.

As an interim step, Eli and Pam Eakes have agreed to head a small, informal steering committee of summit participants that will lead the search for an executive director and board of directors. This group will oversee the most immediate organizational steps:

1. **Executive Director:** This campaign will never really take off until we can hand it over to the right person outside the White House who can work full-time raising money and organizing. Several names have been mentioned – Michael Berman, Sam Brown, Ricki Seidman, Eli Segal. But apart from Eli, who doesn't want the job right now, no consensus candidate has emerged.

2. **Board of Directors:** Several people at the summit would be logical board members – Drew Altman of Kaiser, Pam Eakes, Steve Case, Gloria Estefan. But these decisions must be made carefully: The board needs to reflect the different sectors represented at the summit, have a common understanding of the campaign's mission, and be able to take the lead in raising money. (The teen pregnancy campaign relies on its board primarily for fundraising, and set up advisory task forces on the media, best practices, and grassroots efforts as a way to involve a broader range of experts and activists.)

3. **Prospectus:** Because a campaign like this could go in many different directions, we should make some choices at the outset. We are writing a draft prospectus that will give you and the First Lady a chance to mull over those issues, and that eventually

will serve as a mission statement for the organization and an entrée to foundations. The prospectus will spell out the guiding principles of the organization, the rationale for the campaign, an agenda for the first year, and measurable goals for the long term.

4. **Non-Profit Status:** One of the first steps the campaign needs to take is to formally organize under an existing non-profit (possibly the Kaiser Foundation or Mothers Against Violence), so that it can begin receiving contributions.

We have asked Eli and Pam to help us make recommendations to you in all these areas in the next 30-60 days, so that the organization can be up and running when school resumes in the fall. In the meantime, we are following up with every summit participant through phone calls, photos, and a letter from you thanking them for their involvement and seeking their continued support. We also are firming up commitments to the campaign that several major organizations (YWCA, AMA, Nat. Assn. of Elementary School Principals) made before the summit. Scores of other organizations have written the White House with offers to help the national campaign; we are sending them letters as well, and pursuing those that have the most promise.

II. Communications Strategy

To maintain the momentum of this effort, we will continue to look for new commitments from organizations that took part in the summit, additional actions you can take on your own, and new sectors you can challenge:

1. **Federal Trade Commission / Justice Department study:** Unless the Justice Department backs away from providing the funds, next Tuesday you can announce a joint FTC-DOJ study of whether the movie, recording, and videogame industries live up to their own systems of self-regulation, and to what extent those industries market violence to young people.

2. **Nationwide effort to train teachers to identify troubled youth:** We are working with the NEA and other education groups on a nationwide teacher training campaign. We're still working out the details, but we hope to be able to announce at the Mental Health Conference that Education, Justice, and these organizations would sponsor a series of teleconferences this summer with experts on identifying and helping troubled youth. The Education Department would then make videotapes of the sessions available to every school district before school resumes. In addition, we may be able to join in NEA's announcement of a school safety network that will provide satellite dishes, donated by a company in Littleton, to 1,000 school districts around the country.

3. **Other challenges:** We are working with the Vice President's office to see whether we can persuade a group of retailers to agree to strengthen enforcement of the videogame ratings system by refusing to sell adult-rated software to children. We would like to reach a similar agreement with Blockbuster and other videostores, but

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 26, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed

SUBJECT: Strategy for House Passage of Juvenile Crime and Gun Legislation

To keep pressure on the House to act on your gun proposals as quickly as possible, we need to ensure that the gun issue remains front and center over the next few weeks. As Congress prepares to leave for its Memorial Day recess, we are working with Congressional Democrats, gun control advocates and victims groups, and our allies in the gun industry on a coordinated strategy to keep the focus on passing gun legislation.

I. Update

Yesterday, Speaker Hastert and Chairman Hyde promised that next month the House would pass the major gun components of the Senate bill – mandatory background checks at gun shows, mandatory child safety locks, a lifetime ban on gun ownership for violent juveniles, a ban on importation of high-capacity clips, and a ban on juvenile ownership of assault weapons. Hastert, Hyde, and Bill McCollum also pledged support for the most important measure left out of the Senate bill, raising the handgun age to 21. Hyde said the Senate measures will be added to the juvenile justice bill in committee and brought to the floor in June, but made no commitments about the details of the provisions.

These concessions seem to signal that this summer Congress will send you a juvenile justice and gun bill you can sign. To make sure that happens, we need to maintain the pressure for quick action, and watch out for backsliding in three areas:

1. **NRA loopholes:** The House Republican leadership is obviously eager to avoid a fight with us on guns; Hyde went out of his way to say gun control is "our issue, too." But the NRA remains defiant, and will pressure conservatives to riddle the bill with loopholes. This is a self-defeating strategy, as the Senate discovered, but many House Republicans (and some Democrats) will fall for it, and the NRA will crank up the pressure over the recess. Tomorrow, we plan to send a letter from John Podesta to Hastert commending his decision to support the Senate measures and raising the handgun age to 21, but making clear that we'll keep a close watch on the details.

2. **Democratic defections:** Because they're afraid guns will take hold as a partisan issue, Republicans have moved further and faster than some gun-shy Democrats. To help raise the Democratic comfort level, we have arranged for Bob Ricker and other

representatives of the gun industry to reach out to the Blue Dogs and other wavering members. As in the Senate, we may do better with Southern Democrats than with those from rural areas and out West. In particular, we may need your help in swaying influential hard-liners like Dingell, Stupak, Oberstar, and Sabo. For Democrats from marginal districts, it is especially important that every time we talk about guns, we stress that these are modest, common-sense measures targeted at criminals and juveniles, not the first step in a long-term plan to raise the gun issue at every turn.

3. **Juvenile Justice poison pills:** For months, House Republicans have bent over backward to accommodate Democratic concerns on the juvenile justice bill because they didn't want Democrats to raise the gun issue. Now that guns are on the table, the NRA may conspire with Republicans to add onerous juvenile provisions to make the overall bill unpalatable to us and to Democrats. Hyde and McCollum seem to be leaning in that direction. If so, we will have to make the case that these are partisan diversions designed to block sensible gun legislation and protect the NRA.

II. Communications Strategy

Five years ago, we went through a similar drill to pass the assault weapons ban in the House. The politics have changed, but our targets have not: suburban and marginal Republicans, wavering Democrats, editorial elites. Here is what we have in mind:

1. **Launch an editorial campaign that targets key House districts.** To help build support for the assault ban in 1994, we sent extensive information to local editorial boards in key House districts and followed up with telephone calls to make the case for the ban. We will launch a similar campaign over the recess. We will target newspapers in the districts of suburban, marginal, and undecided Republicans, with a special focus on states with Republican Senators who voted with us last week (Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Virginia) and districts with gun manufacturers who support our efforts. Our mailing also can include a calendar of nearby gun shows and encourage local newspapers to send a reporter to see firsthand how guns are being bought and sold at guns shows in their communities.

2. **Release report on Brady background checks.** In June, the Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics will complete a report updating the estimated number of illegal gun sales that have been stopped through Brady background checks. Ideally, you could release this report just as Congress returns from the Memorial Day recess -- perhaps in a White House meeting with law enforcement, or if we can find the right venue, at a school in a community where a gun show is under way. We can also release a breakdown of the new Brady numbers state by state.

3. **Release report on Gun-Free Schools Act.** Also in June, the Education Department will release a report on how many children were expelled from school during the 1997-1998 school year for bringing a gun to school. As you know, last year's report showed that more than 6,000 students were expelled for bringing a gun to school

during the 1996-1997 school year. We expect this year's report to show a decline in the number of gun-related expulsions, totaling about 5,000. We will work with the Education Department to time the report for the week of June 7.

4. **Release report on youth handgun possession and fatalities.** We have asked the Treasury Department and ATF to review gun tracing data and other statistics related to the possession and use of handguns by juveniles. We will work with them to draft a brief report that underscores the importance of raising the age of youth handgun possession from 18 to 21. As you know, more crime guns are traced to 18- and 19-year-olds than any other age group, and well over 80 percent of these firearms are in fact handguns. Ideally, we would like to release this report by June 14, when the Vice President addresses the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

We will keep looking for other ways to keep the issue in the news. Tomorrow, the House Judiciary Committee will hold a gun hearing with Wayne LaPierre, Eric Holder, Jim Johnson, and a doctor who treated victims in Littleton. Over the recess, we will try to get House Republican moderates to send the leadership a letter supporting 18-21 and the Senate bill without loopholes. We will also encourage the gun industry to work behind the scenes to reassure wavering members, and to keep up a high public profile that provides cover to all who need it.

I.49

8-30-99

'99 AUG 16 PM8:35

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 16, 1999

Looks good! Proceed - need to keep visible

Proceed - looks good! Keep visible

copied
Reed
Liu
Podesta

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT
THE FIRST LADY

FROM: Bruce Reed
Eric Liu

SUBJECT: National Campaign Against Youth Violence

We wanted to give you a progress report on the National Campaign. This memo, which distills the consultations we've had inside and outside the White House, outlines our recommendations for (1) the campaign's goals; (2) its organizational structure and potential partners; and (3) a timetable for action. A lengthier business plan for the Campaign is being drafted as well. Your thoughts on the range of issues articulated here – including potential board members – would be of great use as the Campaign moves forward.

I. Goals

The National Campaign, as a matter of core principle, will be *non-partisan, non-profit, and decentralized.* Premised on the idea that youth violence is a multifaceted problem, and that each of us has the capacity and responsibility to combat the problem, its primary goals will be:

1. To raise awareness of the problem and serve as a clearinghouse for solutions.

One of the most important functions of the Campaign will be educate the public about the nature, extent and costs of youth violence. This means working with media companies to reshape the messages the culture sends our children. The Campaign will also serve as the resource of first resort for any citizen or organization interested in combating the problem. A worthy grassroots project in Boston might be brought to scale or brought nationwide if people in Seattle or Atlanta can easily learn about it. The Campaign will be a hub – an open market of information and inspiration – that will identify, and help replicate, approaches that work.

2. To secure pledges from every sector to change personal or institutional behavior.

The Campaign must make concrete the answer to the question, "What can I do to help?" We considered setting an overarching numerical goal (cut incidents of youth violence by 50 percent in ten years, for instance), but were concerned that such big-picture benchmarks could distort or obscure the work that individuals and organizations themselves can do. We think it

would be preferable – indeed, necessary – to secure specific action commitments on a sector-by-sector basis, in the same way the Welfare-to-Work Partnership and America's Promise work. What can America Online do to filter out violent games? What can pediatricians do to mold the way parents raise their kids in a culture of violence? What can charitable foundations do to leverage their gifts, and what can bar associations do to teach kids mediation? Accordingly, as we detail below, the Campaign will be structured along sectoral lines.

3. To spur the creation of forums where kids and parents can talk about these issues.

For the Campaign to be grassroots in fact as well as name, it must incorporate the views of those with most direct control over the problem: kids and their parents. One of the key goals of the campaign will therefore be to spur the creation of forums – in cyberspace and "real" space – where young people can talk to one another, as well as to adults, to make their concerns and frustrations heard. A youth-centered orientation will be key to the Campaign's legitimacy, and a mental health focus key to its effectiveness.

4. To ensure that guns stay out of the hands of children.

Although the Campaign will not be a single-issue advocacy organization, it can hardly address the problem of youth violence without addressing the question of access to guns. The Campaign will thus work on both the supply side and the demand side of this question. On the supply side, for instance, it will develop initiatives to inform parents about the dangers of guns and to show them how to keep guns out of their children's reach; on the demand side, it will work with media organizations and film studios to make guns less appealing.

5. To devise a new "Index of Youth Safety" that can be used as a standard benchmark.

Various foundations and government agencies periodically issue reports on the state of youth violence or juvenile crime. But what is missing is a comprehensive standard that people can use to measure both the objective incidence of violence among youth and the subjective attitudes of young people about their own sense of safety. It would be an important contribution of the Campaign to devise and put into common practice such an index – and then measure its own effectiveness by a decline in that index. We also expect that the Campaign's function as a clearinghouse for best practices will make evident the most pressing and promising directions for new social science research and public opinion surveys. Though the Campaign itself may not have the staff and resources to conduct this research, it can certainly serve as a catalyst for work by its members and affiliates.

II. Proposed Structure

The Campaign will pull together a wide range of people and organize them in a decentralized system. It will not engage in legislative advocacy; nor will it attempt to force all its disparate participants to arrive at a lowest-common-denominator consensus. Rather, its central function will be to serve as a social spark plug – to catalyze new thinking and new action against youth violence; to encourage and enable bold, persistent experimentation.

The Campaign will consist of an Executive Director, a Board of Directors, and numerous Task Forces. The Task Forces will assign responsibility for the problem of youth violence in a sector-by-sector manner, and will offer solutions in the same way. The Board will shape policy, lend legitimacy and – crucially – raise money. The Executive Director will be the entrepreneur who makes all this happen.

Executive Director. This position encompasses not only management of the Campaign's affairs but development of its machinery. In the mold of Eli Segal at the Welfare-to-Work Partnership, the executive director will be equal parts coordinator, fundraiser, and public entrepreneur. With Eli's help, we have recruited the person he tried to hire to run the Welfare-to-Work Partnership two years ago: Jeff Bleich, managing partner of the San Francisco office of Munger, Tolles & Olson, who was recognized by the American Bar Association as one of the country's leading young attorneys. Jeff is a civic leader in state, national and international affairs, and received California's award for pro bono service. He has strong connections in Silicon Valley and Hollywood, and has written on the subjects of youth violence and criminal justice.

Board of Directors. We aim to select a Board that represents the many sectors of society and that can raise the funds to support the Campaign's activities. There would be approximately twenty members of the Board, with an Executive Committee of five or six. Several first-rate people have already expressed interest in joining, including Steve Case of America Online, Judith McHale of Discovery Networks, Andrew Shue of Do Something, Pam Eakes, and Eli Segal. In addition, we would like to approach a range of other candidates, including: Zoe Baird, Robert Johnson of Black Entertainment Television, Bob Rubin, Erskine Bowles, Magic Johnson, Geraldine Laybourne of Oxygen Media, Edgar Bronfman Jr., Jill Iskol, Melinda Gates, Gloria Estefan, and Bill Cosby. We welcome other suggestions, and any advice for Chair. We will also have room for prominent political leaders (on a bipartisan basis) on the Government Task Force.

Task Forces. Each Task Force would take it upon itself to determine how people in its walk of life can most tangibly and effectively make a difference. The activities of the several Task Forces would be coordinated by the Executive Director. Those activities would involve, for instance, devising industry and corporate pledges of action and sponsoring conferences to showcase great initiatives. Among the proposed Task Forces:

- Internet and computers
- Media/entertainment
- Parent/kids groups
- Government
- Service/philanthropy/religion
- Health/public health
- Academic experts/research

Timetable for Action

August 17: You will unveil a new PSA developed by the Ad Council in which you urge parents to communicate with their children before trouble strikes. At that event, you will also announce the selection of Jeff Bleich as Executive Director for the Campaign and release $15 million in DOJ grants for partnerships between school districts and law enforcement.

Late August: The Campaign opens for business, with an office in San Francisco donated by Bleich's law firm, minimal staff, and assistance (though not direction) from the White House. Bleich's firm will handle the Campaign's 501c(3) incorporation on a pro bono basis. The Campaign will open a Washington office as soon as Bleich can get space donated here.

Late September: The Campaign has its formal kickoff. By then you will be able to announce a group of Charter Board Members – who will provide seed funding – and flagship affiliate organizations. One such organization, SHINE (Seeking Harmony in Neighborhoods Everyday), has already pulled together an impressive $10 million teen-focused celebrity campaign with MTV, Nickelodeon, the Excite website and Tommy Hilfiger's fashion company. SHINE has agreed to run its operation under the rubric of the National Campaign.

November: The Campaign will be fully operational. It will have selected a complete Board of Directors, filled out its roster of Task Forces, begun raising money, and published a formal prospectus to guide the work and work product of the Task Forces.

March 2000: At your suggestion, students from Colorado and across the nation are now planning a March on Washington. The Campaign can use this opportunity to unveil its Index of Youth Safety and to hold numerous town halls and focus groups with young people.

Now through August 2000: Over the next twelve months we will work with the campaign on a series of events – including additional commitments from the entertainment industry and other sectors, as well as conferences on "Giving Parents the Tools They Need" and "What Works."

September 2000: The Campaign will publish – on the Web and in print form – a Best Practices Guide for parents and practitioners.

I.50

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
10-18-99

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

'99 OCT 13 PM 2:05

October 14, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Carly
Burr/Gorg

copied
Tramontano
Reed KEL ILS
Podesta
Berger
Lane
Lew
Burson
Nolan

FROM: KAREN TRAMONTANO
BRUCE REED

CC: JOHN PODESTA
SANDY BERGER
NEAL LANE
JACK LEW
CHARLES BURSON
BETH NOLAN

SUBJECT: Proposed biological terrorism provisions in the Omnibus Crime Bill

Purpose

To finalize the Administration's position on the proposed biological terrorism provisions of the Omnibus Crime Bill, so that the legislation can be sent to Congress.

Executive Summary

This memo is to inform you of the consensus recommendations reached within EOP regarding the bioterrorism provisions of our crime bill. As you know, there has been a great deal of interagency contention over provisions that would bar certain categories of individuals from possessing select biological agents. Through a meeting last month and follow-up discussions, we have brokered a compromise upon which all interested EOP offices (DPC, NSC, OSTP, OMB, OSTP, and WH Counsel) can agree. John Podesta has approved the compromise agreement detailed below. We will now move forward to incorporate the recommendations into our crime bill unless you express any concerns.

Background

It is widely agreed that serious gaps exist in current law regulating possession and transfer of select biological agents. In contrast to chemical, nuclear or radiological weapons, there are currently few laws in place designed to limit the availability of hazardous biological materials to the general public. While current laws are adequate to punish perpetrators after they unleash biological agents, they are not designed to ensure that these substances are kept out of the wrong hands in the first place. Additionally, bioterrorism is a growing concern in Congress and we believe that many on both sides of the aisle will be watching to see if the Administration will produce a draft bill with a strong law enforcement focus before introducing their own proposals.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

10-18-99

The Department of Justice goal in proposing legislation is to ensure that potentially hazardous biological materials do not fall into the wrong hands. HHS agrees with this goal, but has raised concerns that some of the proposed restrictions could chill vital scientific research that may be necessary to safeguard public health, and may cause concern within the medical and scientific community. With these dual concerns in mind, there is interagency agreement that the proposed Crime Bill include new provisions establishing criminal penalties for: possession of biological agents not justified by a peaceful purpose; unsafe handling of harmful biological agents; unregistered possession and unauthorized transfer of selected biological agents; and knowingly perpetrating a hoax regarding the use of biological agents.

Issues for Resolution

Transmittal of the Crime Bill has been held up since May by an interagency dispute over the categories of individuals who would be prohibited from possessing dangerous select biological agents, unless they received a waiver.

In order to address safety and security concerns, Justice believes that it is necessary to enact provisions which would criminalize the possession of dangerous biological agents by certain classes of individuals. The categories proposed by DOJ are similar to those that are applied to firearms, including individuals who are: (1) convicted of a felony crime; (2) under indictment for a felony crime; (3) unlawful users or addicts of any controlled substance; or (4) adjudicated as mentally defective or committed to a mental institution. DOJ believes that these provisions, which permit employer waivers to be issued in most circumstances, would be only minimally intrusive on the legitimate research community.

While HHS accepts the principle of prohibiting categories of "restricted individuals" from working with select biological agents, it believes that the DOJ provisions are too restrictive and could chill valid scientific research. HHS supports a narrower definition of "restricted individual" that it believes will sufficiently limit access to dangerous agents while proving less disruptive to the nation's research institutions.

The agencies also disagree over the waiver provisions. Under the Justice proposal, the employer would be permitted to grant waivers for individuals in the prohibited categories in most circumstances. HHS believes that employers would be reluctant to grant waivers for fear of incurring liability for waived individuals. HHS prefers that a Federal agency – that you would designate after the bill passes – determine the waiver policy, including whether waivers should be granted by a government agency or whether employers should make waiver determinations.

The most contentious issue has been DOJ's proposal to prohibit any non-permanent resident alien from handling select biological agents unless the U.S. Government provided a waiver. This would include many visiting students and scientists admitted under temporary visas. HHS strongly opposed the proposal over concern that it could cast suspicion over foreign nationals in general, and diminish our ability to continue to attract world-class scientists to this field of research. While the agencies disagreed over the breadth of the proposal, both agencies agreed it is appropriate for a federal agency to provide waivers for this category of individuals.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
10-18-99

Consensus Recommendations

On September 9, we held a meeting to resolve the areas of disagreement. In addition to the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services, many interested EOP offices also attended including DPC, NSC, OMB, WH Counsel, OSTP, OVP, and the Chief of Staff's Office. During the meeting, the EOP offices reached a compromise position on the prohibited persons categories. Based on follow up discussions led by OMB, we have also arrived at consensus positions on the visiting foreign nationals and waiver issues that have the agreement of all interested EOP offices.

A. Prohibited persons categories

Within the prohibited persons categories, we agreed that the legislation should include:

- Individuals convicted of a felony crime or dishonorably discharged from the military.
- Individuals under indictment for any felony crime.
- Individuals who are unlawful users of any controlled substance. We agreed to drop language which would have also prohibited individuals who are "addicted to" any controlled substance.

We also agreed to exclude individuals who have been adjudicated as mental defective or committed to mental institutions from the list of prohibited persons.

B. Waivers

While at the 9-9 meeting we discussed an option to allow employers to grant waivers with the assistance of HHS guidance, we have since reached a new consensus position negotiated by OMB. The new compromise position would specify that a federal agency (designated by you after the bill's passage) will determine the waiver policy, including whether waivers should be granted by the government or whether employers should make waiver determinations, with or without government guidance.

C. Foreign nationals admitted under temporary visas

As an alternative to DOJ's original proposal to generally bar *any* non-permanent resident alien from handling select biological agents absent a federal government waiver, we agreed upon a narrower provision that would focus on the countries with which we have the greatest national security concerns. The compromise provision would require federal government waivers for non-permanent resident aliens from any country designated by the State Department as a state sponsor of terrorism (7 countries). This provision will address national security concerns, with no significant impact on legitimate research activities.

November 29, 2000

BRADY BILL ANNIVERSARY AND GUN ENFORCEMENT EVENT

DATE:	November 30, 2000
LOCATION:	Presidential Hall
BRIEFING TIME:	11:50 am – 12:00 pm
EVENT TIME:	12:30 pm – 1:15 pm
FROM:	Bruce Reed

I. PURPOSE

To celebrate the seventh anniversary of the Brady Law and to: 1) call for the development of a new system to notify state and local law enforcement officials of felons and other prohibited persons who have tried to illegally buy guns in their communities; 2) announce 12 new cities to participate in the Administration's Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative (YCGII); and 3) release the 1999 national and city reports on YCGII.

II. BACKGROUND

Today you will be joined by Attorney General Reno, Secretary Summers and Jim and Sarah Brady to commemorate the seventh anniversary of the Brady Law, announce new numbers that demonstrate that the Brady background checks are working, call for the development of a new system to make the Brady Law even more effective, and release the 1999 Youth Gun Crime Interdiction Report detailing guns recovered by law enforcement.

Keeping Guns Out of the Hands of Criminals:

Over 611,000 felons, fugitives, and domestic abusers stopped from buying guns with Brady. Today you will announce that the Brady Law has stopped more than 611,000 prohibited persons from purchasing firearms since you signed it into law on November 30, 1993. Of this total, the successful National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), which was launched in November 1998, has blocked nearly 300,000 illegal sales in only two years.

Calling for a national notification system on illegal attempts to purchase firearms. You will direct the Attorney General and the Treasury Secretary to build on the success of NICS by using new technology to develop a national notification system that more effectively and efficiently provides information to state and local law enforcement about all persons who sought to illegally buy guns and were denied by NICS background checks.

CALLING FOR AN UNPRECEDENTED INCREASE FOR GUN ENFORCEMENT. The President will repeat his call on the Congress to finish its work and send him a final budget that contains his proposal to fund the largest national gun enforcement initiative in history. The President's historic initiative will fund an increase of 500 ATF agents and inspectors, the hiring of hundreds of federal, state and local gun prosecutors, expanded crime gun tracing including more funds for YCGII, more ballistics testing to solve more gun crimes, and research funding for "smart gun" technology.

URGING THE CONGRESS TO CLOSE THE DANGEROUS GUN SHOW LOOPHOLE. The President will challenge the Congress to follow the lead of states like Oregon and Colorado that recently passed ballot measures to close the gun show loophole that allows criminals to buy firearms at gun shows – without a Brady background check and no questions asked. The President will also urge Congress to enact other common sense gun safety measures such as requiring safety locks for handguns, banning the importation of large capacity ammunition clips and barring ~~violence~~ violent juveniles from owning guns for life.

I.5a

Crime - Brady Bill

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: RAHM EMANUEL
BRUCE REED

SUBJECT: STRATEGY IN RESPONSE TO BRADY LAW SUPREME COURT DECISION

The Supreme Court will decide the Brady Law case within the next few months. Most experts believe that the Court will find the law unconstitutional and hold that the Federal Government cannot "require" state and local law enforcement officials to conduct criminal background checks.

The Counsel's Office is providing you a memo with their views on legislative fix options. Here are recommended actions that we think we should take in response to such a ruling.

If Court Rules Brady Law Unconstitutional

Three elements of the law would most likely still be in effect --- 1) Brady's 5-day waiting period; 2) Requirement that gun dealers obtain a statement from purchasers concerning the proposed handgun sale; and 3) Transfer by gun dealers of the statement to state or local law enforcement officers. In addition, the decision would apply only to 24 Brady states, and not to the Brady "alternative" states (where state legislatures have established an alternative system that meets federal standards).

Law enforcement officials would be able to continue to conduct criminal record checks of handgun purchasers -- but only on a voluntary basis. And most law enforcement officials believe that the vast majority of local chief law enforcement officers would continue to perform background checks.

Actions To Take In Response

We have been working with the Justice and Treasury Departments to develop a multi-pronged strategy to respond to such a decision. It is critical that we move quickly to respond to an adverse ruling by the Court. These options will permit us to stand with the Bradys and law enforcement in a united front and challenge Congress and the gun lobby to support reinstating the Brady Law.

law enforcement and the American public. Under option #3, most chief law enforcement officers will conduct background checks; any who refuse will have to take responsibility for halting all handgun sales in their area. This approach sticks to a simple overall message -- no background check, no gun sale. Handgun Control supports this approach.

- Law Enforcement Pledge. Release a pledge signed by chiefs and sheriffs from across the nation vowing to continue to enforce the Brady Law.

- Reno/Rubin Letter. Release letter from Reno and Rubin to every police chief and sheriff in the country urging them to continue their public safety duty to conduct background checks on handgun purchasers. The letter would be sent electronically by Treasury to all state and local law enforcement organizations, and also sent to state attorneys general.

- ATF Letter. Release ATF Director Magaw letter to all Federal Firearms Licensees notifying them of the Court decision and informing them that their obligations under Brady remain unaffected.

Domestic Policymaking in the Clinton-Gore White House 1993-2001: Selected Memoranda and Documents

Welfare Reform Documents (Annex I)

5/30/93	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform in Wisconsin	I.53
6/16/93	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Kathi Way, Mary Jo Bane, David Ellwood Through: Carol Rasco Subject: Preliminary Issues for Welfare Reform	I.54
8/13/93	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Background on Welfare Reform for NGA Meeting	I.55
11/12/93	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: House Republican Welfare Reform Plan	I.56
11/29/93	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Mary Jo Bane, David Ellwood Through: Carol Rasco Subject: Welfare Reform and the FY95 Budget	I.57
12/2/93	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Mary Jo Bane, David Ellwood Through: Carol Rasco Subject: Draft Discussion Paper on Welfare Reform	I.58
12/13/93	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform and Senator Moynihan	I.59
1/19/94	Memorandum for the President From: Mary Jo Bane, David Ellwood, Bruce Reed, Kathi Way Through: Carol Rasco Subject: Timing of Welfare Reform	I.60
2/6/94	Memorandum for Mack McLarty From: Bruce Reed Through: Carol Rasco Subject: William Bennett Article on Ending Welfare for Out-of-Wedlock Births	I.61

2/17/94	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Through: Carol Rasco Subject: Welfare Reform Damage Control	1.62
5/20/94	Memorandum for the Welfare Reform Group From: Joe Goode and Stan Greenberg Subject: Welfare Reform – Priorities and Funding	1.63
5/30/94	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: The Politics of Welfare Reform	1.64
10/18/94	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: New York Welfare Reform Waiver	1.65
2/9/95	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform Update	1.66
2/15/95	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform Activity in the House	1.67
3/2/95	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform Update – House Ways & Means Markup	1.68
4/4/95	Agenda for Meeting With Democratic Senators Subject: Welfare Reform	1.69
5/26/95	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Rahm Emanuel Subject: Welfare Reform Update	1.70
6/13/95	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Congressional Welfare Reform Meeting	1.71
7/14/95	Memorandum for Leon Panetta From: Rahm Emanuel, Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform	1.72
8/11/95	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Rahm Emanuel Subject: Welfare Reform – Recess Strategy	1.73

8/23/95	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform Conference Call with Democratic Governors	1.74
5/17/96	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Background on Wisconsin Waiver and Radio Address	1.75
5/22/96	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform Update	1.76
5/28/96	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Democratic Governors and Welfare Reform	1.77
6/17/96	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Rahm Emanuel Subject: Background on Tuesday's Welfare Reform Executive Actions	1.78
7/23/96	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Welfare Reform Conference	1.79
8/21/96	Memorandum for the President From: Carol Rasco and Jack Lew Subject: Status of Welfare Reform Implementation	1.80
2/17/97	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Lyn Hogan Subject: Welfare Caseload Statistics	1.81
1/27/97	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Add-on to the Micro Credit Awards Event	1.82
6/24/97	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Cynthia Rice Subject: Next Week's Speech on State Welfare Reform Efforts	1.83
12/16/97	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Diana Fortuna Through: Sylvia Matthews Subject: SSA Report on Implementation of Children's SSI Cutoffs	1.84
2/5/98	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Secretary Shalala's Report on Welfare Reform	1.85

10/21/98	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Andrea Kane Subject: Minority Welfare Caseloads	1.86
11/9/98	Memorandum for the President From: Charles F.C. Ruff, Bruce Reed, Elena Kagan, Robert Weiner Subject: Anderson v. Roe	1.87
4/5/99	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed Subject: Secretary Shalala's Report on Welfare Reform	1.88
1/14/00	Memorandum for the President From: Bruce Reed, Cynthia Rice Subject: Second Chance Homes	1.89

I.53

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 30, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: **BRUCE REED**

SUBJECT: **WELFARE REFORM IN WISCONSIN**

I. Gov. Thompson's Time-Limited Welfare Demonstration Project

On Thursday, Gov. Tommy Thompson announced a welfare reform pilot project that includes a work requirement and a two-year time limit. If it passes the state legislature this fall, the project will be tested in two counties -- provided that HHS approves Wisconsin's request for a waiver.

The proposal, called "Work Not Welfare," sounds similar to what you called for in the campaign: everyone who can work must go to work; the state guarantees education, training, and child care; cash benefits end after two years; for those who cannot find a job in the private sector, a public service job will be provided.

Recipients will receive education and training for one year, then be required to work for their benefits in the second year. Child care and health care benefits will continue for up to a year after cash benefits run out. The plan is designed as a decade-long experiment, to be expanded if it works.

Wisconsin will not submit a formal waiver request until the legislature approves Thompson's plan. HHS will have to review it for cost neutrality and other issues. But at first glance, it looks to me like a responsible proposal. The biggest question may be ensuring there are enough jobs to go around. The plan calls for a partnership of business, communities, and local government to generate the necessary jobs.

In announcing the proposal, Thompson said, "If Mr. Clinton is serious about welfare reform, he should take a look at Wisconsin." Thompson is one of five governors who serve on the welfare reform advisory group that the NGA formed at your request.

II. The New Hope Project in Milwaukee

If you talk about welfare reform in Milwaukee, you can also mention the New Hope Project, a pilot project in time-limited welfare in inner-city Milwaukee. The program started last year with 50 people; it plans to expand to 600.

The program provides child care, health insurance, a wage supplement (an additional supplement beyond the federal and Wisconsin EITCs to boost participants' income to 105-115% of the poverty level if they work full-time), and a guaranteed job in the public or private sector.

The New Hope Project was launched with money from foundations, corporations, and state and local government. Congress attached a $6 million New Hope amendment to H.R. 11, the tax bill Bush vetoed last fall. They hope to pass it again this year.

According to New Hope's founders, Milwaukee leads the nation in teen pregnancy rates, and has the largest income gap between whites and African-Americans.

I.54

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
6.21.93

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

93 JUN 17 P6:53

June 16, 1993

Bruce

memo
Good Meeting
Good session
(Needle & coupler of Mother & grandmother here — needle

B

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed
Kathi Way
Mary Jo Bane
David Ellwood

THROUGH: Carol Rasco

SUBJECT: Preliminary Issues for Welfare Reform

Last week, we officially announced a welfare reform working group made up of officials from the White House and the agencies. We have met with key members of Congress in both parties, and are working with an advisory group of governors and other state officials on recommendations that they will present to you at the NGA meeting in mid-August. In the meantime, we will begin a series of public hearings and site visits to promising welfare reform programs around the country.

Our goal is to have a welfare reform plan ready by the fall, for introduction late this year or next January, as the centerpiece of your 1994 State of the Union address. If you would like to move more quickly, please let us know.

We intend to build the welfare reform plan around the themes you set forth in the campaign:

* Making Work Pay, through an expanded EITC and health reform.

* Dramatically Improving Child Support Enforcement, by increasing paternity establishment at birth, improving the collection system, requiring absent parents to take responsibility for their children, and perhaps testing some form of child support insurance.

* Better Education, Training, and Support, by building on the JOBS program to ensure that people have access to the tools they need to escape welfare, and begin to integrate welfare mothers into the larger system of education and training.

* Transitional Time-Limited Welfare and Work, by replacing the current system with one that enables and requires people who can work to go to work.

We have set up 10 working groups to address the major components of a welfare reform plan: 1) Making Work Pay; 2) Child Care; 3) Child Support; 4) Absent Parents; 5) Post-Transitional Work; 6) Transitional Support; 7) Private Sector Job Development; 8) Program Simplification; 9) Prevention/Family Formation; and 10) Modeling.

As we proceed with this project, we would like your general thoughts on how to go about ending welfare as we know it. To begin with, we would like to take up a few pivotal issues:

* How bold? Should we reform welfare or replace it?

* What should time-limited welfare look like? Who should be required to work, what should be done to sanction those who refuse to work, and how quickly should we phase in these reforms?

* What else can we do to promote work, family, and personal responsibility? How far can we go in toughening child support enforcement? Should we consider other measures to help families with children, such as child support insurance and/or a children's tax credit?

ISSUE #1: REFORMING WELFARE VERSUS REPLACING WELFARE

In the campaign, you called for an "end to welfare as we know it," and most of our work so far assumes that our goal is to find a genuine alternative to welfare. We are looking for ways to enable people to support themselves outside the AFDC system, through work instead of welfare, and we are more interested in moving people off welfare as quickly as possible than in simply encouraging them to work for their welfare. Both of these goals require much more than tinkering with the current system — and consequently go much further than most state welfare reform efforts, either in implementation of the JOBS program or in waiver requests for state demonstrations.

State self-sufficiency-oriented welfare reforms tend to focus on improving the JOBS program and providing work incentives within the welfare system, in the form of higher earnings disregards and lower benefit reduction rates. Even the most dramatic state demonstration proposals are not oriented to getting people off welfare quickly and helping them make it outside the welfare system when they work. The Bush Administration followed a policy of welfare reform through state waivers, which many state officials would like to see as the centerpiece of this Administration's approach to welfare reform. We believe that state flexibility and experimentation are critical, but we do not believe that leaving reform entirely

to the states will end welfare as we know it. The states are in no position, legally or financially, to envision genuine alternatives to the current system.

We are operating on the assumption that our goal is to genuinely transform the welfare system while preserving a high level of state flexibility. More modest reforms are possible -- expanding and enriching the JOBS program, or relying on state-generated reform approaches -- and would do a good deal to improve the current system. But we believe we have an obligation and an opportunity to be much bolder, to fashion an approach that moves people quickly off welfare and helps them stay off -- or better yet, helps keep them from going on welfare in the first place. The best kind of time-limited welfare is a system where no one stays on the rolls long enough to hit the limit.

↳ consid do waivers for St. time limited program

ISSUE #2: STRUCTURING TIME-LIMITED WELFARE AND WORK

The principle of time-limited welfare, of ensuring that welfare does not last forever, resonates positively not only with voters but with welfare clients. If supports for work are in place, if we have dramatically improved child support, if we have improved education and training and job placement, then it seems unassailably reasonable to insist that after a time certain, traditional welfare must end and some sort of work must begin. There is real dignity in work, and much real work to be done: public libraries are closing because communities cannot afford staffs, there is an enormous shortage of child care workers, and the non-profit sector is booming, just to name a few.

But significant questions arise: How many people can reasonably be expected to work? Who should pay them, and what should they do? And how can we mount such a massive job effort without creating a make-work nightmare like CETA?

The size of the welfare population alone suggests that a time limit should only be applied to a portion of the caseload, at least at first. Up to 3 million recipients have been on welfare for 2 years or longer. Requiring even half of them to work could require the creation of 1.5 million jobs -- and if those were community service jobs, the program would be several times the projected size of national service.

Cost and capacity are critical issues. For example, we would like to see a system of 100 percent participation in work, education or training. The JOBS program currently spends about $800 million nationwide, and enrolls about 7 percent of recipients -- and even the best states only serve about 15 percent. No state now requires work of more than a small proportion of clients. Requiring people to work or even simply participate will increase costs not only for the programs themselves, but also for day care, transportation, etc.

A new system could be phased in, either by state or by cohort of welfare recipients. That would lower the initial cost and enable us to see what works. The challenge will be

how to control costs while at the same time being bold enough to meet our commitment to real change.

A second important issue in designing time limits is the consequences of non-compliance. A system of required participation and work will only be seen as a genuine end to welfare as we know it if it has serious penalties for non-participation. But current practice allows strong due process concerns, penalties affecting adults only, and extremely low sanction rates of any sort.

The best way around this dilemma is to design a system that involves serious and unavoidable consequences for non-participation, but at the same time provides people enough opportunity that life is possible and desirable off welfare. The easier it is for people to support themselves through work instead of welfare, the fewer people will reach any time limit, the fewer public jobs will be created, and the less important sanctions will be. In the end, finding the right balance between opportunity and responsibility will determine whether or not a welfare reform plan can obtain the political support and the moral legitimacy to survive.

ISSUE #3: CHILD SUPPORT

If we are going to ask more of welfare mothers, we must ask more of absent fathers as well. The current child support enforcement system is so porous that less than a third of absent fathers' potential obligation is actually collected. A dramatically improved system would bring essential support to many single parents, and send a clear message that those who bring children into the world have a responsibility to raise them.

We are looking at every possible means to toughen child support enforcement and demand personal responsibility. These measures might include: universal paternity establishment in hospitals; mandatory wage withholding administered by the states; denying deadbeat parents access to universal health care; making it harder for deadbeats to obtain credit cards, driver's licenses, or professional licenses; requiring custodial parents to establish paternity or lose the right to take a personal tax exemption for their children; and various other efforts to demand responsibility and increase collection.

We will also examine other, more sweeping means of making it easier for parents to raise children. One controversial option, known as child support assurance or insurance, would seek to improve child support enforcement and provide some protection to single parents by providing a government-guaranteed minimum child support payment (say $2,000 or $3,000), even when collections from the absent father fall below the minimum. Minimum child support payments would only be provided to custodial parents with an award in place. Any insured child support benefits would be counted as income for welfare purposes, and welfare benefits would be reduced dollar for dollar. A woman on welfare would be no better off, but if she went to work, she could keep her guaranteed child support.

Proponents of this idea argue that it will make it much easier to leave welfare for work, increase incentives for mothers to get awards in place, and legitimize a genuinely time-limited welfare system. Critics fear that it will let absent fathers off the hook, encourage the formation of single-parent families, and simply provide welfare by another name, without increasing child support collection.

Another option to ease the financial burden of raising children would be to provide some kind of children's allowance or children's tax credit. To hold down costs, such a credit might be limited to young children in working families with incomes under $40,000. The tax credit could be further limited to families where paternity has been established, and capped at a maximum of two children under 6 at any time.

The advantage of a children's allowance is that it recognizes that raising children is a burden for all working families, with two parents or one. Like the EITC, it would provide an additional incentive to work, and it would also give working and middle-class families some much needed tax relief. The disadvantage is that like any tax cut, it will cost money. Joe Lieberman has proposed a credit of $1,000 per young child that would cost $9 billion a year; the more carefully targeted version described above would cost significantly less.

In any case, a major part of our effort will be to look at ways to reduce the formation of single-parent families. Over the last decade, the number of children born to unmarried mothers has grown dramatically, even though the divorce rate has leveled off. Paternity establishment is improving, but unwed births are increasing twice as fast. Keeping people off welfare in the first place is the best system of all.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 13, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: **BRUCE REED**

SUBJECT: **Background on Welfare Reform for NGA Meeting**

I. STATE AND LOCAL TASK FORCE ON WELFARE REFORM

When you spoke to the NGA meeting in Washington in February, you asked them to form a group of state and local officials to advise the Administration on welfare reform. The group, which is chaired by Governor Florio, consists of 14 representatives from NGA, NCSL, APWA, NACO, and the National League of Cities.

This State and Local Task Force on Welfare Reform has met several times with Administration officials over the last three months. In mid-July, the 14 members reached consensus on a concept paper, which is attached. Each of the respective organizations will take up the paper at its summer meetings to endorse or amend it.

The task force's recommendations are in line with the themes which you spelled out in the campaign and which are guiding the Administration's effort. They call for a system of time-limited cash assistance, followed by work; tougher child support enforcement; job creation through the private sector (including an endorsement of empowerment zones); state and local flexibility; and incentives to reward work and family. They urge that states be allowed to pursue state-based demonstrations and experimentation at the same time we pursue national welfare reform.

II. UPDATE ON ADMINISTRATION WELFARE REFORM WORKING GROUP

The Administration working group held its first public hearing on August 11 in Chicago. Mayor Daley and Rep. Bobby Rush attended. The group visited promising local programs at Cabrini Green and elsewhere, and heard moving testimony from welfare recipients, innovators, and activists. (The National Organization of Women tried to denounce us for not including any welfare recipients on the interagency working group, but one member of

the working group grew up on welfare -- HHS Assistant Secretary for Aging Fernando Torres Gil.) More public hearings are scheduled over the next two months in Washington, D.C., Tennessee, Southern California, New Jersey, and New York.

The working group has met with a few dozen members of Congress from both parties, and is working closely with Congressional staff. The big issue in Congress will be how much money to spend. The Republicans were scheduled to announce their own bill, but the moderates and conservatives split over whether to spend any money. In all likelihood, the Republicans will present a no-cost bill. House Democrats are worried that no matter how good the plan we introduce, moderates and conservatives will be able to strip out the funding. We are working on a range of options, from cheap to generous.

We are still keeping open the possibility that your plan might be introduced this year. But you may decide this fall that you would rather unveil it in the State of the Union.

November 12, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRUCE REED

SUBJECT: House Republican Welfare Reform Plan

Earlier this week, House Republicans announced their welfare reform plan, which is based on your campaign pledge to require welfare recipients to work after 2 years. A summary is attached.

I. Elements of the Plan

The Republican plan includes the following major provisions:

1. Work: Requires AFDC recipients to work at the end of two years. Provides $10 billion over 5 years to states to set up CWEP work programs. Phased in over 10 years, starting with 30% of new applicants in 1995. Gives states the option to drop recipients after 3 years in the work program (and a total of 5 years on AFDC). Also requires fathers of children on AFDC to pay child support or take part in a work program.

2. Parental Responsibility: Requires mothers to identify the father in order to qualify for welfare benefits. Requires teen mothers to live at home. Prohibits additional benefits for additional children born while on welfare. Includes other incentives for school attendance, immunization, parenting classes.

3. How to Pay for It: The Republicans raise about $10 billion by eliminating SSI and other welfare benefits (except emergency Medicaid) for most non-citizens. They raise another $20+ billion by capping entitlement programs (EITC, AFDC, SSI, Section 8 housing, Food Stamps) at inflation plus 2% — and by cutting all food and nutrition programs (Food Stamps, WIC, etc.) by 5% and block granting the money to the states. These measures allow them to spend $2 billion on training and $10 billion on work programs, and still claim $21 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years.

II. Pros and Cons

We intend to welcome the Republicans' contribution to the debate, applaud their emphasis on work, responsibility, and your two-year time limit, and pledge a bipartisan effort to pass a welfare reform plan.

If asked, we will express some concerns about the entitlement cap -- it's ridiculous to cap a powerful work incentive like the EITC -- and the across-the-board cut in nutrition programs. We expect the NGA and even some Republican governors to criticize this apparent effort to shift the burden of welfare spending onto the states. We think it's unrealistic to claim that welfare reform can lead to massive deficit reduction in the short run. The Republican plan also doesn't do as much as it could to improve child support collection, or to provide employment and training services to support people in work.

But there is much in the Republican plan that we can work with. We are considering recommending many of the same parental responsibility measures for our own plan, such as requiring mothers to name the father in order to qualify for benefits and no longer giving welfare benefits to teenagers who want to live on their own. The Republican work program is a serious, $10 billion effort to provide community service jobs -- and they phase in the program at a reasonable pace.

In fact, if they dropped the entitlement cap and block grant provisions, the Republicans would still have a revenue-neutral plan that invests $12 billion over 5 years -- which is not a bad starting point for the debate.

The Administration's welfare reform working group has just completed a series of regional hearings in California, Tennessee, Chicago, and New Jersey. We will present a series of options to you next month for consideration in the FY95 budget, and develop legislation for introduction early next year.

WELFARE REFORM

Q. What do you think of the welfare reform agreement announced today between House Republicans and Republican governors?

A. I haven't seen the details yet. I think we've made some progress on important issues like the need for tough child support enforcement, and it's very important to me and to the American people that we put country before party and end welfare as we know it. But as Congress begins this historic debate, let me tell you what I have always believed that welfare reform is about. I've been working on the welfare problem for 14 years now, and I can tell you: Real welfare reform is about moving people from welfare to work, where they'll start earning a paycheck, not a welfare check. It shouldn't be about punishing children because they happen to be poor.

Q. Can you sign a bill that does not contain an individual entitlement?

A. We've got to keep an eye on that issue. I'm all for giving states a lot more flexibility -- I've given waivers to 23 states, more than any other President. But we won't have real welfare reform if all Congress does is shift costs to the states and put children at risk. The real test for any welfare reform bill is: Does it move people from welfare to work? Does it reduce teen pregnancy? Does it hold parents responsible for supporting their children? Does it protect children, not punish them for their parents' mistakes?

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 29, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: **Bruce Reed**
Mary Jo Bane
David Ellwood

THROUGH: **Carol Rasco**

SUBJECT: **Welfare Reform and the FY95 Budget**

I. The Working Group Draft Options Paper

Later this week, the Welfare Reform Working Group will send you a draft options paper on welfare reform. We will continue to refine the document in early December, but we wanted you to see a draft of our recommendations now, as you begin to make decisions about the FY95 budget.

The Working Group has completed the last of its five regional hearings and site visits, and has met with more than 250 interest groups, hundreds of welfare recipients, and dozens of members of Congress, governors, and state officials in both parties. There seems to be remarkable agreement within the Administration on the basic elements of a welfare reform proposal. The Working Group, which consists of 33 subcabinet officials from eight agencies and the White House, held an all-day retreat last week to review its draft recommendations. At the end of the meeting, everyone burst into applause over the level of consensus that had been reached.

We will submit a draft options paper to you this week, and follow up with more specific decision memos and decision meetings as necessary. In the meantime, we will also need to consult further with states and with key members of Congress to begin building a coalition for welfare reform. We will probably need to share specific sections with a carefully selected small number of key players. Our goal, pending your decisions on key issues, is to have legislation ready early next year.

One important development: The American Public Welfare Association (APWA) will soon release its own consensus reform plan, which will be very similar to our recommendations, and will include a two-year time limit followed by work. The APWA plan was developed by a broad bipartisan group of state welfare directors, ranging from

Jerry Whitburn of Wisconsin to Barbara Sabol of New York. We are optimistic that many governors will go along.

The New York Times reported Sunday that we are looking at subsidies for private employers to hire people off welfare. We are focusing on many ways to move people from welfare to the private sector, and this is one option under consideration, but it is not as central as the Times article suggested.

II. Cost Issues

Although definitive cost estimates for welfare reform will depend on decisions you make about key aspects of the plan, the levels themselves are actually quite flexible -- especially during the first 4-5 years of the program. The plan can be phased in slowly, starting with new applicants coming onto the welfare rolls. (The Republican plan uses a similar, gradual phase-in.) The phase-in can be adjusted to fit the amount of money available for welfare reform in the budget.

Three areas are likely to require increased funding: child care for families who are working or in training; expansion of the JOBS program to give more people access to education and training; and administration of the community service jobs program for those who hit the two-year time limit. We would expect these costs to be in the range of $1 to 1.5 billion in FY95, rising to $5 to 6 billion when fully phased in.

Essentially all of these costs are on the entitlement side of the budget. Welfare reform does not require new domestic discretionary spending.

Given the very tight budget and the fact that no money was included in the previous budget for welfare reform, we have been operating on the assumption that any new money spent on this initiative will have to be offset by savings generated by the program and by other entitlement savings.

We have identified several possible sources. Savings could result from increased child support collections and reductions in the caseload. Other entitlement savings could come from a series of initiatives ranging from capping the growth of Emergency Assistance, some tightening of the rules regarding non-citizens seeking to collect public assistance, closer coordination of the tax and transfer system to reduce fraud, potentially making a portion of means-tested benefits taxable the way earnings are for those with incomes above poverty, and a number of other ideas. We are currently working with OMB and Treasury on these and other offsets.