

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. schedule	FLOTUS, Friday, October 10, 1997 (partial) (7 pages)	10/10/1997	P6/b(6), b(7)(E)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Domestic Policy Council (Nicole Rabner)
OA/Box Number: 15408

FOLDER TITLE:

Hillary Rodham Clinton-Participation in [VII Conference of Wives of State
and Government of the Americas] Panama [October 8-9, 1997][3]

2012-1035-S

kc1037

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. schedule	FLOTUS, Friday, October 10, 1997 (partial) (7 pages)	10/10/1997	P6/b(6), b(7)(E)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Domestic Policy Council (Nicole Rabner)
OA/Box Number: 15408

FOLDER TITLE:

Hillary Rodham Clinton-Participation in [VII Conference of Wives of Heads of State
and Government of the Americas] Panama [October 8-9, 1997][3]

2012-1035-S
kc1037

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]

[001]

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997

FINAL-REVISED*

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA/ WASHINGTON, D.C.

PANAMA CITY

LEAD ADVANCE: RICK JASCULCA
INTERCONTINENTAL HOTEL ROOM #1905
011-507-214-1000 PHONE
011-507-214-1512 FAX
P6/(b)(6)

SITE ADVANCE: A.J. MOREWITZ ROOM #1705
P6/(b)(6)

SITE ADVANCE: BRIDGER MCGRAW ROOM #170
P6/(b)(6)

SITE ADVANCE: AIMEE JASCULCA ROOM #809

PRESS LEAD: SAM MYERS, JR. ROOM #1906
P6/(b)(6)

PRESS ADVANCE: MARISA LUZZATTO ROOM #1903

RON ADVANCE: STEPHANIE BAKER ROOM #1710

TRAVELING PARTY: MARSHA BERRY ROOM #2407
KELLY CRAIGHEAD ROOM #2502
SARAH FARNSWORTH ROOM #2205
JULIE MASON ROOM #2008
NICOLE RABNER ROOM #2405
JUNE SHIH ROOM #2401
MELANNE VERVEER ROOM #2408

ADVANCE STAFF
OFFICE: 011-507-214-1000 ROOM #1802
011-507-227-1777 x3277 EMBASSY LINE

EMBASSY CONTROL
ROOMS: 011-507-214-1000 ROOMS #1804, 1805
011-507-227-1777 x3278 EMBASSY LINE
011-507-214-1512 FAX

SCHEDULER: JULIE HUFFMAN
202/456-5315 PHONE
202/456-5340 FAX
P6/(b)(6)
WHCA PAGER #4762 PANAMA CITY

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997
PAGE 2

PREV RON Panama City, Panama

STAFF NOTE: Baggage Call is at 7:45am. Staff participating in the Chica site should leave a change of clothes in a bag marked "TOPSIDE". It will be taken to Howard Air Force Base holding room separately. Staff not going to Chica will depart the hotel at 10:15 am, subject to change due to weather.

NOTE: Dress is casual. Long pants should be worn due to insects. Be sure to apply insect repelent. Repelent will be available in Room 1805. Hiking boots are also strongly recommended.

8:00am DEPART hotel
EN ROUTE Landing Zone, Ft. Clayton
[drive time: 30 minutes]

MOTORCADE MANIFEST:

(b)(7)(e)

8:30am ARRIVE Ft. Clayton

Greeter:

Major General Philip Kensinger, Base Commander

HELICOPTER MANIFEST:

(b)(7)(e)

NOTE: Mrs. Perez Balladares' helicopter will land at 9:20 am. She will proceed to the school for the arrival.

NOTE: All persons aboard the helicopters will wear headsets to listen to the briefing.

8:45am- OVERFLIGHT/PANAMA BRIEFING
9:30am STILL PHOTOS ONLY

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997
PAGE 3

FORMAT:

- The First Lady will receive a briefing aboard the helicopter from Col. David Hunt, Treaty Implementation Officer and Lars Klassen, Director, USAID, Panama.
- The briefing will consist of four parts:
 - * Briefing on the Panama Canal and watershed
 - * Briefing on the Reforestation/AID Project
 - * Briefing on the Range issue
 - * Briefing on Chica

9:30am **ARRIVE** Landing Zone, Chica
 OPEN PRESS/OPEN PUBLIC

Greeters (at the school across from the soccer field):

Mrs. Perez Balladares
Ms. Diamantina Montenegro, Director of Chica School
Mr. Rafael Gomez, Community Representative
Mr. Euclides Mayorga, Mayor of Chica
Ms. Susana Richado de Jorrisos, Governor of Province
2 students from Chica Elementary School

NOTE: While the First Lady holds, the press will depart for the nursery.

9:45am- **HOLD**
9:55am School
 Phone: N/A
 Fax: N/A

NOTE: Upon departure from hold, The First Lady will pose for a photo with four Chica Elementary School teachers.

9:55am **DEPART** School
 EN ROUTE Walking Trail
 [drive time: 5 minutes]

MOTORCADE MANIFEST:

(b)(7)(e)

10:00am **ARRIVE** Walking Trail

Greeter:

Ms. Mirei Endara, INRENARE representative

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997
PAGE 4

10:00am- WALK to Nursery
10:05am

10:05am ARRIVE Nursery

Greeters:

Marissa Martinez, President of Women's Association
Antonia Nunez, VP
Betty Nunez, Secretary
Armando Graell, Treasurer
Ceila Zamora, Vice Treasurer
Cornelia Nunez, Fiscal Officer
Margarita Nunez
Maria del Roseia Nunez
Xenia Gonzalez
Alcibia des Graell
Rosaura Yanguel
Ms. Faustina Nunez de Martinez

10:15am- BRIEFING ON ASSOCIATION FOR GENDER, NATURE
10:40am AND PROGRESS AND TOUR OF NURSERY

Nursery
Chica
Translation: Consecutive
OPEN PRESS

FORMAT:

- The First Lady, accompanied by Mrs. Perez Balladares, Ms. Mirei Endara and Ms. Faustina Nunez de Martinez, enter the nursery, greet the remaining discussion participants, and take their seats.
- Faustina Nunez de Martinez will begin the dialogue with an overview of the AID grant and the nursery project.
- The First Lady will participate in an informal discussion with the participants.

NOTE: The group photo will include the greeters and the discussion participants.

- Upon conclusion of the briefing, The First Lady will pose for a group photo.
- After the photo, Faustina will escort The First Lady, accompanied by the other briefing participants, on a tour of the nursery.

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997
PAGE 5

DISCUSSION PARTICIPANTS:

- The First Lady
- Mrs. Perez Balladares
- Lars Klassen, USAID
- Oscar McKay, Executive Director, NATURA
- Maritza Jean, Environmental Advisor,
TECHNO SERVE
- Ms. Mirei Endara, INRENARE representative
- Ms. Faustina Nunez de Martinez

10:40am **DEPART** Nursery
VIA Foot
EN ROUTE Home of Ms. Faustina Nunez de Martinez
[walk time: 5 minutes]

10:45am- **VIEW HOME GARDEN**
10:50am Home of Ms. Faustina Nunez de Martinez
CLOSED PRES

PARTICIPANTS:

- The First Lady
- Mrs. Perez Balladares
- Ms. Faustina Nunez de Martinez
- Ambassador William Hughes

10:50am **DEPART** Garden
VIA Foot
EN ROUTE Motorcade
[walk time: 5 minutes]

NOTE: Prior to boarding motorcade, The First Lady will pose for two photos. The first photo will be with a group of 20 GIs. The second is with a group of volunteers.

11:00am **DEPART**
EN ROUTE Chica Elementary School
[drive time: 5 minutes]

MOTORCADE MANIFEST:

(b)(7)(e)

11:05am- **DEPARTURE CEREMONY**
11:30am School/Soccer Field
Translation: Consecutive
OPEN PRESS

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997
PAGE 6

FORMAT:

- Mr. Rafael Gomez, Community Representative, proceeds to the stand-up mike and gives brief remarks and introduces Ambassador Hughes.
- Ambassador Hughes makes brief remarks and introduces Mrs. Perez Balladares.
- Mrs. Perez Balladares makes brief remarks and introduces The First Lady.
- The First Lady proceeds to the stand-up mike and makes brief remarks.
- Upon the conclusion of The First Lady's remarks, the students, seated on each side of the stage, will sing a song.

NOTE: The First Lady has the option of walking a rope line upon departure.

- After the song, The First Lady departs for hold.

PARTICIPANTS: Approx. 400 people to attend.

11:35am- **HOLD**
 11:45am Chica School
 Phone: N/A
 Fax: N/A

NOTE: The helicopters will depart in the following order:
 Mrs. Perez Balladares' helicopter, The First Lady's (#1),
 Support Staff (#2) followed by the press helicopter.

11:45am **PROCEED** to Landing Zone

11:55pm **DEPART** Chica Landing Zone
EN ROUTE Howard Air Force Base
 [flight time: 20 minutes]

HELICOPTER MANIFEST:

(b)(7)(e)

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997
PAGE 7

12:15pm **ARRIVE** Howard Air Force Base

Greeters:

Col. Gregory Trebon, US Air Force Base Commander
Major General Philip Kensinger
Brigadier General Robert Wagner, US Army
Cpt. Linda Long, US Navy
Lt. Col. Miller, US Marine Corps

12:20pm **PROCEED** to Hold

STAFF NOTE: Staff will be escorted to a separate hold.

12:20pm- **HOLD**

12:40pm Base Operations
Phone: 507-284-4844 or 507-284-5912
Fax: 507-284-4651

12:45pm **PROCEED** to Hangar
VIA Motorcade
(drive time: 2 minutes)

MOTORCADE MANIFEST:

(b)(7)(e)

12:50pm- **MILITARY COMMUNITY EVENT**
1:20pm Howard Air Force Base Hangar
HRC Holding Room: Base Operations
Phone: 507-284-4844 or 507-284-5912
Fax: 507-284-4651
OPEN PRESS

FORMAT:

- Colonel Trebon, Head of Howard Air Force Base gives welcoming remarks, recognizes the stage guests, then introduces The First Lady.
- The First Lady proceeds to the podium and gives remarks.
- Before the First Lady departs the stage,
P6/(b)(6) daughters of
Colonel Trebon, present The First Lady with a mola (a traditional Panamanian dress).
- Upon conclusion of the presentation, The First Lady walks a 90' rope line right to left and then departs.

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997
PAGE 8

- The First Lady
- Brigadier Gen. and Mrs. Wagner (PJ)
- Lt. Colonel and Mrs. Lee Miller (Marcela)
- Captain Linda Long
- Maj. Gen. and Mrs. Philip Kensinger (Greta)
- Col. and Mrs. Gregory Trebon (Candy)
- Ambassador and Mrs. Hughes (Nancy)

AUDIENCE: Approx. 2000 people representing each of the four military branches and their families to attend.

NOTE: Upon departure from the Hangar, the First Lady will pause briefly for a photo-op with the helicopter pilots.

1:25pm **DEPART** Hangar
 VIA Motorcade
 EN ROUTE Airplane
 [drive time: 2 minutes]

(b)(7)(e)

Col. and Mrs. Trebon (Candy)
Col. and Mrs. Shulman (Gloria)
Col. and Mrs. Urba (Susan)
Col. and Mrs. Robert Jensik (Janet)
Col. and Mrs. T.J. O'Neill (Susan)
Ambassador and Mrs. Hughes (Nancy)
Mr. and Mrs. Ed O'Donnell (Beth)

1:30pm **WHEELS UP** from Howard Air Force Base
 EN ROUTE Andrews Air Force Base
 [flight time: 4 hours and 55 minutes]
 [time change: +1]

7:25pm **ARRIVE** Andrews Air Force Base

7:35pm **DEPART** Andrews
 EN ROUTE The White House
 [drive time: 25 minutes]

(b)(7)(e)

SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST LADY
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997
PAGE 9

8:00pm ARRIVE South Portico

RON The White House

WEATHER FOR PANAMA CITY, PANAMA:

Partly cloudy with chance of showers. Lows in the 70s. Highs in the 80s.

WEATHER FOR WASHINGTON, D.C.:

Partly cloudy and cooler. Wind south to southwest at 5-10 knots. Low in the upper 50s. High in the upper 70s.

UNCLASSIFIED

REGIONAL: LATIN AMERICAN HUMAN RIGHTS OVERVIEW

As multi-party elections have enabled democratically-elected governments to replace dictatorships, regional governments have made substantial improvements in their ability to protect and promote the human rights and fundamental freedoms of their citizens. Despite efforts to counter long-entrenched traditions of impunity, corruption and other official misconduct in their justice systems, these problems remain pervasive. The U.S. has repeatedly emphasized the importance of vigorous investigation and prosecution of those responsible for human rights abuses, in conjunction with improved human rights training for security force personnel.

The necessity to improve all facets of the administration of justice is a reality throughout the region. Prisons are intolerably overcrowded, often make no provision for the separation of different sexes and ages, lack basic sanitation, food service and health care facilities, and employ poorly paid and trained guards. Perpetrators of domestic violence are rarely arrested, prosecuted, convicted or incarcerated. Despite a growing framework of legal protections, the human rights of indigenous people are routinely violated in order to serve commercial interests..

Although there is much that remains to be done, especially on issues pertaining to women and children, regional governments have made significant progress in the areas of democracy and human rights. Panama's ombudsperson has the same privileges and immunities as members of its legislative assembly, which greatly facilitates investigations of human rights abuses. Brazil, assisted by Canada, is leading efforts to draft certain action items for the democracy and human rights initiative for the April 1998 Summit of the Americas. In addition, Brazil has introduced an action plan to combat human rights abuses which includes an interministerial group to address the serious problems of racism and other discrimination. Venezuela's prosecutor general (who serves as the public ombudsperson) and intergovernmental human rights commission work together to assist the executive branch to improve compliance with international human rights norms. Argentina's human rights ombudsperson has been instrumental in coordinating human rights policy, in particular the executive response to terrorist incidents such as the 1992 bombing of the Israeli embassy and the 1994 bombing of the AMIA Jewish cultural center.

We provide grants to foundations and NGOs which support the development of civil society through USAID. These grants provide critical funding for organizations such as the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (its executive director is Argentine). We look forward to assisting regional governments with consolidating their unprecedented gains, and continuing to increase their compliance with international human rights norms.

UNCLASSIFIED



U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
FAC SHEET

WASHINGTON, DC 20523

PRESS OFFICE
(202) 647-4274

USAID ASSISTANCE TO PANAMA

The U.S. assistance program to Panama began in 1940. Over the past 56 years the United States has worked with the government and people of Panama in a bilateral program of financial and economic development. During that time, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and its predecessor agencies have provided \$1.2 billion in concessional loans and grants to Panama. In FY 1997 an additional \$2.7 million was provided.

The current USAID program in Panama supports the U.S. foreign policy objective aimed at the successful implementation of the Panama Canal treaties. Under the treaties, Panama will assume full ownership, control and operation of the Canal on December 31, 1999. The U.S. has a major stake in the smooth operation of the Canal and its smooth transfer to Panamanian control and management. About 12% to 14% of U.S. trade and 4% of world trade transits the Canal.

To achieve this foreign policy objective, the USAID/Panama program has two objectives: "To Improve Management and Protection of the Panama Canal Watershed"; and, "To facilitate the Smooth Transfer of the Panama Canal and the Productive Use of the Reverted Properties in the Canal Area".

Protection of the Canal Watershed: Fresh water powers the Panama Canal. Every ship that transits the Canal requires 52 million gallons of gravity-fed fresh water which is then lost to the sea. The Panama Canal Watershed is the only source available to meet these needs. Its five rivers feed two large lakes which are indispensable to Canal operations. Unfortunately, over the past fifty years, the Watershed has suffered massive deforestation, reducing its forest cover from approximately 80% to slightly less than 40% and eroding its river valleys and lake shores. As a result, the fresh water supplies of the Canal Watershed are increasingly vulnerable to siltation, sedimentation and the reduction of storage capacity of the lakes. Therefore, protection of existing forest cover and extensive reforestation throughout the Canal Watershed is an urgent priority.

USAID supports Panamanian efforts to protect the Panama Canal Watershed by strengthening the management capabilities of responsible central government institutions and local communities within the Watershed. USAID has provided resources for the surveying and demarcation of the boundaries of five national parks within the Watershed; for training of forest guards and park rangers; for the construction of ranger stations, living quarters for forest guards, equipment and administrative facilities; and for reforestation and agroforestry activities. USAID also supports an initiative with the participation of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute to establish a permanent environmental monitoring system in the Watershed to continuously measure key indicators including changes in forest cover, deforestation, reforestation, demographic pressures, water quality, sedimentation, siltation and biodiversity. Also, USAID with The Nature Conservancy and the Government of Panama (GOP) have established a \$25 million

environmental trust fund which will finance park maintenance activities and local PVO's environmental education and awareness programs.

Reversion Process: Imminent transfer of the Canal and the reverted areas present Panama with great opportunities as well as challenges to its system of democratic governance. The extensive U.S. military bases and Canal operating areas which border the Canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific are already reverting to Panamanian control. About 3,408 buildings (25% of all structures in the Canal area) and 65,200 acres (30%) have reverted. With the majority of the scheduled reversion of all properties to the Government of Panama to take place in 1999, Panama must strengthen central and municipal government institutions responsible for managing and protecting these areas. Mounting population pressure and encroachment from nearby urban populations threaten long term protection, planning and productive use.

Strong democratic governance and community participation is required to assure that future use of the reverted areas is compatible with environmental protection of the Canal Watershed, yet also generates continuing sources of employment and income for future generations of Panamanian citizens.

USAID supports Panamanian efforts to assure a seamless transition of the Panama Canal and to offset the loss of employment and income resulting from the closure of U.S. military bases by focussing limited available resources on modernizing and increasing the management capabilities of the key GOP institutions involved in the process. USAID has been providing fundamental, short-term institution-building assistance to the GOP's Transition Commission (for Canal transfer) and the Inter-Oceanic Regional Authority (reverted military bases and other areas). Feasibility studies for the optimal use of reverted properties, improvement of financial management, budgeting, procurement and auditing, as well as technical assistance in areas such as labor relations and public information planning are typical of the type of assistance being provided.

PANAMA: ARRIVAL STATEMENT

I am delighted to be in Panama, a nation of a rich, diverse culture with whom the United States has long enjoyed a close, special relationship.

I look forward to experiencing the warmth of Panama's people and tropical breezes, to listen to its rhythms, and to see first hand such traditional handiwork as the "pollera" (poh YEHR ah --national women's costume) and the "mola" (MOW lah traditional indigenous textile).

I am also here to exchange ideas with the First Ladies of the hemisphere on a range of issues that I hold close to my heart, issues that affect every citizen of the Americas. Together we will search for ways to ensure greater respect for human rights, reduce the debilitating impact of poverty on portions of all our populations and end violence directed at woman and children.

I can think of no more important set of goals and I look forward with sharing my thoughts with the Conference participants.

Once again, I am pleased to have this opportunity to visit Panama and participate in this forum.



U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FACT SHEET

WASHINGTON, DC 20523

PRESS OFFICE
(202) 647-4274

PANAMA CANAL WATERSHED Natural Resources Management Project (MARENA)

The U.S. assistance program to Panama began in 1940. Over the past 56 years the United States has worked with the government and people of Panama in a bilateral program of financial and economic development. During that time, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and its predecessor agencies have provided \$1.2 billion in concessional loans and grants to Panama. In FY 1997 an additional \$2.7 million was provided.

The current USAID program in Panama supports the U.S. foreign policy objective aimed at the successful implementation of the Panama Canal treaties. To achieve this foreign policy objective, the USAID/Panama program has two objectives: improving management and protection of the Panama Canal Watershed; and, facilitating the smooth transfer of the Panama Canal and the productive use of the reverted properties in the Canal area.

The Natural Resources Management Project, MARENA, began in June 1991 as an \$18 million, seven year program. MARENA was created to help protect and manage Panama's renewable natural resources, with an emphasis on the Panama Canal Watershed (PCW), and to promote sustained economic and social development. The project contains four components: Watershed Management; Parks and Wildlife Management; Reforestation, and the Environmental Trust Program.

As a component of the MARENA project, the \$25 million Environmental Trust Program was established in February 1995, with \$8 million in funding from USAID, \$2 million from the Nature Conservancy, and \$15 million from the Government of Panama. The Trust provides funding support for conservation and environmental activities in National Parks and Protected Areas throughout Panama. Additionally, the Trust provides grants to non-government organizations to conduct environmental activities with an emphasis on the Panama Canal Watershed.

Chica, Altos de Campana, a small community located in the Panama Canal Watershed, is a MARENA grant recipient and the site visited by First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton. Activities performed at this site include technical assistance and training for a women's-agroforestry group (ASGENAPRO) in the community of Chica.

The assistance to the women's agro-forestry group began in 1994 with a one-year, \$5,000 grant to develop a nursery for ornamental and medicinal plants and tree seedlings. The private voluntary organization, TECHNOSERVE, provided the technical assistance and training to the group. The effort has been very successful. The plants are sold to banks and other private enterprises in Panama City as well as to a number of distributors.

Bolstered by the success of this initial effort, the group has begun to expand its activities. It has received a second five-year grant for \$86,000, again in collaboration with TECHNOSERVE. With this second grant, the women's group is developing a much larger nursery with native tree species which have been used to

reforest approximately 20 hectares/48 acres in the nearby National Park of Altos de Campana and members' lands around Chica. Incomes are generated by the sale of the seedlings and through wages of the day laborers in the reforestation efforts in the National Park.

ASGENAPRO has aquired four acres of land through income earned by the nursery operation in which productive activities are being developed.



U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PRESS RELEASE

WASHINGTON, DC 20523
<http://www.info.usaid.gov>

PRESS OFFICE
(202) 647-4274

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Jessamyn Sarmiento
October 9, 1997

USAID Grants \$4.8 Million to the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights

Panama City -- First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton announced the signing of a grant to the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights at a ceremony held during the Seventh Annual First Ladies Conference of the Americas. Mark L. Schneider, U.S. Agency for International Development Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean, signed with Juan Mendez, Executive Director of the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IIHR), a 3 year grant totalling \$4,769,597 for the program of promoting human rights and free and fair elections in the hemisphere and the expansion of its gender and human rights activities.

The gender and human rights program will focus on regional grassroots organizations which address human rights issues affecting women and help women get access to the legal support for those rights. The broader IIHR program includes a wide range of conferences, seminars, and technical assistance to governments and non-governmental organizations on many aspects of human rights and elections.

The U.S. Government, through USAID, has been a major contributor to IIHR since its inception in 1980. Currently, USAID provides 24 percent of its operating costs, and complements and strengthens regional programs through its bilateral missions in Latin America and the Caribbean. Support for the IIHR has been an important element of USAID's promotion of human rights in the hemisphere.

The Institute is an independent, international educational and research institution created by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and the Government of Costa Rica. The IIHR seeks to promote respect for human rights and the consolidation of democracy throughout the Americas through research, education, training and technical assistance to governments, regional organizations and NGOs. IIHR conducts a major annual interdisciplinary course on human rights with participants from all countries of the hemisphere and a variety of specialized regional seminars and conferences in different countries.

IIHR has a number of smaller specialized programs including those focusing on the administration of justice, human rights and security forces, and gender and human rights. Its Center for Electoral Promotion and Assistance (CAPEL) is the largest and best known of its specialized programs, and has helped develop electoral practices and organize elections in many countries.

USAID Assistance for Education in Latin America

Guatemala While systematic reforms in public education, including adequate funding, are not yet fully achieved and now will be supported by other donor programs, Guatemala has demonstrated significant improvements with two programs critical to improving education for Mayan children: bilingual education and girls' education. USAID was the first donor to promote bilingual education, now enrolling 218,000 students, with bilingual programs increasing enrollment 34% compared to an 11% increase for Spanish only schools. Girls' education was promoted through several programs: scholarships, the child-centered "new one room school" and bilingual education, together resulting in increased enrollment and completion of upper primary grades. In 1997, USAID will begin limited funding for literacy programs to address the constraint of high illiteracy among the indigenous.

Honduras USAID and Honduran cooperative programs in three areas all have proven highly successful over the 1991-1996 Strategic Plan: education policy reform, teacher training and instructional materials distribution for primary schools; the EDUCATODOS/Education for All alternative basic schooling program, and the CADERH job training program. These programs resulted in increases in primary school completion from 50% to 70% of 14 year olds, in establishing a 9 grade program for drop outs that increased its graduates each year to 22,400 women and 20,600 men in 1996, and sustaining the CADERH job training program producing an average of 350 women and 700 men graduates each year, each of whom will earn \$1000 more a year with new skills. Achievement testing is now regularly implemented and shows increases in test scores.

El Salvador El Salvador's new Strategic Plan, begun in 1995, broadens and deepens the long term success in improving primary education. Based on a 1992 national participatory plan for top-to-bottom reform, Salvador's education program implemented policy reforms, developed and delivered language, math, science, and social studies books for all six grades, trained teachers, and decentralized school management to communities. These reforms resulted in more students staying in school, an increase in sixth grade completion in six years (without repetition) to 47% of boys and 53% of girls in 1996. Achievement testing has begun implementation.

Nicaragua Over the last three years USAID and Nicaraguans have succeeded in reversing the significant negative trends in primary schooling. Teacher training and curriculum development as well as improved administration and decentralization resulted in decreases in the large repetition rates in first grade (41 to 23%) and second grade (17 to 14%), and increasing completion from 20 to 24% for boys and 25 to 31% for girls. Initial achievement tests show increases in math scores.

Haiti Despite major constraints on funding, the Haiti education program has resulted in the NGO FONHEP strengthened capability to improve education in the private, community funded schools serving 86% of Haitian children. FONHEP-assisted schools decreased both repetition and drop out. The National Education Plan, prepared in 1996 with full participation of 750 public and private sector representatives from throughout Haiti, is ready for parliamentary review and approval. A 1996 pilot for 2100 students, used instructional programs on radio and cassettes, to improve learning in language and math.

Dominican Republic In 1996, USAID completed assistance to EDUCA, an NGO which was the catalyst for a ten-year Education Plan, a draft education law, new primary school curriculum and teacher training. EDUCA-assisted schools showed reductions in both grade repetition and school drop-out. EDUCA is private sector supported and its programs will be expanded with other donor assistance.

Jamaica In 1996, USAID completed assistance to primary education, including a management information system to inform policy decision making, achievement testing, curriculum development and teacher training, is being continued by the Jamaican government, with other donor support. The youth at risk program, begun in 1995, helps youth to continue education and job skills programs and develop healthier lives.

Ecuador With very limited funds invested through the G/HCD Advancing Basic Education and Literacy project, USAID Ecuador helped the Fundación Ecuador make significant impacts on awareness of private sector and other leaders about education reform, viewing education as investment in human resources for economic, social, and democratic development rather than social expenditure alone. Program and fund limits make continuing this program after 1997 unlikely.

Peru Beginning in 1997, limited funding will be provided to UNICEF programs in teacher training, instructional materials, and parent-school programs for culturally and linguistically different populations, such as the Aymara in the Puno region west of Lake Titicaca.

LAC Regional Partnership for Revitalization of Education Building on prior efforts by the NGO Inter-American Dialogue and the Advancing Basic Education and Literacy project, the Partnership has developed networks of Latin American leaders to support education policy reforms, with major initiatives on education standards and assessment, education finance, decentralization of governance to communities. Regional meetings of education leaders have taken place on these subjects and will be followed by a seminar presenting in-depth reviews of standards and assessment, in Washington DC, December 1997.

Only three missions have USAID education specialist officers (Honduras, El Salvador, Jamaica), two others replaced USDH positions with contract staff (Guatemala and Nicaragua), and Haiti employed a new contract education specialist. The LAC regional program has two USDH education officers, and a team leader, who is retiring (for health reasons) with no USDH education officers available to take this leadership position and support the Summit of the Americas education initiatives. However, she did recruit two contract education experts through the April 1998 Summit.

The fundamental relationship of expanded education to broad based economic growth

Currently, fifty percent of children in Latin America complete primary school, with only 12 years remaining to achieve the Summit of the Americas goal of 100% completion by the year 2010. Average enrollment for the region is 85.8% (85.1 for girls) with school completion rates ranging from 14 to 93%. Very high enrollment and completion rates are found in the Eastern Caribbean and the Southern Cone countries, with completion of about 80 percent in Costa Rica, Panama; over seventy percent in Mexico, about sixty percent in Ecuador, Peru, and closer to fifty percent in Colombia and Venezuela. Dominican Republic has only 14% and Brazil only 20% of children completing primary school, though about half of children complete fourth grade. Haiti, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Bolivia still have primary school completion rates around forty percent or less.

Long term patterns show the strong link between high education levels of a nation's people and high economic growth; Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, with overall annual GDP per capita growth of 3-7 percent all are following the model of Singapore, Hongkong, and Korea (Human Development Report 1996 p. 66). Country policies determine the efficiency of translating growth into human development; Costa Rica, Chile, and Argentina show advances in human development and economic growth. With appropriate balance, economic growth and human development reinforce each other in positive synergies of causality. If these are unbalanced, nations may find themselves with economic growth benefiting only a few, with possible political problems due to disparities; or, less frequently, nations may find themselves with better educated populations and little economic growth due to poor economic policy (eg, Zimbabwe).

Recent IDB studies showed that Latin America had the highest income concentration in the world: a Gini coefficient of 55 compared to 33 for East Asia, Australia, the United States and Canada. Economic policy reforms in Latin America could accelerate growth to an average of 5.5%; with additional investment in their people's education, growth could increase to 6.5%. Latin Americans average a little more than 5 years of schooling compared to a world average of 6 and over 9 in Asia.

NAPA (National Association of Partners of the Americas) concludes more than ten years of programs in 1997, with the final activity to help the US offices of the organization to develop strategies and training to continue to strengthen and sustain partnerships between U.S. states and LAC countries.

ATIE (Advanced Training in Economics) has produced 161 graduates with Masters or Doctoral degrees, who now are serving in university and other key public and private sector positions throughout Latin America. ATIE concludes in 1998.

CLASP (Caribbean and Latin American Scholarship) programs over the last ten year has provided a wide variety of training for 20,688 persons from throughout LAC. The only continuing program is CASS (the Cooperative Association of States for Scholarships) which provides two-year community college training for less advantaged youth and some six-month training for health workers and science and math teachers. Through 1996, CASS programs served 2904 persons (of the total CLASP trainees), with another 290 beginning studies in late 1997.

Education Funding for Latin America

The country programs received \$16,169,000 in FY96, \$14,501,000 in FY 97; the FY99 budget request in \$9,500,000. Haiti programs are funded separately at about \$4,000,000 per year. Regional programs include the Partnership for Education Revitalization in the Americas, funded at \$1,500,000 a year, and the CASS program, which is funded under a soft earmark by Congress and received \$18,000,000 in FY96, \$13,750,000 in FY97, and \$10,000,000 in FY98; FY99 requested funds are \$8,000,000.

Program Needs in Education

USAID Bolivia decided not to pursue a program to increase rural girls' education, due to lack of funding. Rural, indigenous girls, who average only 2.5 years of schooling. One eighth of urban women and half of rural women are illiterate. The World Bank and IDB-assisted education reform has reached 16% of schools, and has no special effort to increase girls' school completion. USAID does sponsor a school feeding program for 100,000 children (40% girls) in food-insecure areas.

Education initiatives have become the major theme of the 1997-1998 Summit and a new Partnership for Education is beginning with Brazil, but additional no regional funds are available to intensify education policy support for the Summit or to USAID missions to increase education activities in support of Summit education initiatives.

A \$ 6 million Plus Up for Education has been requested in the FY99 budget to expand regional Summit education activities and girls and women's education in the Andes and Guatemala.

With improvements in people's education, the Gini Coefficient would be stabilized, but without improvements, the Gini coefficient will decrease; income would be come even more concentrated. Without opportunity for people to improve their lives, the likelihood of political instability increases.

Achieving more sustained and more equitable growth requires improving education in Latin America. The problem lies not so much in overall levels of financing, but how finance is used. The lowest investment is in public primary education, resulting in very poor quality, high levels of repetition, and low levels of completion and achievement. Too much is spent on university education, providing free education for the middle class and elite graduates of private primary and secondary schools, and on education system administration, including 'ghost' employees. Teachers' salaries are low, resulting in low motivation and accountability as well as teachers' unions more concerned with protecting what little teachers have. Textbooks and other instructional materials account for about one percent of public spending on education. Total school hours are about 800 compared to 1200 in private schools, all this low quality resulting in low student achievement. The poor have no choice but to send their children to these public schools, and no power to influence policy to overcome inequity (Puryear, p. 11). Finally, governance of schools is centralized in Ministries of Education, so that parents do not have power over decision making nor can they demand accountability from their children's schools. Ultimately, due to the low quality and quantity of school completers, the nation, and the owners of business and industry, lack the educated human resources to expand economic growth.

Rates of return to investment in primary education for a nation's people are very high, proven in numerous studies beginning before the 1990 World Conference on Education (Lockheed and Versper, Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries), and continuing with studies of girls education (Summers, 1992) and studies of the education for the indigenous (Psacharopoulos and Patrinos, 1994). Low income nations such as Sri Lanka have shown that with appropriate policies and investments, completion of primary education can be increased greatly. "What is missing in the [LAC] region is the political will to get the job done, starting with the organization of efficient delivery systems..." (IDB Strategy for Poverty Reduction, 1997). Specifically, what is required is to make education a political priority, to focus public investment in education on basic primary and secondary schools, to strengthen the teaching profession, to decentralize education and increase accountability, and to shift attention to outcomes, including performance of students, and school systems (Puryear, p. 14-15).

The fundamental relationship of expanded education to broad based economic growth

Currently, fifty percent of children in Latin America complete primary school, with only 12 years remaining to achieve the Summit of the Americas goal of 100% completion by the year 2010. Average enrollment for the region is 85.8% (85.1 for girls) with school completion rates ranging from 14 to 93%. Very high enrollment and completion rates are found in the Eastern Caribbean and the Southern Cone countries, with completion of about 80 percent in Costa Rica, Panama; over seventy percent in Mexico, about sixty percent in Ecuador, Peru, and closer to fifty percent in Colombia and Venezuela. Dominican Republic has only 14% and Brazil only 20% of children completing primary school, though about half of children complete fourth grade. Haiti, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Bolivia still have primary school completion rates around forty percent or less.

Long term patterns show the strong link between high education levels of a nation's people and high economic growth; Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, with overall annual GDP per capita growth of 3-7 percent all are following the model of Singapore, Hongkong, and Korea (Human Development Report 1996 p. 66). Country policies determine the efficiency of translating growth into human development; Costa Rica, Chile, and Argentina show advances in human development and economic growth. With appropriate balance, economic growth and human development reinforce each other in positive synergies of causality. If these are unbalanced, nations may find themselves with economic growth benefiting only a few, with possible political problems due to disparities; or, less frequently, nations may find themselves with better educated populations and little economic growth due to poor economic policy (eg, Zimbabwe).

Recent IDB studies showed that Latin America had the highest income concentration in the world: a Gini coefficient of 55 compared to 33 for East Asia, Australia, the United States and Canada. Economic policy reforms in Latin America could accelerate growth to an average of 5.5%; with additional investment in their people's education, growth could increase to 6.5%. Latin Americans average a little more than 5 years of schooling compared to a world average of 6 and over 9 in Asia. With improvements in people's education, the Gini Coefficient would be stabilized, but without improvements, the Gini coefficient will decrease; income would be come even more concentrated. Without opportunity for people to improve their lives, the likelihood of political instability increases.

Achieving more sustained and more equitable growth requires improving education in Latin America. The problem lies not so much in overall levels of financing, but how finance is used.

The lowest investment is in public primary education, resulting in very poor quality, high levels of repetition, and low levels of completion and achievement. Too much is spent on university education, providing free education for the middle class and elite graduates of private primary and secondary schools, and on education system administration, including 'ghost' employees. Teachers' salaries are low, resulting in low motivation and accountability as well as teachers' unions more concerned with protecting what little teachers have. Textbooks and other instructional materials account for about one percent of public spending on education. Total school hours are about 800 compared to 1200 in private schools, all this low quality resulting in low student achievement. The poor have no choice but to send their children to these public schools, and no power to influence policy to overcome inequity (Puryear, p. 11). Finally, governance of schools is centralized in Ministries of Education, so that parents do not have power over decision making nor can they demand accountability from their children's schools. Ultimately, due to the low quality and quantity of school completers, the nation, and the owners of business and industry, lack the educated human resources to expand economic growth.

Rates of return to investment in primary education for a nation's people are very high, proven in numerous studies beginning before the 1990 World Conference on Education (Lockheed and Versper, Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries), and continuing with studies of girls education (Summers, 1992) and studies of the education for the indigenous (Psacharopoulos and Patrinos, 1994). Low income nations such as Sri Lanka have shown that with appropriate policies and investments, completion of primary education can be increased greatly. "What is missing in the [LAC] region is the political will to get the job done, starting with the organization of efficient delivery systems..." (IDB Strategy for Poverty Reduction, 1997). Specifically, what is required is to make education a political priority, to focus public investment in education on basic primary and secondary schools, to strengthen the teaching profession, to decentralize education and increase accountability, and to shift attention to outcomes, including performance of students, and school systems (Puryear, p. 14-15).

SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS: USG PROGRESS REPORT

Initiative 16: Universal Access to Education

I. Key Achievements, through September 1997

USAID and the Inter-American Dialogue (IAD) signed a Cooperative Agreement for the Partnership for Education Revitalization in the Americas (Partnership/PREAL), September, 1996. This is a five year activity, funded up to \$6,004,753, funded to \$3,000,000 in FY97.

The Secretariat was established at IAD and the first executive committee meeting took place in Santiago, Chile, in September, 1997.

USAID and IAD formally presented the Partnership and its support for Summit Initiative 16 at the Summit Meeting of the First Ladies in La Paz, Bolivia, December, 1996.

Collaborative meetings with the Government of Mexico Secretariat of Education staff and advisor by Inter-American Dialogue President Peter Hakim and Senior Fellow Jeffrey Puryear took place in late 1996. Contacts included Sylvia Schmelkes of the SOE and Sofialeticia Morales, advisor to the Secretary of Education. Additional meetings with Government of Mexico, Secretariat of Education, on Summit Initiative 16 were held by IAD Jeffrey Puryear and USAID's Sarah Wright in early 1997.

Government of Mexico as Initiative 16 Coordinator submitted a draft Plan of Action for the Summit of the Americas Initiative 16 in April, 1997. This plan apparently is not yet accepted by other governments.

IAD Peter Hakim and Jeffrey Puryear meetings with Government of Chile Minister of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to discuss planning for the Santiago Summit, March, 1998. Education was discussed as a key issue to addressing poverty, one of the Summit's three themes.

Education became a key theme for the Santiago Summit, with items in three areas (basic education, exchanges and distance education, worker training) developed at the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Lima, June 1997.

The Government of Brazil has become active in raising awareness of need for education reform and implementing programs in Brazil to improve education and increase primary school completion.

Partnership/PREAL activities to date include a regional seminar on decentralization and management of education systems, held in Nicaragua in July 1996, a regional seminar on standards and evaluation, Brazil, December 1996, and a regional seminar on education finance (Bogota July 1997).

*The seminar on standards included high level experts on standards from throughout the region, and served to improve dialogue among them on improving evaluation and testing in their countries. A summary of their discussions has just been published by the Partnership/PREAL.

*The recent seminar on education finance engaged 160 leaders from 14 countries in a vigorous discussion of finance issues. Three areas of consensus emerged: successful decentralization of finance requires clear responsibilities and accountability as well as sufficient resources; the central government plays an important role in ensuring equity and quality in education; and increased community involvement helps hold funding administrators accountable for results.

The Partnership/PREAL Task Force on Education, Equity, and Competitiveness in the Americas, met in Chile, January, 1997.

Studies of the process of education reforms in four countries (Jamaica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Paraguay) under USAID's project, ABEL II (Advancing Basic Education and Literacy) were published and widely distributed.

Additional studies and policy papers were published and distributed by IAD/Partnership/PREAL to increase knowledge of education issues in the region.

Regional working groups of experts on education standards and on teachers' unions are in formation.

A bilingual website on education policy and reform was established by PREAL's Chile office to provide access to papers and other information to the region. A joint website on education innovations is being developed with the UNESCO regional office in Santiago.

A conference sponsored with InterAmerican Development Bank and other meetings with World Bank and private sector contacts have continued to expand support for education reform.

II. Anticipated/Planned Actions, June through December, 1997.

Studies on issues in education standards, testing, and assessment of performance will be presented at a workshop in December and published for wide dissemination in Latin America.

*A workshop on improving education statistics will be held for MERCOSUR countries in October 1997 in Santiago Chile. The workshop will result in clearer definition of the most important statistics and steps needed to improve use of statistics for planning education and assessment of progress.

Additional contacts will be made with Chambers of Commerce and other groups on business involvement with education.

Partnership linkages with government and non-government organizations in additional LAC countries will be established by the Partnership/PREAL.

partnership research and policy agenda for analyses and studies developed.

Additional regional working groups of policy makers and analysts formed, to give sustained attention to key policy issues, share information on strategies and results, explore policy implications, and build expertise.



Programa de Promoción de la Reforma Educativa en América Latina y el Caribe
Partnership for Educational Revitalization in the Americas

Possible Summit Recommendations - Education

- Each country should establish a high-profile national commission on educational modernization. The commission will be composed of leaders from the diverse social and economic sectors—business, media, churches, political parties, parents, unions, and professional associations—that have a stake in the country's educational systems and wield political power. It will be designed to draw attention to educational shortcomings, develop support for reform, and generate consensus on policy options.
- Each country should develop a world-class system of education statistics and indicators. The goal would be a system that emphasizes educational outcomes, rather than inputs, and is compatible with the OECD system of international education indicators.
- Each country should develop content and performance standards for education, and establish a national system of assessment based on the new standards. The standards will specify what students should know and be able to do in order to be successful in the global economy and in democratic citizenship. The tests will be administered to all students at specific points in the primary cycle, and perhaps eventually in the secondary cycle.
- Each country should agree to participate in the next round of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).
- Each country will restructure education systems so that schools become more autonomous and accountable to parents and local communities. Central and provincial governments will no longer directly run individual schools, and will concentrate instead on setting standards, evaluating results, and promoting equity. School directors and local communities will be given control over budgets and personnel. New approaches will be devised to give parents choice over what school their children attend, and to promote competition among schools.
- Each country will re-professionalize the profession of teacher, by reforming teacher training, establishing attractive salary levels, linking salaries to performance, and requiring teachers to take responsibility for the quality of their work.
- Each country will commit to investing more money per student at the primary and secondary levels.
- Each country will substantially expand preschool education, making it readily available to the children of families who cannot afford to pay for it themselves. Emphasis will be on encouraging diverse approaches, reaching the poorest families, and promoting private-public partnerships. Countries will enroll 30 percent of age-cohorts by 2000, and 50 percent by 2005.



Inter-American Dialogue • 1221 Connecticut Ave., NW Suite 510
Washington, DC 20036 USA • Tel: (202) 822-9002
Fax: (202) 822-9553 • email: iad@interdialog.org
Internet: www.interdialog.org & www.preal.d

Santa Magdalena 75, Piso 10 • Oficina 1002
Santiago, Chile • Tel: (56-1) 334-4302
Fax: (56-1) 334-4303 • email: preal@remia.cl
Internet: www.preal.d



IIHR Newsletter No. 44

(July-September 1996)

INSTITUTIONAL

The IIHR welcomes its new Executive Director

Juan E. Mendez took up his post as the Executive Director of the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights on September 16.

Our new Director, from Argentina, has a law degree from the *Universidad Catolica Stella Maris de Mar del Plata*, studied Political Science at the *Universidad Provincial de Mar del Plata*, and later received a graduate degree in law from American University (Washington D.C.). He has a long record of service to the cause of human rights.

His personal and professional life is a model of study, dedication and practical application. He has served as the director of important organizations dedicated to the defense of human rights, such as: the *Centro Cristo Rey*, a center for Hispanic immigrants in Illinois, and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights (Washington D.C.). He was also the long-time Executive Director of Americas Watch (now Human Rights Watch/Americas) and until recently the Legal Advisor of Human Rights Watch.

His experience as an attorney includes the defense of the rights of vulnerable people (prisoners, political asylees, minorities) at the national and international levels, including appearances in cases before the Inter-American Court of Human

Rights. He has been a professor at universities in his native country and in the United States he taught the international law of human rights at the law schools of Georgetown University and Notre Dame. At the latter university he was also a visiting fellow of the Kellogg Institute of International Relations. Since 1990 he has taught classes in human rights for judges, as part of a seminar conducted by Professor Louis Henkin and sponsored by the Aspen Institute. He has been invited to teach a summer course at Oxford University in Great Britain in 1997, organized jointly by that academic institution and Georgetown University in Washington D.C.

He is the author of numerous publications on the human rights situation in different countries and on emerging issues of international law in this field. He has published articles on the inter-American system of protection in legal journals such as *Hamline Law Review* and the IHR's *Revista*, as well as in the book published to commemorate the 15th anniversary of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. He was a co-author of a paper on the protection of freedom of expression in the Americas that was presented at a meeting of experts in Johannesburg, South Africa in 1995, organized by Article XIX and the University of Witwatersrand. He has contributed articles on the obligations of the State during periods of transition to democracy to publications in several countries in the Americas and in South Africa. Recent articles will soon appear in *Human Rights Quarterly*, the Working Papers series of the Kellogg Institute, and as the introductory chapter of a book for the University of Notre Dame Press, edited by Professor A. James McAdams and with a foreword by Professor John Dugard of Cambridge University of Great Britain. The English version of "El Vuelo" by Horacio Verbitsky has just been published in New York with an epilogue written by Mr. Mendez.

Between 1970 and 1975 he specialized in labor law and the defense of political prisoners in his native country. He suffered at the hands of the dictatorship that ruled his country during that period on account of his principles and convictions and was imprisoned on two occasions. Adopted as a "Prisoner of Conscience" by Amnesty International, he was subsequently released and went into exile in 1977. In 1981 he was authorized to practice law in the United States and is a member of the Bar Associations of Washington and New York. That marked the beginning of a prolific political and professional career devoted to the cause of human rights. He has been honored and awarded various prizes for his work and was a founder, and remains an active member, of important professional associations and organizations that work on behalf of social justice and peace at the international level.

It is an honor for the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights to have Juan Mendez as its Executive Director, and the staff extends a most sincere and warm welcome to him. The Institute is also delighted to have the opportunity inform the readers of its Newsletter of his appointment.

Ms. Muni Figueres is the widow of Ambassador Danilo Jiménez. Ambassador Jiménez served as ambassador from Costa Rica to the United States from 1987-1990 and as ambassador to the Organization of American States from 1994 until his death in March, 1996. They have two children, Dyalá, 26 years old and José Martí, 24 years old.

Ms. Muni Figueres was born in Costa Rica on February 19, 1945 and is the daughter of the late José María (don Pepe) Figueres, former President of Costa Rica. Ms. Figueres is the sister of the current President of Costa Rica, José María Figueres Olsen.

Ms. Muni Figueres and her husband, the late ambassador, met President and First Lady Clinton, I believe for the first time, at the governors' mansion in Arkansas in early 1990 on the occasion of the Arkansas Conference on the Caribbean.

Ms. Figueres is fluent in Spanish, English and French.

FIRST LADY'S VISIT
Monday, September 15, 1997

**I. BACKGROUND FOR SCENARIO No. 1: VISIT RELATED TO
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE -
PANAMA CANAL WATERSHED**

A. Project Background

1. Project Name and Number:

Natural Resources Management Project (MARENA) No. 525-0306.

2. Project Description:

The MARENA Project was authorized on June 7, 1991 for \$18 million for 7-years. The project addresses the problem of unplanned and destructive use of the natural renewable resources of Panama. The project goal is to promote sustained economic and social development. The purpose is to protect and manage Panama's renewable natural resources, with an emphasis on the Panama Canal Watershed (PCW). The primary Government of Panama implementation agency for the project is the National Institute for Renewable Natural Resources (INRENARE). The project contains four components: Watershed Management; Parks and Wildlife Management; Reforestation, and the Environmental Trust program.

B. Environmental Trust Program:

1. As a component of the MARENA project, the \$25.0 million Environmental Trust program was established in February, 1995 with funding of \$8.0 million from USAID, \$2.0 million from The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and \$15 million from the Government of Panama (GOP). The Trust is intended to be maintained in perpetuity. The Trust provides funding support for conservation and environmental activities in National Parks and Protected Areas throughout Panama. Additionally, the Trust provides grants to non-government organizations to conduct environmental activities with emphasis on the Panama Canal Watershed.

2. Site of one grant recipient:

Chicá, Altos de Campana, Panama Province.

3. Type of Activity:

- Technical assistance and training for a women's-agroforestry group (ASGENAPRO) in the community of Chicá.

4. Chicá Activity Description:

The assistance to the women's agro-forestry group began in 1994 with a one-year, US\$5,000 grant to develop a nursery for ornamental and medicinal plants and tree seedlings. Technical assistance and training was provided by TECHNOSERVE, a PVO. The effort has been very successful. The plants are sold to banks and other private enterprises in Panama City as well as to a number of distributors.

Bolstered by the success of this initial effort, the group has begun to expand its activities. It has received a second five-year grant, in collaboration with TECHNOSERVE, in the amount of US\$86,000. With this second grant, the women's group is developing a much larger nursery with native tree species which have been used to reforest approximately 20 hectares/48 acres in the nearby National Park of Altos de Campana and members' lands around Chicá. Incomes are generated by the sale of the seedlings and through wages of the day laborers in the reforestation efforts in the National Park.

It is important to note that the male population in Chicá is conservative and thus did not participate nor support activities carried out by the women's group under the first grant. However, under the second grant, men have been employed as a labor force to support reforestation activities in the National Park and adjoining areas. While a few men have now actually joined the agro-forestry group, the women's group is still careful in opening the association to new members due to prevailing culture and norms in the community.

ASGENAPRO has acquired 4 acres of land through income earned by the nursery activities in which productive activities are being developed.

TECHNOSERVE continues providing the required technical assistance.

5. Activity Amount and date of initiation/completion:

1st. Grant: US\$ 5,000 From: October 1, 1994
To: October 1, 1995

2nd. Grant: US\$86,000 From: November 6, 1995
To: November 6, 2000

6. Partner Involved:

Fundacion NATURA.

7. Grant funds recipient:

TECHNOSERVE and ASGENAPRO
("Asociacion, Genero Naturaleza y Progreso").

8. Population of the Community:

412 people.

9. Participants Involved:

Currently eleven members (10 Women, 1 man)

CHICA SCENE SETTER

Context of the Event

Chica is an attractive, small community located on the edge of Altos de Campana park, the highest of five parks within the Panama canal watershed (PCW). From the higher areas, you can see the Pacific ocean below. As with the rest of the PCW, deforestation must be arrested and reforestation promoted if the watershed is to continue to provide adequate water for both the canal and the people of Panama City and Colon.

In an effort to promote reforestation while simultaneously empowering women, USAID and the non-governmental organization Technoserve have helped an association (currently 10 women and 1 man) to create a tree and plant nursery. Women have not traditionally been income-earners in this community. As members of the "Association of Gender, Nature and Progress," these women grow and sell trees that are then used to reforest Altos de Campana park. They also grow ornamental and medicinal plants to supplement their families' incomes. Furthermore, their children have helped with the work at the nursery and, thus, are learning new skills, new gender roles, and improving their self-esteem in this process.

Despite being members of different political parties, the women have managed (with help from Technoserve) to overcome their differences and work cooperatively. This process has improved relations within their own families and the community-at-large.

The project has been so successful that now a majority of Chica's women (most of whom are NOT members of the association) have nurseries outside their own homes, which they use to supplement their incomes and improve the lives of their families. Quite literally, the project has transformed women's financial and social status within the community while simultaneously improving the local environment.

Your Objectives:

- To view the association's nursery and meet some of the women involved in it.
- To visit one or more private nurseries located at women's homes.
- To speak to the community in general about the value of the women's and community's work, and, thus, reinforce the women's roles in the rest of the community's eyes and promote conservation (i.e. reforestation) at the community level.

Talking Points:

With women from the Association of Gender, Nature and Progress:

- How has the association's nursery improved:
 - the women's lives?
 - their children's lives?
 - the community over all?
- How has the reforestation affected them and their community?

- How have the private nurseries improved:
 - the women's lives
 - their children's lives?
 - the community over all?

- Thank the women in particular for their work with the nurseries
- Speak to the whole community of your pride in the community's
 - concern for Altos de Campana and efforts to help reforest the park.
 - of their willingness to work together and put aside their differences to improve their lives.
 - of your belief that when people care for each other, they also care for the environment where everyone must live.

U.S., Panama Nearing Troop Accord

Pact Would Let Some Americans Stay

By Peter Baker
Washington Post Staff Writer

PANAMA CITY, Oct. 9—With the Panama Canal scheduled to convert to local control at the end of 1999, the United States and Panama are close to an agreement that would allow about 2,000 American troops to remain stationed here into the next century.

Under the Panama Canal treaties of 1977, the United States is supposed to remove all its military forces when it turns over the strategic locks that connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. But the pact being negotiated now would guarantee a continued American presence here as part of a multinational counter-narcotics center.

"The expectation on both sides is that we can get an agreement," said a State Department official accompanying first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, who is attending a conference here.

The official, who spoke on condition that he not be identified, said negotiations should be completed within the next month. "We're getting down to the final phases of the talks."

Once unthinkable, the prospect of retaining U.S. military forces in Panama would make for an ironic postscript to the long battle over the 50-mile-long canal, which was built and completed by the United States in 1914 and operated by it ever since. For years, nationalist leaders in Panama pressured Washington to withdraw altogether and the decision to comply presented a major political



BY SCOTT DALTON ASSOCIATED PRESS
Hillary Rodham Clinton greets Dora Boyd de Perez Balladres of Panama.

challenge to President Jimmy Carter who had to push the controversial treaties through a skeptical Senate.

But as the date for departure approached, Panama began to consider what it would lose. At first, local leaders were concerned about the economic loss and later they came to view a joint anti-drug operation as a source of international stature, said U.S. officials.

The U.S. detachment, for years the largest in Latin America, has shrunk from 8,000 troops at the beginning of the year to just 4,000 as of Oct. 1, just days after the U.S. Southern Command lowered the American flag over its base to relocate to Miami. About one-fourth of the 4,000 buildings and one-third of the 70,000 acres once occupied by U.S. forces have been handed over to the Panamanians.

Howard Air Base is already the center of U.S. military efforts to cut the flow of South American cocaine into the United States. And officials in both governments believe it would

be an appropriate base for a multinational operation with the same aim.

Under the terms being discussed, the United States would continue to pay for maintenance of the runways and hangars, while other Latin American countries would pay much of the rest of the cost. Such an agreement would not require congressional approval, officials said, however it would be subject to a plebiscite vote by the Panamanian people.

Although opinion polls show public support for a continued U.S. presence, the plan presents some political difficulty for President Ernesto Perez Balladres, who does not want to be seen as betraying the legacy of the late Gen. Omar Torrijos, the charismatic military dictator who won the canal treaties two decades ago.

Officials are contemplating an operation that coordinates the monitoring of drug traffic and training of anti-drug units, possibly including an international law enforcement academy along the lines of that set up in Budapest.

Hillary Clinton arrived here Wednesday night for the hemisphere's annual meeting of first ladies, formally called the Conference of Wives of Heads of State and Government of the Americas. This year's theme is empowering women to claim their rights in the emerging democracies of Latin America.

"No nation can hope to succeed in our global economy if half of its people lack the opportunity and the right to make the most of their God-given potentials," Clinton told the other spouses. "And as we can all attest, in too many countries, my own as well, too many rights are denied and too many doors of opportunity remain tightly closed."

The Washington Post
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997

E. J. Dionne Jr.

Child Care Without Ideology?

President Clinton's detractors see child care as one of those adorable soccer mom issues he routinely embraces to his political benefit. No wonder he and first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton are hosting a White House Conference on Child Care on Oct. 23. What's not to like about nurturing kids?

It turns out that as soon as the government gets involved, the answer is: plenty. The veterans of two decades of child-care arguments bear the scars of ideological combat. The impasse created by the old battles is why so much remains to be done.

Already, there are warnings that this conference has a hidden agenda: to revive proposals for a massive federal day-care program. "If what we do is empower government to spend more time with our kids instead of empowering parents to have more private and sectarian (i.e., church-based) options, then we're moving in the wrong direc-

tion," says Gary Bauer, president of the Family Research Council.

"I certainly have qualms," said David Blankenhorn, president of the Institute for American Values, "and I know others have qualms, about using recent research on early childhood development to justify new federal child-care programs and regulations."

The research he's talking about found that the amount of stimulation and affection children get in their first three years has a lot to do with how well their brains develop. Many parents know this instinctively, but the scientists helped kick off the new round of concern about infant care.

Two things are true about the child-care debate: (1) Ideological conflicts are inevitable, and (2) they are the last thing this discussion needs right now.

Ideology is a fancy word for people's morals, habits, values and commitments. Few questions raise more of a

moral ruckus than how kids should be brought up and who should do the job.

Conservatives make a fair point when they insist that government programs should not discriminate either against or in favor of couples in which a parent stays home. But if the debate gets bogged down in people's views of feminism and government, parents looking for just a little help won't get any.

Traditionalists such as Bauer say the problem is that parents, especially mothers, are working too much outside the home. But there are many two-paycheck families—earning, say, \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year—in which the mother or father would love to be home at 3 p.m. when the kids get out of school, yet simply can't afford to leave work.

If Bauer wants to lobby his allies among conservative business people to demonstrate their traditional values by letting more parents get home early, more power to him. In the meantime,

what about that two-paycheck couple? Might it not be helpful to keep the schools open until 6 p.m. with homework assistance, music, arts or sports programs?

Bauer says a loudly ideological "No!" because this would "continue down the road we're on where we think government bureaucrats and social workers can make up for what parents should do." Blankenhorn has a less reflexive response, welcoming the idea of "using school grounds for community-based programs available to all children."

Another idea likely to emerge from the conference is using regulatory and tax relief to help employers create more and better child care at workplaces and to encourage small employers to pool resources.

The conference will also deal with the reality that there's a lot of bad child care out there. This raises the hackles of conservatives, who warn that bureaucrats will regulate the care given

by churches, neighbors—or Grandma. Well, yes, some regulations can be crazy. But recent day-care horror stories suggest that the well-being of kids requires some enforceable rules and safety checks.

Expanding choice would help too. "If parents have choices, they're not going to choose the option where a kid has a coach crawling on him or gets locked in a closet," says Margy Waller, an analyst at the Progressive Policy Institute. But options require money, whether for vouchers, tax credits or more school-based infant care. Where will the money come from?

The mantra for the conference, says White House spin-doctor-in-chief Rahm Emanuel, is "access, affordability, safety." A clever slogan that, because it's designed to bury as many ideological issues as possible. In the case of child care, Clinton's gift for dodging ideology may be exactly what kids and their parents are looking for.

The Washington Post
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997

On Tape, Reagan Appeals to Donors At White House

By Ruth Marcus
Washington Post Staff Writer

A1

The setting was the stately East Room of the White House. Dozens of the party's biggest donors crowded in for a pep talk by the president, who thanked them for giving the party the "financial strength to recapture" the White House and urged them to do more.

"And let me ask you now, I know this is silly, but can I count on you to help?" the president asked to thunderous applause. "I thought that might be your answer. Besides keeping the White House, at the top of our list is getting back the Senate. And I know we've got a lot of people here today who'll help lead the charge."

That was 10 years ago. The president was Ronald Reagan and the contributors were the Republican Eagles, an elite group of donors who had given at least \$10,000 in that year to the Republican National Committee.

See REAGAN, A9, Col. 3

REAGAN, From A1

In the month after the Sept. 30, 1987 event, the party collected \$1.3 million in renewals and new memberships in the Eagles, the RNC finance chairman said at the time.

The Reagan remarks were captured by the White House Communications Agency—the same agency that videotaped President Clinton's White House coffees. The tape, archived at the Reagan library, was provided to The Washington Post by a Democratic source.

It has become common for presidents of both parties to reward big donors with White House dinners. The Republican Team 100 donors were feted at the White House during the Bush administration, while the Democratic National Committee's trustees have

been entertained there during Clinton's tenure. Both parties have defended those events as legitimate thank-yous for supporters. And Clinton administration officials have pointed to the Bush and Reagan events as evidence that they simply continued—or at worst perfected—an already robust tradition of stroking contributors.

The Reagan tape, with his exhortation to the Eagles for future "help" and the party's apparent success in raising money from them afterward, provides yet another illustration of the fuzzy line between permissible reward and improper solicitation.

For example, Republicans have seized on comments that Democratic fund-raiser John Huang allegedly made at one White House coffee that Clinton attended with Democratic donors. One

participant, whose remarks were disputed by others, said Huang told the group, "Elections, as you know, cost money, lots of money, and I'm sure everyone in this room will want to support the reelection of the president."

In his East Room remarks, Reagan stressed the importance of the money the group provided, likening the Eagles to the "cavalry coming to the rescue" of the party after the Watergate scandal and the disastrous midterm elections of 1974. "Thanks to the Eagles, the Republican Party had the financial strength to recapture not only the White House but to win the Senate as well."

A.B. Culvahouse, Reagan's White House counsel at the time, said he saw no problem with Reagan's remarks and a huge difference between them and Clinton's coffees and other activities.

He said the East Room is considered part of the White House residence, not an official space; that Reagan had only large receptions a few times a year rather than repeated small gatherings, and that no issues of substance were discussed. He added that events like this were fully disclosed on Reagan's schedule, not secret coffees.

"There was no solicitation," Culvahouse said. "It was a general kind of reception where he was thanking them for help and asking them to help in the future...."

But Kent Cooper of the Center for Responsive Politics said the Reagan tape appears "very similar" to GOP charges of Clinton's use of the White House for fund-raising. "You want to use the aura of the White House to thank and also induce donors to be part of your team and that's the type of carefully crafted language that substitutes for the phrase, 'Give me as much as you can of your money.'"

The Washington Post

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997

Reno 'Mad' About Delay in Obtaining Videotapes

By Roberto Suro
Washington Post Staff Writer

A1

Attorney General Janet Reno said yesterday that the delay in providing Justice Department investigators with videotapes of President Clinton's fund-raising coffees had frustrated and angered her and strained her relationship with the White House.

"I was mad," Reno said, describing how she reacted last Saturday when she learned of the existence of the 44 videotapes showing Clinton greeting political supporters. She said the White House had not responded to Justice Department requests for the tapes in a timely manner and then waited several days to inform the department that it had finally found them.

"When you have a situation where the White House has recognized the responsibility to produce the documents, it is very, very frustrating to have them produced in such a delayed fashion," Reno said. "And I also thought that we should have been told immediately, as soon as they were found."

Reno said the tapes have not changed her assessment that the White House coffees they depict were lawful. But her comments marked an extraordinary public critique of the White House at a time when both Clinton and Vice President Gore are the subjects of Justice Department inquiries that could lead to independent counsel investigations of their fund-raising activities.

Reno refused to say whether the delay in producing them was now the subject of a criminal investigation. Lanny A. Breuer, the White House counsel who handled the tapes, was called before a federal grand jury Wednesday and questioned about why it had

See RENO, A6, Col. 1

RENO, From A1

taken the White House so long to produce the videotapes, officials said.

Reno's comments came a day after Clinton said the mishandling of the tapes was an innocent mistake and White House officials apologized to her.

"We understand the reasons that Attorney General Reno expressed her anger and concerns today, and we have already both privately and publicly expressed our sincerest regrets," said Lanny J. Davis, a White House spokesman.

Reno's relationship with Clinton has been distant, if not icy, for years, but she has managed to avoid direct confrontations with the White House

even during difficult episodes such as the controversy over White House access to confidential FBI files.

Asked about the state of her relations with the White House, Reno said, "I think anytime somebody gets upset and mad at what happened, there perhaps is a strain."

The attorney general's comments came at a weekly news conference at which she responded again to critics who say she should seek an independent counsel to investigate campaign finance allegations because the Justice Department's own investigation has been ineffective.

Last Friday Reno opened a preliminary investigation into telephone solicitations by Gore from the White House, a major step toward the appointment of an independent

counsel, but she rejected a request from Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee to seek an independent

"When I say that I am determined to follow every lead, I mean it."

—Attorney General Janet Reno

dent counsel on a broad range of alleged campaign fund-raising abuses by both Clinton and Gore. Among the specific matters she addressed were the White House coffees.

Reno said no information had

emerged to that point to indicate that Clinton had solicited funds during the coffees in what might be a violation of a law prohibiting fund raising on government property.

Then on Saturday the Justice Department was informed by the White House that it had found the 44 videotapes that were covered by subpoenas issued months ago. Investigators for the Senate Governmental Affairs committee, which had also sought the tapes, had been told about them Friday, and White House lawyers had discovered the tapes Wednesday.

Reading a statement yesterday, Reno said that "no one can shout loud enough, or write a headline big enough, or use words shrill enough

to keep me from doing what I think is the right thing on this investigation."

Defending the 11-month Justice Department inquiry, Reno said, "there have been claims that we have somehow tied investigators' hands, or chosen not to pursue all available leads or spared high level figures by not triggering provisions of the Independent Counsel Statute. These claims are not true."

Reno noted that the task force conducting the campaign finance investigation now numbers 120 FBI agents, attorneys and support staff and that it has obtained more than a million pages of documents and conducted hundred of interviews.

"When I say that I am determined to follow every lead," she added, "I

mean it, but I don't mean to follow innuendo or rank speculation."

Congressional Republicans have criticized Reno for months for her handling of the campaign finance investigations and have increased their attacks this week, questioning both her competence and objectivity. Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) said Monday that Reno has failed "to convey the tone of urgency and seriousness necessary to win cooperation from those under scrutiny."

Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah), chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, said yesterday he would consider holding hearings on Reno's conduct of the inquiry. "I really believe there are some things here that have to be explained," Hatch said.

The Washington Post
Friday, October 10, 1997

No, Mr. Ickes, Not Every President

By Lyn Nofziger

WASHINGTON here was Harold Ickes when President Richard Nixon needed him?

Mr. Ickes, President Clinton's former deputy chief of staff, is wonderful at obfuscation, with a unique ability to take facts and alleged facts and twist them to his use and the President's benefit.

Doubters need only read a transcript of Mr. Ickes's opening statement on Wednesday to the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, which is investigating illegal and unethical political fund-raising practices, to know that he would have done Mr. Nixon proud at the Watergate hearings by insisting the truth is only as he would have us see it.

Mr. Ickes's statement appears to have two purposes: to protect Mr. Clinton and to bring President Ronald Reagan and his White House

Ronald Reagan knew fund-raising's place.

down to Mr. Clinton's level. One way he does this is by asserting that Mr. Reagan personally raised campaign money out of the White House.

I have talked to Mr. Reagan's personal secretary and the two men who

served as his personal aides during his eight years in office, and each one is adamant that Mr. Reagan never phoned for or personally solicited money. That coincides with my own knowledge of President Reagan.

Yes, he thanked people who had donated, he invited them to events in the White House, and he allowed his signature to be used on Republican Party fund-raising letters. Show me a modern President who hasn't. But here was a man who so revered the Presidency that he would not demean it by taking off his coat in the Oval Office. Would he then dial for dollars in that same office? Don't be silly.

In his statement, Mr. Ickes mentioned me and Ed Rollins, my successor as Mr. Reagan's assistant for political affairs. Mr. Ickes stated that "the office of political affairs had, and I quote, 'specific links to the Republican National Committee and the House and Senate G.O.P. campaign units, so that all elements of the party apparatus would have a designated contact in the White House.'"

With his testimony, Mr. Ickes was trying to imply, "See, everyone does it." And he's right; the Reagan White House had a political office that handled the President's political chores. But Mr. Ickes, in trying to justify the Clinton White House's fund-raising activities, mixes apples and oranges. For the fact is, we did not raise money in the Reagan political office or anywhere else in the White House.

What we did was what has been done in every White House. We helped people who had helped us, screened people who wanted appointments to be sure they were Reagan supporters, arranged for the President to thank people who had contributed or in other ways had helped, and stayed in touch with the President's supporters around the country.

But it is one thing to thank a contributor; it is another to use the power and influence of the Presidency to finagle large sums from people who otherwise might not give.

In Mr. Ickes's view, it was proper to hold coffees in the White House for the purpose of raising money, proper for both the President and Vice President to make money-raising phone calls from their White House offices and proper for Vice President Al Gore to participate in a political fund-raiser held in a Buddhist temple.

There is a difference between Mr. Reagan's conduct in office and Mr. Clinton's — although Mr. Ickes apparently fails to see it. And this blindness may be the ultimate explanation behind today's fund-raising scandal. □

Lyn Nofziger was an aide to President Ronald Reagan.

The New York Times

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1997

BC-PANAMA-HILLARY-SCENE (PICTURE)

Hillary Clinton sends ship into Panama Canal

By Arshad Mohammed

MIRAFLORES LOCK, Panama, Oct 9 (Reuter) - With a flick of her wrist, Hillary Rodham Clinton twisted two chrome-plated levers on Thursday and sent a 33,000-ton South Korean freighter on its way to the Pacific Ocean through the Panama Canal.

On the second day of her visit, the U.S. first lady paid a visit to the Panama Canal, the massive engineering feat that links the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and has long been a symbol of U.S. imperialism in Latin America.

Mrs. Clinton clearly relished the tour and her chance to work the controls of the 50-mile (83 km) canal, which was completed in 1914 and will be handed over to the Panamanian government at the end of 1999.

Twisting a series of levers in the control tower near the canal's Pacific mouth, Mrs. Clinton opened the gates to allow the ship through one lock and to unleash about half the 52 million gallons (196.8 million litres) of water needed to move it through the canal.

"I've heard about it all my life, but seeing it is very impressive," Mrs. Clinton said after watching the Choyang Chance, a South Korean ship en route from Savannah, Georgia to Long Beach, California, make its way through the lock.

The massive ship, piled high with red, blue and green metal containers filled items ranging from electronics to perishable foods, cleared the canal with just two feet (60 cm) on either side.

Mrs. Clinton arrived in Panama on Wednesday to attend a conference of first ladies from North, South and Central America. She was due to fly back to Washington on Friday after touring the canal by helicopter.

She devoted most of Thursday to the conference, urging her counterparts from the region to work harder to make sure women enjoy their full legal and civil rights and participate fully in the Democratic process.

After operating the canal, Mrs. Clinton was presented with a certificate as a "Control House Operator" by canal officials and told that she was welcome to work anytime, especially the night shift on Christmas.

"Everybody's always asking what I'm going to do when my husband is no longer president. I may have found my calling," she said with a laugh. "I may need a job in a few years." REUTER

**** filed by:RB--(--) on 10/10/97 at 02:23EDT ****

**** printed by:WHPR(SCOH) on 10/10/97 at 09:20EDT ****

PM-Mrs Clinton-Panama,600

First lady takes control of canal locks, gets a job offer

By NANCY BENAC= Associated Press Writer=

PANAMA CITY, Panama (AP) Hillary Rodham Clinton may have found her calling.

The first lady got a chance to control the Panama Canal's Miraflores Locks on Thursday, and she took to the job with gusto.

Twisting a series of chrome-plated levers with gradually increasing confidence, Mrs. Clinton unleashed 26 million gallons of water to send the South Korean cargo ship Choyang Chance on its way to the Pacific Ocean.

"Everybody's always asking what I'm going to do when my husband's no longer president," Mrs. Clinton told a gaggle of control house onlookers. "I have found my calling. I've been offered a job."

She did not back down even when operations supervisor Eduardo Hevia warned that he needed someone for the midnight shift on Christmas.

"I'm your person," she promised.

Mrs. Clinton's three-day visit to Panama was built around an annual conference of first ladies from throughout the hemisphere. But it was also an opportunity for her to get a firsthand look at one of the world's biggest real estate transactions.

Under a treaty negotiated during the Carter administration, the United States is turning the Panama Canal and its military bases here over to the Panamanians. The handover becomes final on Dec. 31, 1999.

Mrs. Clinton's admiring reaction to the canal's operation, overseen by Panamanian administrator Alberto Aleman, served to underscore the Clinton administration's message that the handover is proceeding smoothly.

Panama has been gradually taking over operation of the 84-year-old canal in recent years, and insists it is ready to assume full control. The transfer comes amid pressure to expand the waterway's capacity and concerns about its safety without the presence of the thousands of U.S. soldiers who guarded it.

But none of that was on the public agenda Thursday during Mrs. Clinton's goodwill visit.

"I've heard about it all my life but seeing it is very impressive," she said, exchanging waves with South Korean crew members passing through the locks under her control. One man on board doffed his cap; a woman quickly snapped photos of Mrs. Clinton and her entourage.

The first lady was joined at the locks Thursday night by other first ladies for the signing of a declaration at the close of the annual Conference of Wives of Heads of State and Government of the Americas.

The women pledged their nations to combat a variety of social problems and inequities, particularly those affecting women and children in rural areas.

"We continue to be deeply concerned about the persistent poverty and inequity of rural women in the Americas," the declaration said. "As a priority, this requires the design of expeditious actions that strongly integrate rural women in educational, productive and commercial activities."

Earlier Thursday, Mrs. Clinton told the first ladies that allowing women to "seek and claim their rights as citizens and as human beings is the only way we can ensure that our democracies old and new survive and thrive into the 21st century."

Today, Mrs. Clinton was visiting a rural village where women have established a nursery that helps them supplement meager family income while supplying plants for the canal's watershed area.

Because the canal's locks operate without pumps, it requires 52 million gallons of fresh water to send one ship through the waterway. Deforestation has made the watershed increasingly vulnerable to sedimentation and reduced the storage capacity of its lakes.

**** filed by:APE(--) on 10/10/97 at 02:01EDT ****

**** printed by:WHPR(SCOH) on 10/10/97 at 09:21EDT ****

AM-Mrs Clinton, 1st Ld-Writethru, a0623,650

First lady says time to change attitudes toward women

Eds: INSERTS grafts 13-14, At the canal, with color

By NANCY BENAC= Associated Press Writer=

PANAMA CITY, Panama (AP) In a region where dictatorships have given way to democracies, Hillary Rodham Clinton urged nations of the Americas Thursday to go a step further to protect the rights of women.

The only way for democracies to "survive and thrive," she said, is to give women more power "to seek and claim their rights as citizens and as human beings."

Speaking at a conference of Latin American first ladies, Mrs. Clinton suggested the challenge could be more difficult than the giant undertaking of building the Panama Canal, whose Pacific entrance was just blocks away.

"Instead of mountains, we seek to move hearts, to change old attitudes, to banish hunger and disease and ignorance, to educate all our children ... to empower the women of our hemisphere to participate fully in the life of our nations," Mrs. Clinton said.

The first lady, speaking at the annual Conference of Wives of Heads of State and Government of the Americas, included the United States among the countries where women need greater opportunity.

"In too many countries, my own as well, too many rights are denied and too many doors of opportunity remain tightly closed," Mrs. Clinton said.

Without being specific, she called for changes in both law and attitude to protect women's property and employment rights, combat sexual and domestic violence, encourage political participation and reduce poverty.

"Democracy can only achieve its fullest potential when women are not barred by law, by ignorance, by tradition or custom, or intimidation from making their voices heard at the ballot box and from pursuing their most cherished dreams," she said.

Mrs. Clinton underscored her message by witnessing the signing of a \$4.8 million grant from the Agency for International Development to the Inter-American Institute on Human Rights, the region's pre-eminent human rights organization.

Where once the institute's focus was repressive regimes that engaged in torture and execution, now its Gender and Human Rights program pushes for greater legal and political opportunity for women.

Mrs. Clinton cited signs of progress throughout Latin America. In Costa Rica, for example, women pushed through a law against domestic violence and worked to train police about the problem. In El Salvador, she said, legislators have modernized rape laws and required politicians to pay child support before running for office.

The first lady also was swearing in new Peace Corps volunteers on Thursday and touring the Panama Canal, which the United States is gradually turning over to the Panamanians under a treaty negotiated during the Carter administration.

At the canal, Mrs. Clinton turned chrome-plated levers to unleash 27 million gallons of water and send a South Korean freighter through the Miraflores Lock and on its way to the Pacific Ocean.

"I've read about it all my life but seeing it is very impressive," she said.

After returning home Friday, the first lady returns to Latin America

Sunday with President Clinton for a visit to Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela. She plans to use the trip to see success stories local programs that ensure women have access to credit, family planning, education and other needs.

"We should not rest until we have repealed laws, swept away the webs of tradition, stared down the forces of intimidation that stifle the potential of women and children that keep nations from being truly democratic and fully free," she said.

Mrs. Clinton first met with first ladies from the region in 1994, when she

invited them to attend a symposium on children while their husbands were meeting hers at the Summit of the Americas in Miami.

The women reciprocated by inviting her to attend their annual first ladies' conference. This is the third year Mrs. Clinton has joined them.

**** filed by:APE(--) on 10/09/97 at 20:52EDT ****

**** printed by:WHPR(SCOH) on 10/10/97 at 09:21EDT ****

PRESIDENT LEADS A BROAD DEFENSE OF FUND-RAISING

REJECTS SPECIAL INQUIRY

As Ickes Spars With Panel and Lawyer Answers Subpoena, Tape Dispute Continues

A1

By STEPHEN LABATON

WASHINGTON, Oct. 8 — Hoping to calm the political tempest over belatedly discovered White House videotapes of the President Clinton's meetings with Democratic donors, Mr. Clinton today defended his fund-raising practices, while current and former White House advisers carried the same message to Congress and a Federal grand jury.

In his most extended comments about the videotaped snippets of 44 White House coffees with supporters, Mr. Clinton rejected the latest Congressional suggestions, mostly by Republicans, that the appointment of an outside counsel was the only way to insure a credible investigation of the fund-raising practices employed in his last campaign.

As President Clinton spoke, a senior White House lawyer was on his way to testify before a Federal grand jury to defend the Administration's failure to comply with Congressional and Justice Department subpoenas that had requested all evidence, including videotapes, related to Democratic fund-raising.

The grand jury appearance of the lawyer, Lanny A. Breuer, whose job it is to answer such subpoenas, also coincided with a second day of Congressional testimony by Harold M. Ickes, the former deputy White House counsel, who was also a chief orchestrator of the Democrats' now much-criticized fund-raising operation in the 1996 campaign cycle. Again Mr. Ickes robustly defended the fund-raising. [Article and excerpts, page A26.]

The President met briefly with reporters this morning before embarking on a campaign fund-raising swing through New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and he contended that the tapes included nothing to alter Attorney General Janet Reno's conclusion, announced last Friday, that no independent counsel was needed to investigate the White House coffees. He reiterated his belief that failure to turn the tapes over in a timely fashion to an investigating committee was a result of a simple mistake, not deliberate defiance.

"I was surprised that these films had been subpoenaed and not turned over," Mr. Clinton said. "I think there is a logical reason for it. I am frustrated whenever there has not

Continued From Page A1

been absolutely full compliance. But I think it's in everyone's interest that the films be turned over, and I would urge you to watch them if you haven't. I think they will reinforce the fact that no one has done anything wrong here."

The full-throttle defense by the Clinton Administration followed two days of intense criticism of the White House for failing to turn over the tapes until after Ms. Reno announced she would not recommend an independent counsel to investigate the coffees or the foreign contributions the Democrats had had to return.

Although the tapes do not appear to show any illegal fund-raising, they provide an unusual window into the courting of generous supporters by the President and his aides. The White House told the Justice Department about the tapes on Saturday, hours after Ms. Reno announced her decision. Some of the tapes were made public on Sunday.

The Justice Department issued its grand jury subpoena to Mr. Breuer on Tuesday. Ms. Reno was said to have been angry and frustrated by the tardiness with which the tapes were disclosed. Mr. Breuer told the grand jury that the tapes were discovered only last week, an official involved in the investigation said.

The official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, said Mr. Breuer testified that the tapes were discovered on Wednesday by White House lawyers, who had been pressed repeatedly by Republican investigators from the Senate committee investigating campaign fund-raising for the tapes.

Mr. Breuer is also said to have told the grand jury that he failed to notify the Justice Department until Saturday because he had been off from work on Thursday for the Jewish new year, Rosh ha-Shanah, and had tried unsuccessfully to reach Justice Department officials on Friday.

White House aides have said that the tapes were overlooked, not deliberately withheld. They blamed the failure in large part on the deluge of requests for information.

In a letter today to the ranking Republican and Democrat on the investigating panel, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, Charles F. C. Ruff, the White House counsel, said the Administration had complied with subpoenas "as completely as could reasonably be expected in light of the enormous range and volume of materials demanded and the difficulty of searching the files of so many offices and individuals."

Mr. Ruff continued: "That said, however, I recognize that any deficiencies in our searches, no matter how unintentional, create difficulties for the committee. In this instance, of course, the White House should have found the videotapes as the result of our original search directives. That they were not found then was, I assure you, a result only of inadvertence."

White House lawyers have said

that archivists who produce and store the tapes failed to punch the term "coffees" into their computerized tape log of Presidential events.

Mr. Clinton asserted that Republicans were making an issue of the videotapes to divert attention from their opposition on Tuesday to legislation intended to overhaul campaign finance laws.

Republican opposition and procedural maneuvers blocked a vote on the bill, sponsored by Senators John McCain, Republican of Arizona, and Russell D. Feingold, Democrat of Wisconsin.

"Yesterday there was yet one more attempt to kill any campaign finance reform," the President said. "That is the real story there lurking in the weeds. I actually think it's pretty good strategy for those who are trying to kill campaign finance reform to try to talk about these films of events in the White House which were legal and which I want everybody to watch."

But in a sign that little has changed, President Clinton was in northern New Jersey and Philadelphia today to raise about \$1.5 million for the state and national Democratic parties. Mr. Clinton appeared at five fund-raising functions. Two were planned to help James E. McGreevey, a New Jersey State Senator seeking to unseat Gov. Christine Todd Whitman of New Jersey.

In Philadelphia the President appeared at three functions to raise \$730,000 to help bail out the debt-swamped Democratic National Committee. The party is reeling from deficits from the return of more than \$3 million in illegal contributions and soaring legal bills for last year's campaign.

The President's day began with an appearance at a Baptist church in Newark, where he spoke of the importance of affordable day care for working parents and former welfare recipients entering the work force.

Aides said the speech and the Democratic Party events had been planned for weeks.

"Day in, day out we do the country's business," said a White House spokesman, Joe Lockhart. "Some days we raise money for the party."

Continued on Page A27

The New York Times

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

Ban on Method of Late Abortion Passes House Despite Veto Threat

A

By NEIL A. LEWIS

Continued From Page A1

WASHINGTON, Oct. 8 — The House approved by a wide margin today a ban on a form of late-term abortion that opponents see as violent, unnecessary and a political vulnerability of those who defend abortion rights.

President Clinton, who vetoed the measure once before, has promised to do so again. The measure passed the House by six votes more than the two-thirds needed to override a veto, but when the Senate approved the same measure last May, supporters were three votes short of the number needed to override.

Supporters of the measure said they would lobby hard for those three votes, but they were also looking past the override fight and into next year's Congressional elections. People on both sides of today's debate said the issue could be important in a number of Senate and House races.

The ban on the procedure, known medically as intact dilation and extraction and by opponents as "partial-birth" abortion, passed the House by a vote of 296 to 132, more than the 290 needed for an override.

The Senate passed the bill last May by a vote of 64 to 36.

Abortion opponents have found that public revulsion at the abortion procedure is a potent political weapon. Representative Tim Roemer of Indiana, one of 79 Democrats who voted for the ban, called it "a gruesome, brutal and grisly procedure that is only inches from infanticide."

The votes to ban a specific abortion procedure represent a change in the course of public debate since the landmark Supreme Court decision in 1973 affirming a woman's right to abortion. When opponents began calling the late-term procedure a partial-birth abortion two years ago, the move to outlaw it suddenly gained political momentum and became a winning issue for them after years of mostly defeats in the courts.

Mr. Clinton vetoed this legislation once before, saying it did not contain an exemption to protect the health of a pregnant woman. Today he said that while he has long opposed late-term abortions, he could not deny the procedure to "that small group of women in tragic circumstances who need an abortion performed at a late stage of pregnancy to avert death or serious injury."

Representative Charles T. Canaday, a Florida Republican who supports the ban, said that while he fully expected Mr. Clinton to veto the measure, his side would revisit the issue next year and try to publicize it before the elections.

That means, as one senior lobbyist for an anti-abortion group said, intense pressure will be focused on a

handful of senators to obtain those final three votes.

Representative Nita M. Lowey, a Westchester Democrat, who helped lead the fight against the bill, accused those supporting the measure of not really wanting to stop abortions, because outlawing the late-term procedure would only force doctors to use other methods.

"What they want is a political issue," she said.

In the procedure, a late-term fetus is partially delivered feet first and then the doctor uses a vacuum to suction out brain tissue before collapsing the skull to remove the entire fetus. Opponents of the ban say the method is rarely used and is sometimes needed to maintain a woman's fertility.

Indeed, as the bill's supporters spoke, they displayed large striking drawings of doctors using the procedure to draw out a fetus from the birth canal.

Among Democrats voting for the ban was Representative Charles W. Rangel, the New York Democrat who had previously voted against prohibiting the procedure.

Strategists for the anti-abortion movement said they hoped the issue will play an important role in Florida next year, where Senator Bob Graham, a Democrat who voted against the ban will be running for re-election. In addition, Representative Mark W. Neumann, a Wisconsin Republican who has announced his candidacy for the Senate and who supported the ban, has said he will use the partial-birth abortion ban as an important argument against Russell W. Feingold, the incumbent Democrat. One abortion opponent, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said he hoped Senator Carol Mosley-Braun of Illinois would change her vote against the ban before her re-election campaign.

"If we don't get it next year, we believe we can probably get it enacted after the next election," that strategist said, referring to the proposed ban. Ralph Reed, the former executive director of the Christian Coalition and now a political consultant, has called the ban on the procedure "a winning, gold-plated issue, going into the 1998 elections."

Senator Max Cleland, Democrat of Georgia, who voted against the bill in May is also likely to be the focus of a lobbying campaign.

Supporters of the ban on the procedure were able to win an important ally in May, just before the vote, when the American Medical Association endorsed the ban. The endorsement came after a few changes in the measure, aimed mostly at protecting doctors who use the procedure. Other medical groups like the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists have opposed the ban.

The bill had been stalled on Capitol Hill. The House passed it in March, with enough votes to override a veto. The Senate passed it in May, three votes shy of the votes needed to override. The Senate then changed the bill to win the A.M.A. endorsement, so the bill had to be sent back to the House.

Under the measure, doctors who use the procedure could be fined and sentenced to two years in prison. The patient would be exempt from criminal penalties.

Mr. Clinton wrote a letter outlining his opposition to the bill on Tuesday to Representative Steny H. Hoyer, a Maryland Democrat who opposes all late-term abortions. The President said he would be willing to sign a bill outlawing the procedure if it made an exception to preserve the health of the mother. The bill, which will be sent to him this week, has an exemption only to save the life of the mother.

Representative Canaday told reporters that Mr. Clinton's request was unacceptable because it would allow abortion providers to simply declare the procedure was necessary for the patient's mental health.

Representative Tom Coburn, an Oklahoma Republican and a family practice doctor who has delivered 3,200 babies, has taken a leading role in the effort to ban the procedure. "There is never a medical reason for this procedure," he said today. "It has to do with murder at the convenience of abortionists."

But Representative Lynn Woolsey, a California Democrat, said it was offensive for lawmakers to decide such issues. "It continues to amaze me that the members of this House have such little faith that they would deny access to a possibly lifesaving procedure out of some ridiculous notion that women don't care about their babies."

A lingering question in the debate is whether such a ban would be constitutional. In July, a Federal court in Michigan threw out a state law similar to the one passed today.

The New York Times

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

Continued on Page A29

1/2

How House Members Voted on Anti-Abortion Measure

WASHINGTON, Oct. 8 (AP) — Following is the 296-to-132 roll-call by which the House of Representatives today approved a Senate-passed bill banning a procedure used to end some late-term pregnancies. A "yes" vote is a vote to approve the bill. Voting "yes" were 79 Democrats and 217 Republicans. Voting "no" were 123 Democrats, 8 Republicans and 1 independent. Y is a "yes" vote. N is a "no" vote. X denotes those not voting. There is one vacancy in the 435-member House.

ALABAMA

Republicans — Aderholt, Y; Ba-tus, Y; Callahan, Y; Everett, Y; RHev, Y.

Democrats — Cramer, Y; Hilliard, X.

ALASKA

Republicans — Young, Y.

ARIZONA

Republicans — Hayworth, Y; Kolbe, N; Salmon, Y; Shadegg, Y; Stump, Y.

Democrats — Paslor, N.

ARKANSAS

Republicans — Dickey, Y; Hutchin-son, Y.

Democrats — Berry, Y; Snyder, N.

CALIFORNIA

Republicans — Billbray, X; Bono, Y; Calvert, Y; Campbell, N; Cox, Y; Cunningham, Y; Doolittle, Y; Dreier, Y; Galleply, Y; Herper, Y; Horn, N; Hunter, Y; Kim, Y; Lew-Is, Y; McKeen, Y; Packard, Y; Pombo, Y; Radanovich, Y; Riggs, Y; Rogan, Y; Rohrabacher, Y; Royce, Y; Thomas, Y.

Democrats — Becerra, N; Berman, N; Brown, N; Capps, N; Condit, Y; Dellums, N; Dixon, N; Dooley, N; Eshoo, N; Farr, N; Fazio, N; Filner, N; Harman, N; Lantos, N; Lofgren, N; Martinez, Y; Matsui, N; Millender-McDonald, N; Miller, N; Pelosi, N; Roybal-Allard, N; Sanchez, N; Sherman, N; Stark, N; Tauscher, N; Torres, N; Waters, N; Waxman, N; Woolsey, N.

COLORADO

Republicans — Hefley, Y; McInnis, Y; Schaefer, Dard, Y; Schaffer,

Bob, Y.

Democrats — DeGette, N; Skaggs, N.

CONNECTICUT

Republicans — Johnson, N; Shays, Y.

Democrats — DeLauro, N; Gelden-son, N; Kinnally, N; Maloney, Y.

DELAWARE

Republican — Castle, Y.

FLORIDA

Republicans — Billrakis, Y; Can-ady, Y; Diaz-Balart, Y; Foley, Y; Fowler, Y; Goss, Y; McCollum, Y; Milca, Y; Miller, Y; Ros-Lehtinen, Y; Scarborough, Y; Shaw, Y; Stearns, Y; Weldon, Y; Young, Y.

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

GEORGIA

Republicans — Barr, Y; Chambliss, Y; Collins, Y; Deal, Y; Gingrich, Y; Kingston, Y; Linder, Y; Nor-wood, Y.

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

HAWAII

Democrats — Abercrombie, N; Mink, N.

IDAHO

Republicans — Chenoweth, Y; Crapo, Y.

ILLINOIS

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

Democrats — Biagolevich, N; Cos-tello, Y; Davis, N; Evans, N; Gu-

Herrez, N; Jackson, N; Lipinski, Y; Poshard, Y; Rush, N; Yates, N.

INDIANA

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

Democrats — Carson, N; Hamilton, Y; Roemer, Y; Visclosky, Y.

IOWA

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

Democrat — Boswell, Y.

KANSAS

Republicans — Moran, Y; Ryan, Y; Snowbarger, Y; Tiahrt, Y.

KENTUCKY

Republicans — Bunning, Y; Lewis, X; Northup, Y; Rogers, Y; Whit-field, Y.

Democrat — Baesler, Y.

LOUISIANA

Republicans — Baker, Y; Cooksey, Y; Livingston, Y; McCrery, Y; Tauzin, Y.

Democrats — Jefferson, Y; John, Y.

MAINE

Democrats — Allen, N; Baldacci, N.

MARYLAND

Republicans — Bartlett, Y; Ehr-lich, Y; Glichest, Y; Morella, N.

Democrats — Cardin, N; Cum-mings, N; Hoyer, N; Wynn, N.

MASSACHUSETTS

Democrats — Delahunt, N; Frank, N; Kennedy, N; Markey, N; Mc-Govern, N; Meehan, N; Moakley, Y; Neal, Y; Oliver, N; Tierney, N.

MICHIGAN

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

Democrats — Barcia, Y; Bonior, Y; Conyers, N; Dingell, Y; Kildee, Y; Kilpatrick, N; Levin, N; Rivers, N; Slabenow, N; Stupak, Y.

MINNESOTA

Republicans — Gutknecht, Y; Ramsfald, Y.

Democrats — Luther, N; Minge, Y; Oberstar, Y; Peterson, Y; Sabo, N; Ventura, N.

MISSISSIPPI

Republicans — Parker, Y; Picker-ing, Y; Wicker, Y.

Democrats — Taylor, Y; Thomp-son, N.

MISSOURI

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

Democrats — Clay, N; Danner, Y; Gephardt, X; McCarthy, N; Skel-ton, Y.

MONTANA

Republican — Hill, Y.

NEBRASKA

Republicans — Barrett, Y; Berv-ler, Y; Christensen, Y.

NEVADA

Republicans — Ensign, Y; Gib-bons, Y.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Republicans — Bass, Y; Sununu, Y.

NEW JERSEY

Republicans — Franks, Y; Freling-huysen, Y; Lofblondo, Y; Pappas, Y; Rouzema, Y; Saxton, Y; Smith, Y.

Democrats — Andrews, N; Menen-dez, N; Pallone, N; Pascarella, Y; Payne, X; Rothman, N.

NEW MEXICO

Republicans — Redmond, Y; Schiff, X; Skeen, Y.

NEW YORK

Republicans — Boehlert, N; Forbes, Y; Gilman, N; Houghton, Y; Kelly, Y; King, Y; Lazio, Y; McHugh, Y; Paxon, Y; Quinn, Y;

Solomon, Y; Walsh, Y.

Democrats — Ackerman, N; Engel, N; Flake, Y; Hinchey, N; LaFalce, Y; Lowey, N; Maloney, N; Marlon, Y; McCarthy, N; McNulty, Y; Nadler, N; Owens, N; Rangel, Y; Schumer, N; Serrano, N; Slaughter, N; Towns, N; Velazquez, N.

NORTH CAROLINA

Republicans — Ballenger, Y; Burr, Y; Coble, Y; Jones, Y; Myrick, Y; Taylor, Y.

Democrats — Clayton, N; Ether-idge, Y; Hefner, Y; McIntyre, Y; Price, N; Wolf, N.

NORTH DAKOTA

Democrat — Pomeroy, Y.

OHIO

Republicans — Boehner, Y; Cha-bol, Y; Gilmore, Y; Hobson, Y; Ka-sich, Y; LaTourette, Y; Mey, Y; Oxley, Y; Portman, Y; Pryce, Y; Regula, Y.

Democrats — Brown, N; Hall, Y; Kaplur, Y; Kucinich, Y; Sawyer, N; Stokes, N; Strickland, Y; Traficanti, Y.

OKLAHOMA

Republicans — Coburn, Y; Islook, Y; Largent, Y; Lucas, Y; Watkins, Y; Walls, Y.

OREGON

Republican — Smith, Y.

Democrats — Blumenauer, N; De-Fazio, N; Furse, N; Hooley, N.

PENNSYLVANIA

Republicans — English, Y; Fox, Y; Gekas, Y; Goodling, Y; Green-wood, N; McDade, Y; Peterson, Y; Pitts, Y; Shuster, Y; Weldon, Y.

Democrats — Borski, Y; Coyne, N; Doyle, Y; Fattaah, N; Foglietta, Y; Holden, Y; Kanjorski, Y; Kilink, Y; Mascara, Y; McHale, Y; Murtha, Y.

RHODE ISLAND

Democrats — Kennedy, Y; Wey-gand, Y.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Republicans — Graham, Y; Inglis, Y; Sanford, Y; Spence, Y.

Democrats — Clyburn, N; Spratt,

Y.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Republican — Thune, Y.

TENNESSEE

Republicans — Bryant, Y; Duncan, Y; Hilleary, Y; Jenkins, Y; Wamp, Y.

Democrats — Clement, Y; Ford, N; Gordon, Y; Tanner, Y.

TEXAS

Republicans — Archer, Y; Armey, Y; Barton, Y; Boedilla, Y; Brady, Y; Combett, Y; DeLay, Y; Gran-ger, Y; Johnson, Sam, Y; Paul, Y; Sessions, Y; Smith, Y; Thornberry, Y.

Democrats — Bentsen, N; Doggett, N; Edwards, N; Frost, N; Gonza-lez, X; Green, N; Hall, Y; Hinojosa, Y; Jackson-Lee, N; Johnson, E.B., N; Lampson, Y; Ortiz, Y; Reyes, Y; Rodriguez, N; Sandlin, Y; Sten-holm, Y; Turner, Y.

UTAH

Republicans — Cannon, Y; Cook, Y; Hansen, Y.

VERMONT

Independent — Sanders, N.

VIRGINIA

Republicans — Bateman, Y; Blifley, Y; Davis, Y; Goodlatte, Y; Wolf, Y.

Democrats — Boucher, N; Goode, Y; Moran, Y; Picklett, N; Scott, N; Sisisky, Y.

WASHINGTON

Republicans — Dunn, Y; Hastings, Y; Metcalf, Y; Nethercull, Y; Smith, Linda, Y; White, Y.

Democrats — Dicks, N; McDermott, N; Smith, Adam, N.

WEST VIRGINIA

Democrats — Mollahan, Y; Rahall, Y; Wise, N.

WISCONSIN

Republicans — Klig, Y; Neumann, Y; Petri, Y; Seassenbrenner, Y.

Democrats — Barrett, Y; Johnson, Y; Kind, Y; Kleczka, Y; Obey, Y.

WYOMING

Republican — Culin, Y.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

The New York Times

2/2

SENATE

Ickes, Under Questioning, Gives Committee No Quarter

By DAVID E. ROSENBAUM

WASHINGTON, Oct. 8 — At times combative, at times whimsical, Harold M. Ickes today parried every thrust and swipe from Republican senators investigating campaign finance practices, never giving an inch or wavering in his loyalty to President Clinton.

"We did what the law permitted," said Mr. Ickes, the chief political officer in the White House during last year's election campaign, implying that in politics, legal and proper are synonymous.

Later he embellished that refrain. "We were littered with lawyers," he said.

Mr. Ickes has been deposed and interviewed countless times on campaign finance matters. His testimony today, before the Senate Governmen-

If the senators were disturbed by Mr. Ickes's theme that there is no right or wrong in politics, only legality or illegality, it rarely showed.

Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, Democrat of Connecticut, asked whether anyone in the White House had ever said: "Hey, the lawyers tell us that technically this is legal. But is it right?"

But the question was posed among a string of others; Mr. Ickes never addressed it, and neither Mr. Lieberman nor anyone else ever returned to it.

The committee's Republicans were frustrated because Mr. Ickes couched most of his answers with phrases like "my recollection is" or "I may have, but I don't recall it" — words intended to inoculate him against accusations of perjury.

Still, he was a confident, compelling witness. In the sea of politics, most of the witnesses who have testified before the committee have been guppies. Mr. Ickes, if not a whale, is certainly a shark. And the Republicans seemed eager for combat with a figure who by his own description was the "point man" for campaign finance matters in the White House.

At one point, Don Nickles of Oklahoma, the deputy Republican leader in the Senate and perhaps the committee's most aggressive questioner, was asking Mr. Ickes about a particular document that had not been located.

"Obviously we're talking about obstruction of justice," Mr. Nickles said.

Most witnesses before Senate committees do not have the audacity to interrupt a member, but as Mr. Nickles tried to continue speaking, Mr. Ickes broke in: "If I may, Senator, since you're now alleging obstruction of justice —"

Senator Nickles cut him short: "I'm trying to find out if there was obstruction of justice."

Mr. Ickes interrupted again: "I think you're alleging it."

Their voices raised, the two men then talked over each other until Senator Fred Thompson of Tennessee, the committee chairman, restored order.

Late in the day, in another give-and-take, Senator Nickles asked whether political supporters had been given trips on Air Force One.

"No, we basically invited people we didn't like, Senator," Mr. Ickes retorted, beginning to tire and barely keeping his temper in check.

And when Senator Nickles mentioned the many times Mr. Huang had visited the White House, Mr. Ickes snapped, "That's a cheap shot, Senator." The witness said it was not fair to pin on him or the President activities of Mr. Huang that they had known nothing about. "Innuendo is easy," he asserted.

At another point, Senator Susan Collins, Republican of Maine, accused the Clinton White House and the Democratic National Committee of bypassing career Government officials on policy matters affecting contributors.

"I think the message is very clear here," Senator Collins said. "If you give enough money to the D.N.C., you're at least going to get access to the political appointees or the President or the Vice President."

Mr. Ickes replied curtly. "And if you give enough money to Republican senators, you'll get access, too." Combative though he was, Mr. Ickes's testimony was filled with whimsy.

When a questioner mentioned Dick Morris, a Clinton re-election strategist who for decades has been a political rival of Mr. Ickes, the witness said, "First of all, I don't want to vouch for anything or everything that Dick said."

When the subject returned to Mr. Morris, Mr. Ickes was asked whether his rival had liked a certain set of political advertisements. He replied, "Dick didn't think much of anything that didn't come from him."

A friendly questioner, Senator Carl Levin, Democrat of Michigan, asked Mr. Ickes about his reputation for taking copious notes and for collecting and saving documents like a pack rat.

Mr. Ickes answered by referring to his father, Harold L. Ickes, who was President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Interior Secretary, and to the embarrassment of a Treasury Department official whose diary was subpoenaed in a Whitewater investigation.

"I think it's sort of a historical thing," the witness said. "If you think I kept notes, my father kept a lot of notes. And quite frankly, I was thinking about keeping a diary when I first came down here. The Whitewater subpoenas seared me in that regard, and I decided not to."

So went the only day of the committee's questioning of Mr. Ickes, who on Tuesday had just enough time to present an opening statement before the panel recessed.

His testimony today followed a stir that Senator Thompson, the committee chairman, caused first thing this morning.

Mr. Thompson disclosed that White House logs showed that Martin Davis, a campaign consultant to Mr. Carey, the teamster president, entered the White House on June 17, 1996, at the same time as two of the Clinton campaign's top fund-raisers for a meeting with the President in the personal residence. Mr. Davis pleaded guilty last month to participating in an illegal scheme to funnel money from the teamsters' treasury to the Carey campaign.

Mr. Thompson implied that these records meant that the three men had engaged in a private meeting with the President. He suggested that the topic might have been a swap of money between Democrats and the Carey campaign.

But a few minutes later Alan Baron, counsel to the committee's Democrats, provided fuller evidence showing that Mr. Davis and the fund-raisers had all been at the White House for a lunch sponsored by the Democratic National Committee, not for a private meeting with the President.

Later in the day Mr. Thompson apologized. He said in essence that he had been a victim of poor staff work, that he had "left the wrong impression" and that he was prepared to "eat crow."

The central theme of a big-fish witness: If it's at all legal, it's entirely proper.

tal Affairs Committee, broke no ground that had not been covered before. Among the points he made were these:

¶He knows nothing about a proposed plan in which the Democrats were to swap funds with the re-election campaign of Ron Carey, president of the teamsters' union.

¶He did not, contrary to what a witness testified last month, ask a potential donor to shred a fund-raising document.

¶He never intervened with the Interior Department on behalf of party-supporting Indian tribes in Minnesota and Wisconsin that wanted to sink a casino proposal by a rival tribe.

¶The coffees Mr. Clinton held in the White House for his supporters were not explicitly fund-raisers, though they were helpful in generating contributions.

¶Any phone calls the President made to prospective contributors were legal.

¶If Mr. Clinton had known of illicit practices by John Huang, the party's chief solicitor of contributions from Asian-Americans, he would have had Mr. Huang dismissed.

The New York Times

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

document that you have referred to exhibit was submitted to the committee of my files, Senator.

from Newsweek, or from your files?

from my files, Senator.

It wasn't a copy that came from Newsweek? It was the original file? Every copy I've ever seen of this has Newsweek on the top.

Well, that's not what you asked me. The copy that you have came from Newsweek, but the copy that was, the document that was submitted to this committee came from my files.

Q. Did you destroy the original document?

A. I did not.

Q. Did you turn the original document over to the committee?

A. I did not. I don't think I've ever seen the original document, Senator. I was on Air Force One. The document was processed at the White House.

Q. Did you dictate the notes that, where the printed document came from?

A. Which notes are you referring to?

Q. Ask committee staff to pull up the handwritten notes of 1286. It's a few pages back.

A. Two pages?

Q. And basically it says where all this money should go to the tax-exempt. And then we have a typewritten copy. That's it that is on the screen.

A. I'm sorry, Senator, you're going a little fast here.

Q. Well, it's on the screen.

A. O.K., yeah, the screen is a little tough to read.

Q. O.K. And aren't those your notes?

A. It's very faint, yes, that's my handwriting.

Q. O.K., and then there's a typewritten — it is important, because there is a question of your veracity. Mr. Meddoff testified under oath that you told him to destroy the document. The document that we've received, the only document that the committee has received is a copy that came from Newsweek. It did not come from your office. This information was subpoenaed from you. The question is: Did you destroy the document? You do not have the original? Why wasn't the original submitted to the committee?

A. Well, Senator, you've asked me about five questions.

Let me just try to back up and see if I can —

Q. Well, answer the last one. Why wasn't the original document submitted to the committee?

A. I don't know, Senator, because I don't think it exists.

Q. You don't think the original document exists, but yet do you think this total thing is a forgery?

A. I didn't say that, Senator.

Q. Well, there are some documents that disappeared. And obviously we're talking about obstruction of justice. Mr. Meddoff testified that you informed him to destroy the document. He did not destroy the document. That's the document that we have before us.

A. If I may, Senator, since you're now alleging obstruction of justice.

Q. I'm trying to find out if there was obstruction of justice.

A. I think you're alleging it. The facts are as follows, Senator, and I've testified to these fully in the deposition, which is, I assume, available for anybody to read. I was on Air Force One when I talked to Mr. Meddoff. The memorandum that is at Exhibit 1287 was dictated by me, to the best of my recollection, to somebody at the White House. It was typed there and it was sent from the White House to Mr. Meddoff. I never saw the original of that document, of that memorandum. I don't know where it is. I don't know if it exists. It certainly is not in my file.

Q. Now, if the White House —

A. If I may, Senator, please —

Q. Well, wait a minute. Don't take up my 10 minutes. If the White House —

A. Senator, with all due respect —

Q. If the White House —

A. Senator, with all due — Mr. Chairman?

Q. Mr. Ickes —

A. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, the Senator is alleging obstruction of justice. . . .

O.K. So I have never seen the original of the document, Senator, of the memo. Newsweek did fax that memo. I received a copy of the memo from Newsweek. That was in my files. That was turned over. That's the document that you're referring to here, number one. Number two is, virtually every pertinent aspect and piece of information that is in the typed memo is also contained in my handwritten notes, which were turned over to the committee.

SENATOR NICKLES Mr. Ickes, I was wondering, if the White House faxed this information to Mr. Meddoff, why wouldn't that original copy be also in the information that we subpoenaed?

A. I don't know, Senator. I wasn't there. I was on Air Force One.

Q. Let me ask you a couple of other questions. Have you ever been present at any time at White House meetings with the President and the teamsters president, Mr. Carey?

A. I apologize, Senator. Would you repeat

that?

Q. Have you been present at a White House meeting with, a meeting with President Clinton and the president of the teamsters, Mr. Carey?

A. I don't recall. I've been at a lot of meetings with the President with a lot of different people. I may well have been. I don't have a specific recollection as I sit here today.

Q. Mr. Ickes, you've been before this committee a lot. You've said, and I've heard that you're a brilliant person, and many, many times you've said, "I don't recall" "I don't specifically remember." Do you remember a meeting with Mr. Carey and the President of the United States or, let me rephrase that. Was there a meeting with Mr. Carey, the president of the teamsters union, and the President of the United States?

A. Do I recall being at such a meeting?

Q. No. Was there a meeting with President Clinton and Mr. Carey of the teamsters union?

A. As I sit here today under oath, Senator, I don't recall a specific meeting. I would be very surprised if there had not been a meeting between the President and Mr. Carey, as there had been a meeting between or meetings between the President and a number of leaders of international labor unions.

Q. Were you ever present for discussions with Mr. Carey and the President, or did you have any discussions with Mr. Carey or Mr. William Hamilton regarding the Pony Express Company and the Department of Labor complaints against the company?

A. I recall Mr. Hamilton and maybe Mr. Carey. I don't recall raising the Pony Express issue. It was an issue that the teamsters were very concerned about. . . .

Q. In regards to the meeting dealing with Pony Express, did you intervene with the Department of Labor concerning the teamsters and Pony Express?

A. Well, again, I go back. I don't know what you mean by the term "intervene."

Q. Did you raise, on behalf of the teamsters, issues that the Department of Labor would confront Pony Express Company?

A. With whom?

Q. I'm just asking, did you intervene on behalf of the teamsters with the Department of Labor? I'm not trying to define it so narrowly that you can say no. Did you intervene on behalf of the teamsters with the Department of Labor and the Pony Express Company?

A. Well, again, I don't know what you mean by "intervene." I don't recall having any discussions with the Department of Labor. I may well have to find out the status. I don't think I did. . . .

The New York Times

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

2
2

Honorable Fatigue

Jane Alexander, head of the National Endowment for the Arts for the past four years, has decided to give up her career as an arts administrator and return to acting. Who can blame her? She has endured four years of lunches, speeches, meetings, arguments, assurances and compromises, just to make sure that Congress dismantles the N.E.A. only a brick at a time. The theater and Hollywood have nothing worse to offer. Last week a Senate-House conference committee agreed to give the N.E.A. \$98 million for fiscal year 1998, a reduction of \$1.5 million from 1997 and \$78 million since 1992. That is the kind of thing Ms. Alexander has been obliged to call a victory, and in this legislative climate, it is. But as part of the settlement, Congress has granted itself added authority over the distribution of arts money and placed its own representatives on the N.E.A.'s grant-making board. That would sting even if Congress had doubled the Endowment's budget.

That the N.E.A. continues to exist in any meaningful sense at all is a tribute to Ms. Alexander's doggedness and her commitment to the Endowment as a functioning, grant-making institution and not merely a symbol. Under the relentless pressure of conservatives in Congress, the N.E.A. has for the past few years been searching for an insuperable rationale for its existence, the kind of argument that would cause a conservative member of the House to strike his forehead with his fist and shout "Eureka!" Social and economic utility is the argument favored at the moment. "The N.E.A. is a great investment," the Endowment posits in a list of "Ten

Facts About the N.E.A." It "helps build community." It stimulates local economies.

These things are true, but in fact there is only one good argument for the existence of the N.E.A., and it was stated by Congress when the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act was passed in 1965: "While no government," Congress opined, "can call a great artist or scholar into existence, it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to help create and sustain not only a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry, but also the material conditions facilitating the release of this creative talent." Significantly, this language, which was part of the N.E.A.'s mission statement as recently as 1995, has disappeared from more recent versions of that document, which say only that the Endowment's mission is "to foster the excellence, diversity and vitality of the arts in the United States, and to broaden public access to the arts."

The era when "encouraging freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry" was something Congress could legitimately support with hard Federal dollars seems a very long time ago. As a concession of sorts to the N.E.A., the Senate-House conference committee has given it permission to seek private funding, in essence giving the Endowment license to privatize itself. This may work for the national helium reserve, which President Clinton has recently agreed to privatize, but it cannot work for the reserves of thought and imagination — the foundation of free speech — whose protection is a public matter.

Surprising Sequel in the Mideast

No one expected the botched Israeli assassination attempt against a Hamas leader in Jordan to help revitalize peace talks with the Palestinians. But that seems to have happened. Yesterday Israel's Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, and the Palestinian leader, Yasir Arafat, held their first face-to-face meeting in eight months.

To appease King Hussein's anger over the assassination attempt, Israel had already released Sheik Ahmed Yassin, the founder and religious leader of Hamas, from prison. Sheik Yassin has now returned to Gaza, where he may well start putting new pressures on Mr. Arafat to toughen his negotiating demands on Israel.

This combination of events — Israeli embarrassment over the attempted assassination and Sheik Yassin's re-emergence on the scene — seems to have jolted Mr. Netanyahu and Mr. Arafat into a starker appreciation of the dangers that lie before them. While Mr. Yassin's public remarks have so far been mild, he envisions no more than a temporary truce with Israel — and that only if Israel agrees to meet his maximalist demands for full

Palestinian rule in the West Bank and Gaza and the uprooting of all Jewish settlements.

It is therefore encouraging to see Mr. Netanyahu and Mr. Arafat talking again. When Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visited the Middle East last month, she tried unsuccessfully to get Mr. Arafat to commit to unconditional cooperation with Israel on security issues and Mr. Netanyahu to agree to a "time out" on expanding Jewish housing in Jerusalem and the occupied territories. Now, in the aftermath of the assassination fiasco and its attendant political damage to both sides, there is every reason to face the larger issues of peace and address Ms. Albright's original requests.

It is just possible that this week's visible strengthening of Hamas reminded Israeli leaders that Mr. Arafat, flawed though he is, still represents their only available negotiating partner. The same events may also have focused Mr. Arafat's attention on the need to stop posturing and deliver tangible results to his constituents. It has been a roller-coaster week, but it is ending with hopes of a new beginning toward Israeli-Palestinian peace.

The New York Times

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

House Again Votes to Ban Abortion Procedure

By John E. Yang
Washington Post Staff Writer

The House renewed a confrontation with President Clinton on an emotionally and politically charged issue yesterday by overwhelmingly approving legislation that would outlaw a controversial abortion procedure, sending the measure to the White House for a promised veto.

Lawmakers voted 296 to 132 largely along party lines to agree to relatively minor changes the Senate made nearly five months ago to the identical legislation that Clinton rejected last year. The House voted to overturn Clinton's veto last year but Senate leaders failed to muster the necessary two-thirds majority.

In letters to Democratic lawmakers

earlier this week, Clinton reaffirmed his vow to reject the bill. "Should the House agree to the Senate amendment and send [the bill] to me for signature, I will veto the legislation," he wrote Tuesday.

Congressional officials are expected to quickly deliver the bill to the White House but probably will not attempt a veto override until next year, according to Rep. Charles T. Canady (R-Fla.), the bill's prime sponsor.

One reason for waiting until next year is to give Senate leaders time to try to round up enough votes to overturn the veto.

While the margin of yesterday's House vote—the fifth time the body has voted on the issue in two years—was well above what would be needed

to overturn a veto, the Senate fell three votes short of a two-thirds majority when it approved the measure May 20. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) told reporters yesterday there was a "good chance" bill supporters would prevail. "We believe the Senate is within a vote or two of being able to override a veto," he said.

In addition, pushing an override attempt into 1998 would put it closer to the congressional elections. Canady rejected suggestions that the timing of the votes was intended to maximize the political impact. Public opinion polls show Americans strongly opposed to the procedure, which antiabortion forces have dubbed "partial-birth" abortion.

See ABORTION, A9, Col. 1

ABORTION, From A8

"There's no magic time to do it," Canady said. "This is the kind of issue that has some staying power. Whether we're voting in March or September will not have much of an impact."

Abortion rights supporters complained that the congressional push on this issue has more to do with politics than with banning the procedure. Last year, they noted, Clinton vetoed the legislation in April but congressional leaders did not schedule an attempt to reverse him until September, as the presidential campaign was beginning in earnest.

"Why are we voting on this piece of legislation again and again?" asked Rep. Diana DeGette (D-Colo.). "The reason is clear—in the 1998 elections,

the Republicans think they can saddle people with this."

"They're not interested in getting legislation, they're interested in getting a political weapon," said Joanne S. Blum, lobbyist for the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League, an abortion rights advocacy group.

The measure would outlaw an abortion procedure in which a fetus is pulled out of the birth canal feet first. The surgeon then punctures the back of the fetus's head and removes the brain, permitting the skull to be partially collapsed and brought through the cervix, the narrowest part of the birth canal.

The bill would subject physicians who perform the procedure to fines and up to two years in prison. In

addition, it would allow the father of the fetus and, if the woman is younger than 18, the woman's parents to sue the doctor. The only exception in the bill is if no other procedure would save the woman's life.

In May, the Senate adopted modest changes intended to add protections for physicians who may be liable for prosecution under the legislation. Afterward, the American Medical Association backed the measure.

Rep. Constance A. Morella (Md.) was one of only eight Republicans, all of them moderates, to vote against the measure. Virginia Reps. James P. Moran, Virgil H. Goode Jr. and Norman Sisisky were among the 79 Democrats to support it.

Staff writer Helen Dewar contributed to this report.

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

Clinton Rejects Allegations Over Tapes

Republicans Criticized for Efforts to Kill Campaign Finance Reform

By Thomas B. Edsall
Washington Post Staff Writer

NEWARK, Oct. 8—President Clinton said today that Republicans are trying to divert attention from their role in preventing campaign finance reform and rejected GOP charges that he failed to take responsibility for what happened in the White House.

Before departing Washington for a day of fund-raising and campaigning, Clinton insisted that videotapes of White House political events, sought for months by the Senate committee investigating campaign finance allegations and turned over only in recent days, "will reinforce the fact that no one has done anything wrong here."

"What's going on here is that under the smoke screen of the films, which everybody can now freely watch, there was yet one more attempt . . . to deal the death knell to campaign finance reform," he told reporters.

On Tuesday, Senate Governmental Affairs Committee Chairman Fred D. Thompson (R-Tenn.) demanded Clinton "step up to the plate and take responsibility" for the long delays producing tapes showing him with campaign contributors at White House events and for the lack of cooperation shown to the committee by some key party fund-raisers.

Clinton shot back that Thompson was motivated by sour grapes over the committee's failure to produce major evidence of illegality. "I think he may be disappointed in the results of the hearings," he said.

Clinton sought to deflect charges that his staff deliberately delayed delivery of the films until after Attorney General Janet Reno rejected a GOP request to immediately seek an independent counsel to investigate a variety of campaign finance allegations made by Republicans and Thompson's specific accusation that the White House has engaged in a "clear pattern of delay . . . trying to run out the clock on the committee" which has a Dec. 31 deadline to complete its work.

"I was surprised that these films had been subpoenaed and not turned over," Clinton said, adding that he has been "frustrated whenever there has not been absolutely full compliance." He said the films "will reinforce . . . that no one has done anything wrong here . . . everybody

ought to watch them and see what they show. That's what they're for."

He said Republicans are engaging in what he described as an unrelenting effort to kill campaign finance reform: "They've done it every year in the Senate, they've done it every year with a filibuster. This year, they're prepared to use a filibuster

Clinton said the videos "will reinforce . . . that no one has done anything wrong here."

and two or three other tactics because they raised more money, more big money and more money from other sources, than the Democrats."

Later at a fund-raiser in Philadelphia, Clinton insisted that the fight for campaign finance legislation is not over. "The opponents thought they had it killed yesterday, but we've got a little life left in us," he said.

That is not the view of Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.), who told reporters earlier in Washington that he regards campaign finance legislation as dead for this year and moved to block its advocates from trying to revive it as an amendment to popular legislation reauthorizing highway and other transportation programs.

"Campaign finance reform is not going to pass this year," he said. "So why do they want to drag it out and block other legislation that's needed . . . and nominations we can get approved? I don't think it makes any sense."

Lott said he does not intend to schedule votes on nominations by Clinton so long as the bill's backers tie up legislation with efforts to attach campaign finance proposals. "As long as they are fiddling with campaign finance, there won't be any nominations" voted on.

Lott's comments came shortly before the Senate voted for the second day in a row to block action on campaign finance legislation sponsored by Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Russell D. Feingold (D-Wis.). The bill's backers fell seven

votes short of the 60 needed to break a GOP filibuster in an initial vote Tuesday. In today's vote, they were eight short, having lost the support of Sen. Tim Hutchinson (R-Ark.), who objected to what he described as "partisan guerrilla warfare" that was threatening other legislation.

For most of his trip, Clinton stayed away from Washington controversies. He used one of his two appearances on behalf of New Jersey state Sen. James McGreevey (D), who is challenging Gov. Christine Todd Whitman (R), to announce that "last month another 250,000 people went from welfare to work. That's a stunning number. Now, in four years and eight months, 3.6 million people who were living in families on welfare now live in families at work, drawing a paycheck."

He said it was "yet another piece of evidence that welfare reform is working far better than anyone had predicted it would." But some critics say there is little evidence that all the recipients who have left the rolls have gotten jobs.

In Washington, Vice President Gore also announced that the federal government has hired nearly 2,000 welfare recipients—20 percent of Clinton's goal of hiring 10,000 people by the year 2000.

During today's swing through Newark and Philadelphia, Clinton was expected to raise at least \$1.5 million, with half going to the Democratic National Committee and half to the New Jersey Democratic Party to support McGreevey.

Introducing Clinton, McGreevey attacked Whitman for allowing New Jersey to have the highest automobile insurance rates and property taxes in the nation and for borrowing large amounts of money through state bonds placing the burden of "a crushing debt" on the state.

"I was listening to Senator McGreevey talk," Clinton told the audience of about 400 at the Metropolitan Baptist Church here, "and I thought, 'That man knows what he wants to do and that's the beginning of wisdom and the prospect of success.'"

McGreevey continues to trail Whitman by about 10 percentage points in polls, and Clinton aides acknowledge he has an uphill fight.

Staff writer Helen Dewar in Washington contributed to this report.

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

Teamsters Contributions To Clinton Effort Probed

By Susan Schmidt
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Senate committee investigating allegations of campaign fund-raising abuses turned its attention for the first time yesterday to the possibility that funds from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters were improperly directed into the Clinton-Gore reelection effort last year.

The panel's chairman, Sen. Fred D. Thompson (R-Tenn.), suggested early yesterday that President Clinton knew about an alleged conspiracy to swap Teamsters contributions in exchange for Democratic fund-raisers directing big donors to contribute to the reelection effort of Teamsters President Ron Carey. Thompson's comments came as the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee questioned former White House deputy chief of staff Harold Ickes on Democratic fund-raising during the 1996 campaign.

But late in the day, Thompson backed away from the accusation, saying he had "left the wrong impression" that Clinton attended a private meeting in 1996 with a consultant to the Teamsters just four days before the union decided to contribute \$236,000 to state Democratic parties.

"If you have to eat crow, or maybe half a crow, it's better to eat it warm than cold," Thompson said after

See TEAMSTERS, A14, Col. 1

TEAMSTERS, From A1

learning more about the June 17, 1996, White House luncheon.

Still, Justice Department and Senate investigators are examining ties between the Teamsters and the Democratic National Committee in an effort to determine whether they engaged in an illegal conspiracy to effectively swap contributions between the Clinton and Carey reelection campaigns.

The committee today is scheduled to question two witnesses about the relationship between the Teamsters and the DNC during last year's elections. Richard Sullivan, the former Democratic National Committee finance director, and Mark Thomann, a former Northern California fundraiser, are to be asked about an effort to direct a \$100,000 contribution from a would-be DNC donor to the Carey campaign.

Yesterday, the panel produced White House entry logs showing that two top Democratic Party officials and a Teamsters consultant attended a White House luncheon with President Clinton on June 17, 1996. Consultant Martin Davis has pleaded guilty in a money-laundering scheme designed to benefit Carey's reelection.

It was during this period, four days later in fact, that Teamsters money began flowing to state Democratic parties. On June 21, according to one source who has seen the document, Teamsters political director Bill Hamilton issued a rush authorization for a series of state contributions totaling \$236,500. Three days later the checks were issued.

Terence R. McAuliffe, the former finance chairman of the Clinton-Gore campaign, and Laura Hartigan, the campaign's finance director, said yesterday through their attorneys that they did not discuss contributions to Carey at the White House event, which was attended by other party donors and fundraisers.

It was the timing of the White House visit in relation to the contributions that drew Thompson's attention yesterday, and his implication that the Teamsters contribution had been discussed with the president in a "private" meeting. But after the White House noted that Clinton had attended only the lunch and that other donors unaffiliated with the Teamsters had been present, Thompson apologized.

Both McAuliffe and Hartigan have been questioned by federal prosecutors in New York and by Senate investigators about conversations with Davis and the sequence of events that unfolded in the summer of 1996 as the Carey campaign fought an uphill battle for funds against challenger James Hoffa and the Democrats scrambled for contributions to ensure they would win in November.

Davis's role in the alleged plot was detailed in a criminal information filed in September by U.S. Attorney Mary Jo White of the Southern District of New York, who charged that he discussed a money swap with two unnamed Democratic officials. As a result of allegations of a broad money-laundering scheme by Carey aides, a federal judge has thrown out the 1996 Teamsters election results, which Carey won by a slim margin.

Davis, a Washington-based consultant who also did work for the DNC, is cooperating with the federal probe along with two other Carey campaign aides who have pleaded guilty. His attorney said yesterday he could not discuss the White House lunch because it is part of the ongoing investigation.

Court documents offer only sketchy details of the discussions and Democratic Party officials have offered varying accounts. The DNC has said none of its officials was involved in a money swap.

According to court documents, Davis, the part owner of the Washington-based consulting firm, The November Group, learned in May or June 1996 about planned Teamster donations to various Democratic campaigns and began trying to use the money as "a means to induce the DNC to raise money for the Carey campaign."

McAuliffe introduced Davis to his Clinton/Gore '96 finance aide, Hartigan, as a point person who could coordinate labor contributions, according to Senate documents.

In June 1996, Hartigan set up a lunch at the Palm restaurant in Washington where Davis proposed to her and Sullivan that the DNC find \$100,000 in donations for Carey. In the same discussion, Davis talked about generating \$1 million for the Democrats, according to documents in the hands of Senate investigators.

Hartigan's office sent Davis a memo on June 12, 1996, listing states where the Teamsters should direct funds.

Meanwhile, sometime in July the Democrats began trying to find a

home for a \$100,000 donation from Judith Vasquez, a Filipina businesswoman who wanted to give to the DNC but was ineligible.

Documents show that DNC officials first tried to direct the donation to Carey's campaign. But it was determined she could not give to the union because she was an employer. The money ended up with Vote Now '96, a nonprofit South Florida voter registration group closely tied to the DNC.

A memo allegedly written by Sullivan that is now in the hands of Senate investigators offers a cryptic comment: "Vote '96 underwriting Teamsters."

Thomann's lawyer Robert Freibert said he was instructed by Sullivan about how to handle the Vasquez contribution. Sullivan's lawyer Robert

Bauer said that Sullivan did not participate in a plan to swap contributions but believed it was legal and desirable to help the Carey campaign.

Thomann also got a call from Teamsters lawyer Nathaniel Charny, who was charged with ensuring that Carey contributions complied with the law. Charny "kind of pressured him," Freibert said, to find a way for Vasquez to give to Carey, perhaps through the name of her husband. Charny's lawyer did not return phone calls. Thomann eventually told Sullivan that "he was recusing; he wanted nothing more to do with the Vasquez money. He wanted out because he was uncomfortable with it," his attorney said.

Ickes, a key figure in the Senate committee's investigation of campaign fund-raising improprieties, testified for about seven hours yesterday about his role as the White House's "point man" in coordinating political and fund-raising activities with the DNC and the Clinton-Gore reelection committee.

Occasionally combative when a few Republican committee members challenged him, Ickes strongly defended Democratic fund-raising practices, denied that any laws were broken, and frequently replied to hostile questions with thrusts against the GOP's fund-raising operation.

"Boy, you're tremendous," Sen. Pete V. Domenici (R-N.M.) said in grudging admiration.

Staff writers Edward Walsh in Washington and Sharon Walsh in New York contributed to this report.

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

Out of the Fire and Back Into the Spotlight

Arts Agency's Jane Alexander on Her Term

By Jacqueline Trescott
Washington Post Staff Writer

When Jane Alexander arrived for work yesterday morning at the National Endowment for the Arts, a job offer for a television series was already on her desk.

"Please let me breathe," was her reply. After all, she hadn't yet officially told the staff she was stepping down as head of the endowment by the end of the month.

Otherwise, she was noticeably upbeat about both the future and the past of the agency she's leaving after four years of battles over money, morality and integrity, fighting off obstinate conservatives on one side and outraged artists on the other.

"As much as I love the agency, it has always been my intention to return to mainly the theater. I feel confident that I am leaving the agency in good shape and that the worst is over in terms of the argument about the appropriate role for the federal government in the arts," said Alexander, who is 57 and takes back home to New York a

See ALEXANDER, C4, Col. 1

ALEXANDER, From C1

shelf full of public service citations to go with her Tonys and Emmys.

Not even the NEA's worst moments—say, House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) making a rare appearance during a House debate to shore up the troops who wanted to shut down her agency—pushed Alexander to the edge.

There were times that were "demoralizing, discouraging and frustrating," she said, but added: "I am not a quitter. I have never left a show before my contract was up. . . . It wasn't like people were breaking my knees every day or holding my head underwater."

She wore a regal purple suit with a red and black blouse, and the worry lines on her handsome face seemed to have disappeared almost overnight.

Alexander's tenure has been highly visible. The agency has been under political fire from its opponents since the late 1980s. On her first venture into public service, Alexander had to learn the subtleties of demanding legislators who controlled the purse strings and the hearing-room microphones. Additionally, as part of the agency's mandate since 1965, Alexander had to help the artists and groups who viewed NEA funding as a lifeline and were equally capable of grandstanding.

"She was placed in a no-win situation of trying to forge compromises that would placate the attack forces . . . and not disturb the needs of the arts community," said Robert Lynch, the president of Americans for the Arts, a lobbying group. Yet it was the criticism from the artists themselves, said Alexander yesterday, that left more bruises than, say, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) on the Senate floor quoting from a novel he considered obscene and which he believed to have been supported by the NEA.

"If I ever felt hurt by any criticism, it came from the artist community, of which I am a part. A lot of artists wondered why I didn't resign, throw up my hands, throw down the gauntlet as a gesture. I thought that was naive of them," says Alexander, who was more interested in hard work than symbolism.

One piece of direct evidence of her diligence was the conversion of moderate Republicans to the agency's side.

A conversation with Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) helped crystallize that strategy. "He said 'Jane, don't waste your time with me. I am always going to be a supporter of the endowment. Don't waste your time with those who are opposing the agency. You need to spend your time with the fence-sitters.' I did that," she explained. Yesterday Rep. Sidney Yates (D-Ill.) said that this effort, supplying the undecided with facts they could use in their home districts and in debates with opponents, was one of Alexander's hallmarks. "We had so many who were on the fence,

and they came around. That is a tribute to her," said Yates.

A statement from President Clinton read: "Jane Alexander has led the National Endowment for the Arts with courage, vigor and imagination." Even one of the leaders of the Republican rebellion was restrained. "We wish Ms. Alexander would stay. It's her agency we'd like to see go away," said Rep. John T. Doolittle (R-Calif.), chairman of the Conservative Action Team.

Yet Alexander is not leaving totally satisfied or complacent. When the House and Senate conference committee report is filed, the agency will have a slightly reduced budget of \$98 million, with only \$31 million in the grants pool administered from Washington. She worries about that but believes that even if the agency faces another political firestorm and further reductions, the arts will find a way.

"There is no way you can keep arts or artists down," especially in a democracy, she says. "Artists are like weeds in concrete; they will move through the concrete to get the sunlight. I knew that that was always going to happen."

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

Public Broadcasting Close to Getting More U.S. Funds

By Paul Farhi
Washington Post Staff Writer

After years of hearing conservatives threaten to "zero out" their federal funds, the people who bring "Barney & Friends" and "All Things Considered" to the nation are on the verge of winning a big raise from Congress.

Lawmakers have budgeted about \$300 million in taxpayer support for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which passes federal dollars from Congress to America's public radio and TV stations. That appropriation, for fiscal 2000, is a 20 percent increase from the previous year and

the first hike of any kind after five years of stagnant or declining government support.

If the appropriation becomes law in the next few weeks, as most congressional watchers expect, it would mark a huge political as well as fiscal comeback for public radio and TV.

Only two years ago, conservatives led by House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) were pummeling public broadcasting for alleged bureaucratic bloat and liberal programming bias.

But unlike the National Endowment for the Arts, which barely survived similar political attacks this year, CPB's federal

funding has enjoyed wide bipartisan support.

"Is the worst over?" asked Bob Coonrod, CPB's new president. "Well, the worst is over in the sense that there is no longer [significant talk of] eliminating public support for public broadcasting. There are a number of things that look good."

Public broadcasting officials and congressional aides agree that efforts to wipe out public broadcasting's federal funding underestimated the grass-roots backing for public stations.

Although public stations generally have smaller audiences than commercial programming, popular shows such as "All

Things Considered" on National Public Radio and "Sesame Street" on the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) attract tens of millions of listeners and viewers each week. Many stations have urged their supporters to write or call Congress to protect the stations' funding.

"The American people expressed their very strong support for public broadcasting and Congress got the message loud and clear," said Rep. John Porter (R-Ill.), who chairs the House subcommittee that oversees CPB's funding.

Rep. W. J. "Billy" Tauzin (R-La.) is pre-

See PUBLICTV, E2, Col. 3

PUBLICTV, From E1

paring legislation aimed at eventually ending CPB's annual government subsidy by creating a multibillion-dollar trust fund for public broadcasters. The fund would be capitalized by a one-time government appropriation and annual contributions from commercial broadcasters, who in exchange would be permitted to escape some, if not all, of their public service obligations. Congress has considered similar ideas in the past but didn't act on them.

Public broadcasters say cuts in CPB's funding over the past five years have forced them to become more entrepreneurial and efficient.

Many of the nation's 179 public TV stations and 694 radio stations froze hiring or eliminated jobs over the past four years, according to David Brugger, president of America's Public Television Stations, a Washington lobbying organization. The 12 public TV stations in Florida, for example, combined their program-buying and fund-raising activities.

PBS, the Alexandria-based programming service, has more than offset flat contributions from the CPB and its affiliated stations with increased investment income and revenue from marketing home videos and educational materials. The service is projecting \$252.6 million in revenue in 1998, a 47 percent increase over 1996.

Some public stations, such as Chicago's WTTW-TV, say they will be able to raise more money if federal rules restricting paid announcements are relaxed. The rules prohibit public stations from accepting "underwriter" messages that, for example, explicitly urge viewers to buy a product or compare competing products.

"We believe it can be done without compromising the character of public broadcasting," said Marty McLaughlin, a vice president of WTTW.

Meanwhile, despite the imminent increase in public money, some suggest it won't be enough to keep up with rising programming expenses and the cost of converting stations from analog technology to digital transmission. Public broadcasters estimate the cost of that transition at \$1.7 billion, or roughly the amount raised by all stations last year.

Said APTS' Brugger, "We are not ungrateful to Congress... but it's still going to take a lot of money to maintain public broadcasting."

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

Fast Track Clears House Panel, but Fight Looms

By BOB DAVIS

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON — The House Ways and Means Committee approved "fast-track" trade legislation, but so few Democrats voted for the measure that it faces tough odds of winning approval in the full House.

The House panel voted 24-14 for the legislation, which authorizes the administration to negotiate trade pacts on an expedited basis through 2001. But only four of the panel's 16 Democrats voted for the measure. Members had said that about six Democratic votes were necessary to demonstrate sufficient Democratic support for the measure to pass the House. Members of both parties often take their cues on trade issues from their allies on the ways and means panel.

The committee's chairman, Texas Republican Bill Archer, exulted at the strong showing among Republicans, who voted 20-2 for the measure. But he cautioned that "the cause of free trade is in trouble if Democrats don't do much, much better in the House." Democratic Rep. Robert Matsui of California, the panel's staunchest supporter of fast-track, didn't disguise his disappointment. "We just wanted to get through this vote," he said. "We got by."

Fast-track authority, which expired in early 1994, is an expedited process lawmakers use to approve trade bills. Under the procedure, lawmakers agree to vote yes or no on a trade bill, but not to amend it. Foreign trading partners won't negotiate trade deals with the U.S. unless the White House has fast-track authority because they worry that Congress will try to amend the agreements. The North American Free Trade Agreement and the world trade pact in Geneva required fast-track authority to win approval in Congress.

The meager showing among Democrats puts the Clinton administration and Republican leaders in a difficult position.

Neither wants to bring fast track to the floor if it is likely to suffer defeat. Rejection of fast track would represent the biggest defeat in Congress for open trade since the end of World War II. In 1995, the GOP leadership never brought up for a vote a fast-track bill that passed the Ways and Means Committee along strictly partisan lines and seemed bound for defeat by the House.

However, unless fast track is scheduled for a vote, the White House and business community won't be able to lobby most effectively for the measure. The specter of defeat — and the resulting blow to U.S. prestige and trade leadership — is among the most potent arguments that fast-track proponents have.

Fast track faces tougher obstacles than Nafta did at a similar time in the congressional approval process, and Nafta required full-bore lobbying by the president and business, as well as a slew of trade promises by the administration. Now, the Nafta sales job has become perhaps the toughest obstacle in pushing fast track.

The Clinton administration hasn't been able to deliver on a number of promises made to lawmakers to protect from competition tomatoes, wine and other products — thus making it harder for the White House to cut deals over fast track. Moreover, the ferocity of the Nafta campaign engendered lasting enmity among labor leaders, who have spent the past three years arguing that the trade pact was a failure and pressuring lawmakers to oppose fast track.

The administration plans to use fast track to extend Nafta to Chile and to begin negotiations on a Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, a kind of super-Nafta including all Latin America.

In addition, many U.S. businesses were powerfully motivated to lobby for Nafta because they had plans to boost exports or investment south of the border. They could expect tangible results for their efforts. In the case of fast track, Chile is a far smaller market than Mexico, and an Americas-wide free trade zone is years in the future, if it ever comes into being.

Both the White House and other fast-track supporters have criticized business lobbying on fast track so far as ineffectual. "The business community wanted to know what specific language was before they got active," said Mr. Archer.

Now, the main business-lobbying

group, America Leads on Trade, plans a big push during Congress's 10-day Columbus Day recess to try to persuade undecided lawmakers to support fast track. The group plans to spend \$600,000 over the next week airing television and radio advertisements in 104 congressional districts, as well as dispatching troops to the districts of undecided lawmakers.

At its heart, the battle over fast track revolves around a fight between labor and management. Unions argue that trade measures should explicitly protect and expand the rights of workers, and they criticize the fast-track bill for failing to do much to help. Indeed, under the Ways and Means measure and a similar one that passed the Senate Finance Committee last week, fast track could be used to approve trade deals in which parties agree to maintain their rules on labor, but not to bolster them. Businesses argue that tougher labor provisions would harm their ability to compete internationally.

—Robert S. Greenberger
contributed to this article.

The House at Its Worst on D.C.

THE HOUSE of Representatives should not dishonor itself today by adopting the long list of wide-ranging riders tacked onto the D.C. appropriations bill by subcommittee chairman Charles Taylor (R-N.C.). It's hard to recall a recent District appropriations bill that goes as far as this measure in reducing the nation's legislators to the level of city council members. Republican and Democratic members ought to be embarrassed even to consider such a small-minded measure on the House floor.

Here's a taste of what Mr. Taylor and his supporters consider legitimate House of Representatives' business nowadays:

- A ban on private helicopters flying over the District of Columbia.
- Reducing the requirement to give notice to D.C. police officers of so-called out-of-schedule assignments from 28 to 14 days.
- Requiring all city-owned vehicles (except security, rescue and armored cars) to get at least 22 miles per gallon.
- Requiring the D.C. government to buy American.
- Reducing the size of the D.C. mayor's security detail.

In addition, the bill has been loaded down with heavy ideological and political baggage that ultimately may doom the city's \$4.2 billion budget if it reaches the White House. The committee-approved measure would prohibit the city from using its own funds to help pay for abortions for women on Medicaid. The bill, as amended, also sets caps

on D.C. welfare benefits, limits medical malpractice liability, cuts 200 administrative positions from the schools and waives the Davis-Bacon Act so that nonunion wages can be paid to workers making school repairs. Rep. Taylor also takes gratuitous shots at the powers of the financial control board. Some of these provisions appear out of the blue without having had the benefit of public hearings either in the D.C. Council or Congress. They represent the unilateral whims and obsessions of a subcommittee chairman.

If those provisions don't ultimately sink the bill, there's a good chance the school voucher add-on to the appropriation will invite a presidential veto. The upshot of these riders—both the arcane and the contentious—is to jeopardize a well-thought-out 1998 D.C. budget that city elected officials and the financial control board worked hard to produce. If, as feared, Congress sends the White House a bill that President Clinton rejects, the District can look forward to perhaps months of limping along without a budget.

The House of Representatives need not do this to the nation's capital or itself. The city needs an appropriations bill that will help it manage its own affairs competently as both a locality and a national capital. It does not need and cannot conceivably be helped in its effort to reform itself by the silly, showboating indulgences of congressmen who act as if they had nothing useful to do until it's time to go off to their subsidized shrimp-feeds and other freebie receptions.

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

MARY McGRORY

Domestic Disputes

Such was the level of hostility at the Thompson committee that former Clinton aide Harold Ickes, who has as much attitude as any man in Washington, was reduced to the role of spectator at a scene of domestic violence, and, maybe for the first time in his life, an unwitting agent of acrimony. It was a bit of a comedown for an erstwhile mover and shaker who drew the first audience of any size in months of hearings in Hart 216.

The big fireworks of Ickes's second day on the stand came in a nasty row between Chairman Fred Thompson and ranking Democrat John Glenn, who shouted and sputtered at each other like a couple who had been cooped up too long in a tenement. The charges they made were familiar. The intensity and the fury were new. The old astronaut has been the Johnny One Note of the hearings, ever bewailing Thompson's refusals to honor Democratic subpoenas, mourning the lack of bipartisanship of the Watergate and Iran-contra committees. He bellowed that Thompson had done indefensible things.

Often Thompson, who has taught himself not to whine, listens in silence, but yesterday he blew up at Glenn and the Democrats for imposing a cutoff date for the hearings, which makes it possible, he says, for the White House to run out the clock and stall, as on the delivery of the hilarious tapes of their coffees. He sounded like a heart-scalded spouse: "I kept reaching out to you time and time and time again to the extent that I received criticism from my own party because I was trying to be fair to you."

Everyone is angry now. Glenn's pitiful strategy of "Everybody does it" is not a defense for the excesses of the Clinton administration. Everybody knows that everybody does it in politics; the problem is one of degree not of kind. Sen. Carl Levin (D) backs up Glenn and keeps bringing up Republican outrages, which nobody is disputing. Sen. Joseph Lieberman is the Democrat on the committee who understands best that by dispassionate statements and judicious questioning, he can actually find out something that could be useful in drafting legislation that could prevent the recurrence of such abuses.

He asked Ickes if anyone ever asked, when they were not breaking the law at the White House, "But is it right?" The answer, of course, was no.

Both sides are frustrated. On Tuesday, the Senate voted against limiting debate on the killer amendment to the McCain-Feingold reform bill that had

been crafted by Republican leader Trent Lott, and then voted similarly on McCain-Feingold. Lott has joined in the trashing of Thompson. He apparently expected Thompson to destroy Clinton, whose ratings are the highest of his life. Democrats expected the hearings to make the passage of campaign reform relatively easy, and it is now dead, if not buried. The Republicans must realize they look foolish as they scream over every new revelation of White House misconduct while standing fast against any change in the system.

In such an atmosphere, Ickes, who was Clinton's main money man, was somewhat diminished, although he needled and put down his interrogators in his accustomed way. Thompson knew that he would get little but lip from Clinton's former right-hand man.

Ickes's opening statement, scholarly and swaggering, was heavy with details about George Bush's highly politicized White House. Washington has for months vibrated with speculation about Ickes's motives. Would he get even for the appalling way Clinton cashiered him last January? Ickes learned from the press that he was fired as deputy chief of staff. Clinton decided bland beats abrasive in high help and agreed to Erskine Bowles's demands for Ickes's head as a condition of taking the job of chief of staff.

Ickes went quietly but took some 50 cartons of papers with him. They provided some embarrassments for the president. But Ickes is now a consultant, joining the ranks of his nemesis, Dick Morris, and in that business, it is better to be tight with the White House. So Ickes told the committee grandly that its quarrel was with the law, not the Clinton reelection team.

Thompson has tried manfully to link Clinton to the whole situation. He suggested the president "step up to the plate" and take responsibility. If Thompson had read the remarkable piece by Michael Lewis in the New York Times Magazine, he would have known he was wasting his breath. Ickes, with the president's dagger in his back, finally confronted him. He said to the president, "I do not deserve this treatment."

"I know," responded the leader of the free world. "It's terrible. Someone leaked."

In other words, the crime was not for Clinton to have betrayed an old friend. The crime was that "somebody" spilled the beans. In his plea, Thompson was appealing to something that may not exist: the conscience of Bill Clinton.

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

WASHINGTON

'Fast track' trade measure passes House panel's vote

President Clinton's push for "fast track" trade authority survived a key vote in the House tax-writing committee Wednesday. But the 24-14 margin included only four of 16 Democrats, and broader Democratic support will be needed for the measure to pass the full House. Chairman Bill Archer, R-Texas, says the vote shows that Democrats are "too liberal, too influenced by the money and power of Washington's big labor bosses." Passage would allow a president to negotiate trade agreements that Congress would then approve or reject but couldn't change. The White House says it can't reach deals to bring down trade barriers without such authority. But organized labor and many liberal Democrats say they want stronger measures to protect workers' rights and the environment. The Senate Finance Committee passed similar legislation last week.



Jackson: Mission is Africa

SPECIAL ENVOY: President Clinton named Jesse Jackson special envoy to promote democracy in Africa, where in six years the number of democracies has grown to 23 from five. Jackson, 56, led a U.S. team to the African African-American Summit in Zimbabwe last summer. In 1994, he led observers to South Africa's election that made Nelson Mandela the country's first black president. Jackson sought the Democratic presidential nomination in 1984 and 1988.

AMBASSADORS: President Clinton named San Francisco businessman James Hormel, 64, ambassador to Luxembourg. He is a leading Democratic donor who gave \$186,700 in the last election cycle. He would be the first openly gay U.S. ambassador.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved former House speaker Thomas Foley as ambassador to Japan. The panel also approved former senator Wyche Fowler, D-Ga., to Saudi Arabia; Stephen Bosworth to South Korea; and Alphonse La Porte to Mongolia.

NUCLEAR WASTE: The House Resources Committee disapproved a controversial nuclear store proposal but sent it to the floor for debate anyway. The panel cited opposition by Nevada residents. One plan is to build a facility at the Nevada Test Site to keep radioactive nuclear waste until a permanent underground site is built at nearby Yucca Mountain. The House Commerce Committee and the full Senate has approved similar legislation.

PRESIDENTIAL POPULARITY: President Clinton's ratings are beginning to slip after being largely immune to accusations that he abused campaign finance laws. An Oct. 3-5 USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll puts Clinton's job approval at 55%, down from 61% a month ago. The poll also found people are divided over whether Vice President Gore, a focus of the fund-raising investigation, is trustworthy enough to be president: 45% say he is; 44% say he isn't.

ALSO . . .

► **DEFENSE SPENDING:** President Clinton signed a \$247.7 billion Defense Department spending bill, but he has until Tuesday to single out items for a veto. Clinton cut 38 items totaling \$287 million in an earlier spending bill and three items from bills that White House aides say would have cost \$815 million over five years.

► **CHILD-CARE INITIATIVE:** President Clinton said increasing the availability and lowering the cost of child care is the "next great frontier." In his effort to improve conditions for families, Clinton, touting a White House conference on child care scheduled for Oct. 23, appeared in Newark with New Jersey Democrat Jim McGreevey, who is challenging GOP incumbent Gov. Christie Whitman.

► **SURGEON GENERAL:** David Satcher, 56, encountered no serious problems in his confirmation hearing to be surgeon general. Satcher, director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention since 1993, pledged to emphasize what people can do themselves to improve their health.

► **GLOBAL WARMING:** Two dozen farm groups led by the American Farm Bureau launched a TV campaign attacking President Clinton's proposed global climate treaty, saying it would increase fuel taxes and bankrupt farmers. Environmentalists say cutting emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases that some say are warming the planet can be done without dire consequences.

► **LANDS TREATY:** The House voted 236-199 to require congressional approval for U.S. land to be designated by international bodies for historic or environmental protection. Proponents say it's a sovereignty issue. Opponents say there already are 67 U.S. sites and the designations don't affect government land-use decisions or private property rights.

Written by Paul Leavitt with staff and wire reports

What We've Learned

Sen. Robert Bennett, the conservative Utah Republican and conspiracy bug, and Sen. Robert Torricelli, the sometime-liberal New Jersey Democrat and political hustler, agree: The Fred Thompson-led hearings on campaign finance scandals have failed.

Yesterday's session with former White House Deputy Chief of Staff Harold Ickes, marked chiefly by acrimony between the senators, lent credence to that notion.

Yet it is wrong. Conceivably, evidence of criminal action will emerge from these Senate deliberations; clearly they have added pressure on Attorney General Reno



Politics & People

By Albert R. Hunt

to name an outside counsel. Most important, however, is that decades from now, these hearings will demonstrate what a rotten campaign finance system dominated the last part of this century.

Committee Democrats, with few exceptions, have acted as defensive counsels for the Clinton-Gore fund-raising abuses. The undeniable reality is that the president, panicked by the 1994 elections and in keeping with the anything-goes money culture of Arkansas, decided that his re-election justified using any means to raise money. The vice president, who should have known better, was a willing, even eager, participant.

Access was sold, and the Clinton-Gore campaign, after accepting public funds, evaded the legal spending limits by illicitly using soft money donations as their political piggybank. Subsequently the White House has stonewalled efforts to reveal what happened. Others have done it all, too; this crowd, however, took it to new depths.

Chairman Thompson—already beset by problems of uncooperative participants and an unrealistic Dec. 31 deadline—has made mistakes. He has dealt poorly with the ranking Democrat, Sen. John Glenn; he promised more revelations than he could deliver on foreign governments' illegal contributions; and he should have more aggressively hauled in big money men close to Messrs. Clinton and Gore.

But his successes in only 26 days of hearings far outnumber these shortcomings. We knew about Roger Tamraz before, but the blatant way he bought access to the Clinton White House—the Democratic Party chairman intervened with the CIA—was astounding; every time some self-serving politician says all we need is more money or more big contributors, the Tamraz testimony should be played back.

All standards were abandoned, starting with the vetting process to keep shady characters like Mr. Tamraz and Johnny Chung out of reach of the president and vice president. Thanks to the hearings, it's now clear that the infamous John Huang was foisted onto the Democratic National Committee by the White House. To give President Clinton the most generous benefit of the doubt, a blind eye was turned to illegal foreign donations in his 1996 campaign.

Much existing information has been enhanced, foremost the insatiable and often sleazy ways soft money was obtained and used to circumvent campaign spending limits. There seems little doubt that the White House has only been forthcoming often because of the committee's presence and pressure; most recently the curiously belated release this week of the videotapes of the coffees with fat cats. (And, yes, a few of the juiciest news stories over the past several months have been leaks from the Thompson committee.)

Yet Sen. Thompson and the hearings have come under savage attack—from Re-

publicans. Conservatives have leaked stories to friendly outlets charging that Sen. Thompson has blown it, that the committee has been tougher on Republicans like former GOP Chairman Haley Barbour than on Democrats, and that the Tennessee Republican has been primarily interested in advancing his political career.

These anonymous attacks are coming from Majority Leader Trent Lott and aides to right-wing senators on the committee. Sen. Lott still seethes, colleagues say, at Sen. Thompson's initial decision to investigate not only illegal activities but also improper ones, although that was the criterion the Watergate committee used two decades ago. (The other senator from Mississippi, Thad Cochran, who sits on the committee, thinks these attacks are unfair: "Fred deserves very high marks.")

Actually, these right-wingers have blown their opportunities. Senate Whip Don Nickles of Oklahoma was put on the panel to be a partisan pit bull and has proven woefully unequal to the task. When Sen. Robert Smith of New Hampshire this week claimed, in dead seriousness, that this was the "worst scandal" in the history of the republic, he wasn't to be confused with Henry Steele Commager.

More fundamentally, these carping critics misunderstand the nature of congressional investigations and the politics of this issue.

Successful congressional investigations, such as Watergate, invariably are bipartisan. Those that are not—the ill-fated Alfonse D'Amato hearings of the last Congress, which even he now disclaims, or



Fred Thompson

the circus that Dan Burton (R., Ind.) finally unveils in the House today—are flops.

This is especially true when probing the president. "Bipartisanship is the key to success," observes Yale political scientist David Mayhew, a congressional scholar. Otherwise, "the public tends to write it off as nothing more than a partisan scrap."

If the current campaign financing system was above-board and the only problem was that Messrs. Clinton and Gore violated an otherwise clean system, these right-wingers might have a point. But voters, and most politicians, know that's a canard. The system corrupts Republicans and Democrats alike.

The fact that Haley Barbour is the subject of a grand jury inquiry, however, is his own making. Mr. Barbour set up a phony think tank that was used to launder illicit Asian money to help Republicans in critical 1994 elections. That was initially exposed by the crack CNN investigative reporter Brooks Jackson (crack no doubt because of his training at The Wall Street Journal) who asked whether the "Contract With America was partly financed in Hong Kong." Mr. Barbour's denials were flatly contradicted by almost all of the scheme's other major participants.

This drives some Republicans crazy. Maybe it's because Mr. Barbour—who helped engineer the surreptitious \$50 billion tax break for the tobacco companies last summer—is a charter player in the money and influence-peddling game to which these incumbents are so addicted.

For all the achievements of this committee, Sen. Thompson has faced severe limitations, including an inability to even get into congressional fund-raising abuses. That's why the Senate ought to vote on the sensible suggestion of Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D., Conn.) to extend the committee's Dec. 31 deadline. A roll call vote on that would be revealing.

Stocks retreat on Fed speech

By James Kim
USA TODAY

Stocks, bonds and the dollar staggered Wednesday after Federal Reserve head Alan Greenspan said optimism on Wall Street might be excessive.

The Dow Jones Industrial average sank 83 points to 8095. The Standard & Poor's 500 fell 9.28 to 973.84. Damage elsewhere was limited. The Russell 2000 index of small companies slipped 0.12 points to 463.66. And the Nasdaq composite index bucked the trend, rising 4.50 points to 1741.77, its 47th straight record.

Analysts say the spark for the selling came from Greenspan, who surprised financial markets with comments on Capitol Hill that Wall Street is making unrealistic assumptions about continued strong economic growth and low inflation.

That sent tremors through financial markets.

▶ Bond prices sank, pushing the yield on the 30-year Treasury bond up to 6.37%. Tuesday, it had fallen to 6.23%, the lowest since February 1996.

▶ The dollar dove. It fell to 1.7485 German marks from 1.7571 late Tuesday and slid to 121.05 Japanese yen from 122.56.

Greenspan's strongest comments were about the stock market. He rebutted the notion of a "new economy" of ideal conditions for stocks. That belief has been key in helping Wall Street justify the bullishness that has kept the historic bull market alive and pushed most stock indexes to records the past week.

But traders and analysts don't expect Greenspan's comments to lead to an extended downturn. Wall Street is still upbeat about third-quarter earnings reports in coming weeks. Stocks may have been due for a pause, anyway, they say.

"This is not the type of sell-off that says we are in for a big downturn," says Bill Dodge, portfolio manager at Marvin & Palmer Associates. It's a "reminder that we have to be realistic about the economy."

Supporters see quick passage of adoption reform bill

By Richard Willing
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — A bill to increase adoptions from public foster care could be signed into law as early as next month, key sponsors predicted Wednesday.

"The best child-rearing machine ever invented is the family (and) adoption is the most powerful social intervention ever known," Rep. Dave Camp, R-Mich, said at a hearing on the Senate proposal.

"We could have 10,000, 20,000,

30,000 more adoptions a year... (if) we can act together and I believe we can," Camp said. Adoptions from foster care have averaged about 20,000 a year since 1982.

The Senate bill, and a companion bill that passed the House of Representatives in April, would limit the time a child could spend in foster care before being put up for adoption. Both bills also would provide financial incentives to states and to individuals to make adoption more attractive. Public adoptions are financed by a combination of state

and federal funding.

Camp, co-author of the House bill, was one of six senators or representatives who testified in support of the Senate bill. That bill, which has bi-partisan support, is expected to be sent to the full Senate for a vote the week of Oct. 20. If approved as expected, the bill would be combined with the House bill and sent to President Clinton for his approval.

Clinton has signaled that he is likely to sign an adoption reform bill.

However, controversy over billions in new spending could side-

track it. Wednesday, Sen. Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, criticized the bill for creating "new entitlements" by paying for drug treatment centers, homeless shelters and "birthing homes" under the guise of encouraging adoptions.

The Senate version also contains an estimated \$2.3 billion in new federal spending to encourage adoptions of children with special needs. Proponents say much of that would cover programs states now pay for.

The adoption reform bills seek to make more children available for

adoption quickly by limiting time spent in foster care. In the Senate version, for instance, a child can spend no more than 12 months in a row or 24 months total in foster care without being put up for adoption or returned to his parents. Both bills would allow states to act to end parental rights immediately when murder or other violent abuse has occurred. Current federal law requires "reasonable efforts" to reunite families without reference to a child's well-being.

Both the Senate and House bills of-

fer cash incentives to states that increase placements of foster children, which the W.K. Kellogg Foundation estimates number 494,000.

"It is time to shift the focus of the foster care system toward safety and adoption," said Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-W.Va., a bill co-sponsor.

But the Senate bill contains several provisions not in the House version. Among the most controversial: funding for "permanency options" other than adoption, including giving other family members substantial stipends to care for a child.



Angel Franco/The New York Times

A Little Help From the President **A1**

President Clinton campaigned in New Jersey yesterday with James E. McGreevey, a Democrat who hopes to unseat Gov. Christine Todd Whitman. They greeted children at a Head Start program in Newark. Page A32.

The New York Times

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997 |

Clinton, Teamster met at height of conspiracy

By Bill Sammon
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A1

President Clinton met with Martin Davis, Teamsters President Ron Carey's top campaign consultant, at a time when Davis was conspiring with key Clinton fundraisers to illegally swap campaign contributions in last year's elections.

The meeting, revealed yesterday by Sen. Fred Thompson, Tennessee Republican, provides the strongest indication to date that the widening Teamsters scandal leads directly to the White House. It is also potentially embarrassing to Mr. Clinton because Davis pleaded guilty last month to conspiracy, mail fraud and embezzlement of union funds and is cooperating in an ongoing federal investigation of the Teamsters.

White House Special Counsel Lanny J. Davis accused Mr. Thompson, chairman of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, of implying that Mr. Clinton was part of the criminal conspiracy. Mr. Thompson made his remarks during questioning of Harold Ickes, former White House deputy chief of staff, in the panel's televised fund-raising hearings.

"Before someone suggests on national television a criminal conspiracy, he ought to have his facts straight," Lanny Davis said. "The White House has challenged Senator Thompson to withdraw his suggestive commentary."

Mr. Thompson later backed down from any inference that the meeting was attended only by Mr. Clinton, Martin Davis and the Clinton-Gore campaign's two top fund-raisers, both of whom knew about the scheme to swap campaign contributions. He quickly clarified that a total of nine persons met with Mr. Clinton.

Still, the revelation that Mr. Clinton met with Martin Davis just days before the consultant set into motion the scheme to swap contributions raises new questions about the role of the White House in the Teamsters scandal.

Lanny Davis said the June 17

see CLINTON, page A10

CLINTON

From page A1

meeting in the White House was a Democratic National Committee luncheon, whose purpose "was to secure political and financial support from friends and supporters of the president — much like the White House coffees."

He said it was the only time, as far as he knew, that the president met with Martin Davis.

Asked if Mr. Clinton and Martin Davis discussed the plan to swap contributions between the Clinton and Carey re-election campaigns, Lanny Davis said he had "no idea" what the president talked about in one-on-one conversations with those in attendance.

However, Martin Davis did discuss the scheme with the Clinton-Gore campaign's two top fund-raisers in the weeks before the trio met with Mr. Clinton on June 17. Terence McAuliffe, chairman of the Clinton-Gore campaign, and Laura Hartigan, the campaign's finance director, are cooperating with prosecutors in the federal grand jury investigation of the Teamsters in New York.

Davis hatched the scheme after failing to raise enough legitimate money to head off a strong challenge to Mr. Carey by James P. Hoffa. He decided to go after funds in the Teamsters treasury, as well as the union's political action committee, both of which were off-limits.

In order to launder these funds, Davis proposed funneling them through the Clinton-Gore campaign and the DNC. He offered to direct Teamsters contributions to these groups if Democratic fund-raisers agreed to solicit contributions from wealthy donors to the Carey campaign.

To sweeten the pot and ensure the cooperation of the donors — who otherwise would have given their money directly to the Democrats — Davis agreed to give the Democratic politicians five or 10 times more in Teamsters money than the donors gave to the Carey campaign.

The illegal scheme was approved by officials of the Clinton-Gore campaign and the DNC, according to U.S. Attorney Mary Jo White, who is leading the Teamsters probe in Manhattan.

Although no evidence has surfaced that Davis, Mr. McAuliffe or Miss Hartigan discussed the scheme at the June 17 lunch with the president, Davis decided four days later to set the plan into motion, Mr. Thompson said.

"This June 17, 1996, meeting with the president occurred only four days before ... the Teamsters determined they would indeed send \$236,000 to state Democratic parties as part of the contribution-swap scheme," he said.

Although Mr. Ickes acknowledged the contributions were made in a "coordinated campaign" to state Democratic parties, he said, "There is absolutely nothing unusual with that."

Mr. Thompson replied: "Well, I would agree that, indeed, there's nothing unusual with that. There's nothing unusual with the Teamsters sending money to coordinated campaigns. And there's nothing unusual for supporters of Clinton-Gore to be sending money to the Carey campaign, I suppose."

"But when it's done as a part of a conspiracy and a coordinated effort, it's against the law," Mr. Thompson said.

In order to make good on its end of the bargain, the DNC found a woman who was willing to give \$100,000 to the Carey campaign. The woman had first tried to give the money to the DNC but was barred from doing so because she is a foreigner.

In the end, even the Carey campaign turned down the money because the woman was an employer. Federal rules prohibit employers from donating to candidates in a Teamsters election.

Meanwhile, Davis was having better luck with similar money-laundering schemes involving liberal political groups like Citizen Action. The schemes brought tens of thousands of dollars into Carey campaign coffers in exchange for hundreds of thousands in Teamster funds going to groups that helped elect Democrats.

The Washington Times
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

Excerpts From Testimony by Ickes on Fund-Raising by the Democrats

By The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Oct. 9 — Following are excerpts from testimony today by Harold M. Ickes, a former White House deputy chief of staff, at a hearing of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee on 1996 campaign finance practices, as transcribed by the Federal Document Clearing House, a private transcription company. Questions were from Senators Richard J. Durbin of Illinois and Don Nickles of Oklahoma, who referred to R. Warren Meddoff, a Florida businessman who has testified that Mr. Ickes asked him for a \$1.5 million campaign donation.

Questions by Senator Durbin

Q. One of the allegations against the Vice President involves a memo, which I believe the date was February of 1996, Feb. 22, 1996. . . . The argument came down to the hard money-soft money question and whether or not there was anything in your memo, which this appears to be, to the President and Vice President, which would have alerted them to the fact that telephone solicitations from that point were going to be for hard money as opposed to soft money. Now, there has been a lot of conversation back and forth as to whether that was the stated intent of the memo. The position of the Republican majority was this was fair warning to the Vice President. He went ahead and made the calls anyway. Would you like to give me your interpretation of what this memo was meant to say and what it did say?

MR. ICKES Well, Senator, this memo, as has been testified to before by others, was alerting the President and the Vice President and others that we were in fact short of soft money, and just basically putting people on alert that we were short of soft money at that time. The President's note I think — his writing is more impossible than mine, exceeded only by Leon's — but I think it says something about, "Can you raise it by direct mail campaign?" I don't recall whether I responded to that question or not, but the fact is you don't raise soft money by direct mail campaigns.

Q. So the premise by the Republican majority that this memo was the basis to give notice to Vice President Gore that his telephone campaign solicitations would be for hard money is a premise you, the author of the memo, dispute?

A. I would dispute that, and I would say just generally while we are on that subject the President and the Vice President, to the extent they made phone calls, or were asked to make phone calls, were asked to make phone calls to close on very large contributions. I will tell you, Senator, that in my experience of some 11 Presidential campaigns, a number since the 1974 act was put in place, that when you're talking 20, 30, 40,

50, 100 thousand dollars, the thing that automatically comes into your mind is soft money. . . .

Questions by Senator Nickles

I want to ask the clerk to put up Document 1287. This is a document that I think somebody else on the panel, Mr. Meddoff's memo that you had to Mr. Meddoff. . . .

A. I have that.

Q. The fax. Did that fax originate from Air Force One, or was that phone call from Air Force One?

A. Well, you've asked two questions. Which, this is, you've asked me to look at a fax.

Q. O.K. Did that fax originate from, from where?

A. It originated from the White House.

Q. From the White House. And, but it also dealt with your phone call. Wasn't the phone call that you made to Mr. Meddoff while you were en route with the President on Air Force One?

A. To the best of my recollection, it was I am quite sure that I talked with him from Air Force One.

Q. O.K., did you, this, did you turn this document over to the committee or to the Justice Department?

A. The document we have in front of us?

Q. Yes. The document.

A. Well, wait, I'm sorry, Senator, you, sometimes you double up on your questions.

Q. Did you submit this document to this committee?

A. The document that we're looking at? Yes, this came from my files.

Q. This document came from I believe Mr. Meddoff and Newsweek. I don't believe this document came from you.

A. I think, Senator, O.K., I think my lawyer, Amy Saverin, informed me that the SCGA-02963 indicates that it is produced from my files.

Q. Well, I might inquire more of the committee staff. I, it was my understanding that this information didn't come from your staff, that you didn't submit this information. I'll try to find out. I, we will find out.

Let me ask you, there is some question, part of this says that there was a fall, Mr. Meddoff said that you contacted him and urged, you, him to destroy this document. Is that correct?

A. I did not urge him to destroy the document, the best of my knowledge. And I have testified to that in the deposition that I gave I think to, to Mr. Madigan.

Q. O.K., so you testified that you didn't tell him to destroy the document, but you're also saying that you submitted this document to the committee?

The New York Times

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

1
—
2