

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. draft	Memo for Abner Mikva from Walter Dellinger. Subject: Line Item Veto Act. (11 pages)	12/21/1994	P5
002. draft	Memo on the Line Item Veto. (4 pages)	n.d.	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Paul Weinstein
OA/Box Number: 18471

FOLDER TITLE:

Line Item Veto [2]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1244

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

PAUL - this is fabulous!

Line-Item Veto

In Putting People First, President Bill Clinton proposed "to eliminate pork-barrel projects and cut government waste, (by asking) Congress to give the President the line item veto." During the last session of Congress, the House of Representatives passed expedited rescission authority which would have given the President three days after enactment of an appropriations bill to propose a rescission. The House Appropriations panel would have seven days to act on the measure, and the House would have to vote by the tenth day. If it passed the House, the Senate would follow the same procedures. The President endorsed this legislation last session because it was the only bill of its type that had any chance of passing. Unfortunately, the Senate never brought the bill to the floor.

Background

~~Presidents have been calling for a line-item veto since Ulysses S. Grant (it was in the Confederate constitution, but was never used).~~
~~Presidential calls for a line-item veto date to Ulysses S. Grant in the 1870s (it was in the Confederate constitution, but was never used).~~ ~~But~~ ^{enabled them to} Until 1974, Presidents had impoundment authority, which in effect was similar. They could simply order agencies not to spend money on certain activities. It was often the source of tension between the branches, but the strain reached the breaking point under President Nixon. When Nixon tried to ^{expand} money

~~After the 1972 election, Nixon used his impoundment authority to order a moratorium on subsidized housing and cuts in disaster assistance and farm programs. He also withheld \$9 billion for the 1972 Clean Water Act, which had become law after Congress overrode his veto.~~

^{replaced} Congress responded with the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Control Act, which substituted presidential impoundment authority with rescission authority. Under rescission authority, ^{the president} chief executives can propose eliminating funds for specific activities, but Congress must approve the rescissions within 45 days or they die.

~~Rescissions~~ Since 1974, lawmakers have adopted some presidential rescissions, ignored others and substituted many of their own. In 1986 and 1987, Congress rescinded just 1 percent of the money Reagan requested. A year later, Reagan didn't bother to request rescissions. However, in 1981, Congress rescinded 71 percent of his \$16.5 billion in proposed rescissions. Congress approved 80 percent of Carter's requested \$90.9 million in rescissions in 1979. In 1992, President Bush asked to rescind \$7.9 billion, Congress rescinded \$8.2 billion by trimming a broader array of programs than Bush had proposed. The Clinton Administration proposed 65 rescissions last year for a total cost savings of \$3.2 billion. Congress approved all or part of 45 of them totalling \$3.2 billion.

From 1974 through mid-December 1992, Presidents had sent Congress spending cut proposals worth \$69.2 billion; Congress enacted cuts totaling \$86.5 billion. But ~~even with all that~~, total enacted rescissions have amounted to only slightly more than 3 percent of cumulative deficits since 1974.

Types of Line Item Veto Authority

Line Item Veto Authority -- Would allow the President to veto individual items in an appropriations bill, while the rest could become law. The veto would be subject to congressional override by either a two-thirds majority or (in some versions) a simple majority.

Line Item Reduction Authority -- Would allow the President to reduce the amount of spending authority for individual items in an appropriations bill while keeping the rest of the program intact. This authority would also be subject to congressional override and has customarily been coupled with line item veto authority.

Enhanced Rescission Authority -- Would allow the President to submit items for rescission. Budget authority in such a rescission message is ~~is~~ deemed permanently cancelled unless the Congress passes a joint resolution, would be subject to a presidential veto and subsequent congressional override. *that*

Expedited Rescission Authority -- Would allow the President to propose items for rescission by sending a draft rescission bill to the Congress. The Congress would have to take an up-or-down vote within prescribed period. This authority is considered veto-proof because Congress's failure to pass the rescission bill would leave the President nothing to veto.

Budget Savings

Exactly how much could have been saved if the President had line-item veto authority has been an issue of contention. The General Accounting Office (GAO) estimated in a report in 1992 that approximately \$70 billion would have been chopped from the budget from 1984-1989 if the President had line-item veto authority. However, the Congressional Research Service -- at the behest of line-item veto opponent Robert Byrd -- argued the GAO report used the wrong methodology and estimated the savings at only \$3 billion over the six years. The true savings potential is probably somewhere in between.

State Experience

43 states have some form of the line-item veto. The data on how effective the line-item veto has been in curbing state spending is mixed. Most argue that the line item veto has been more effective as a mechanism for governors to advance their legislative priorities instead of the legislature's.

In Arkansas, then-Governor Clinton did not use his line-item veto authority extensively, at least in part because appropriations bills there come by the hundreds, each dealing with one subject. In 1991, he vetoed nine such bills.

Republican Contract Proposal

The House Republican bill would give the President line item veto authority over appropriation bills and targeted tax benefits in revenue bills. The legislation would allow the President to rescind all or part of any discretionary budget authority or veto any targeted tax benefit within any revenue bill if he determines it would:

- Help reduce the Federal budget deficit;
- Not impair any essential government function;
- Not harm the national interest;

The Presidential rescission would take effect unless Congress decided to disapprove within ~~20~~ twenty calendar days. The President would then have ten days to exercise his authority to sign or veto the rescission/receipt disapproval bill.

Advantages

- Restore^s fiscal balance between the Executive and Congress that was greatly altered after passage of the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Control Act.
- A major tool to help reduce the budget deficit and eliminate Congressional pork spending.
- Strengthen^s the President's hand in negotiating with Congress to fully fund his investment agenda. Would substitute presidential budget priorities for congressional ones.
- Unlike a Constitutional Amendment, which would have to be ratified by three-fourths of the state legislatures, the Republican bill takes effect immediately.
- Unlike a Constitutional line item veto, this combination of rescission and veto would allow the President to also go after the pork set forth in appropriation's report language, where most of it is hidden (the Lawrence Welk Museum, for example).
- This bill also allows the President to reduce spending within a line item instead of eliminating the whole line item. This type of spending restraint mechanism has proven to be more effective at the state level than traditional line-item authority.
- This legislation includes^a provision developed by Senator Bill Bradley which allows the President to veto certain targeted tax benefits.
- Unlike expedited rescission, the Congress would ~~have to overturn the President's veto instead of just voting yes or no.~~

need a two-thirds majority in both houses to block a rescission, not just a simple majority in either house

*50%?
2/3?*

? You haven't really explained difference b/w Constitutional + statutory. Do you need to?

Disadvantages

- Could prompt Congress to pack appropriations bills with even more pork -- and leave it to the President line-item it out.
- Could encourage creation of more entitlements that would be out of the reach of the veto power.
- Will be opposed by certain traditional Democrats and special interests whose programs could be targeted for elimination in a Republican administration.
- Could be instances where a President would not want to line-veto a certain program for political reasons, thus opening he/she to criticism of protecting pork.

Recommendation

Support the House Republican bill, ^{so long as it} ~~with the insistence and insist that~~
~~#~~ takes effect immediately, not in 1997 or some future presidency.
If they're for it, they should be for it right away.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	To Charles Konigsberg, Robert Damus, Charles Kieffer, et al. from Charles Konigsberg. Subject: Item Veto. (9 pages)	03/06/1996	P5
002. email	To John Hilley from Charles Konigsberg. (1 page)	03/05/1996	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Economic Council
Gene Sperling
OA/Box Number: 10089

FOLDER TITLE:

Line Item Veto

Van Zbinden

2007-0624-F

vz1246

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]

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

07-Mar-1996 10:07am

TO: John C. Angell

FROM: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr
Domestic Policy Council

CC: Gene B. Sperling
CC: Bruce N. Reed
CC: Peter Jacoby

SUBJECT: Analysis of current line item veto compromise language

Attached is OMB's detailed analysis of the current line-item veto compromise discussion draft. At some point we should put together a meeting on this to discuss our position. As you can tell, there are a considerable number of problems with the current Conference draft.

Please let me know how you want to proceed.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

06-Mar-1996 09:06pm

TO: (See Below)

FROM: Charles S. Konigsberg
Office of Mgmt and Budget, LA

SUBJECT: ITEM VETO

FOLLOWING IS A REVISED ANALYSIS OF THE LATEST ITEM VETO DRAFT; I HAVE INCORPORATED COMMENTS RECEIVED ON WEDNESDAY; LET ME KNOW ASAP IF YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS. THANKS.

Summary of comments on House Item Veto Draft
(dated March 4, 1996 -- 1:18pm)

The following provisions could render the item veto ineffective:

1. The lockbox language -- requiring automatic reductions in spending caps -- would impair the ability of the President and Congress to pay for supplemental appropriations; the automatic cap reductions would not permit the President and the Congress to eliminate wasteful spending early in the year and use the savings to pay for necessary additional spending later in the year.
2. Requiring the President to transmit cancellations of wasteful spending on the same day as enactment of spending bills is unrealistic -- especially given the extensive findings and determinations which are required to accompany all cancellations. A period of time -- 10 to 20 days -- following enactment is necessary for the authority to be exercised effectively.
3. The definition of targeted tax benefit is too narrow to be truly effective in eliminating special interest tax provisions; it also fails to delegate any authority to the President to identify special interest provisions.
4. The "nonseverability" provision needlessly makes the authority to cancel discretionary spending dependent on the constitutionality of authority to cancel direct spending and tax provisions.
5. Making the Act effective only upon enactment of a balanced budget agreement, needlessly postpones the availability of authority which is needed to eliminate wasteful spending. The authority should be made available now and should be applied to

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

unobligated balances from already enacted FY96 bills.

DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--
Preliminary comments on House Item Veto Draft
(dated March 4, 1996 -- 1:18pm):

PROVISIONS WHICH COULD RENDER ITEM VETO INEFFECTIVE:

1. Lockbox: The lockbox language, set forth in [brackets] as new section 1024, would require the President to: reduce the statutory discretionary spending caps to reflect rescissions of discretionary budget authority; and to eliminate from the PAYGO scorecard any positive balance that would otherwise have accrued from applying the item veto to new direct spending or tax benefits.

This is problematic, especially on the discretionary side, because the automatic lowering of spending caps, would make it difficult for the Congress to pay for necessary supplementals later in the year (or to pay for emergency supps which, although not required to be offset, has been the recent pattern).

Suggested improvement in the lockbox mechanism: Provide that the rescinded or canceled amounts be placed in an "emergency reserve" to be available to offset emergency supplementals and other emergency legislation. Although such "emergency legislation" does not legally require offsets, the availability of these emergency reserves might facilitate supplementals and other emergency legislation when needed.

2. Time for transmittal of cancellation message: Earlier versions of item veto had given the President 10 days following enactment of spending/revenue bills to identify items for cancellation; the Administration had recommended 20 days as a more realistic time period. This offer, however, requires that special messages be transmitted "on the same calendar day as enactment of the law to which the cancellation applies."

Especially in the case of discretionary appropriations, this is unrealistic and unworkable. Appropriations legislation often has to be signed immediately upon presentment to the President in order to continue vital government functions; this would leave no time at all to identify wasteful spending in legislative and report language, and to prepare the very detailed findings required for cancellation messages. For discretionary appropriations, the language should provide 20 days following enactment of a bill to prepare cancellation messages (however, it might be workable to transmit cancellation messages on targeted tax benefits, on or near the date of enactment, since they would already be clearly identified in the law).

If less than 20 days is provided, consideration should be given to: (1) paring down the extensive findings required to accompany cancellation messages; and/or (2) permitting most of the findings to be transmitted at a later time than the actual

DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--
cancellations. If only a few days are provided to review bills, the qualifier "to the maximum extent practicable" should precede the list of required determinations and findings.

5. Definition of Targeted Tax Benefit: The draft language would define targeted tax benefit as "any revenue-losing provision which provides a federal income tax deduction, credit, exclusion or preference to 100 or fewer beneficiaries" with several exceptions; the definition also includes transition rules that provide special treatment to 10 or fewer taxpayers, with exceptions. Congress would identify in the statutory language, provisions falling within this definition -- based upon determinations made by the JCT.

The Treasury Department notes that it will be difficult, if not impossible for anyone to determine the number of persons affected by any particular tax provision. This test requires too much precision and is too easy to avoid or manipulate in the drafting process and by taxpayers. It creates an incentive for tax benefit provisions to be drafted too broadly. In addition, it provides no time limit within which this "100 or fewer" standard must be met.

The provisions also fails to delegate any authority to the President to identify special interest provisions.

A definition of targeted tax benefit closer to the original Senate definition is preferable -- i.e., causing a revenue loss and "having the practical effect of providing more favorable tax treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited group of taxpayers when compared with other similarly situated taxpayers."

4. Nonseverability: The draft contains in [brackets] a nonseverability provision which would invalidate the entire item veto mechanism if any part of the mechanism -- cancellation of targeted tax benefits, for example -- were to be found unconstitutional. The statute should be severable, so that -- for example -- cancellation of discretionary budget authority could continue, even if cancellation of direct spending or tax benefits is successfully challenged.

3. Effective Dates and Sunset: This Act would become effective upon enactment of a balanced budget (by 2002), and would sunset in FY 2002. Authority to eliminate wasteful spending and special interest tax provisions should be provided immediately -- without delay -- and should be permanent. In addition, in order to be most effective, the cancellation authority should be made applicable to unobligated balances from already enacted FY 1996 appropriations.

DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--
ADDITIONAL ISSUES:

o Disapproval bill: is defined as a bill which disapproves every cancellation associated with a particular spending or revenue bill. Is the intention that disapproval bills must reject every cancellation?

o Identifying congressional districts: The draft would require that each cancellation message identify "the specific State and congressional district, if any, affected by the cancellation; and the total number and dollar value of all cancellations imposed during the current session of Congress on the State and congressional district...." This requirement is unduly burdensome and unnecessary: unduly burdensome for OMB which will already face the difficult task of carefully vetting each provision of spending and revenue bills immediately upon presentment; and unnecessary because the objective of the cancellation authority is to eliminate wasteful spending wherever it may occur, without regard to geographic distribution.

o Definition of "item of new direct spending": The phrase "relative to the most recent levels calculated pursuant to section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control act of 1985" incorrectly references section 251; should be 257. Also, the reference to increasing any "Federal financial obligation" has no definitive budget meaning.

o Definition of "cancel": This draft is preferable to earlier drafts because the term "cancel" is substituted for the constitutionally problematic term "veto." However, the definition of "cancel" -- particularly with respect to new direct spending and targeted tax benefits -- is too vague. We recommend the following:

The term "cancel" means--

(A) with respect to "new direct spending," withholding the authority to obligate the United States pertaining thereto, and suspension of legal entitlement to claim any benefits or payments deriving therefrom; and

(B) with respect to "targeted tax benefits," the suspension of legal entitlement to claim any Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, preference or other tax benefit deriving therefrom.

o Disapproval bills: are required to be titled "A bill disapproval the recommendations submitted by the President on". Use of the term "recommendations" is inaccurate; the special messages are more than mere recommendations. The term "cancellations" would be more appropriate.

DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--
Previous Administration comments which have been incorporated:

(for EOP use only)

- o Uses the word "cancel" with respect to direct spending and targeted tax benefits, instead of "veto" which we objected to on constitutional grounds.
 - o Inserts "new" before "direct spending" in order to clarify.
 - o JCT's determination of what is a targeted tax benefit would be written into law, thereby apparently solving the potential Chadha problem (earlier version had limited the President's authority based solely on determinations made by the JCT).
 - o Latest draft has dropped the Senate provision prohibiting the inclusion of non-emergency items in an emergency bill.
 - o Deletes the 3-judge court judicial review mechanism but retains the requirement for expedited consideration.
-

DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--
Time-line under latest House item veto language:

(for EOP use only)

(Session Days)

DAY 1: Date of enactment of spending or revenue
 bill; President to transmit special messages on the
 same calendar day (single special message for each
 Act); cancellation is effective unless disapproved,
 as outlined below

DAY 5: Disapproval bills, if any must be introduced
 in House and Senate

7 days following
introduction: Committees must report disapproval bills
 (day 12)

DAY 30: Congressional consideration of the
 disapproval bill and any conference report thereon must be
 completed (conferences may be required because it's in order in
 the House and Senate to strike specific disapprovals,
 and it's in order in the Senate to add additional
 disapprovals).

Track 1:

Spending/revenue provisions
are cancelled unless, w/in
10 calendar days (excluding
Sundays) after the expiration
of the congressional review
period (above), a disapproval
bill is enacted into law
bill

Track 2:

In the case of a veto,
5 session days are provided
for consideration of the
veto message; the spending/
revenue provisions are
cancelled unless within 10
calendar days the disapproval
has become law (due to an
override)

DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--DRAFT--
Information which must accompany cancellations:

(for EOP use only)

Message shall specify:

1. Dollar amount of BA, or identify the direct spending or tax benefit.
2. Determination whether the cancellation will reduce the budget deficit.
3. Determination that the cancellation will not impair essential Government functions.
4. Determination that the cancellation will not harm the national interest.
5. Reasons for the cancellation.
6. To the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect.
7. All facts circumstances and considerations relating to or bearing upon the cancellation.
8. To the maximum extent practicable, the estimated effect of the cancellation upon the objects, purposes and programs for which the canceled authority was provided.
9. The adjustments that will be made to the discretionary spending caps or the PAYGO scorecard and an evaluation of the effects on sequestration.
10. The specific project or governmental function cancelled.
11. The specific State and congressional district affected and the total impact of cancellations during the current session on the State and congressional district.

Distribution:

TO:	Charles S. Konigsberg
TO:	Robert G. Damus
TO:	Charles E. Kieffer
TO:	Lisa Kountoupes
TO:	Joseph Minarik
TO:	Barry B. Anderson
TO:	James J. Jukes
TO:	Jacob J. Lew
TO:	James C. Murr
TO:	Harry E. Moran
TO:	Betty I. Bradshaw
TO:	Elena Kagan
TO:	Paul J. Weinstein, Jr

Forwarded By Bruce Reed

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

05-Mar-1996 11:41am

TO: John Hilley

FROM: Charles S. Konigsberg
Office of Mgmt and Budget, LA

CC: Stacey L. Rubin
CC: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr
CC: Charles E. Kieffer
CC: Jacob J. Lew

SUBJECT: ~~Confidential~~

DETERMINED TO BE AN ADMINISTRATIVE
MARKING Per E.O. 12958 as amended, Sec. 3.3 (c)

Initials: VL Date: 10/27/2010
2007-0624-F

John--Republican staff have been instructed to bring item veto to closure, in case final language is needed as part of a debt ceiling package this month. I have a quiet commitment from Domenici's staff to have OMB do a technical vetting of the language before it's finalized. However, our ability to influence the process depends on keeping our involvement quiet; the House conferees will not want any White House involvement at all. (OMB already quietly provided Senate staff with a lengthy list of technical comments in December, some of which I understand have been incorporated). I have been keeping Barbara informed throughout this process. I'll let you know as soon as we have any new info. --Chuck

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. email	To Gene Sperling, Bruce Reed, Rahm Emanuel et al. from Paul Weinstein, Jr. Subject: Line-Item Veto. (2 pages)	12/10/1996	P5
001b. email	Duplicate of 001a. (2 pages)	12/10/1996	P5
001c. email	To Charles Konigsberg, Robert Damus, Jacob Lew, et al. from Paul Weinstein, Jr. Subject: Line-Item Veto Guidelines. (1 page)	12/02/1996	P5
001d. email	Duplicate of 001c. (1 page)	12/02/1996	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Economic Council
Gene Sperling
OA/Box Number: 24552

FOLDER TITLE:

Line Item Veto

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1250

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

E X E C U T I V E O F F I C E O F T H E P R E S I D E N T

10-Dec-1996 07:46pm

TO: (See Below)

FROM: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr
Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: Line-Item Veto

Gene: Per your request, the following give the pro and cons for having the President direct OMB to issue guidelines on the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto:

Pro:

1. Preempts Republican attempts to limit the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto.
2. Underscores President's commitment to balancing the budget.
3. Consistent with the President's efforts to take unilateral/Executive action on issues important to the American people.
4. Sends message to Congress that the Administration is serious about using the Line-Item Veto and underscores its significance as a negotiating tool in the upcoming budget process.
5. Clears up misunderstandings about the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto and clarify for the Administration what budget and targeted tax items can be subject to the Line-Item Veto.

Con:

1. Issuing specific guidelines about the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto now may limit our flexibility in using the Line-Item Veto later in the budget cycle.
2. Issuing guidelines may scare Members of Congress and Republican leadership and provoke them into passing legislation that would curtail the Line-Item Veto.
3. Issuing guidelines may underscore a message that the Line-Item Veto will allow the President to dramatically reduce the budget deficit, when in fact the new authority is very limited.

ps. Melissa, when will the meeting be rescheduled?

Distribution:

TO: Gene B. Sperling

CC: Bruce N. Reed

CC: Rahm Emanuel

CC: Martha Foley

CC: Charles E. Kieffer

CC: Charles Konigsberg

CC: Barbara Chow

CC: Mark J. Mazur

CC: Elena Kagan

CC: Robert G. Damus

CC: Jacob J. Lew

CC: Melissa G. Green

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

10-Dec-1996 07:46pm

TO: (See Below)

FROM: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr
Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: Line-Item Veto

Gene: Per your request, the following give the pro and cons for having the President direct OMB to issue guidelines on the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto:

Pro:

1. Preempts Republican attempts to limit the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto.
2. Underscores President's commitment to balancing the budget.
3. Consistent with the President's efforts to take unilateral/Executive action on issues important to the American people.
4. Sends message to Congress that the Administration is serious about using the Line-Item Veto and underscores its significance as a negotiating tool in the upcoming budget process.
5. Clears up misunderstandings about the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto and clarify for the Administration what budget and targeted tax items can be subject to the Line-Item Veto.

Con:

1. Issuing specific guidelines about the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto now may limit our flexibility in using the Line-Item Veto later in the budget cycle.
2. Issuing guidelines may scare Members of Congress and Republican leadership and provoke them into passing legislation that would curtail the Line-Item Veto.
3. Issuing guidelines may underscore a message that the Line-Item Veto will allow the President to dramatically reduce the budget deficit, when in fact the new authority is very limited.

ps. Melissa, when will the meeting be rescheduled?

Distribution:

TO: Gene B. Sperling

CC: Bruce N. Reed

CC: Rahm Emanuel

CC: Martha Foley

CC: Charles E. Kieffer

CC: Charles Konigsberg

CC: Barbara Chow

CC: Mark J. Mazur

CC: Elena Kagan

CC: Robert G. Damus

CC: Jacob J. Lew

CC: Melissa G. Green

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

02-Dec-1996 03:14pm

TO: (See Below)

FROM: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr
Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: Line-Item Veto Guidelines

As you can see from Bruce Reed's E-Mail, He is interested in exploring the possibility of the President issuing a memorandum to particular agencies (OMB, Treasury, Justice), directing them to develop guidelines on the scope of a President's authority under the line-item veto act. As you are all aware, the Congress (JCT for one), is issuing its own guidelines in part to clear up considerable misunderstandings as well as to preempt our "excessive" and potentially "incorrect" use of the line-item veto. The purpose of issuing the guidelines would be three-fold:

- 1) Preempt the Republican Congress on the scope and authority of the line-item veto;
- 2) Show the President's continued commitment to taking unilateral/Executive action on important issues;
- 3) Underscore the President's continued commitment to deficit reduction.

The memorandum would be quite simple. It would direct OMB, Treasury, and Justice in X days to develop guidelines regarding the correct procedures for use and the scope of the line-item veto authority as it relates to discretionary spending, new entitlements, and targeted tax benefits. We could also put in some language about the importance of deficit reduction, etc.

Please let me know what you think. I assume we would need to move on this quickly, since the authority goes into effect January 1, 1997.

thanks.

Distribution:

TO: Charles Konigsberg
TO: Robert G. Damus

CC: Jacob J. Lew
CC: Bruce N. Reed
CC: Martha Foley

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

02-Dec-1996 03:14pm

TO: (See Below)

FROM: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr
Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: Line-Item Veto Guidelines

As you can see from Bruce Reed's E-Mail, He is interested in exploring the possibility of the President issuing a memorandum to particular agencies (OMB, Treasury, Justice), directing them to develop guidelines on the scope of a President's authority under the line-item veto act. As you are all aware, the Congress (JCT for one), is issuing its own guidelines in part to clear up considerable misunderstandings as well as to preempt our "excessive" and potentially "incorrect" use of the line-item veto. The purpose of issuing the guidelines would be three-fold:

- 1) Preempt the Republican Congress on the scope and authority of the line-item veto;
- 2) Show the President's continued commitment to taking unilateral/Executive action on important issues;
- 3) Underscore the President's continued commitment to deficit reduction.

The memorandum would be quite simple. It would direct OMB, Treasury, and Justice in X days to develop guidelines regarding the correct procedures for use and the scope of the line-item veto authority as it relates to discretionary spending, new entitlements, and targeted tax benefits. We could also put in some language about the importance of deficit reduction, etc.

Please let me know what you think. I assume we would need to move on this quickly, since the authority goes into effect January 1, 1997.

thanks.

Distribution:

TO: Charles Konigsberg
TO: Robert G. Damus

CC: Jacob J. Lew
CC: Bruce N. Reed
CC: Martha Foley

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Paul Weinstein to Carol Rasco at 17:00. Subject: Balanced Budget Meeting. (1 page)	11/02/1993	P5

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/01/1993-12/14/1994]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1253

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 02-NOV-1993 17:00:00.00

SUBJECT: Balanced Budget Meeting

TO: Carol H. Rasco (RASCO_C) (OPD)

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Carol:

During last night's meeting, there was general agreement to oppose the balanced budget amendment. The real topic of debate was how to keep the President on the high ground on the deficit reduction issue. Gergen suggested that we need to find additional cuts beyond the President's proposed five year package. Stephanopoulos, Gene Sperling, Howard Paster, all disagreed. Saying we needed to use any additional spending cuts to pay for investments.

Gergen and Gene are redoing a memo originally drafted by Laura Tyson on behalf of the President to the Congress. The letter -- which is attached -- states the President's reasons for opposing the balanced budget amendment. While the letter mentions enhanced rescission -- which has passed the House -- and the Line-Item Veto as alternatives, I think this point needs to be highlighted. I believe we should add a line which asks the Congress to enact enhanced rescission of Line-Item Veto before the end of the year. This would allow members to vote on something that the President has stated he wants, and would give them some cover on the deficit issue. It also keeps the President on the high ground.

Paul

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Charles Konigsberg to Robert Damus, Jacob Lew, Matha Foley et al. at 15:14. Subject: Line-Item Veto Guidelines. (2 pages)	12/02/1996	P5
002. email	Charles Konigsberg to Paul Weinstein, Jr.; Bruce Reed, Martha Foley et al. at 15:47. Subject: RE: Line-Item Veto Guidelines. (1 page)	12/02/1996	P5
003. email	Paul Weinstein, Jr. to Gene Sperling, Bruce Reed, Rham Emanuel et al. Subject: Line-Item Veto. (2 pages)	12/10/1996	P5

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/21/1996-04/10/1997]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1254

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

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

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1996 15:14:13.45

SUBJECT: Line-Item Veto Guidelines

TO: Charles Konigsberg
READ:NOT READ

(KONIGSBERG_C) Autoforward to: Remote Add

TO: Robert G. Damus
READ:NOT READ

(DAMUS_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee

CC: Jacob J. Lew
READ:NOT READ

(LEW_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee

CC: Bruce N. Reed
READ: 3-DEC-1996 10:32:03.42

(REED_B) (WHO)

CC: Martha Foley
READ: 2-DEC-1996 15:16:02.87

(FOLEY_M) (WHO)

CC: Mark J. Mazur
READ: 2-DEC-1996 16:25:57.16

(MAZUR_M) (WHO)

CC: Barbara Chow
READ:NOT READ

(CHOW_B) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee

CC: Gene B. Sperling
READ: 2-DEC-1996 15:15:20.58

(SPERLING_G) Autoforward to: Melissa G. G

CC: Charles E. Kieffer
READ:NOT READ

(KIEFFER_C) Autoforward to: Remote Address

TEXT:

As you can see from Bruce Reed's E-Mail, He is interested in exploring the possibility of the President issuing a memorandum to particular agencies (OMB, Treasury, Justice), directing them to develop guidelines on the scope of a President's authority under the line-item veto act. As you are all aware, the Congress (JCT for one), is issuing its own guidelines in part to clear up considerable misunderstandings as well as to preempt our "excessive" and potentially "incorrect" use of the line-item veto. The purpose of issuing the guidelines would be three-fold:

1) Preempt the Republican Congress on the scope and authority of the line-item veto;

2) Show the President's continued commitment to taking unilateral/Executive action on important issues;

3) Underscore the President's continued commitment to deficit reduction. The memorandum would be quite simple. It would direct OMB, Treasury, and Justice in X days to develop guidelines regarding the correct procedures for use and the scope of the line-item veto authority as it relates to discretionary spending, new entitlements, and targeted tax benefits. We could also put in some language about the importance of deficit reduction, etc.

Please let me know what you think. I assume we would need to move on this quickly, since the authority goes into effect January 1, 1997.
thanks.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 2-DEC-1996 09:01:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Bruce N. Reed

ATT SUBJECT: Good Idea

ATT TO: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P)

TEXT:

Don't you think we should do some kind of WH Directive on this?

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

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:26-NOV-1996 16:02:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr

ATT SUBJECT: Line-Item Veto

ATT TO: Gene B. Sperling (SPERLING_G)

ATT CC: Martha Foley (FOLEY_M)

ATT CC: Bruce N. Reed (REED_B)

TEXT:

As you know, the President will have line-item veto authority starting this January. Different agencies and Congressional offices are developing guidelines for how they believe the mechanics of the veto operate and the extent/reach of this new authority.

In order to get everyone at the EOP on the same page, I wanted to suggest to you that you convene a meeting of the relevant people to try to put flesh out the Administration's view on how the veto will operate. I would be happy to help put together such a meeting. I believe at a minimum the following people should be involved.

White House

Yourself

Martha Foley

Myself

Barbara Chow

Elana Kagan (Counsel's Office)

Mark Mazur (Tax issues)

OMB

Chuck Kieffer

Chuck Konigsberg

Bob Damus

Jack Lew (?)

Treasury

Office of Tax Policy Representative

Michael Barr

Let me know how I can help.

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Charles Konigsberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1996 15:47:00.00

SUBJECT: Re: Line-Item Veto Guidelines

TO: WEINSTEIN_P

(WEINSTEIN_P@a1@cd) (OPD)

READ: 2-DEC-1996 17:21:21.74

CC: reed_b

(reed_b@a1@cd) (WHO)

READ: 3-DEC-1996 10:45:21.33

CC: foley_m

(foley_m@a1@cd) (WHO)

READ: 2-DEC-1996 15:47:55.72

CC: mazur_m

(mazur_m@a1@cd) (WHO)

READ: 2-DEC-1996 16:32:05.36

CC: green_mg

(green_mg@a1@cd) (OPD)

READ: 2-DEC-1996 15:51:52.87

CC: Robert G. Damus

(Robert G. Damus@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

CC: Jacob J. Lew

(Jacob J. Lew@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

CC: Barbara Chow

(Barbara Chow@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

CC: Charles E. Kieffer

(Charles E. Kieffer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 2-DEC-1996 15:41:00

We have some serious concerns about issuing guidelines on LIV. Please hold off until we have a chance to discuss.

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

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 10-DEC-1996 19:46:34.94

SUBJECT: Line-Item Veto

TO: Gene B. Sperling (SPERLING_G) Autoforward to: Melissa G. G
READ: 10-DEC-1996 23:09:27.79

CC: Bruce N. Reed (REED_B) (WHO)
READ: 11-DEC-1996 09:05:35.40

CC: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ: NOT READ

CC: Martha Foley (FOLEY_M) (WHO)
READ: 11-DEC-1996 09:31:55.23

CC: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C) Autoforward to: Remote Address
READ: NOT READ

CC: Charles Konigsberg (KONIGSBERG_C) Autoforward to: Remote Add
READ: NOT READ

CC: Barbara Chow (CHOW_B) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee
READ: NOT READ

CC: Mark J. Mazur (MAZUR_M) (WHO)
READ: 11-DEC-1996 08:53:55.65

CC: Elena Kagan (KAGAN_E) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee
READ: NOT READ

CC: Robert G. Damus (DAMUS_R) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee
READ: NOT READ

CC: Jacob J. Lew (LEW_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee
READ: NOT READ

CC: Melissa G. Green (GREEN_MG) (OPD)
READ: 10-DEC-1996 23:09:27.79

TEXT:

Gene: Per your request, the following give the pro and cons for having the President direct OMB to issue guidelines on the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto:

Pro:

1. Preempts Republican attempts to limit the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto.
2. Underscores President's commitment to balancing the budget.
3. Consistent with the President's efforts to take unilateral/Executive action on issues important to the American people.
4. Sends message to Congress that the Administration is serious about using the Line-Item Veto and underscores its significance as a negotiating tool in the upcoming budget process.
5. Clears up misunderstandings about the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto and clarify for the Administration what budget and targeted tax items can be subject to the Line-Item Veto.

Con:

1. Issuing specific guidelines about the scope and authority of the Line-Item Veto now may limit our flexibility in using the Line-Item Veto later in the budget cycle.
2. Issuing guidelines may scare Members of Congress and Republican leadership and provoke them into passing legislation that would curtail the Line-Item Veto.
3. Issuing guidelines may underscore a message that the Line-Item Veto will allow the President to dramatically reduce the budget deficit, when in fact the new authority is very limited.

ps. Melissa, when will the meeting be rescheduled?

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. email	Sarah Bianchi to Russell Horowitz at 16:36. Subject: Alaska. (2 pages)	08/09/1997	P5
------------	--	------------	----

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/11/1997-08/10/1997]

Van Zbinden

2007-0624-F

vz1255

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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]

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.

[illegible]

Alaska's Federal Medicaid Match Increase

Pros for Including in the Line Item Veto

- Is consistent with criteria necessary to justify the line item veto.
- Would avoid setting precedence for numerous other states to advocate for extremely expensive changes in their Medicaid formula.
- Illustrates to other states that changes to the Medicaid program must be made in the context of broader reforms and discourages future actions for similar legislative changes by the Congress.
- There are other financing mechanisms, like a Federal waiver or increased managed care, that can reduce state spending on Medicaid if needed, without the burden of setting a problematic FMAP change precedence.
- We will probably not undermine Alaska's ability to serve currently eligible low-income beneficiaries. Without the higher matching rate, Alaska itself projects its Medicaid spending to increase 6 percent per year. Moreover, the HCFA does not believe that the lack of these additional dollars will have such a negative impact on this population.

Cons for Including in Line Item Veto

- Alaska probably has the best case in the nation about the inequity of their Medicaid formula. Their cost of living is the highest in the nation.
- Although difficult, it is possible to make the case that Alaska is so unique among other states that modifying its FMAP should not set a precedence for other states to advocate for increasing their FMAP.
- Clearly, with the infusion of these new Federal dollars, more underserved populations will receive services than without this investment.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	David Dreyer to Gene Sperling, Paul Deegan, and Todd Stern at 8:52. Subject: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	06/11/1994	P5
002. email	David Dreyer to Fax at 10:35. Subject: Outline for an Analysis/Idea. (4 pages)	11/16/1994	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/25/1994-12/14/1994]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1257

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: David Dreyer (DREYER_D) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 11-JUN-1994 08:52:00.00

SUBJECT: Line UItem Veto

TO: Gene B. Sperling (SPERLING_G) (DEFAULT)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Paul A. Deegan (DEEGAN_P) (OPD)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Walter Dellinger is testifying before the Congress on June 15th regarding the line item veto. We should talk with him before he does this: (1) to make sure he understands the campaign position on this issue, (2) to get him to incorporate good news about the deficit and the economy in his testimony.

D2

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

CREATOR: David Dreyer (DREYER_D) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-NOV-1994 10:35:18.38

SUBJECT: Outline for an analysis/idea

TO: FAX (94820432,Mr. Ehrlich)

(TLXA1MAIL_\F:94820432\C:Mr. Ehrlich\)

READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

I. What happened

A. We got slaughtered. Event of historic proportions. Worse bloodbath since 1922 in the Harding Administration, but even he didn't lose control of both chambers. Ronald Reagan didn't wake up after losing 26 House seats and become a Mondale liberal; and, even though our losses were more profound, neither should we ask the President to become something he is not. We need to understand what happened and try to figure out why and then adjust accordingly, while still to our own selves being true.

B. Demographics

o Largest gender gap recorded between men and women in the last eight Congressional elections.

o In three previous elections, we split the white vote. In this election, whites voted 6 of 10 Republican.

o We lost 19-

☐ 29 and over 60 year olds by 49% to 51%. We lost people 30-

☐ 44, 45-

☐ 59 by 8 and 6% margins respectively, when we won them in 1992. We carried people under \$30,000, and we lost everybody earning more. In 1992, we won people earning 30-

☐ 50,000. We won people who approved of the President's performance but lost by 17% to 83% margin people who don't approve of his performance. We carried Clinton voters but lost Perot and Bush voters.

C. Economic issues were central

1. Standard of living better/66x34/21%
2. Standard of living same/50vs.50/55%
3. Standard of living worse/37-

☐ 63%/23%

4. Historically, when people are feeling bad economically,

they vote Democratic. This time they didn't.

II. Why did it happen

A. Our economic message failed: the people who turned out against don't believe we are working to make their economic future better. For too long, our message was: "You don't know how good you have it, just listen to our accomplishments." We tried to convince people -

□

-

□

57% of whom think the country is either stagnating, in recession or depression -

□

-

□

that thing were great.

B. We lost some of the President's most unique characteristics that he brought to the campaign as a candidate when we began to govern; namely, voters thought he would govern from the center and because of gays, taxes, and health care became convinced he is too liberal; voters thought he would shake things up and he became a creature of Congress, politics as usual.

C. Lost message frame

What....say	About Republicans	About Democrats
GOP	Reformers/prochange Limited government Your money back	Old Regime Big Government High taxes

III. What are we going to do?

Message frame as it exists:

What....say	About Republicans	About Democrats
Democrats	For wealthy, spec Extremists	For Middle Class Moderates

A. Restore the President as an agent of change in Washington. Political reform, governing reform, administration, regulatory and bureaucratic reform.

B. Identify and act upon concerns about the moral collapse of the country.

C. We need something to say over the next two years. Reengage in the economy, not trade. Deal with people who feel left out: How are we going to defend the middle class? How can we provide security and opportunity to people in a changing world?

D. Pick our opportunities but decide where we can drive the Republicans out of the mainstream.

E. Help our Democratic friends in Congress operate in the Minority -

☐

-

☐

As Clinton stays on a larger stage.

IV. How Can you Help? Ladder of contribution. They won't play fair. Proportionality. Whitewater.

A. Help us recapture terrain of change and reform.

1. They will abolish the NEA. What will we try and abolish? Numerically insignifiant but have

synbolic import. Don't drop real concerns. politics of change based on symbols.

a. Power of anecdote and incident

2. If you had the line item veto, where would you use it?

3. Where are the next generation of \$500 hammers?

4. How can we advance the REGO message?

B. Help us fight on productive ground; don't engage in counter-

☐

productive strategies. (How you gonna pay for it on drug message?)

C. Where can we bold, identify with the concerns of average Americans? Target concerns of working families between 20-

☐

40,000. Where can we tell people: We share your values, we feel your pain, and we are going to fight like hell to make your lives better and your future better. Not for sake of boldness -

☐

for m.c.

D. Monitor your areas and tell political staff where we can make the turn.

E. Propose items that hurt them at home when they cut them; propose cuts they appear hypocritical in opposing. Make their lives miserable; they are not going to play fair -

☐

-

☐

why should we?

No longer have to suck up to Congressional barons.

Nothing is too small.

F. Remember we are running for reelection. We have to win California, the Northeast and the Midwest, the Pacific Northwest. It ain't gonna be easy, but it ain't over either. Women and downscale voters. Working families earning \$20-

□
50,000. Tight incomes. Married with children, not 90210. People who feel trapped and think that mortification of flesh is their only way out.

G. 90% of the voters in 1994 did exactly what they did in 1992.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Douglas Letter to Susan Brophy at 15:54. Subject: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	03/16/1995	P5
002. email	Douglas Letter to Martha Foley, Charles Konigsberg, and Robert Damus at 15:55. Duplicate of 001. (1 page)	03/16/1995	P5
003. email	Joseph Minarik to Charles Konigsberg and Robert Damus at 11:35. Subject: Re: Item Veto - Tax Expenditure Definintion. (1 page)	03/20/1995	P5
004. email	Douglas Letter to Robert Damus, Charles Konigsberg, and Martha Foley at 8:55. Subject: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	03/23/1995	P5
005. email	Douglas Letter to Robert Damus, Charles Konigsberg, and Martha Foley at 13:19. Subject: RE: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	03/23/1995	P5
006. email	Robert Damus to Martha Foley at 13:28. Subject: RE: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	03/23/1995	P5
007. email	Douglas Letter to James Castello at 13:10. Subject: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	03/24/1995	P5
008. email	Douglas Letter to Martha Foley and Patrick Griffin at 11:30. Subject: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	03/24/1995	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/08/1995-03/27/1995]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1258

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

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

CREATOR: Joseph Minarik (MINARIK_J) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 20-MAR-1995 11:35:04.27

SUBJECT: RE: ITEM VETO--TAX EXPENDITURE DEFINITION

TO: Charles S. Konigsberg (KONIGSBERG_C) (OMB)

READ: 20-MAR-1995 13:04:14.35

CC: Robert G. Damus (DAMUS_R) (OMB)

READ: 20-MAR-1995 12:06:56.31

CC: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L) (OMB)

READ: 20-MAR-1995 11:37:05.63

CC: Jacob J. Lew (LEW_J) (OMB)

READ: 20-MAR-1995 11:39:36.71

CC: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C) (OMB)

READ: 20-MAR-1995 11:39:58.86

CC: Barbara C. Chow (CHOW_B) (WHO)

READ: 20-MAR-1995 11:40:50.79

TEXT:

Chuck: I'm not sure I follow. Assume, for sake of argument, that a capital gains tax cut is a "line," and that it loses revenue. Archer and Packwood think it isn't covered by the language. But the President issues a line-item veto. Aren't we in court then? I think this is a different question from whether the capital gains tax cut is, in fact, a "line." As I read the language, an enrolling clerk could roll together (so that's why they call it "enrolling!") any revenue loser with a revenue gainer of greater size, so that it no longer qualified for the item veto because it did not lose revenue. So there are ways around the law, but having the enrolling clerk (or the Committee Chairmen, for that matter) interpret "having the practical effect" and "similarly situated" are not among them.

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

CREATOR: Robert G. Damus (DAMUS_R) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 23-MAR-1995 13:28:20.70

SUBJECT: RE: Line Item Veto

TO: Martha Foley

(FOLEY_M) (OMB)

READ: 23-MAR-1995 13:29:53.98

CC: Douglas N. Letter

(LETTER_D) (WHO)

READ: 23-MAR-1995 13:28:39.79

CC: Charles S. Konigsberg

(KONIGSBERG_C) (OMB)

READ: 23-MAR-1995 14:49:38.98

TEXT:

Ditto here re en bloc ok w/out provision in the bill.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Paul Weinstein, Jr. to Anna Winderbaum at 14:55. Subject: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	06/21/1995	P5
002. email	Christa Robinson to Gene Sperling at 17:19. Subject: Rivlin Press Avail. (1 page)	07/17/1995	P5
003. email	Paul Weinstein, Jr. to Lawrence Haas and Rham Emanuel at 19:07. Subject: Line Item Veto Event. (3 pages)	07/19/1995	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[06/09/1995-07/26/1995]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1262

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

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

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 21-JUN-1995 14:55:05.50

SUBJECT: Line Item Veto

TO: WEINSTEIN_P (OPD)

READ: NOT READ

IND_TO: Anna Winderbaum

(WINDERBAUM_A) (WHO)

READ: 21-JUN-1995 17:07:31.09

TEXT:

Earlier this week, Bruce chaired a meeting of OMB, DPC, Counsel, NEC, and the CoS' office on the Line Item Veto. This legislation, which the President supports, has passed both the House and the Senate, but is now stalled on the hill (they haven't even announced the conferees yet).

This is a good wedge issue for us, if the Republicans don't pass the bill (which it looks like increasingly they won't, at least this year), they look like hypocrites because it was a "Contract" promise and something Dole and Gingrich promised to do this year. We want to keep the Republicans feet to the fire on this, and since the Line Item Veto is something most Governors have (and I believe support the President getting) we wanted to know if we could get a letter from a bipartisan group of Governors calling on the Speaker and Dole to move this bill this year. (If it is only democrats that will do as well).

Can you arrange such a letter, Bruce and I would be happy to sit down and draft something.

Thanks.

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

CREATOR: Christa T. Robinson (ROBINSON_C) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 17-JUL-1995 17:19:42.92

SUBJECT: Rivlin Press avail

TO: Gene B. Sperling

(SPERLING_G) Autoforward to: Elena R. Mcc

READ: 17-JUL-1995 18:17:13.84

TEXT:

Rahm thinks Rivlin should do some event (ie. press club speech) before the end of this week blasting the Republicans for abandoning their responsibility for the line item veto. She should call the Republicans on being scam artists. (You should talk to Rahm for a clearer explanation of what he wants her to talk about.) Thanks.

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

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 19-JUL-1995 19:07:55.90

SUBJECT: Line Item Veto Event

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L) (OMB)
READ: 20-JUL-1995 18:30:59.27

TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
READ: NOT READ

TEXT:

This is a draft line-item veto proposal from Bruce and Gene. is going to Erskine in draft form.

Let me know if you have any ideas.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 19-JUL-1995 19:06:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE: p

ATT CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

Date: 7/19/95

____ ACCEPT

____ REGRET

____ PENDING

TO: Billy Webster
Assistant to the President and Director of
Scheduling and Advance
FROM: Bruce Reed, Deputy Assistant to the President
for Domestic Policy
Gene Sperling, Deputy Assistant to
the President
for Economic Policy

REQUEST: Short statement criticizing Congressional
leadership for inaction on legislation to give the
President the Line

☐

-Item Veto.

PURPOSE: To clearly define the President as the leading
advocate for Line

☐

-Item Veto and to put the
Republicans on the defensive for not fulfilling
one of the major promises of the "Contract With
America." It will also complement efforts to
define the President as serious about balancing
budget (the President will be giving a balanced
budget speech the following Monday).

BACKGROUND: The President has advocated the line

☐

-item veto
since he was Governor

of

Arkansas, where he had line

□

-item veto authority and balanced 12 budgets in a row. Passing the line

□

-item veto in order to change business as usual in Washington was a key promise of Putting People First. Since he entered office, the President has called on Congress to form of the Line

enact some

□

-Item Veto. When the Republicans took control of Congress, he urged them to pass the strongest line

□

-item veto

possible, to

him to veto special interest tax incentives, and to

make it effective

immediately.

The House of Representatives acted early in passing a strong version of line

the

□

-item veto on March February 6. The Senate followed with pas

sage of a weaker and more complex version of the veto on March 23. Yet, despite passage of this legislation in both houses, there has no meeting of conferees and the Speaker last week declared the bill dead for this year.

PREVIOUS

PARTICIPATION: The President has made several statements on Line-Item Veto since entering office.

DATE AND TIME: July 21, 1995

BRIEFING TIME: Five Minutes

DURATION: Twenty Minutes

LOCATION: White House or the East Front of the Capitol, where the Republicans signed the

"Contract With America."

PARTICIPANTS: OMB Director Rivlin (?)

OUTLINE OF

EVENTS: The President would speak for ten to fifteen minutes. He will challenge the Congress to pass the line

□

-item veto now if they are serious about balancing the budget. He will emphasize that passage of this legislation is about closing the door on business as usual in Washington. If Congress is serious about changing the way Washington works and getting a handle on wasteful spending, they will put politics aside, stand up to the special interests, and pass this

bill. No matter what party, the President needs the line item veto to bring discipline to the budget process.

REMARKS: Yes

MEDIA: Yes, But questions for the President would not be permitted.

FIRST LADY'S No

ATTENDANCE:

VICE PRESIDENT'S No

ATTENDANCE:

SECOND LADY'S No

ATTENDANCE:

RECOMMENDED

BY:

CONTACT: Paul Weinstein, 6

☐

-5577.

ORIGIN

OF PROPOSAL: DPC, NEC, OMB

ALTERNATIVE: The President would meet with key supporters of the line

☐

-item veto

like Senator McCain and Senator Bradley at the White House.

Afterwards they would make a statement about the need to move immediately to send the bill to the President's desk.

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Charles Konigsberg to James Castello at 16:03. Subject: Doug Letter's Comments Follow. (1 page)	09/11/1995	P5
002. email	Charles Konigsberg to James Castello at 16:03. Subject: Revised Line Item Veto Letter Follows. (2 pages)	09/11/1995	P5
003. email	Martha Foley to Gordon Adams at 14:06. Subject: Re: Mil Con. (1 page)	09/21/1995	P5
004. email	Paul Weinstein, Jr. to Lawrence Haas at 10:41. Subject: Line Item Veto Lines. (1 page)	09/28/1995	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/07/1995-12/20/1995]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1263

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

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

CREATOR: Martha Foley (FOLEY_M) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 21-SEP-1995 14:06:46.15

SUBJECT: RE: Mil Con

TO: Gordon Adams (ADAMS_G) (OMB)
READ: 21-SEP-1995 16:20:36.63

CC: Jacob J. Lew (LEW_J) (OMB)
READ: 21-SEP-1995 14:09:49.44

CC: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C) (OMB)
READ: 21-SEP-1995 14:13:28.47

CC: Barbara C. Chow (CHOW_B) (WHO)
READ: 21-SEP-1995 20:11:15.21

TEXT:

I'm not sure it was startling.

But anyway, there is a split as to whether to sign it quietly or make a fuss over line-item veto or let it become law without signature.

I don't think we intend to signal a position on signature in the near future, in any case, although it ain't too hard to read the tea leaves.

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

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 28-SEP-1995 10:41:45.92

SUBJECT: Line Item Veto Lines

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS

(HAAS_L) (OMB)

READ: 28-SEP-1995 18:11:26.87

CC: Barry J. Toiv

(TOIV_B) (WHO)

READ: 28-SEP-1995 10:56:05.34

TEXT:

Here at two lines Bruce and I were putting together for the letter:

"It is the height of cynicism to refuse the President this essential tool to cut the budget and deny teh American people something which the Republican majority and the President promised to enact."

"The American people sent us here to change the way Washington does business. Passing the line-item veto would be a good place for this Congress to start."

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. email	Martha Foley to Lawrence Haas at 9:00. Subject: Re: WSJ and Wash. Times. (1 page)	03/21/1996	P5
------------	---	------------	----

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/14/1996-03/27/1996]

Van Zbinden

2007-0624-F

vz1264

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

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

CREATOR: Martha Foley (FOLEY_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 21-MAR-1996 09:00:04.31

SUBJECT: RE: WSJ and Wash Times

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L) (OMB)
READ: 21-MAR-1996 10:25:26.68

CC: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C) (OMB)
READ: 21-MAR-1996 10:58:47.14

CC: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ: 21-MAR-1996 09:04:30.49

CC: Jacob J. Lew (LEW_J) (OMB)
READ: 21-MAR-1996 09:26:46.85

TEXT:

Process aside (and I have some thoughts on that), in my personal view, the last g..... thing we need to be dealing with in the current appropriations process, going into an election where we are running against the Senate majority leader, is a brand-new line item veto that will be gamed by the Republicans, watched (by them and the press) like a hawk and used against the President no matter what he does with it.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Paul Weinstein, Jr. to Lawrence Haas and Rahm Emanuel at 19:07. Subject: Line Item Veto Event. (3 pages)	07/19/1995	P5

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[06/27/1995-07/26/1995]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1265

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

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

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUL-1995 19:07:55.90

SUBJECT: Line Item Veto Event

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L) (OMB)
READ:20-JUL-1995 18:30:59.27

TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

This is a draft line-item veto proposal from Bruce and Gene. is going to
Erskine in draft form.

Let me know if you have any ideas.

----- ATTACHMENT 1 -----

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:19-JUL-1995 19:06:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

Date: 7/19/95

____ ACCEPT

____ REGRET

____ PENDING

TO: Billy Webster
Assistant to the President and Director of
Scheduling and Advance
FROM: Bruce Reed, Deputy Assistant to the President
for Domestic Policy
Gene Sperling, Deputy Assistant to
the President
for Economic Policy

REQUEST: Short statement criticizing Congressional
leadership for inaction on legislation to give the
President the Line

☐

-Item Veto.

PURPOSE: To clearly define the President as the leading
advocate for Line

☐

-Item Veto and to put the
Republicans on the defensive for not fulfilling
one of the major promises of the "Contract With
America." It will also complement efforts to
define the President as serious about balancing
budget (the President will be giving a balanced
budget speech the following Monday).

BACKGROUND: The President has advocated the line

☐

-item veto
since he was Governor

of

Arkansas, where he had line

□

-item veto authority and balanced 12 budgets in a row. Passing the line

□

-item veto in order to change business as usual in Washington was a key promise of Putting People First. Since he entered office, the President has called on Congress to enact some form of the Line

□

-Item Veto. When the Republicans took control of Congress, he urged them to pass the strongest line

□

-item veto

him to veto special interest tax incentives, and to immediately.

enact some

possible, to

make it effective

The House of Representatives acted early in passing a strong version of line

the

□

-item veto on March February 6. The Senate followed with pas

sage of a weaker and more complex version of the veto on March 23. Yet, despite passage of this legislation in both houses, there has no meeting of conferees and the Speaker last week declared the bill dead for this year.

PREVIOUS

PARTICIPATION: The President has made several statements on Line-Item Veto since entering office.

DATE AND TIME: July 21, 1995

BRIEFING TIME: Five Minutes

DURATION: Twenty Minutes

LOCATION: White House or the East Front of the Capitol, where the Republicans signed the

"Contract With America."

PARTICIPANTS: OMB Director Rivlin (?)

OUTLINE OF

EVENTS: The President would speak for ten to fifteen minutes. He will challenge the Congress to pass the line

□

-item veto now if they are serious about balancing the budget. He will emphasize that passage of this legislation is about closing the door on business as usual in Washington. If Congress is serious about changing the way Washington works and getting a handle on wasteful spending, they will put politics aside, stand up to the special interests, and pass this

bill. No matter what party, the President needs the line item veto to bring discipline to the budget process.

REMARKS:

Yes

MEDIA:

Yes, But questions for the President would not be permitted.

FIRST LADY'S No

ATTENDANCE:

VICE PRESIDENT'S

No

ATTENDANCE:

SECOND LADY'S No

ATTENDANCE:

RECOMMENDED

BY:

CONTACT:

Paul Weinstein, 6

☐

-5577.

ORIGIN

OF PROPOSAL: DPC, NEC, OMB

ALTERNATIVE: The President would meet with key supporters of the line

☐

-item veto

like Senator McCain and Senator Bradley at the White House.

Afterwards they would make a statement about the need to move immediately to send the bill to the President's desk.

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Lawrence Haas to Barry Toiv at 20:37. Subject: Line-Item Veto. (1 page)	07/16/1997	P5
002. email	Alphonse Maldon to John Hilley at 15:53. Subject: POTUS Comments Regarding MILCON Appropriations... (1 page)	07/16/1997	P5
003. email	William Marshall to Lisa Hertzner and Charles Ruff at 14:48. Subject: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	08/01/1997	P5
004. email	Robert Weiner to William Marshall at 15:17. Subject: Re: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	08/01/1997	P5
005. email	William Marshall to Robert Weiner at 15:50. Subject: Re: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	08/01/1997	P5
006. email	Robert Weiner to William Marshall at 16:04. Subject: Re: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	08/01/1997	P5
007. email	William Marshall to Charles Ruff at 11:16. Subject: Line Item. (1 page)	08/07/1997	P5
008. email	Barry Toiv to Michael McCurry at 14:46. Subject: LIV (1 page)	08/08/1997	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[06/19/1997-08/08/1997]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1266

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lawrence J. Haas (CN=Lawrence J. Haas/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUL-1997 13:20:37.00

SUBJECT: Line-item veto

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Frank feels strongly that we should low-key this -- the more we talk about it, they more they'll look for ways to hide things so that we can't use the veto.

Anyway, if asked, Mike should say something like:

* We haven't seen any actual legislation reach the President's desk that has tax provisions in it.

* When the time comes, we will obviously look at it, along with the spending provisions.

* We're basically where we've always been -- the President thinks this can be an effective tool to root out waste when the time comes.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alphonse J. Maldon (CN=Alphonse J. Maldon/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUL-1997 15:53:01.00

SUBJECT: POTUS comments regarding MILCON Appropriations in Weekly Legislative Report

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The POTUS indicated in your Weekly Legislative Report, dated July 11 that we should look at Military Construction Appropriations as a possible line item veto.

HR 2016, Military Construction Appropriations legislation which passed the House would provide \$9.2 billion in funding, \$800 million more than the Administration requested.

FYI, OMB has requested DOD to conduct a scrub of all milcon programs to assess the economic impact to the quality of life, family housing, military readiness, environment, etc. that could possibly be affected should the POTUS decide to exercise his authority of the line item veto.

Line item veto sets up a politic that should be carefully considered when it concerns the welfare of troops. As you know, DOD will quietly work the Hill to maintain support for this funding. Congressional critics (Stevens, McCain, Thurmond, Warner, Spence Murtha, Skelton, Weldon, etc.) will also condemn the POTUS for not supporting troops who are defending our democracy. Bosnia will be the focus of attention unless DOD is totally abroad.

While I agree that the opportunity seems appropriate for veto action, I recommend that you talk to Frank Raines and perhaps a later call should be made to Secy Cohen before the Potus makes a final decision.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-AUG-1997 14:46:07.00

SUBJECT: liv

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

TEXT:

I'm leaving you with bunch of materials on line-item veto, some you had some you didn't. One is something we're not supposed to have. I am available to explain some of the tax and spending provisions to you. I understand some of them but I don't have good explanations in writing.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. email	Fred DuVal to Emily Bromberg at 16:58. Subject: Gov. Calls. (1 page)	09/17/1997	P5
------------	--	------------	----

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/09/1997-10/02/1997]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1267

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]

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Fred DuVal (CN=Fred DuVal/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 17-SEP-1997 16:58:52.00

SUBJECT: Gov. Calls

TO: Emily Bromberg (CN=Emily Bromberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

didn't you urge that we not put this in writing?

----- Forwarded by Fred DuVal/WHO/EOP on 09/17/97 04:53 PM

Mickey Ibarra

09/17/97 11:03:30 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Fred DuVal/WHO/EOP, Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP

cc: Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP, Emily Bromberg/WHO/EOP

Subject: Gov. Calls

I have reviewed the Call Sheets for the Sept. 26 calls. On Alaska, please add language to Medicaid section that indicates that the Governor spoke directly to the President to appeal for exclusion of this issue from the line item veto actions we were considering and that the President decided to support the Gov's. view.

We may need to elevate the issue of education depending on where we are on the standards and testing Congressional conference battle. Please monitor this issue and let's confer next week on this item next week.

I appreciate getting these Call Sheets to review so early. Thanks.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Mickey Ibarra to Lynn Cutler, Jacob Lew, and Fred DuVal at 21:55. Subject: Utah Veto. (1 page)	10/06/1997	P5
002. email	Todd Stern to Sean Maloney and Phillip Caplan at 11:12. Subject: Re: Motorcade for Climate Change. (2 pages)	10/07/1997	P5
003. email	Stephen Silverman to Sylvia Mathews at 18:51. Subject: Olympic Village Issue. (1 page)	10/07/1997	P5
004. email	Sylvia Mathews to Stephen Silverman at 17:09. Subject: Re: Olympic Village Issue. (1 page)	10/08/1997	P5
005. email	Lawrence Haas to Emily Bromberg and Fred DuVal at 19:57. Subject: Line-Item Veto Rollouts. (2 pages)	10/08/1997	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/06/1997-10/09/1997]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1268

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mickey Ibarra (CN=Mickey Ibarra/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 21:55:29.00

SUBJECT: Utah Veto

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Fred DuVal (CN=Fred DuVal/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

Nelson Reyneri (CN=Nelson Reyneri/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Based on the conversation we had with Erskine and the President's statement today on the Line-Item veto I think our best response to Utah is the following:

The Utah veto was made because the project was not requested by the military, does not make a contribution to the national defense in the coming year, and will not benefit the quality of life and well-being of our men and women in the military.

This veto was not an attempt to reduce our support for the Olympics in the year 2002. The Clinton Administration stands ready to work with the appropriate Utah officials, Congress, and the military to address this project in the future. Many of the projects vetoed today have merit, and should be considered again.

What say you on this? Any suggestions? I spoke to Mayor Corradini tonight and have a call in to the Governor now.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Todd Stern (CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 11:12:52.00

SUBJECT: Re: Motorcade for Climate Change

TO: Sean P. Maloney (CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

This is Jen's reply to my earlier question about why we were going to step on climate change conference with a line-item veto event. President, for the record, expressed his displeasure on the same subject during our briefing with him. He knew this would step on the climate change conference and, as things turned out, it did.

You'll see Jen's reply, in which she says that no one (meaning us) had alerted scheduling that we were running up against last day for action on the milcon bill, which forced action Monday. It may also be the case, as Jen suggests, that OMB wouldn't have been ready before Monday at any rate. However, something is wrong in our system if scheduling and other senior people are unaware of when bills are coming up for signing. We should be circulating most OMB enrolled bill memos to a handful of appropriate people -- even minor ones so people can weigh in as to whether we should have a real event or even just a brief photo op with some Member whose pet project is involved. On major bills, including any appropriations bill, we need also to be keeping people very up to speed orally, like in the 7:45 am morning meeting. And we should not allow ourselves to get boxed in by tardiness on OMB's part. While I'm on subject of bills, let me also reiterate that we should never wait until 9th or 10th day for action on bills unless there's some good reason.

----- Forwarded by Todd Stern/WHO/EOP on 10/07/97 10:49 AM -----

Jennifer M. Palmieri

10/06/97 01:39:25 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Todd Stern/WHO/EOP

cc:

bcc:

Subject: Re: Motorcade for Climate Change

As you know, I am a firm believer in the one message event a day rule -- but today is the last day for action on MilCon. No one thought to warn us of this fact, unfortunately, so I did not know until Friday that the MilCon event would have to be on Monday. To be fair, an early warning probably would not have helped because OMB would not have been ready before Monday and we obviously could not have moved the climate change conference to a different day.

So we step on ourselves once again!

Todd Stern

10/05/97 11:25:33 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Motorcade for Climate Change

I need Nicholas Lapham to go in motorcade if possible so he can stay here with me as late as possible.

Also -- do you know how this line item veto event got selected for our Climate Change day? What happened to the one-message event at a time theory? tds

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 18:51:20.00

SUBJECT: Olympic Village Issue

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I'm not sure what the process was, but we (I) could have used a bit of a heads up on the Olympic Village inclusion in the line-item veto yesterday. I got a call at 12:20 pm yesterday from Mike Huerta and Judy Gold from DOT who were in with Mayor Cordini. Jack Lew was good enough to take my call and also speak with the Mayor and Mickey to explain it. Nonetheless, this could have been handled better overall. We now have to figure out what to do going forward. I will talk to Gordon Adams to see what his thoughts are. The press was only moderately critical in Salt Lake, I think in good part to Cindy Gillespie and, I guess, Mickey mollifying folks.

As a reminder, I will be convening a working group of agency officials dealing with Olympic matters, Thursday at 11am in 180 OEOB. I hope to include Larry Haas in this and other meetings on the Olympics.

Thanks. I hope all is well. Steve

P.S. Later this week (or early next) you will receive a six month review of the Administration's follow-up to the Philadelphia Service Summit and a look ahead at the next six months. Bibb, Diana and I are preparing this. After reviewing with Bruce and Goody, we will forward through you to the President (unless you think otherwise). Thought is being given to how to release (maybe as a report) the review aspects of this in advance of or on the Summit six-month anniversary later this month..

P.P.S. As you might know, Bibb, Diana and I had a very productive meeting with Kevin and Andrew on service opportunity issues. They're doing some terrific things.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-OCT-1997 17:09:34.00

SUBJECT: Re: Olympic Village Issue

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

TEXT:

sorry about SL. I was not in on this one, but will watch in the future.

Stephen B. Silverman
10/07/97 06:51:14 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Sylvia M. Mathews/WHO/EOP
cc: Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP
Subject: Olympic Village Issue

I'm not sure what the process was, but we (I) could have used a bit of a heads up on the Olympic Village inclusion in the line-item veto yesterday. I got a call at 12:20 pm yesterday from Mike Huerta and Judy Gold from DOT who were in with Mayor Cordini. Jack Lew was good enough to take my call and also speak with the Mayor and Mickey to explain it. Nonetheless, this could have been handled better overall. We now have to figure out what to do going forward. I will talk to Gordon Adams to see what his thoughts are. The press was only moderately critical in Salt Lake, I think in good part to Cindy Gillespie and, I guess, Mickey mollifying folks.

As a reminder, I will be convening a working group of agency officials dealing with Olympic matters, Thursday at 11am in 180 OEOB. I hope to include Larry Haas in this and other meetings on the Olympics.

Thanks. I hope all is well. Steve

P.S. Later this week (or early next) you will receive a six month review of the Administration's follow-up to the Philadelphia Service Summit and a look ahead at the next six months. Bibb, Diana and I are preparing this. After reviewing with Bruce and Goody, we will forward through you to the President (unless you think otherwise). Thought is being given to how to release (maybe as a report) the review aspects of this in advance of or on the Summit six-month anniversary later this month..

P.P.S. As you might know, Bibb, Diana and I had a very productive meeting with Kevin and Andrew on service opportunity issues. They're doing some terrific things.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lawrence J. Haas (CN=Lawrence J. Haas/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-OCT-1997 19:57:36.00

SUBJECT: Line-item veto rollouts

TO: Emily Bromberg (CN=Emily Bromberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Fred DuVal (CN=Fred DuVal/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI. Let me know if you don't hear from me in a timely basis about follow-up. I hope this helps. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Lawrence J. Haas/OMB/EOP on 10/08/97
07:57 PM -----

Lawrence J. Haas

10/08/97 07:56:28 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Franklin D. Raines/OMB/EOP@EOP, Jacob J. Lew/OMB/EOP@EOP

cc: Jill M. Blickstein/OMB/EOP@EOP, Janet Himler/OMB/EOP@EOP

Subject: Line-item veto rollouts

As you know, various White House offices are very unhappy about the process that led to the President's line-item vetos on the military construction bill, and the subsequent notification and roll-out strategies.

In that regard, Fred Duval and Emily Bromberg asked me earlier today to chat with them about how the process works (or doesn't) and how we might make it better. I explained that OMB staff provides a universe of possibilities to the two of you, that you bring the material to Erskine's office for a discussion (or discussions) among the very small senior economic team, that the team makes recommendations to the President (orally or in writing) and that the President makes his decisions. I made it clear that while frustration among those not in Erskine's small group is understandable, we are in no position to make it larger. Erskine made the call, and he's the only make to change it.

Anyway, Fred and Emily clearly understand the basic reality of a tightly-held process. They were searching for a reasonable way to make their lives easier for themselves and their (state) constituencies.

We discussed two possibilities.

First, as Jack mentioned at today's OMB staff meeting, I discussed the possibility of a same-day, OMB-led briefing among White House offices before the President makes his announcement. Presumably, one of you could walk the senior White House folks through the coming Presidential announcement and the rationale behind it, equipping them with what they need to explain and defend the decisions to their constituencies. Also at the same meeting, presumably, we could finalize plans for the timing of heads-up calls to lawmakers, governors, etc.

Second, in response to their inquiries about how constituencies can make their cases for various items before the President makes his decision, I noted that Frank generally sees no downside -- and, in fact, sees plenty of upside -- to listening to the concerns of those who might be affected by our decisions down the road. I made it clear that we certainly would be in no position to make commitments about what decision would or would not ensue, and they were not looking for any.

I think Fred and Emily came away from our informal chat with a much better feeling about the process and how we might ease their plight. I firmly believe that others would feel the same if we took the steps I discussed with them (or others of a similar nature).

Where does that leave us?

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	David Dreyer to Gene Sperling, Paul Deegan, and Todd Stern at 8:52. Subject: Line Item Veto. (1 page)	06/11/1994	P5
002. email	Paul Dimond to William Galston, Gene Sperling, and Isabel Sawhill at 18:12. Subject: National Workforce Development Board. (2 pages)	08/06/1994	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
Default ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 1100000

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/04/1993-03/06/1995]

Van Zbinden
2007-0624-F
vz1271

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: David Dreyer (DREYER_D) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 11-JUN-1994 08:52:00.00

SUBJECT: Line UItem Veto

TO: Gene B. Sperling (SPERLING_G) (DEFAULT)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Paul A. Deegan (DEEGAN_P) (OPD)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Walter Dellinger is testifying before the Congress on June 15th regarding the line item veto. We should talk with him before he does this: (1) to make sure he understands the campaign position on this issue, (2) to get him to incorporate good news about the deficit and the economy in his testimony.

D2

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

CREATOR: Paul R. Dimond (DIMOND_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-AUG-1994 18:12:46.94

SUBJECT: national workforce development board

TO: William A. Galston (GALSTON_W) (OPD)

READ: 8-AUG-1994 18:49:46.64

TO: Gene B. Sperling (SPERLING_G) (PDONE)

READ: 8-AUG-1994 08:27:49.88

TO: Isabel Sawhill (SAWHILL_I) (OMB)

READ: 8-AUG-1994 08:49:54.71

CC: Bruce N. Reed (REED_B) (OPD)

READ: 8-AUG-1994 09:10:26.68

TEXT:

A Team,

The Kenedy-Kassebaum draft proposes an independent Workforce development Board with substantial authority (including grantmaking to leading edge states, as in School-to-Work, to lead the charge in transforming adult ETR and labor market systems. Included on the board are Secretaries of DOL, DoEd, HHS, Commerce (plus 8 reps of business, 4 from organized labor, 4 from education and training institutions appointed by House Speaker, Minority Leader, Senate Majority and Senate Minority Leaders). The powers and manner of appointment, obviously raise serious executive vs. congressional power issues, but why not use this as an opportunity to consider something much bolder!

The basic motivation behind the Workforce Development Board is that no agency now has authority (or all have overlapping/conflicting authority) to really consider let alone catalyze truly transforming reform. Why don't we consider proposing a total transformation of the federal bureaucracy in the State of the Union (and, another 125,000/250,000 reduction in the federal civilian/military workforce; a VERY LARGE x amount of discretionary/mandatory cuts with a BIG y going to deficit reduction and a BIG z to high-priority POTUS investments in people, technology research and infrastructure; line item veto; two-year budgets; abolish another bunch of commissions and councils; and include any other transforming New Democrat/Reinvent federal government initiatives that fit). The new Agency structure:

Department of Investment and Growth (DoEd, DoL, HHS that is programmatic, DoC, DoAg, DoT, HUD, EPA, Interior, DoEn that is non-military)

Department of Revenues and Entitlements (Treasury, HHS-Social Security-DoAg-other agencies that is check-writing)

Department of External Affairs (State Department, NASA, DoD, DoEn that is defense-related)

Department of Justice

Just something minor for you to chew on!

I don't see any downside. We say that the the Secretaries in working with the POTUS/VPOTUS on their performance agreements all agreed that such a major transformation is both a transforming opportunity and very doable. On a unified basis the entire Administration goes to the people and we challenge Republicans/Democrats in the next Congress to put this in place so that whoever wins in 1996 will have a federal government that really can work -- for whatever policy ends -- to help the US compete and win well into the 21st century. If the Republicans oppose, we can go after them in 1996. If the old Democrats oppose, they don't have any place else to go in 1996. At worst it gives us an ability to run with the people against an obstructing Congress. And it gives us

another cornerstone in our platform to make a claim on a new democratic-middle class majority: reorganizing/streamlining our federal government enables us to invest more -- and much more effectively (with less bureaucracy and taxpayer cost) -- in ordinary Americans, with the expectation that our people will take personal responsibility for the extraordinary achievements that will help all Americans make the historic crossing to competing and winning in the expanding, increasingly free market, global economy that the USA will lead into the 21st century. And if it passes, it will give all of you much to do -- but with major new authority and investment dollars to really do something about major POTUS priorities.

Dimond aka Paul

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Christa Robinson to Gene Sperling at 17:19. Subject: Rivlin Press Avail. (1 page)	07/17/1995	P5
002. email	Paul Weinstein, Jr. to Robert Gordon at 17:13. Subject: RE: Line Item Veto, A Major... (1 page)	07/20/1995	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
Default ([Line Item Veto])
OA/Box Number: 1100000

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/06/1995-08/07/1995]

Van Zbinden

2007-0624-F

vz1272

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

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

CREATOR: Christa T. Robinson (ROBINSON_C) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUL-1995 17:19:42.92

SUBJECT: Rivlin Press avail

TO: Gene B. Sperling

(SPERLING_G) Autoforward to: Elena R. Mcc

READ:17-JUL-1995 18:17:13.84

TEXT:

Rahm thinks Rivlin should do some event (ie. press club speech) before the end of this week blasting the Republicans for abandoning their responsibility for the line item veto. She should call the Republicans on being scam artists. (You should talk to Rahm for a clearer explanation of what he wants her to talk about.) Thanks.

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

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein, Jr (WEINSTEIN_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 20-JUL-1995 17:13:28.76

SUBJECT: RE: LINE-ITEM VETO, A MAJOR GOP PRIORITY, STALLS IN CONGRESS

TO: Robert Gordon

(GORDON_R) (OPD)

READ: 20-JUL-1995 17:13:48.03

CC: Gene B. Sperling

(SPERLING_G) Autoforward to: Elena R. Mcc

READ: 20-JUL-1995 17:42:26.01

TEXT:

We should definitely try to do a meeting with McCain. From all reports, he is pissed off.