

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. list	Mayors Attending White House Meeting (partial) (3 pages)	2/5/93	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
 Domestic Policy Council
 Bruce Reed (Subject File)
 OA/Box Number: 21205

FOLDER TITLE:

Mayors

rs56

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

June 20, 1995

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
BY SATELLITE TO U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

11:15 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mayor Rice. And I want to begin by congratulating Mayor Ashe on a great year as president. I have enjoyed working with you very much. And I look forward working with you, Norma, in the year ahead.

I also want to say hello to some of my old friends in Miami. I see Mayor Daley and Mayor Clark are there. I understand that Secretary Brown and Secretary Cisneros are also both with you today.

Let me say before I go forward that I noticed in one of the previous sessions you had that it was suggested that we don't need the Department of Housing and Urban Development anymore. Let me say that I think Henry Cisneros and his whole team have done a magnificent job, and I don't think we want to send Andrew Cuomo to the beach just yet. I hope you agree.

I also want to thank all of you for giving me this chance to speak with you today. I'm very proud that our administration has worked in an unprecedented partnership with our cities, our communities, and especially our mayors. You make real budgets. You deal with real problems. You know the real concerns of our people as we try to restore the American Dream. I'm looking forward to our continued cooperation. And I want to keep focused on the real problems our country faces.

You have heard in the previous speakers who have appeared before you strands of the great debates now going on in Washington and throughout our country. There are those who say that our primary problems are personal and cultural, not economic and political. There are those who say that the biggest problems we face are due to the fact that the federal government has too much authority, and more ought to be given to the state and local level.

Well, I have to say to you that I'm glad to have these debates. I was making these arguments long before this presidential election season; indeed, long before I became a candidate for president in 1992, when I was a governor, working on the values problems we face, like teen pregnancy and youth violence and all kinds of personal irresponsibility in our society. You and I know that unless people do the right things themselves that we can't solve the problems of our society.

And I was calling for a devolution of responsibility back to local and state governments long before I ever ran for President. So these are not just issues of a political season for me. But let's keep our eyes on what we have to do in terms of the real problems that you deal with every day. We do have a values crisis in this country. We need to exalt responsibility and work and family and community. We need to be less violent, less irresponsible and less divisive.

We do have an economic problem in this country. We've got years of stagnant wages and people who are working hard and being

NORE

punished for it. We need to grow the middle class and shrink the under class and empower people to make the most of their own lives.

We've got a governmental problem in this country. We need a government for the 21st century that is less bureaucratic and more entrepreneurial and more oriented toward partnerships where more is done at the grass-roots level.

Now, I believe all that. But the question is, what are we going to do about it? And if we use a lot of rhetoric to divide the American people again and to divide the problems we face in terms of values as against economics, and national against local, instead of recognizing that what we need is to face these issues and all their aspects and we need a real hard-nosed partnership, then we'll be in trouble. After all, the problems you face every day are the very reasons I ran for President. I believe we had to empower our people and our communities to meet the demands of change at the grass-roots level where people live.

Now, there are some in Washington who believe we can make government work just by juggling programs from the federal bureaucracies to the state bureaucracies. You and I know that the right way is to give local governments, community organizations and individual citizens and their neighborhoods the tools they need, the resources they need to improve their own lives.

In 1992 I laid out an agenda to send power, capital and, most important of all, hope to the people who are working hard to make the most of their communities and their own lives. We still have a good ways to go, but I am proud that we have kept that commitment.

Look at what we have already achieved together: We created the empowerment zones and the enterprise communities, awarding tax incentives and grants to spur economic growth in 105 communities that also supports good values. We're creating a network of community development banks and financial institutions to lend, invest, provide basic banking services in places that need the most to the people who can do the most to change the social conditions we all want to change.

We passed final regulations for the Community Reinvestment Act to help our banks and thrifts make good loans and investments, to help people rebuild our troubled communities. The SBA established one-shop -- one-stop capital shops to distribute \$3 billion in loans and investments for small and minority businesses over the next five years. We fought to save the community development block grants and our economic plan in the face of huge opposition.

Now, those are the things that we have done together -- just some of the things we've done together. Now it's up to us to continue a partnership to create jobs, raise incomes, lift living standards and improve the values and the strength of our communities. We can do that, and we have done that, working with the new Congress.

I have supported and signed into law, for example, the bill to minimize the unfunded mandates that tell you what to do without giving you the resources to do it. I was proud to do that. But I also want you to know that I vetoed the rescission bill in part because of the cuts that affect you directly. For example, the Congress in this rescission bill would cut grants to cities that have already been obligated to make our water safer. These grants were already committed, the letters had gone out. To cut them now would be worse than an unfunded mandate, it would be a defunded mandate. And I don't intend to let that happen.

Another reason I vetoed the rescission bill is because the Congress had cut the community development financial institutions and added language which made it almost impossible for them to operate. I am proud that we've already awarded one large bank in Los Angeles and we've got more work to do on that front. We shouldn't turn back now from a proven commitment that will bring free enterprise to the most distressed areas of our country.

Now, we have to approach a new budget. And as we do it, I want to continue to work together with you to seize this opportunity to build a stronger future for all of our people, to do it in a way that supports our economic interest and our values, and works to reform the government and give you more responsibility.

For the first time in a long, long time the leaders of both political parties now share the will to balance the federal budget. That's an important issue, and I want to talk about it just a moment.

We know that that requires some tough calls. But if we can balance the budget, it will mean in the years ahead there will be more money to invest in our people, in our cities, and in our future, and less money that has to be spent just paying interest on yesterday's debt. The difficult task ahead is for us to have the will necessary to do it and to cast partisanship aside so that we can get the job done in a way that helps instead of hurts the long-term prospects of our people. We need a budget that balances debts and credits, but also keeps our values in balance. That's what our responsibility as leaders demand.

We faced that challenge together in the first two years of our administration, when we cut the deficit by a trillion dollars in seven years and still were able to invest in the tools that our communities and our people have to have to compete and win in the global economy. The work now has to go on.

Now, with that in mind, last week I outlined my plan to eliminate the deficit in 10 years. My plan cuts federal spending by \$1.1 trillion, on top of the \$1 trillion in deficit reduction enacted in our '93 budget plan. This new budget does not raise taxes. It is disciplined, it is comprehensive, and it is serious. It won't be easy, but we need to do it -- and we can.

Our plan proves that you can balance the budget and still invest in things that will keep America strong and growing, like education, health care, research and technology.

To accomplish these goals we have to focus on five basic priorities. First, we've got to help people make the most of their own lives. That means, while we cut the deficit we should increase investment in education, not cut it. Second, we have to control health care costs, but we should do it by strengthening Medicare, saving Medicaid -- reforming them -- not by slashing services for the elderly. We can maintain benefits by cutting costs through genuine reform, including cracking down on the substantial amount of Medicaid fraud and abuse and giving more incentives for more efficient and cost-effective ways of delivering care.

Third, we need to cut taxes, but for the middle class, not for the wealthiest Americans who don't really need it. Fourth, we can save money by cutting welfare, but we have to do it in a way that saves enough for investment to move people to work. The congressional proposals are too tough on children and too weak on work. We need to be tough on work and supportive of children.

And in that regard, I want to thank all of you there who, in the spirit of bipartisanship, have come out in support of our efforts to achieve real welfare reform that moves people from welfare

to work. The bill that was recently introduced in the Senate by Senators Daschle and others achieves that objective, and those of you who are supporting it, I am very grateful for that. We can save funds, but we have to save enough to invest in people, to empower them to end welfare as we know it; not just to cut people off and not worry about the consequence to the children.

The fifth principle is to balance the budget in 10 years, not seven. Now, we could do it in seven as some in Congress want, but there's no reason to inflict the amount of pain that would cause or to run the risk of recession. A highly respected economic group out of the Wharton Business School recently estimated that one of the Republican budgets would actually cause a recession, driving unemployment to 8.6 percent and delaying balancing the budget by two years anyway.

Now, in spite of all this, don't let anybody fool you. Balancing the budget in 10 years will require real cuts; it will cause real pain. We can and we should discuss where those savings should be found. We have to decide about whether the savings should come out of programs like the community development block grants, which I know are very important to you and which I have strongly supported. I still believe in them very strongly. But let me be straight with you. If we don't cut the community development block grant, then there will have to be some cuts in some other programs that you and I care about.

We have to do that if we're going to bring the budget into balance. But let me say again, we should do this -- we should do this. We never had a huge structural deficit before the 12 years before I became President, before the years between 1981 and 1993. And I'll tell you how big the problem is. Right now, today, our budget would be in balance today if it were not for the interest we have to pay on the deficit run up between 1981 and 1993 in January. So we have got to turn this around. We cannot continue something that we only started 12 years ago.

But I want to remind you there is a big difference between my plan and the congressional plans. It's the difference between necessary cuts and unacceptable pain. It's the difference between a deficit reduction plan that goes to balance budgets and still invest in our future and one that cuts off our future. It's the difference between one that will reduce the deficit in ways that will promote long-term growth and one that will reduce the deficit in ways that risk a severe, near-term recession.

I am going to fight to avoid cutting education, hurting people on Medicare, undermining critical investments in our communities. It would be wrong to sacrifice those investments just to meet a seven-year deadline when we can get the job in 10 years. It would be wrong to cut in those areas that will help our people restore the American Dream, raise our incomes so that we can give a tax cut to people who don't really need it.

One of our most important challenges is to make sure that the American people feel more secure in their homes and neighborhoods as well. And therefore, I thank you again for joining me in the fight against crime and the fight for the crime bill last year. Without your support we could not have possibly passed it, especially given the bitter opposition of some members of Congress to the assault weapons ban and to giving cities the flexibility that you need in the prevention funds.

I know some of you had conflicting opinions and different needs when it came to our plan to provide 100,000 new police officers. But I believe we have a national crisis on crime because we don't have enough police officers on the street. Over 30 years we've watched as the violent crime rate tripled and our police

departments only increased by 10 percent. Now we've found the funds to pay for police in the right way. We cut unnecessary government at the national level and sent the savings to our communities for more police officers. That is the kind of bargain the American people deserve. The philosophy behind that was to do what could be done to reduce crime.

But I would also remind you, under our plan, we gave localities enormous flexibility in spending the prevention funds because you know what works at the local level. It is ironic today that there are those who are trying to dismantle our national commitment to put 100,000 police on the street in the name of giving you more flexibility when less than a year ago they were saying that giving you more flexibility would lead to widespread abuse in the spending of federal money.

The truth is that a lot of these programs to give you more flexibility, from welfare to crime, are really just ways to cut spending that invests in our future and our economy and our security. If we'll adopt my budget plan, we can give you more flexibility and still do those things and balance the budget. Behind all of these initiatives -- or not just shuffling from federal to state bureaucracy, but trying to empower our people directly -- is the philosophy we are using to help our people meet the demands of the global economy in their own lives.

Some still say, as I said -- let me just give you one example, finally -- that we ought to trust the federal government to train our workers. We've got about 70 or 80 different training programs. Then there are some that say, no, let's give all these programs to state government. But I say, we shouldn't empower one bureaucracy over another.

In the future, in every one of your cities, the ability of the American people who live there to do well in the global economy will depend upon our ability to directly empower individual Americans, to directly empower them to make the most of their own lives, including having a lifetime right to constant re-education and training.

So let me talk with you, finally, today about an effort that we're making now that would give people those most important tools they need to build better lives. It is central to the rebirth of your cities. If you have more people who can get good jobs and who can earn higher incomes, then so many of the problems that you face, so many of the problems you face will be lessened.

So here's how I want our people to get those jobs and to keep them in this global economy that is always demanding more and more of them. I want to do something that's modeled on the G.I. Bill. Fifty years ago, as World War II was coming to an end, our country created the G.I. Bill that gave a whole generation of Americans the education to create an unprecedented prosperity. What I have proposed today is a G.I. Bill for America's workers -- to help a whole new generation of Americans secure decent lives and decent incomes for themselves and their families.

The principle is simple: Education and training can no longer stop at high school. We've all got to keep on learning to keep pace with the dynamic global economy. And the best way to make it happen is to put the power directly in the hands of individual Americans who have to do the learning. Today there is a confusing maze of 70 -- at least 70 -- job-training programs sponsored by the federal government. What we want to do is to consolidate them into a single grant and that grant will have but one purpose -- to put money directly into the hands of people who need it.

Through our School-To-Work initiative, we'll continue to help high school students or graduates who want further training get that in order to compete. Through our skilled grants we'll help the worker who has lost a job who is grossly under-paid and under-employed to take the responsibility to get a new leg up in the global economy. We also want to make it easier and cheaper for workers to get loans to build on their education. That means expanding, not cutting, Pell Grants and direct student loans. And it means the right kind of tax cuts -- not tax cuts for people who don't need them, but tax cuts for middle-income Americans who can use the money to invest in their training and their children's education. We propose a tax cut for the cost of all post-high-school education.

Now, these things will make opportunity real for more Americans, and make opportunity real for more of your cities. The G.I. Bill for America's workers will make it possible for more and better jobs for people who live in your communities, and will help attract jobs and expand your economic base.

You think about it. If everyone considering investing in your communities knew that every person who wanted a job could get the job training in a direct voucher from the federal government which could go to your community colleges to get the kind of training they need, that would help us to do what you need to do. We want to make you a full partner in designing a system of adult education and job placement. That will mean that community colleges, which are the new life-blood for so many of your citizens, will be even stronger and, more importantly, will mean that you will be able to use this as a tool to develop your own economies.

I believe this approach will play a major role in our goal, our common goal to restore the American Dream. I'm pleased that this morning in The Los Angeles Times there was an article that I hope you've all had a chance to read, written by Al From, the president of the Democratic Leadership Council, a Democrat; and by Jack Kemp, the former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, a Republican. Here's what they say about our G.I. Bill.

They say -- quote -- "It offers an all-too-rare opportunity for members of Congress of both parties to discard partisan squabbling and cooperate on a measure that can help hard-working Americans acquire the skills they need to lift their incomes. The needs of this great country of ours demand that all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, ask ourselves the question: Can we make it work? The correct answer is: We must."

I could not have said it better. Al From and Jack Kemp, the Republicans and the Democratic mayors out there who are listening to me today, just remember, as we balance the federal budget, as we help all Americans prepare for a bright future, we have got to seize this moment of great opportunity. We've got to put our national priorities above party politics and put the American people first.

That's what I was trying to do when I had that conversation in New Hampshire with the Speaker of the House the other day.

This is a moment of immense promise. We can renew the American Dream. But we have to work together, and we have to avoid trying to divide our people by false choices. Good economics, sound values, strong communities, a government that works -- that's what we really need, and I will work with you to achieve it.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

MAYOR ASHE: Mr. President, we are genuinely pleased and warmed by your remarks. And we have three questions that we would

like to pose to you. First, I will ask a question as President, and then Mayor Daley, the Vice President of the U.S. Conference of Mayors; and then Paul Heimke, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee for the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Our bipartisan Conference of Mayors has endorsed Senator Daschle's bill that gets at the real issues of welfare reform. We support the greater accountability, but we also need training, child care, and job creation. Can you tell us what the prospects are for the real welfare reform this year? And how can we as mayors make a difference since we may feel the effects of some of the draconian measures that are going on?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the prospects for real welfare reform really depend upon whether the Senate Republicans, or at least the block of moderate Republicans who understand these issues, will work with the Democrats on something like the Daschle bill.

You know, there is a hard core in the Senate who are demanding that there be no welfare reform bill unless all aid is cut off to unmarried mothers and their children born out of wedlock, even though the Catholic Church, the National Governors Association, your group, everybody I know says that that would be unfair to children.

If the rest of the Republicans will leave that block and join with Senators Daschle and Broaux and Mikulski and the others who are on this bill, we could work out a bill that would make a real difference.

And let me say, one of the important things, I think, about the Daschle bill is that it really heavily emphasizes the importance of child care. As I look back over the time that has elapsed since, as a governor, I worked on the welfare reform bill of 1988, if you ask me what its single biggest shortcoming was, I would say that we should have done more in child care.

And if we do what I have suggested here -- and I think a lot of the Republicans want to do this -- and we take all these various training programs and put them into a big block and let unemployed workers access them, then that could help to provide the training money for an awful lot of people on welfare who want to move to work; so that if the Daschle bill itself or any future amplification of it that could have bipartisan support in the Senate, could really focus on child care, I think we could get a welfare reform bill that is tough on work and good for children, instead of the other way around.

So I would urge all of you -- especially the Republican mayors -- you have a lot of allies in the Republican Party in the Senate; welfare reform ought to be a bipartisan issue. If we could get a good bill out of the Senate, I feel confident that we could have a bipartisan majority in the House that would vote for it as well if we could get it out of the conference committee.

So that is what I would implore you all to do. This is a huge deal for the United States. And the Daschle bill is an opening, an outreach for a genuine bipartisan compromise that doesn't just dump a lot of money back on the states and localities -- excuse me, a lot less than you used to have in a way that would lead to people being cut off with nothing good happening.

MAYOR DALEY: Mr. President, we all as mayors want to thank you for standing with us on the issues of crime and violence. You have heard not only from mayors, but the police chiefs and citizens of what we in the cities have been trying to do to fight crime.

From your kept promise, and you've done this, providing over 100,000 new cops, signing the Brady Bill, signing the assault weapons ban, you have been there to help us in our efforts to both fight and prevent crime. And your Department of Justice has done an excellent job in implementing the cops program in last year's crime bill.

Given the uncertainty in Congress over the future of crime legislation, how can we work together with you in your administration to assure that the funding is there on as flexible a basis as possible for our policing and our prevention efforts?

THE PRESIDENT: I think, Mayor, what you have to do is to, again, emphasize in the Senate where this is being debated and ultimately in the conference committee that we need to have more flexibility for the cities, but that it is unacceptable, at least for me and I hope for many of you, to come off of our commitment on 100,000 police.

I have watched many panels and I've seen a lot of your mayors on C-Span. You know, I actually get to watch you as well as you watching me, and I know that some of the mayors believe that we've been too firm on the police requirements because some cities have already increased their police forces and can't take maximum advantage of this. But I have to tell you I think there is a national interest in increasing the police forces of this country by about 20 percent. And, after all, this crime bill was funded by a reduction in the national employment -- people in the federal government.

On the other hand, I have been strongly in favor of absolutely maximum flexibility for you in other aspects of the crime bill and would be in favor of even more flexibility in other aspects of the crime bill as long as we don't undermine our commitment to 100,000 police. If we can get more flexibility in the other areas of prevention and imprisonment, I would be in favor of it. I will work with you to do anything I can in that regard.

MAYOR ASHE: Thank you, Mr. President. The next questioner is Paul Helmke, Mayor of Fort Wayne.

MAYOR HELMKE: It's good to have the opportunity to talk to you again, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

MAYOR HELMKE: We all realize that regardless of whether the budget's balanced in seven years or 10 years there's going to be less money coming to cities from the federal government. We believe strongly that the issue of flexibility beyond just the crime bill is important to us in terms of helping us find efficiencies at the local level.

In January, Speaker Gingrich spoke to us about a contract with cities. I know that the Vice President has talked to some of our officers with some of his ideas on flexibility and opportunities for efficiency at the local level. I'm curious as to your thoughts with regard as to how we can find more efficiencies, more flexibility and work together with both sides of the aisle as well as officials at the federal level, the local level to help cities as we go through this process so we can meet the human needs that are very real in all of our cities.

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, Paul, let me say that I think that we have to do this. I didn't give you any specific numbers in my remarks, but let me tell you that even with a 10 years balanced budget plan, if you don't cut education and if you have a tax cut much smaller than the ones contemplated by either the Senate or the House, it would still require about a 20-percent overall cut

in other discretionary spending because we're all at about the same place on where we think defense ought to be.

Now, that's over a 10-year period -- for my budget at least. What I think we need to do here is, before this budget is actually passed in the fall, or in late summer, but probably be in the fall, we need to know before the budget is passed what the new arrangements with our cities will be.

Now, let me just give you one example. I would like to preserve the community development block grant program. If we can, I have proposed it to be continued at the present level of funding in 1996. The Senate budget resolution proposes to cut it in half.

What I think we ought to do -- and I know -- by the way, I wanted to compliment Secretary Cisneros. He has been waging a very strong fight within our administration to try to make sure that the cuts come in other areas and the community development block grant program is preserved at its present level. We could do that.

You might argue that we could even increase it if some of the other categorical programs were folded into it so that if we are going to go forward here, maybe some new purposes should be added to it. I am open to all that. I want to reduce regulation. I want to increase your flexibility, not just for the cities, but for all local units. We just announced a 40-percent cut in the regulations of the Department of Education, for example. Most of you don't run your own school districts, but some of you do, and that will be important to you.

We are moving in the right direction here. But I think we have got to be willing, before this budget is passed, to sit down with the cities and, in fairness, also with the states and the counties, and try to design what the new agreement will be about this money and how it's going to be funded. And I think there are great opportunities for you to get some more flexibility and for you to determine how we ought to do it. And I am more than willing to go forward with you on that basis.

MAYOR ASHE: Mr. President, we thank you very much for giving us this opportunity, and we will take the challenge to respond and open up a dialogue that really moves this country forward in the interest of cities and the people that we represent.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mayor Rice, Mayor Daley, Mayor Helmke, thank you all. I appreciate your good work.

END

11:45 A.M. EDT

QUESTION 1 (Mayor Victor Ashe of Knoxville)

The U.S. Conference of Mayors supports an adjustment of the 1990 census to correct for a minority undercount and provide a fair and just count of our citizens -- a position consistent with the view of Commerce Secretary Brown when he served as Chair of the Democratic National Committee. Unfortunately, the Administration has appealed an Appeals Court ruling favorable to the cities in the 1990 census lawsuit to the Supreme Court. As expressed in a resolution adopted by the Conference yesterday, we are dismayed by this decision, and I would like to ask what are the chances of the appeal being withdrawn and the Administration adjusting the 1990 census to correct for the undercount.

Answer:

While I am very sensitive to the concerns reflected in your question, I do not expect the petition for certiorari to be withdrawn. The Department of Justice does not take the position in its brief that the 1990 census was correct or that the manner in which it was conducted was the most appropriate one available at the time.

At issue, instead, is whether a federal court has the authority, in essence, to direct the Census Bureau to employ any one particular methodology as it approaches this complex task. Our position is that this is not an appropriate function for the courts. Once that issue is resolved, then I think we should then turn to the question of whether, on a prospective basis, a different methodology should be used.

WELFARE REFORM

(Mayor Norm Rice of Seattle)

Q. Yesterday, the Conference of Mayors endorsed a resolution in support of your approach to welfare reform and the Senate Democratic bill. How do we make sure that Congress passes real welfare reform, and doesn't just dump the problem in our cities' lap?

A. We ought to be able to pass real welfare reform, because there is an overwhelming, bipartisan consensus in this country that we should put people to work, because welfare should be a second chance, not a way of life. The key to real welfare reform is moving people to work, not just cutting them off. I have given 29 states the freedom to experiment with their own approaches to welfare reform, and the common thread in every one of those waivers is work. If we're going to reform welfare, work has to be our top priority.

We can reach a bipartisan agreement on this, as you have done, if we put work at the center of our efforts, and don't try to do welfare reform on the backs of the children. One of the things that frustrates me most about Washington that's different from the rest of the country is that a few people on the fringe are willing to hold up big, important changes over narrow, extreme differences. That's what's happening in the Senate right now: a handful of members threatening to stop welfare reform unless it places an outright ban on assistance to young unmarried mothers and their children -- even though the Catholic Church, the National Governors Association, and most Americans without regard to party strongly oppose that idea. We can achieve real reform. But if we're going to get it, we need more bipartisan cooperation and less extremist threats.

QUESTION III (Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago)

The mayors greatly appreciate the work of Attorney General Janet Reno and Associate Attorney General John Schmidt in implementing the crime bill. As you know, mayors favor direct and flexible law enforcement funding for cities. The House has passed its new crime bill which contains a \$10 billion block grant, and Senator Dole has now said that he will support legislation to provide block grant funding directly to cities, not the governors. Could you please tell us how you envision the crime bill issue proceeding, and how we can work together to seek crime bill funding this year.

Answer:

- I've been very clear with Congress: I will not support any effort to gut our effort to put 100,000 new police on the street.
- We've already awarded money for 17,000 new officers to cities all over this country, and you need to let Congress know not to mess with this program.
- My new budget makes funding for the crime bill a priority: we put money for the Trust Fund for 2001 and 2002 as well, and we don't cut police, prisons, or prevention. The House Republicans do, and that's a mistake.

QUESTION IV (Mayor Norm Rice of Seattle)

Mr. President, in regard to your new budget plan, we are concerned that we cannot find our priority program, the 21 year old Community Development Block Grant, (CDBG), on your list of protected programs -- a list which includes many other programs such as the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund and Americorps. Could you please tell us where CDBG stands in your budget.

Answer:

As you know, the Senate Budget Resolution calls for a 50% cut in CDBG. For FY 1996, in my budget plan, I protect CDBG at FY 1995 levels.

As we move toward balance, some tough decisions will have to be made. However, the difference between my plan and the congressional plans is the difference between necessary cuts and unacceptable pain. I am going to fight so we can avoid cutting education, Medicare and critical investments in our communities. It would be wrong to sacrifice those investments just so we can meet a 7 year deadline, when we can get the job done in 10 years. And it would be wrong to cut in areas that will help our people restore the American Dream so that we can give a tax cut to the well-off who do not need it.

QUESTION.V (Mayor Norm Rice of Seattle)

The Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich (GA), has personally appeared before and written to the U.S. Conference of Mayors requesting that we prepare a "Contract with Cities." We find this to be an encouraging sign from the Congress. I recently met with Vice President Gore and we shared ideas on this matter. Mayors would like a similar initiative with your Administration. The Speaker's request and your response could help us all as we address, in a bipartisan effort, the challenges before the city governments in serving all urban and suburban citizens of this nation.

Answer:

Since the very beginning I have made sure that the Vice President included the cities as part of our Administration's reinventing government initiative. That's why we pushed for unfunded mandates legislation and for empowerment zone legislation -- both of which were included in the original National Performance Review.

The Vice President and I do not just want to simply give everything back to the States. We know that to truly help cities we must simplify all the bureaucracy they face -- replacing the federal bureaucracy with a state bureaucracy often doesn't help anyone at all.

That's why I've asked the Vice President to take another look at the agencies -- to try and simplify the regulations that waste your time and your money. Last week the government, acting on my instructions, got rid of 16,000 pages of regulations and promised to simplify another 31,000. That's why I've asked the Vice President to work to get the red tape out of your programs -- so that we can save administrative costs but keep program dollars.

I applaud Speaker Gingrich's offer but frankly, we're way ahead of him. We have already heard your call for a simpler more user friendly federal government and we have already dedicated the federal government to being a partner with you.

QUESTION VI (Mayor Victor Ashe of Knoxville)

When will the Administration appoint the members of the crime commission created under last year's crime bill?

Answer:

- The funding for the Crime Commission is not authorized to be funded until FY 1996.
- I have included approximately \$1 million for the Commission in my budget, however Congress has not yet appropriated the funds for this Commission.
- We are already well underway in the process of selecting the appointees to the Commission and as soon as I am certain of the funding, I will proceed with the Administration appointees.

MEMO TO DPC STAFF

FROM: JEREMY BEN-AMI *JB*

SUBJECT: RESOLUTIONS FOR CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

DATE: JUNE 12, 1995

Reed.
RAM
COPS resp.
could be a problem

As mentioned at the DPC morning meeting, everyone should review the attached documents and E-mail your comments to Anna Winderbaum by COB Tues., June 13. Please CC: Jeremy.

Your comments should explain what you see as problematic to the Administration. Attached also is Marcia Hale's memo, which explains the purpose of us reviewing the resolutions. Thanks.

REED

Resolution No. 14

Submitted by:

The Honorable Thomas Menino
Mayor of Boston

WELFARE REFORM

- 1) **WHEREAS**, there is a widely acknowledged need to reform the current welfare system; and
- 2) **WHEREAS**, the transition to self-sufficiency relies on the critical relationship between welfare reform, the development of workforce skills, and the creation of jobs; and
- 3) **WHEREAS**, the development of workforce skills requires that adequate training is provided that will be relevant to the jobs available before entrance into the workforce and that these employment opportunities are meaningful and provide a living wage, and that child care, health care, and other necessary services are provided; and
- 4) **WHEREAS**, to ensure that reform of the welfare system will be effective, job creating, whether public or private sector, must be a vital part of the equation to ensure that those who cannot find work have opportunities to find employment; and
- 5) **WHEREAS**, existing employment and training activities such as the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) have proven to be critically important to helping disadvantaged adults and at-risk youth and the resulting public/private relationship that is key to JTPA and the JOBS component of the current welfare system; and
- 6) **WHEREAS**, an effective and efficient service delivery system for welfare clients must be customer-oriented and have a universal, performance-based accountability system that monitors the acquisition of skills and attainment of jobs and economic self-sufficiency,
- 7) **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors believes there is a critical link between welfare reform and the development of workforce skills to ensure long term employment, increased and relevant skill levels, economic self-sufficiency, and the development of jobs; and

- 8) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that steps to ensure success for economic self-sufficiency and long-term employment of welfare clients requires that adequate training for the development of workforce skills be provided before these individuals are entered into the workforce for meaningful employment opportunities that provide them a living wage; and
- 9) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that job creation, whether private or public, must be a vital part of the reform effort in order to ensure employment opportunities for those transitioning out of welfare; and
- 10) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that any education, training, and job placement programs targeted to welfare recipients should be coordinated with existing workforce development activities such as JTPA and its business/government partnership and the JOBS component of the current welfare system; and
- 11) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the coordination and consolidation of such existing employment and training activities will include reciprocal sharing of resources and consolidating administrative procedures to ensure streamlined and non-redundant service delivery structures and not merely a reduction in funding; and
- 12) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that mayors and local boards be recognized as partners and are an active part of planning, designing, and implementing job training and job creation services to meet the needs of the local welfare recipient; and
- 13) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that all workforce development programs that impact the workforce training system at the local level, including welfare reform, should be customer-oriented rather than process-oriented with a universal performance-based accountability system that measures the acquisition and retention of non-subsidized employment and transition out of the welfare system to economic self-sufficiency; and
- 14) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that federal resources must be sufficient to implement job training and integrate welfare recipients into viable jobs.

Projected Cost: Unknown

NEED
Resolution No. 39

Submitted by:

The Honorable Bruce Todd
Mayor of Austin

The Honorable Paul Helmke
Mayor of Fort Wayne

THE CHALLENGE OF OKLAHOMA CITY

- 1) **WHEREAS**, the tragic bombing of Oklahoma City's federal building made the American public aware of the potential for domestic terrorism and the hate which is festering within certain segments of our society; and
- 2) **WHEREAS**, it is important that our nation's laws regarding terrorism -- domestic and international -- be re-assessed and strengthened where necessary; and
- 3) **WHEREAS**, the flow of shared intelligence among federal, state and local law enforcement authorities has often been in one direction only -- from the local level to the federal; and
- 4) **WHEREAS**, irresponsible and inflammatory statements about gun control and federal law enforcement have contributed to a disaffection with government and threats of violence against public officials; and
- 5) **WHEREAS**, such statements are particularly reprehensible when broadcast to large numbers of people; and
- 6) **WHEREAS**, mayors and all elected officials have a critical role to play in fostering tolerance and understanding in their communities and in the nation as a whole,
- 7) **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors urges Congress to consult with mayors and other elected officials and then to act quickly and in a bipartisan manner on counter-terrorism legislation which provides needed powers to federal officials without compromising civil liberties; and
- 8) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that in the investigation and sharing of information on terrorist and potential terrorist acts, The United States Conference of Mayors urges that federal, state and local authorities maintain open, two-way channels of communication; and

cont.

5/2/90

Resolution No. 38

Submitted By:

The Honorable Sharpe James
Mayor of Newark

The Honorable Rosemary Corbin
Mayor of Richmond

COMMENDING U.S. EPA FOR FUNDING "BUY RECYCLED" TRAINING INSTITUTE

- 1) WHEREAS, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, recognized the increase in material disposed in landfills; and
- 2) WHEREAS, sanitary landfill space is at a premium; and
- 3) WHEREAS, EPA recognized that much of the material entering the waste stream could be recycled, reused or incorporated in the manufacture of new products; and
- 4) WHEREAS, EPA recognized the substantial purchasing power of local governments; and
- 5) WHEREAS, U.S. EPA funded the highly successful "Buy Recycled" Campaign in 1990, at which time only 28 cities had policies to buy recycled products; and
- 6) WHEREAS, to date 201 cities have established policies to purchase recycled products and 219 cities buy recycled products absent a written policy; and
- 7) WHEREAS, the U.S. EPA recognizes that a need exists to inform cities of the availability, competitive pricing and high quality of recycled goods; and
- 8) WHEREAS, the U.S. EPA recently announced a grant to The U.S. Conference of Mayors for the establishment of a "Buy Recycled" Training Institute,
- 9) NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that The U.S. Conference of Mayors commends the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for its partnership in developing the National "Buy Recycled" Training Institute; and
- 10) BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that The U.S. Conference of Mayors encourages all mayors to require their city procurement officials to participate in the Institute's training program on how to purchase products made of recycled content.

Projected Cost: Unknown

Resolution No. 41

✓ REED
MCCOWN

Submitted by:

The Honorable Mike Johanns
Mayor of Lincoln

IN SUPPORT OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

- 1) **WHEREAS**, last year Congress approved the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1994 ("1994 Crime Bill") with a strong bi-partisan vote; and
- 2) **WHEREAS**, the 1994 Crime Bill authorized funding for several programs to support local crime prevention programs; and
- 3) **WHEREAS**, mayors have supported a balanced approach to anti-crime legislation which includes punitive measures, police hiring programs and crime prevention programs; and
- 4) **WHEREAS**, the nation's mayor consider funding for programs such as domestic violence prevention initiatives, youth recreation and youth employment grants vital to local crime control efforts; and
- 5) **WHEREAS**, Congress' is considering changes to the 1994 Crime Bill,
- 6) **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors urges the inclusion of federal assistance for crime prevention programs in any anti-crime legislation that Congress enacts; and
- 7) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that Congressional appropriators ensure that crime prevention programs are fully funded.

Projected Cost: Unknown

DEED
McCann

Resolution' No. 42

Submitted by:

The Honorable Deedee Corradini
Mayor of Salt Lake City

PREVENTION FUNDING

- 1) **WHEREAS**, all local state and federal approached to reducing crime must contain both law enforcement and prevention components; and
- 2) **WHEREAS**, the 1994 crime bill authorized a significant amount of funding for prevention programs; and
- 3) **WHEREAS**, the crime bill's authorized prevention programs were not proposed to be fully funded by the Administration in FY96; and
- 4) **WHEREAS**, the Administration is doing a good job implementing the crime bill,
- 5) **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors strongly supports full funding of the crime bill's prevention programs; and
- 6) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors supports the Congress and Administration considering the establishment of a block grant to be allocated directly to local governments for prevention programs and activities; and
- 7) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors urges the Congress and Administration to work with local officials on any changes to the authorized prevention programs or their funding levels.

Projected Cost: Unknown

REED
Resolution No. 44

Submitted by:

The Honorable Bill Campbell
Mayor of Atlanta

THE ATLANTA RESOLUTION

- 1) **WHEREAS**, drug abuse is one of the most critical problems facing our cities and is inextricably linked to crime and violence; and
- 2) **WHEREAS**, drug abuse cuts across all cultural, racial and economic lines, and illicit drugs impair millions of Americans; and
- 3) **WHEREAS**, drug use and addiction contribute to the breakdown of our families, the abuse of adults and children, the spread of HIV/AIDS, school dropouts and the declining quality of education, homelessness, urban decay, high health care costs, and low economic productivity that compromises our ability to compete in the global marketplace; and
- 4) **WHEREAS**, we must reduce the number of people who use drugs and the number of people with the disease of addiction to significantly improve the most pressing domestic issues we face; and
- 5) **WHEREAS**, drug use is a preventable behavior and drug addiction is a treatable disease,
- 6) **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors endorses the Atlanta Resolution, which has already been signed by hundreds of mayors, and which says:
 1. We, the nation's mayors, reject all proposals to legalize illicit drugs. This is not the answer to the drug problem in our cities.
 2. Prevention works: We have achieved real progress in decreasing drug use and in understanding what works.
 3. Diminishing resources and public focus now threaten future success.
 4. We must provide significantly greater resources and leadership -- from government, corporate and nonprofit sectors at national, state and local levels -- for the demand reduction efforts of prevention, intervention, research and treatment. Specifically:

Resolution No. 43

Submitted by:

The Honorable Dennis Archer
Mayor of Detroit

THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

- 1) **WHEREAS**, equal justice is fundamental to the American system of government under laws; and
- 2) **WHEREAS**, the inability to afford legal counsel effectively denies access to justice to individuals with legal needs; and
- 3) **WHEREAS**, Congress created the Legal Services Corporation in 1974 to provide legal assistance to those who would be unable to afford adequate legal counsel and to serve the ends of justice; and
- 4) **WHEREAS**, the continued operation of the Legal Services Corporation is essential to the guarantee of equal justice, to ensure access to the courts for those otherwise unable to afford access, and the efficient operation of the courts; and
- 5) **WHEREAS**, proposals are under consideration in Congress that would eliminate or greatly reduce funding to the Legal Services Corporation and restrict the actions which legal services attorneys can take on behalf of their clients,
- 6) **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors strongly supports continued funding for the Legal Services Corporation at levels sufficient to enable it to continue to fulfill its vital role in the efficient administration of justice in the United States; and
- 7) **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that The United States Conference of Mayors opposes any restrictions that would deny the clients of legal services attorneys the same remedies available to other Americans.

Proposed Cost: None



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410-0001

MAYORS

FAX TRANSMISSION

DATE: Feb. 1, 1993

NUMBER OF PAGES (including this page) 4

TO: Banci Reed

FROM: Secretary Cisneros

PHONE: 486-7739

PHONE: _____

(the phone number of this fax machine is (202) 700-2676)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410-0001

MEMORANDUM: Mack McLarty, Chief of Staff
Mark Gearan, Deputy Chief of Staff
Howard Paster, Legislative Affairs
Carol Rasco, Domestic Policy Council
George Stephanopoulos, Communications Director
Christine Varney, Cabinet Secretary

FROM: Henry Cisneros, The Secretary

SUBJECT: Meeting with Mayors/Economic Stimulus

DATE: February 1, 1993

Background

In order to explore the local projects that can be made ready for immediate action if a stimulus package is approved, I have invited the Mayors of the nation's 20 largest cities -- as well as the leadership of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities -- to a project assessment meeting this Friday, February 5th. The meeting will be held at HUD's office at 2 p.m.

The meeting will focus on the role federal housing and community development programs can play in stimulating the nation's economy. I expect the Mayors to provide details on the projects in their cities which could move swiftly to completion with additional federal funds.

I will also be reporting on several administrative and regulatory actions that HUD is taking to accelerate the release and expenditure of housing funds that are already appropriated and which can create jobs across the country even though they would not formally be part of a stimulus package.

Accelerated release of federal housing monies will not only help meet pressing affordable housing needs; they will also help stimulate the economy in distressed communities by generating jobs both directly -- through construction and rehabilitation activities -- and indirectly -- through increased demand for manufactured products.

Recommendation

I recommend that our meeting with the Mayors be followed (or preceded) by a half-hour audience with the President on economic stimulus and other urban issues. If the President cannot attend, the meeting could be with the Vice President or with the the

Domestic and Economic Policy Advisers and the Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs offices. A White House meeting would serve several purposes:

First, it would illustrate the President's commitment to cities and urban issues. This is particularly timely given the President's meeting today with the National Governor's Association.

Second, it would focus attention on the upcoming economic stimulus announcement. Specific emphasis would be placed on projects which are "ready-to-go" if given national leadership and appropriate resources. There are literally thousands of qualified individuals and groups throughout the nation -- nonprofits, neighborhood activists, state and local governments, lenders, builders -- who are willing and able to undertake quick and meaningful action.

Third, as with the Governors meeting this morning, a Mayors meeting could be made more substantive by White House announcement of initiatives that HUD has taken -- and will continue to take -- under the President's direction. Three initiatives are of particular note.

1. HUD will accelerate the release of FY 1993 public housing modernization funds (\$3.1 billion) by some 3-4 months and will take other action to unclog the larger (\$6 billion) pipeline. I expect to send memoranda to HUD's Regional Offices (as well as explanatory letters to key Members of Congress and constituency groups) within the next few days. Expedited release of these funds will ensure swift attention to pressing housing needs, like vacant public housing, and will also generate additional jobs. The Congressional Research Service estimates, for example, that every \$1 billion of public housing modernization funds creates 18,000 jobs.

2. HUD has developed an action plan to help states and localities promptly implement the HOME (housing block grant) program; some \$2.5 billion in appropriated funds remain largely unspent. The Action Plan includes specific short-term and long-term items covering statutory changes, regulatory changes, program clarifications and technical assistance initiatives.

3. HUD has drafted an Executive Order on homelessness which could outline the Administration's approach to this issue. The Executive Order would direct HUD, HHS and other federal agencies to implement long-term solutions to the problem of homelessness (e.g. linkage between services and housing, employment and housing, etc); use closed military bases (and other military properties) to expand the supply of transitional housing for homeless persons; initiate joint efforts to eliminate the use of welfare hotels by the summer of 1994; and reconstitute the Interagency Council on the Homeless.

We stand ready to explain the substance of each of these three items which are ready for the President to announce. Each has been carefully reviewed within this Department over the last ten days and organized by our public affairs staff for its coherent message.

We need a decision as to whether a White House meeting is possible at all in order to obtain the necessary clearances for the Mayors during the next several days and to prepare the substantive package outlined in this memo. I look forward to hearing from you.

Attachment

Mayors Invited to HUD Project Assessment Meeting

1.	Mayor David Dinkins	New York, NY
2.	Mayor Tom Bradley	Los Angeles, CA
3.	Mayor Richard Daley	Chicago, IL
4.	Mayor Stephen Clark	Dade County, FL
5.	Mayor Bob Lanier	Houston, TX
6.	Mayor Edward Rendell	Philadelphia, PA
7.	Mayor Susan Golding	San Diego, CA
8.	Mayor Coleman Young	Detroit, MI
9.	Mayor Steve Bartlett	Dallas, TX
10.	Mayor Paul Johnson	Phoenix, AZ
11.	Mayor Nelson Wolff	San Antonio, TX
12.	Mayor Susan Hammer	San Jose, CA
13.	Mayor Kurt Schmoke	Baltimore, MD
14.	Mayor Stephen Goldsmith	Indianapolis, IN
15.	Mayor Frank Jordan	San Francisco, CA
16.	Mayor Edward Austin	Jacksonville, FL
17.	Mayor Greg Lashutka	Columbus, OH
18.	Mayor John Norquist	Milwaukee, WI
19.	Mayor Willie Herenton	Memphis, TN
20.	Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly	Washington, DC
21.	Mayor Don Fraser	Minneapolis, MN
22.	Mayor Sharpe James	Newark, NJ
23.	Mayor Sidney Barthelmy	New Orleans, LA
24.	Mayor Glenda Hood	Orlando, FL
25.	Councilmember Carolyn Long Banks	Atlanta, GA
26.	Mayor Manyard Jackson	Atlanta, GA
27.	Mayor Ray Flynn	Boston, MA
28.	Mayor Xavier Suarez	Miami, FL
29.	Mayor Norm Rice	Seattle, WA
30.	Mayor Michael White	Cleveland, OH
31.	Mayor Hector Acevedo	San Juan, PR
32.	Mayor Karen Humphrey	Fresno, CA
33.	Mayor James Schelbel	St. Paul, MN
34.	Mayor Jerry Abramson	Louisville, KY
35.	Mayor Jan Laverty Jones	Las Vegas, NV
36.	Mayor Althaus	York, PA
37.	Mayor Paul Helmke	Fort Wayne, IN

Mayors

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEETING WITH SECRETARY HENRY CISNEROS AND MAYORS

DATE: Friday, February 5, 1993

LOCATION: State Dining Room, The White House

TIME: 3:00 p.m.

From: Regina T. Montoya
Loretta T. Avent

I. PURPOSE

This is a component of a meeting organized by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

II. BACKGROUND

Secretary Henry Cisneros has invited the Mayors of the 20 largest cities and the leadership of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities to a meeting at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Secretary Cisneros asked that you meet with the Mayors for approximately forty-five minutes.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The Vice President
Regina Montoya
Loretta Avent

See attached list of Mayors and leaders from USCM and NLC.

IV. PRESS PLAN

There will be open photo press at the conclusion of the meeting.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

See Social Office scenario.

VI. REMARKS

Talking points from the Department of Housing and Urban Development are attached.

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- 3:00 p.m. You will enter the room and meet and greet the Mayors.
- 3:05 p.m. The Mayors will be asked to sit down.
- 3:07 p.m. Secretary Henry Cisneros will introduce the Vice President.
- 3:08 p.m. The Vice President will make comments.
- 3:12 p.m. Secretary Henry Cisneros will introduce you.
- 3:15 p.m. You will make your comments.
- 3:25 p.m. End of your statement
- 3:26 p.m. No more than two Mayors will make statements.
- At conclusion of Mayors' statements, the open photo press will enter.
- 3:30 p.m. You will depart from the State Dining Room.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. list	Mayors Attending White House Meeting (partial) (3 pages)	2/5/93	P6/b(6)

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Bruce Reed (Subject File)
QA/Box Number: 21205

FOLDER TITLE:

Mayors

rs56

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Mayors Attending White House Meeting - 2/5/93

Final - No Additions

<u>Name</u>	<u>S.S. #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>
Jerry Abramson Louisville, KY	[REDACTED]	9-12-46
Hector Acevedo San Juan, PR	[REDACTED]	11-8-47
Bill Althaus York, PA	[REDACTED]	1-28-48
Carolyn Long Banks Atlanta, GA -- City Councilmember	[REDACTED]	10-30-40
Sidney Barthelomy New Orleans, LA	[REDACTED]	3-17-42
Steve Bartlett Dallas, TX	[REDACTED]	9-13-47
Tom Bradley (or representative) Los Angeles, CA	[REDACTED]	
Richard Daley (or rep.) Chicago, IL	[REDACTED]	4-24-42
David Dinkins New York, NY	[REDACTED]	7-10-27
Ray Flynn Boston, MA	[REDACTED]	7-22-39
Don Fraser Minneapolis, MN	[REDACTED]	2-20-24
Susan Golding San Diego, CA	[REDACTED]	8-18-45
Stephen Goldsmith Indianapolis, IN	[REDACTED]	12-12-46
Kay Granger FORT WORTH, TX	[REDACTED]	1-18-43
Lawrence R. HAWKINS Dade County, FL -- Commissioner	[REDACTED]	4-21-43
Paul Helmke Fort Wayne, IN	[REDACTED]	11-24-48

02/04/93 17:32 HUD OFFICE OF LEGISLATION * 34366220

Glenda Hood Orlando, FL	[REDACTED]	3-10-50
Karen Humphrey Fresno, CA	[REDACTED]	9-27-45
Maynard Jackson Atlanta, GA	[REDACTED]	3-23-38
Sharpe James Newark, NJ	[REDACTED]	2-20-36
Paul Johnson Phoenix, AZ	[REDACTED]	7-6-59
Jan Lavery Jones Las Vegas, NV	[REDACTED]	3-16-49
Frank Jordan San Francisco, CA	[REDACTED]	3-20-35
Sharon Pratt Kelly Washington, DC	[REDACTED]	1-30-44
Bob Lanier Houston, TX	[REDACTED]	3-10-25
Greg S. Lashucka Columbus, OH	[REDACTED]	3-28-44
John Norquist Milwaukee, WI	[REDACTED]	10-22-49
James Perron Elkhart, IN	[REDACTED]	7-29-55
Edward G. Rendell Philadelphia, PA	[REDACTED]	1-5-44
Norm Rice Seattle, WA	[REDACTED]	5-4-43
Joseph P. Riley, Jr. Charleston, SC	[REDACTED]	1-19-43
Kurt Schmoke Baltimore, MD	[REDACTED]	12-1-49
Paul Soglin Madison, WI	[REDACTED]	4-22-45
Xavier Suarez Miami, FL	[REDACTED]	3-21-49

Wellington E. Webb Denver, CO	[REDACTED]	2-17-41
Michael White Cleveland, OH	[REDACTED]	6-13-51
Nelson Wolff San Antonio, TX	[REDACTED]	10-27-40
HUD Staff		
Henry Cisneros	[REDACTED]	6-11-47
David Cohen	[REDACTED]	12-9-37
Terrence Duverney	[REDACTED]	1-29-43
Michael Janis	[REDACTED]	10-28-42
Bruce Katz	[REDACTED]	6-21-59
George Latimer	[REDACTED]	6-20-35
Jacquie Lawing	[REDACTED]	9-27-64
Jean Nolan	[REDACTED]	10-25-59
Shirz Thomas	[REDACTED]	6-24-35
Frank Wing	[REDACTED]	9-27-37
Others		
Don Borut Executive Director, National League of Cities	[REDACTED]	7-12-41
Tom Cochran Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors	[REDACTED]	9-30-41



MAYORS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410-0001

MEMORANDUM: Mack McLarty George Stephanopoulos
Mark Gearan Christine Varney
Howard Paster ~~Regina Montoya~~
Carol Rasco Marcia Hale

FROM: Bruce Katz, Chief of Staff BK

SUBJECT: Agenda for 2/5/93 White House Meeting w/ Mayors

DATE: February 2, 1993

Friday Meeting

The Secretary has asked me to coordinate with your offices the agenda for the scheduled Friday White House meeting with the Mayors of the nation's 20 largest cities and the leadership of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and National League of Cities.

This meeting will provide an opportunity for President Clinton to announce several initiatives HUD is taking to accelerate the release and expenditure of housing funds that are already appropriated and which will aid cities and the economy.

The President's announcement will demonstrate:

- the Administration's commitment to cities and urban issues;
- the role federal housing and community development programs can play in stimulating the nation's economy; and
- how the President and the Secretary are "moving the bureaucracy" of a federal agency for the benefit of individuals, particularly low-income people.

We envision the meeting falling into three basic parts: (1) President (and Vice President) addresses the Mayors on stimulus and new initiatives; (2) key White House appointments address the Mayors; and, (3) Secretary Cisneros and the Mayors discuss the ways in which Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds will be spent in the cities.

Proposed Agenda

1. (Open to Media) At 2:00 p.m. Secretary Cisneros will introduce the President. The Mayors are anxious to hear about economic stimulus; the President could deliver the same message he gave the Governors Monday. He could then announce two initiatives HUD will take under the President's direction:

- accelerating the release and expenditure of FY 1993 public housing modernization funds (\$3.1 billion) and other actions to unclog the larger (\$6 billion) pipeline;
- taking actions to help states and localities promptly implement the HOME (housing block grant) program (\$2.5 billion in unspent appropriated funds);

No more than two Mayor(s) -- most likely the one(s) representing the largest city there -- will address the President on behalf of all the Mayors. At about 2:30 the President will excuse himself.

2. (Closed to Media) Secretary Cisneros will introduce key White House staff, each of whom would address the Mayors for about five minutes. We propose the following people, if available, participate in the program due to their anticipated interaction with the cities: Leon Panetta, Bob Rubin, (Carol Rasco), Howard Paster, Alexis Herman and Regina Montoya. (Bruce Reed)

3. (Closed to Media) Following this (about 3 p.m.), Secretary Cisneros will lead a CDBG project assessment discussion. Prompted by anticipated inclusion of additional CDBG dollars in the stimulus package, this will be a frank session. The Secretary and Mayors will discuss specifically where and how additional CDBG monies would be spent in a stimulative and expeditious manner. The Secretary will make clear this money will only be made available if tangible, visible results are achievable. This session will conclude the meeting.

Press/Logistics

The most newsworthy aspect of this meeting will be the President's participation and announcements. Therefore, it would make sense to open this part to the press. The remaining discussions will be less newsworthy, and should be closed to the media. The HUD Public Affairs office is working with White House Communications on possible satellite hook-ups from the White House back to the mayor's respective cities after the meeting.

If space allows, the entire meeting could take place at the White House. We will arrange for the Mayors, Secretary and appropriate staff to arrive together. And we will provide Intergovernmental Affairs with the necessary security information on attendees.

Jacquie Lawing (708-3634) in the Secretary's office will serve as the contact person for this meeting. I look forward to discussing this with you.

Homelessness

On the advice of the White House Communications office, we have withdrawn our homelessness initiatives from this meeting to plan a more expansive, multi-agency event that will focus attention on the Administration's response to this major issue.

**WHITE HOUSE MEETING WITH MAYORS
DRAFT TALKING POINTS FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON
February 5, 1993**

Economic Stimulus

(Will be provided by the White House.)

New HUD Initiatives

There is no single federal agency or entity that is more important to the health and vitality of our cities than the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Yet, during the past decade HUD's mission has been clouded by burdensome regulations and bureaucratic slow-downs.

The result has been programmatic gridlock.

Billions of dollars -- for public housing modernization, for affordable housing programs -- are appropriated but not spent.

In the aftermath of political scandal, a culture of excessive risk avoidance has permeated the Department.

HUD, quite simply, has become an impediment to meaningful action, rather than an enabler of innovative and lasting solutions.

The true victims have been tens of thousands of low-income families whose access to decent, safe, sanitary and affordable housing has been delayed if not denied.

However, under the direction of Secretary Cisneros, HUD will be an effective partner with states and localities and will help forge solutions in our cities.

Today we announce new initiatives which highlight this commitment by expediting the release of federal funds, streamlining critical rules and identifying key legislative revisions that we will send to the Hill.

First, HUD will accelerate the release of FY 1993 public housing modernization funds -- \$3.1 billion -- by some 3-4 months. The agency will take other actions to unclog the \$6 billion stuck in the pipeline from previous fiscal years.

Expedited release of these funds will ensure swift attention to pressing housing needs, like vacant public housing, and will also generate additional jobs. The Congressional Research Service estimates, for example,

that every \$1 billion of public housing modernization funds creates 18,000 jobs.

Second, HUD has developed an action plan to help states and localities promptly implement the HOME (housing block grant) program; some \$2.5 billion in appropriated funds remain largely unspent. The Action Plan includes specific short-term and long-term items covering statutory changes, regulatory changes, program clarifications and technical assistance initiatives.

These actions are in the spirit of reinventing government, of ensuring that federal programs can effectively, efficiently and expeditiously address critical needs in our communities.



NEWS

United States Conference of Mayors

1620 Eye Street, N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20006

Portland, Oregon
June 14, 1994

STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS ON THE PRESIDENT'S WELFARE REFORM PROPOSALS

Mayors believe the basic structure of the President's welfare reform plan is sound and fair, and yesterday we adopted a policy resolution which reflects this.

The Clinton Administration has worked hard for more than a year to develop a proposal to redirect the welfare system, making it one that provides training and work and at the same time requires responsibility. We support its basic principles: to prevent teen pregnancy and promote parental responsibility, to make work pay and provide child care, to provide two years of transitional assistance followed by work, and to reinvent government assistance.

But we have concerns relating to several specific provisions -- the importance of utilizing existing employment and training systems and of assuring that the subsidized jobs created through the work program provide a positive experience and sufficient wages to the individual while at the same time addressing community needs.

We also are concerned about some of the provisions intended to promote parental responsibility, particularly those which allow states the option to deny additional benefits to families which have additional children -- the family cap.

Finally, we must oppose the entitlement cuts that would pay much of the costs of welfare reform. Cutting benefits to non-citizens and low income Americans shifts costs to state and local governments and hurts a vulnerable segment of our population. We know there are few good financing options, but there must be a better way.

We look forward to working with the Administration and the Congress to address the concerns we have raised and to craft badly needed reforms to our welfare system, reforms which will benefit both the client and the community.

CONTACT: Mike Brown, Laura DeKoven Waxman, (503) 226-4404, (202) 293-7330