

This is the revised
draft w/ more of
an emphasis on
the Israel trip since
Rep. King rec'd. a TV
note from POTUS re:
Ireland. This letter was
approved by Susan
Brophy.

DRAFT

96 JAN 2 A10:20

Dear Representative King:

Thank you for joining me on my recent trips to Israel, Northern Ireland and Ireland.

In Israel, Prime Minister Rabin sacrificed his life to advance the cause of peace, and for that he will always be remembered. As I stated when Prime Minister Peres visited the White House last month, I am more committed than ever to promoting peace among Israel and her neighbors.

Peace was at the heart of both of these missions, and by attending these historic events with me ~~in Israel and Ireland~~ you have not only ~~been~~ both demonstrated support for my peace initiatives in ~~these countries~~ and an understanding that ~~the~~ America's support for peace must be bi-partisan.

I thank you for your commitment to both Israel and Ireland and for working with me to ensure that our Nation remains steadfast in seeking a lasting and genuine peace.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Peter T. King
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

From: Todd Stern
To: ~~Phil/Todd/Helen~~
From: Jocelyn
To: Jocelyn Tolley

DRAFT

The first draft.

Dear Representative King:

Thank you for joining me on my recent trips to Israel, Northern Ireland and Ireland.

Peace was at the heart of both of these missions. In Israel, Prime Minister Rabin sacrificed his life to advance the cause of peace. In Ireland, the parties are closer now to a life of peace than at any other time in this century. However, for peace to succeed in Israel and Ireland, strong American backing is essential.

By attending these historic events with me in Israel and Ireland, you have not only demonstrated support for my peace initiatives in these countries, but you have demonstrated that America's support for peace must be bi-partisan.

I thank you for your commitment to both Israel and Ireland and for working with me to ensure that our Nation remains steadfast in seeking a lasting and genuine peace.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Peter T. King
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Susan

Celtic Images
original photography
by
Rick Henderson

Chrom
THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
12-23-95

Dec. 20, 1995

Mr. President, Mrs. Clinton and Chelsea,

Wishing you the happiest of holiday seasons!

Rick and Kathie Henderson

Original to Dorskind

Jim Dorskind

Please coordinate
the reply.

Send Jim Newley

P.S.

Dear President Clinton,

We are so proud of your courageous
efforts to bring peace to Northern Ireland. We
wish you continued success in 1996.

deb,

12/26

I have given a copy of this to todd with a note that I am sending the original to Dorskind; BUT will you check w/oval to see if something was attached to this letter or is POTUS wanting to do letter to thank them for their holiday wishes/support.

1-2-96



Framed picture - Gift
Unit should have info!

12

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

DATE: 1-2-86

TO: Pat Gortton
Bruce Reed
FROM: Rahm Emanuel
Staff Secretary

Ken Aptel Room 260

Can you all determine
what, if anything, we want
to do about this.

I assume we'll need
some kind of reply.



United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-0903

December 22, 1995

96 JAN 2 P 1:51

The Honorable Bill Clinton
President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20500,

Dear Mr. President:

I applaud your efforts to change welfare as we know it and to institute a new system which focuses on work and individual responsibility and breaks the current dependency cycle for so many Americans.

On December 21, 1995, the House of Representatives passed the welfare reform conference report. Following House action, the Senate turned to consideration of the measure.

I would like to bring to your attention an extremely significant policy and financial issue imbedded in the pending conference report which could have a dramatic impact on the state of Florida.

I am referring to the provisions in the legislation which effectively repeal the protections enacted in 1980 which permit certain Cubans and Haitians to receive assistance on the same basis as refugees.

For decades the state of Florida has been the principal point of entry for both legal and illegal Cuban and Haitian arrivals. You will recall that during your presidency the alarming exodus of rafters from Cuba precipitated a September 9, 1994 joint communique between the United States and Cuba that committed our country to a minimum annual migration level of at least 20,000 Cubans.

With respect to Haitian entrants, for over a decade, the United States has admitted countless thousands of rafters and other individuals. Recent indications of instability in Haiti portend further groups of Haitians seeking refuge in America.

Since 1980, the United States has permitted Cuban and Haitians to receive federal assistance on the same basis as refugees.

Mr. President, every single version of welfare reform legislation

that I have seen up to this point fails to maintain this federal commitment, thereby shifting the cost for these Cuban and Haitian arrivals to the taxpayers of Florida. Although I have not seen a final version of the conference report, there is every indication that it does not contain a provision to maintain Cuban-Haitian eligibility. That is intolerable and unacceptable.

I bring this matter to your attention because of the immense future implications such a statutory change would have. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to make this issue one of your top priorities in the days ahead as welfare reform legislation is negotiated.

I am enclosing with this letter a legislative amendment which would remedy this problem, as well as a copy of the Department of Justice's position paper on the Cuban-Haitian entrant issue.

Mr. President, thank you for giving this urgent matter your careful attention.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Ted Kennedy", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

United States Senator

BG/jms



Congressional Research Service • The Library of Congress • Washington, D.C. 20540-7000

December 6, 1995

TO : Honorable Bob Graham
Attention: Jere Skipper

FROM : Larry M. Eig
American Law Division
and
Joyce C. Violet
Education and Public Welfare Division

SUBJECT : Treatment of Cuban/Haitian Entrants under
Welfare/Reconciliation Alien Eligibility Restrictions

This memorandum follows up our previous discussions of proposals to restrict public benefits for aliens, and possible amendments to those proposals to insure parallel treatment of Cuban/Haitian entrants and refugees. As discussed, the alienage restrictions in leading welfare and reconciliation legislation would treat Cuban/Haitian entrants, as defined in title V (the "Fascell-Stone amendment") of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96-422), less favorably than aliens who enter as refugees for purposes of qualifying for Federal public benefits. The primary purpose of the Fascell-Stone amendment was to assure equality of treatment.

Under the vetoed budget reconciliation bill, H.R. 2491, even those aliens defined as qualified aliens in the bill (e.g., permanent residents, refugees, asylees, and long-term parolees) would generally be (1) barred from SSI and food stamps, (2) subject to a State option to deny assistance under major Federal block grants, and (3) for aliens arriving after enactment, denied most assistance for 5 years. Nevertheless, aliens arriving as refugees are excepted from the first two of these requirements for 5 years, and excepted outright from the third (even though aliens arriving as refugees may adjust to permanent resident status after a year). There is no comparable exception for Cuban/Haitian entrants who are qualified aliens. Any conference committee report of H.R. 4, the major welfare bill, will likely contain alienage restrictions similar to those in H.R. 2491, plus additional restrictions on State benefits.

The Fascell-Stone amendment was adopted primarily because of concern about the fiscal impact on Florida of large numbers of aliens arriving outside of normal immigration channels. It remains in effect today. The Fascell-Stone amendment requires that certain Cubans and Haitians who are in the United

CRS-2

States other than as permanent residents be treated as refugees for purposes of assistance under title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (INA), as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980.¹ The President also was granted discretionary authority to allow these Cuban/Haitian entrants to obtain other Federal assistance on the same basis as refugees. To date, there has been no need to exercise this authority because Cuban/Haitian entrants have qualified for assistance in their own right as parolees or, after adjustment to permanent resident status, as immigrants.

To maintain equal access of refugees and Cuban/Haitian entrants to public assistance may require at least two amendments to the proposed alienage restrictions in the reconciliation/welfare bills. First, the apparently preemptive language of the proposed 5-year ban on assistance for new arrivals in the budget reconciliation/welfare bills (i.e., *"Notwithstanding any other provision of law,..."*) may be read as a basis for denying future Cuban/Haitian entrants participation under means-tested refugee assistance programs in title IV of the INA. Among these programs are temporary refugee cash assistance (RCA) and refugee medical assistance (RMA). To assure that Cuban/Haitian entrants would continue to participate under these programs, the 5-year ban on new arrivals in the reconciliation/welfare bills could be amended to include means-tested refugee assistance programs under title IV of the INA to the list of excepted programs. Alternatively, a new, separate provision could be added to the reconciliation/welfare bills to preserve current eligibility standards for refugee assistance programs.

A second amendment to the proposed alienage restrictions in the reconciliation/welfare bills could address Federal benefits more broadly. This amendment could expressly include Cuban/Haitians entrants in the definition of qualified aliens. This amendment further could add Cuban/Haitian entrants to the lists of aliens who are excepted from the various alienage restrictions in the budget reconciliation/welfare bills and do so in a way that would assure that Cuban/Haitian entrants, like refugees, are to remain excepted for 5 years despite any subsequent adjustment to permanent resident status. The following is one possible formulation of the excepted class: "aliens who qualify as Cuban/Haitian entrants, as defined in section 501(e)(2) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, for 5 years after such qualification, unless a final order of exclusion or deportation has been entered against them."

The prospective fiscal impact of permitting Cuban/Haitian entrants (like aliens entering as refugees) to receive Federal assistance during their first 5 years here is unknown. A large portion of the minimum 20,000 per year

¹Under Fawell-Stone, aliens in any of the following 3 groups qualify as Cuban-Haitian entrants, so long as no final deportation or exclusion order has been issued against them: (1) aliens granted parole under the Attorney General's parole authority who have not acquired any other immigration status, (2) aliens in exclusion or deportation proceedings, and (3) aliens with pending asylum applications. Most, but not all, Haitians and Cubans who would qualify for entrant status under the third category also would qualify under the first category. Under the budget reconciliation/welfare bills, only aliens who become Cuban-Haitian entrants as parolees would be qualified aliens for purposes of the alienage restrictions in those bills.

CRS-3

migration level called for under our 1994 migration agreement with Cuba is likely to arrive as parolees, who, in turn, qualify as Cuban/Haitian entrants. However, the process of selecting parolees to meet minimum Cuban migration requirements is structured in part to favor Cubans who are least likely to require public support, at least in the short run. Also, even though reported usage rates of SSI among Cuban noncitizens is high, these rates may be overstated because they may not take into account the subsequent naturalization of some recipients. Furthermore, permitting Cuban/Haitian entrants to receive benefits for 5 years upon their arrival (like refugees may) would not appear to significantly affect projected savings from proposed restrictions on long-term noncitizens already here.

One potential funding issue concerns not so much the cost of allowing Cuban/Haitian entrants to receive benefits as it does which program will be bearing the cost. If the reconciliation/welfare bills were to allow Cuban/Haitian entrants to continue to receive refugee assistance but not allow them to receive other benefits on their arrival, the entire refugee resettlement program could face substantial new burdens. This is so because refugee assistance in part is designed to cover certain support costs that cannot be met through other means-tested programs. To the degree that Cuban/Haitian entrants will be denied access to these other programs first time under the budget reconciliation/welfare bills, they will have to turn instead to refugee assistance for support.

We hope you find this memorandum to be useful. Do not hesitate to contact us further on this or any other subject.

CUBAN AND HAITIAN ENTRANT ELIGIBILITY UNDER WELFARE REFORM

Issue: Under the Congressional welfare reform proposal Cuban and Haitian entrants lose their eligibility for means-tested public benefits.

Background: Under the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, and in response to the migration crisis known as the Mariel boatlift, the President was directed to exercise authorities with respect to Cuban/Haitian entrants which are identical to those pertaining to benefits and assistance to refugees who are admitted pursuant to section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (ANew).

The welfare reform legislation establishes that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, with the exception of refugees admitted under section 207 of the ANew, asylees, and a limited number of other aliens, a qualified alien (e.g. one admitted for permanent residence) who enters the United States after enactment of the bill is not eligible for any Federal means-tested public benefit during the alien's first 5 years in the United States. Thus, entrants would lose their eligibility.

Discussion: In response to the 1993-94 Cuban and Haitian migration crises which were similar to Mariel, the United States and Cuba agreed to establish safe, orderly and legal migration processes for Cubans attempting to resettle in the United States.

Under the terms of this agreement, Cuba agreed to take measures against anyone seeking illegally to flee to the United States. The United States agreed legally to admit 20,000 Cuban nationals a year.

Cuban and Haitian entrants, like refugees, do not necessarily have close family ties. Like refugees, they often lack English language and transferable employment skills. Access to benefits and the Federally funded domestic refugee resettlement program is critical to their ability to achieve early economic self-sufficiency.

Cuban and Haitian access to Federal means tested benefits would lessen the impact on State and local communities across the nation; especially in South Florida where over two-thirds of the migrants resettle.

The elimination of these public benefits might even result in our inability to fulfill our migration commitment as the private sector which assists in the resettlement process may reconsider its partnership with the Federal government. This would result in increased costs on State and local governments and may result in another uncontrolled outflow of illegal migration from Cuba.

**Amendments to Title IV - Restricting Welfare and Public Benefits
for Aliens**

**To ensure that Cuban and Haitian entrants receive the same
benefits as refugees:**

1. In section 402(a)(2)(A)(i) after the word "Act", insert "or as an alien who meets the definition contained in section 501(e) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980;"
2. In section 402(b)(2)(A)(i) after the word "Act", insert "or as an alien who meets the definition contained in section 501(e) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980."
3. In section 403(b)(1)(A) after the word "Act", insert "or as an alien who meets the definition contained in section 501(e) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980."
4. In section 412(b)(1)(A) after the word "Act", insert "or as an alien who meets the definition contained in section 501(e) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980."

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 2, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: TODD STERN *TJS*
HELEN HOWELL *HPH*

SUBJECT: Lowering of Flags for Death of Admiral Arleigh A. Burke

Yesterday, Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy (ret.), died of pneumonia at Bethesda Naval Hospital at the age of 94. He gained fame in World War II as the tactical commander of Destroyer Squadron 23 in the Pacific. His flamboyant and brilliant tactics gained him the nickname "31-Knot Burke," and the Navy recently named the most powerful class of destroyers ever built after him. Following the war, Admiral Burke became the only person to serve three terms as Chief of Naval Operations (1955-61), and was the leading architect of the postwar Navy. He led the Navy into the age of jet aircraft, guided missiles and nuclear submarines. He also ensured that it was equipped to fight peripheral wars with conventional weapons, a settled part of defense doctrine even today.

Admiral Burke will be interred at the U.S. Naval Academy Cemetery with full honors on Thursday, January 4, 1996, as authorized and directed by the Secretary of the Navy. The ensign on board all U.S. Navy ships and at all Naval bases, stations, and facilities will be flown at half mast in honor of Admiral Burke until sunset on January 4. More than 2,500 dignitaries are expected to attend Admiral Burke's funeral.

As a mark of respect to Admiral Burke's memory, and in recognition of his status as the leading architect of the postwar Navy as well as one of the great American heroes of World War II, we recommend that you order the flag to be flown at half-staff on all Federal buildings and grounds until interment. A proclamation to that effect is attached for your signature.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend that you sign the attached proclamation.

☐ Concur

☐ Disagree

☐ Discuss

DEATH OF ADMIRAL ARLEIGH A. BURKE

- - - - -

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

As a mark of respect for the memory of Admiral Arleigh Burke, one of our Nation's foremost naval heroes, I hereby order, by the authority vested in me as President of the United States of America by section 175 of title 36 of the United States Code, that the flag of the United States shall be flown at half-staff upon all public buildings and grounds, at all military posts and naval stations, and on all naval vessels of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions until interment. I also direct that the flag shall be flown at half-staff for the same period at all United States embassies, legations, consular offices, and other facilities abroad, including all military facilities and naval vessels and stations.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this second day of January, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 2, 1996

MEETING WITH DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

DATE: January 2, 1996
LOCATION: Oval Office
TIME: 4:30 PM-5:30 PM
From: Patrick Griffin *PG*

I. PURPOSE

To discuss strategy for the 6:00 PM meeting on the budget with bipartisan congressional leadership.

II. BACKGROUND

This meeting will concentrate on the strategy for putting together a bipartisan agreement on the budget.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Senator Daschle
Representative Gephardt

IV. PRESS PLAN

Pool spray TBD.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

As usual.

VI. REMARKS

None required.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 2, 1996

MEETING WITH BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS

DATE: Tuesday, January 2, 1996
LOCATION: Oval Office
TIME: 6:00 PM- 8:00 PM
From: Patrick Griffin *PG*

I. PURPOSE

To continue discussions with congressional leadership regarding the budget.

II. BACKGROUND

As you know, most aspects of the budget have been discussed in great detail over the past few days. Today's discussion will center around the possibility of putting together a bipartisan agreement. Areas of commonality and differences will be discussed.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Senator Dole
Senator Daschle

Speaker Gingrich
Representative Gephardt
Representative Armey

IV. PRESS PLAN

Pool spray TBD.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

As usual.

VI. REMARKS

None required.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

DATE: ~~12~~ 1-2-86

TO:

George

FROM: Staff Secretary

In case you haven't
seen. Pretty good news.

Ted

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 29, 1995

96 JAN 2 10:34

MEMORANDUM TO PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
LEON PANETTA
LAURA TYSON
CAROL RASCO

CC: CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

FROM: IRA C. MAGAZINER

SUBJ: HEALTH CARE "LANDMINES" IN RECONCILIATION

We have fought hard to prevent the Republicans in Congress from hurting tens of millions of vulnerable Americans by destroying the Medicare and Medicaid programs. As the final negotiations unfold, we will be focused on overall budget numbers. We should make sure that structural changes do not "sneak through" which could undermine the Medicare and Medicaid programs to an even greater extent than overzealous budget cuts.

1. Prevent "cherry picking" in Medicare

We must guard against attempts to allow health insurers or providers to risk select within the Medicare program. Denying or discouraging insurance for those who are sick or are likely to become seriously ill, or not covering their necessary treatments, or charging them significantly higher rates, is the easiest way for health plans to make money.

These practices harm tens of millions of non-elderly Americans today. Among the elderly, health plans will be even more motivated to exclude or discourage high risk patients because a small percentage of patients utilize a very high percentage of services each year.

Successful insurance systems require large pools of healthy people who pay more in premiums than the value of services they use each year in order to cover the risk that they might some day need more services than they can afford.

Most countries create very large pools by placing the elderly and disabled in the same group as the general population. We already segregate them. If we allow the pool of elderly to be further fragmented, the Medicare program will eventually fall apart.

There are many subtle ways for health plans to risk select even if it is officially not allowed. Loopholes which allow risk selection often have enticing features to them and regulations to prevent it are often cumbersome and bureaucratic.

The Republican medsave accounts and balance billing provisions encourage risk selection. Allowing health plans to design different benefits packages without a guaranteed comprehensive base of benefits also allows risk selection. Selective marketing practices or facility location or the ability to price differentially to different consumers or groups of consumers also allows risk selection.

The number one priority of the insurance and health provider allies of the Republicans is to have Medicare rules set so that they can risk select. Even if we keep the worst Medsave and balance billing provisions out, they will try to find other more sophisticated ways to set the rules of competition to their benefit.

The inevitable results of introducing risk selection into Medicare will be that the government will maintain most of the costs of the program (because it will pay for the sickest people who the insurers avoid), but with much less revenue (as private insurers capture premiums from the relatively healthy people they insure). The sickest among the elderly will eventually see a severe diminution of services because of increased prices which neither the government nor they can afford.

As you know, I believe that managed competition can create efficiencies, that integrated care can achieve savings and that substantial cuts can be made in the Medicare program. However, we must take great care that we do not agree to structuring the new system in a way which will eventually destroy the program.

2. Preserve the Medicaid Entitlement

The number of uninsured is rising at well over one million people net each year. The pace of insurance loss is accelerating as some employers drop coverage for family members of their employees, and some do not provide insurance to new or temporary workers. In addition, benefits are being cut for millions of others who have insurance. Long term care needs are also increasing faster than services.

Without increases in Medicaid coverage over the past decade, these problems would have been even more severe. While many governors and legislators would not favor a decline in Medicaid coverage even under a general block grant, others who do not believe in the Medicaid entitlement and don't see poor Medicaid recipients as important constituents politically will cut back on coverage.

We have been firm in our support of the entitlement, but must be sure that "back door" methods of erosion are not built into the reconciliation bill.

Even under a per capita cap, loopholes which effectively deny needed services to eligible populations could have perverse effects. Too great an erosion of the guaranteed benefits package, funding formulas which effectively eliminate hospitals and health centers in economically distressed areas and redefined eligibility rules which give too much "wiggle room" for defining currently eligible populations out, all could have this effect.

The result of this erosion could be an acceleration of the number of uninsured people, a decline in public health in medically underserved areas and increased costs as preventive care declines and uncompensated care increases.

3. Keep Overall Cuts Reasonable

I have always felt that the Medicare and Medicaid programs could be and should be cut. You may remember that the biggest disagreements during the formation of the Health Security Act came because the health care team wanted caps on the growth of Medicare and Medicaid which HHS and the economic team thought were too stringent.

Having said this, cuts too far beyond those we have now proposed, in the absence of broader reforms, could have serious adverse effects on the health care system.

Over \$100 billion in "cuts" have already been taken off the baseline over seven years compared to the numbers we looked at two years ago. In addition, in the Health Security Act, we reinvested a significant portion of the savings back into the health system for universal coverage. We also had protections for institutions in underserved areas who disproportionately serve Medicare and Medicaid patients.

The biggest risk is with Medicaid. Without universal coverage and integration of Medicaid into the private system, it is difficult to achieve savings much beyond what we have proposed without doing serious harm to the most vulnerable patients and health providers.

From a policy perspective, if we must find health care cuts beyond those already proposed, we should look to Medicare and we should use a general cap. Nobody can predict the effects of the various cost shifts which will take place over the next few years. A more general capping system would be preferable to specified cuts (beyond the areas we have already specified), because it would allow greater flexibility in the future.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

DATE: 1-2-91

TO:

Leon
Harold

FROM: Staff Secretary

I don't know whether
you've seen this. How
do you want to handle?



cc: John Angell
Michele Foley



THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON

DEC 29 1995

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing on behalf of my 236,000 employees, to urge that, at the very earliest possible moment, you propose emergency legislation to allow for federal employees to be paid in spite of the lack of regular appropriations or a full continuing resolution. This will allow all employees to receive full pay until a resolution is reached in this crisis.

I have 202,000 employees at work across this great nation in Veterans Affairs Medical Centers, Regional Benefits offices and National Cemeteries. In spite of their commitment to providing care and services to veterans in this most difficult and uncertain time, they will be paid less than one-half of their normal take-home pay on January 2, and will receive no pay on their next pay day unless there is some action by January 8.

I have received countless messages and anecdotes from these loyal VA caregivers asking me, "Who will pay our mortgage...buy food, clothes and medicine for our children?" "Christmas was a little slim this year," they say. "How am I going to pay my bills?"

I must tell you I am deeply concerned about these members of our VA family and their colleagues in other federal agencies. I am proud of them for coming to work, but I am concerned that while they are busy caring for veterans, we need to worry about them and their families. Like many other Americans, they live from paycheck to paycheck, and cannot afford to be short-changed -- especially at the beginning of the month when many bills come due.

For these very heartfelt reasons, please consider proposing emergency legislation that would assure that they are paid. Nine months ago, we were all appalled when federal employees were attacked in Oklahoma City. We cannot now stand by and watch as they are used by the Congressional majority as pawns in the budget negotiations.

Thank you in advance for your thoughtful consideration.

Respectfully,

Jesse Brown

*Mr. President -
This will put the
Republicans in a very
Awkward position if they
come out against it.*



Putting Veterans First

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

DATE: Jan 2, 1996

TO: Shirley Sagawa

FROM: Staff Secretary

The attached note was written by the President on Mr. Allen's final status report. We are forwarding to you for appropriate handling.

Thank you.

Ms. Shirley Sagawa
Corporation of National Service
1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20525

✓ required by the Bill to examine crime and drug enforcement and prevention. The "Contract on America" says nothing about drugs. Republicans sent an appropriations bill to you that cuts funding for Federal law enforcement task forces of the FBI, DEA, and Treasury, and cuts the DEA, FBI, U.S. Marshals, drug prosecutors, Bureau of Prisons, and other drug fighting resources.

cc: Means
to Rumsfeld

De-Luca
Luter

(D) **Panetta and Rivlin responses to Sec. Reich budget question.** Reich had asked why neither school-to-work apprenticeships nor the GI Bill were deemed a "priority investment" for budget purposes. Leon says this "has been fixed," and Rivlin explains that we are fighting hard for these programs. She reports that we are proposing: an additional \$153 million above the likely FY 96 appropriation of \$218 million for School-to-Work; and an additional \$1.1 billion for the GI Bill programs (17% of the entire \$6.6 billion add-back total) -- in addition to School-to-Work, Summer Jobs (+\$635 million), Dislocated Worker Assistance (+\$362 million), adult training grants to states (+\$117 million), and One-Stop Career Shopping (+\$29 million). In total, these increases would raise funding for GI Bill programs to \$4.1 billion or \$300 million below FY 95. We are continuing the priority of GI Bill programs reflected in your June balanced budget (except that financing for school-to-work and one-stop career shopping -- short term initiatives intended to be taken over by the states -- ends in 2001 under the June budget).

cc: Leon
Rivlin

(E) **Rick Allen memo on AmeriCorps.** Gallup poll -- 83% favor program, though name recognition only 24%. Internal polls show Republican attacks raised name identification by 50% over the last year without reducing public approval. Press -- Editorials run 4 to 1 in our favor, but negative pieces are increasing as AmeriCorps is targeted more by Republican Leadership in Congress. Main charge: "a luxury we can't afford." In response, we stress cost-effectiveness (a \$1.60 to \$2.60 return on each federal dollar invested), and role of unpaid volunteers, as well as State and private sector support. Reauthorization -- required in FY 1996. Rick urges that you try to protect: the current education award (\$4,725); floor on membership (25,000); a living allowance that ensures diversity; federal quality standards; and a national identity for AmeriCorps. Likely Republican lines of attack -- means-testing the education award and/or living allowance; restricting or eliminating the federal presence; capping per participant costs and increasing the match; tightening prohibitions against advocacy; reducing the number of members; and transferring the Senior Corps to HHS to eliminate the program's most potent constituency.

cc: Leon
News
to House
Scott

(F) **Rasco response re medical coverage for people with HIV/AIDS.** There is no data distinguishing between those working and not working, but it is estimated that 15% of people with AIDS have private health insurance (often restricted, e.g., no coverage of prescription drugs), 30% have no insurance, 50% receive Medicaid benefits, and 5% are eligible for Medicare. Many of the uninsured and underinsured rely on public hospitals for inpatient care, and programs funded by the Ryan White CARE Act for outpatient care, drug purchase assistance, and/or help with COBRA premiums. However, states often exhaust their allotted CARE funds before the grant period ends.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 5, 1995

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
12/27/95
5 DEC 13 P4:08
C. Leary

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: RICK ALLEN **RA**

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT

Attached to this, my last report before returning to the private sector, are the following:

1. Another national poll confirms broad support for AmeriCorps: Gallup released a poll in September that provided the fifth national confirmation of the overwhelming support for AmeriCorps (83% positives; a majority calling for expansion and only 7% calling for reduction or elimination). This poll (commissioned by the McCormick Foundation) is consistent but not as favorable as our internal polls (including Gallup's) have been. We have found that clearly indicating what AmeriCorps Members do (teaching and tutoring; helping community policing; disaster relief, etc.) pushes approval above 90%. Among other findings, this poll puts AmeriCorps' name recognition at 24% (our internal polls have us in the low 30s) -- either way, the initiative has a long way to go before it becomes a cultural icon on the level of the Peace Corps. The good news is that the relentless Republican attacks raised AmeriCorps' name identification by 50% (per internal polls) over this last year, without reducing public approval. The poll suggests that criticisms on philosophical grounds don't resonate (the Republicans' polls must agree, given their focus on cost and impact, rather than "government-paid volunteerism").
2. Press Coverage: A sampling of recent print press coverage is grouped as follows:
 - One article and a number of editorials from battleground and other important states and a summary of editorial coverage since the September, 1994 Launch.
 - Four articles of interest: One about a Member who used his AmeriCorps CPR training to save a man sliced by a boat propeller; another showing AmeriCorps helping cops on the beat; a the third reiterating Notre Dame's strong support of AmeriCorps; and the fourth from a leading banking industry spokesperson, recommending that banks invest in local AmeriCorps programs to meet their CRA obligations. Your long-time supporter, New Hampshire's Chris Gallagher, Sr. (on our Board) has been spearheading this effort.
 - A fairly typical negative editorial. Although program or Member-profile reportage has been almost uniformly positive, and editorials run about 4 to 1 in our favor (with the bulk of negatives being the same piece run throughout a chain of papers), the number of negative pieces has climbed as AmeriCorps has become a more frequent target of the Republican Congressional leadership. The attachment has the attack de jour: AmeriCorps is a "luxury we can't afford". Our response has included the following:
 - A. Three independent cost/benefit studies show that AmeriCorps is a cost-effective investment, returning at least \$1.60 to \$2.60 in measurable benefits for each federal dollar invested. Tight budgets require smart investments like AmeriCorps.
 - B. As leaders in both parties try to reduce the role of government, greater citizen involvement will be needed. AmeriCorps shows the way by increasing the number and effectiveness of unpaid volunteers and by creating alumni with life-long commitments to serving their communities.

- C. Similarly, AmeriCorps is a proven model of New Federalism -- that's why Republican Governors have been so supportive. Initiatives that reduce the federal presence and increase state and local authority and responsibility should be emphasized, not eliminated.
- D. AmeriCorps provides a proven vehicle for increased private sector support of community initiatives and organizations.

3. Reauthorization: What must be preserved to keep AmeriCorps your legacy? It is possible that the appropriations battles will overlap with the reauthorization process (all parts of national service must be reauthorized during FY 1996). Your control over the latter is less than over the former, since Congress can end national service merely through inaction, without harming other programs they favor.

We are taking the following approach:

- Working with Senate Chair Kassebaum and staff to begin Committee consideration this month, and aiming to fashion a Chair's mark before the Presidential primaries begin.
- Conducting our own outreach to develop field support.
- Attempting to negotiate modifications (such as increasing the required private sector match) with key Senate Republicans (including lead critic Chuck Grassley).

I think it is critical for you to determine at the earliest possible point what you want to keep sacrosanct about AmeriCorps (at least until it is clear that a specific change provides the margin of needed Congressional votes). I would encourage you to call for a briefing from Harris and Eli as soon as possible -- your guidance is necessary because there are few common assumptions either internally or on the Hill. I would think the minimum list should include:

1. The existence of a meaningful education award (I think any retreat from the current \$4725 should be considered only as a last resort).
2. An absolute floor on the number of Members (perhaps the current 25,000), with the resulting funding implications.
3. A living allowance sufficient to ensure diversity of Members.
4. A federal entity to set standards and ensure quality; perhaps also to select some minimum level of programs (currently, one-third of AmeriCorps programs are nationally selected).
5. A national identity for AmeriCorps.

I anticipate the following major lines of attack from Republicans:

1. Means-testing the AmeriCorps education award and/or the living allowance;
2. Restricting or eliminating the federal presence (clearly, stopping federal agencies from sponsoring AmeriCorps programs, and perhaps ending any national grant selection or converting all of AmeriCorps into a block-grant);
3. Capping per participant costs (either federal share or total) and increasing the match;
4. Tightening prohibitions against advocacy;
5. Pushing AmeriCorps into irrelevancy (eg., by drastically reducing the number of Members or by stopping national identity);
6. Transferring the Senior Corps (RSVP, Senior Companions and Foster Grandparents) to HHS, to eliminate the most politically potent constituency for service and the Corporation.

I am deeply grateful to have had the chance to serve in your Administration for nearly three years, and am committed to doing whatever I can to advance your interests while in private life.

The National Security Archive

Gelman Library, Suite 701
2130 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Phone: 202/994-7000
Fax: 202/994-7005
nsarchiv@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu

96 JAN 11 P2:51

S- could
you mail this
back to Tom
Blanton at address
in paper left.
1-

POLITICS AND PROSE BOOKSTORE

invites you to a book talk by

Tom Blanton

editor of

White House E-Mail: The Top Secret Computer Messages The Reagan/Bush White House Tried to Destroy,
(New York: The New Press, 256 pp. plus 1.44 megabyte computer disk), distributed by W.W. Norton &
Company. \$14.95 at your local bookstore.

Tuesday, January 9, 1996

7 p.m.

5015 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington D.C.

(at Nebraska Avenue, parking in the rear)

"A cross between history and voyeurism"

-- Michael Wines, *The New York Times*, 11-26-95.

"Astonishing"

-- Sue Ellicott, BBC, 10-14-95.

"Explosive"

-- Mark Dery, *Newsweek*, 12-11-95.

"Techno thriller of the year"

-- Mary Elizabeth Williams, *Wired* magazine, November 1995.

"Forget the Nixon tapes"

-- *Publishers' Weekly*, 8-7-95.

1-11
Tom -
Snowstorms &
typically bad mail
service apparently conspir
to bring this to my desk
just now. But
hope the talk went
well & congrats on
the book.
Hope you & Ann
are well.
[Signature]

REMARKS BY
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
AT THE FUNERAL SERVICE
FOR AMBASSADOR M. LARRY LAWRENCE
ARLINGTON CEMETERY
JANUARY 17, 1996

96 JAN 16 P 7: 07

1/16

DID not use.

the single spaced version and speech cards
were forwarded to POTUS in his schedule
notebook for 01/17.

s

[Acknowledgements: Mrs. Lawrence; the Lawrence family; Secretary Christopher; Rabbi Michael Sternfield; distinguished guests and friends]

We are gathered here today to celebrate the life of a great American. The Talmud teaches us that "Good men do not need monuments. Their deeds remain their shrines." Ambassador Larry Lawrence's life was a shrine to goodness, bravery, and generosity.

Ambassador Lawrence brought his abundant energy and fresh vision to every task he undertook. As our nation's Ambassador to Switzerland, he was a tireless and effective advocate of U.S. interests. But his service to his country did not begin with his diplomatic assignment. During World War II at the age of 18, he volunteered as a Merchant Marine. On a mission to help our allies, he was wounded when his ship was sunk by enemy torpedoes in arctic waters.

Larry often said that that experience was a defining moment in his life.

Larry's civilian life showed the same courage and resolve. He rose from a humble childhood during the Depression to great heights as an entrepreneur, philanthropist, and patriot. One of his greatest achievements in business was the restoration and stewardship of California's grand Hotel del Coronado.

His quiet philanthropy also touched many lives and reflected the spaciousness of his life. Whether it was a gift to the arts or to a hospital or to a university, he gave generously and always from the heart.

Larry's passion for politics was also legendary. He was a long-time supporter of progressive candidates and causes. I am especially grateful for the friendship and support Larry gave me.

Long before I became President, he was there, in good times and tough times.

Ambassador Lawrence's life was a monument to the good. I know that he would want all of us to continue striving to do our part, as he always did, to make this world a better place for each other and for our children.

This is the best and most lasting tribute that we can offer this remarkable man.

I am reminded of the words of William Faulkner, who once said, man "is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance." The generous soul of Larry Lawrence endures. May God now wrap him in the warm embrace of his eternal love.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY

PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON

AT THE FUNERAL SERVICE

FOR AMBASSADOR M. LARRY LAWRENCE

ARLINGTON CEMETERY

JANUARY 17, 1996

96 JAN 16 P 7 : 07

[Acknowledgements: Mrs. Lawrence; the Lawrence family; Secretary Christopher; Rabbi Michael Sternfield; distinguished guests and friends]

We are gathered here today to celebrate the life of a great American. The Talmud teaches us that "Good men do not need monuments. Their deeds remain their shrines." Ambassador Larry Lawrence's life was a shrine to goodness, bravery, and generosity.

Ambassador Lawrence brought his abundant energy and fresh vision to every task he undertook. As our nation's Ambassador to Switzerland, he was a tireless and effective advocate of U.S. interests. But his service to his country did not begin with his diplomatic assignment. During World War II at the age of 18, he volunteered as a Merchant Marine. On a mission to help our allies, he was wounded when his ship was sunk by enemy torpedoes in arctic waters.

Larry often said that that experience was a defining moment in his life.

Larry's civilian life showed the same courage and resolve. He rose from a humble childhood during the Depression to great heights as an entrepreneur, philanthropist, and patriot. One of his greatest achievements in business was the restoration and stewardship of California's grand Hotel del Coronado.

His quiet philanthropy also touched many lives and reflected the spaciousness of his life. Whether it was a gift to the arts or to a hospital or to a university, he gave generously and always from the heart.

Larry's passion for politics was also legendary. He was a long-time supporter of progressive candidates and causes. I am especially grateful for the friendship and support Larry gave me.

Long before I became President, he was there, in good times and tough times.

Ambassador Lawrence's life was a monument to the good. I know that he would want all of us to continue striving to do our part, as he always did, to make this world a better place for each other and for our children.

This is the best and most lasting tribute that we can offer this remarkable man.

I am reminded of the words of William Faulkner, who once said, man "is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance." The generous soul of Larry Lawrence endures. May God now wrap him in the warm embrace of his eternal love.

Thank you.

Wednesday, January 17, 1996

File Portus
a
SG

9:00 AM

Coffee

TAB A

10:30 AM

Memorial Service for
Ambassador Lawrence
and Remarks

TAB B

January 16, 1996

COFFEE WITH SUPPORTERS OF
THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

DATE: January 17, 1996
LOCATION: MAP ROOM
TIME: 9:00 AM
FROM: RICHARD SULLIVAN

- I. PURPOSE
To meet with supporters of the Democratic National Committee
- II. BACKGROUND
This is one of a series of coffees that you are hosting with the top supporters of the DNC.
- III. PARTICIPANTS
See attached list.
- IV. PRESS PLAN
Closed press.
- V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS
Enter Map Room, discuss informally, and depart.
- VI. REMARKS
None required.

POTUS
SG
PANETTA
ICKES
~~BOWLES~~ Lieberman
NH

POTUS Coffee January 17 Attendees

Mr. James I.C. Chiang

Chairman

Asian American Council of America

Los Angeles, CA

Mr. Chiang also serves as the President of Madera Farms, Inc. an investment and development company. He serves as Attorney-in-Fact of the Sino-American Cultural and Technical Foundation representing a number of American firms in Taiwan including Western Geophysical and Core Laboratories. Other consulting clients include Occidental Petroleum Company, J. Ray McDermott Groups and Fluor Corporation. Through Fluor Corporation and its subsidiary, Western Offshore Drilling and Exploration Company, Mr. Chiang was instrumental to the construction of the first drilling vessel built in Taiwan. Mr. Chiang completed his B.A. degree at East Texas Baptist College in Marshall, Texas. Through a special act of Congress sponsored by then Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson in 1960, Mr. Chiang became an American citizen.

Mr. George Kourpias

President

International Association

of Machinists & Aerospace Workers

Upper Marlboro, MD

Mr. Kourpias also served as Vice President of the National Council of Senior Citizens and as a member to the Advisory Council on Social Security. In 1993, he became the first union official appointed by President Clinton to serve as a member of the OPIC.

Mr. Weldon Latham

Senior Partner

Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge

Washington, DC

Mr. Latham's practice specializes in government contracting, general corporate law and legislative and regularity matters as well as representing clients in matters such as acquisitions, mergers, securities and set-aside programs. He previously served as Assistant General Counsel, OMB during the Ford Administration and General Deputy Assistant Secretary, HUD in the Carter Administration. Mr. Latham was appointed by President Clinton to the Small Business Administration National Advisory Council. He has also been appointed by the last three Governors of Virginia to the Boards of George Mason University, Virginia Commonwealth University and the Regulatory Reform Advisory Committee.

Mr. Herb Miller

Chairman

American Malls International

Washington, DC

Mr. Miller is also the founder, Director and Principal Stockholder of Western Development Corporation and The Mills Corporation, a shopping mall developer and manager that includes properties such as Georgetown Park, Potomac Mills and four other "Mills" shopping malls.

Mr. Lionel Pincus

Chairman

E.M. Warburg, Pincus & Company

New York, NY

Warburg, Pincus is a financial Mr. Pincus serves as a Trustee of Columbia University, the Ittleson Foundation, the Montefiore Medical Center and the German Marshall Fund as well as Director of the School of American Ballet and National Park Foundation. He is also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Wayne Rogers

Founder and President

Synergics Energy Development

Annapolis, MD

Synergics is dedicated to the development of independent power facilities. The firm also provides consulting services in engineering and project development. Mr. Rogers also serves as Chairman of the U.S. Export Council for Renewable Energy.

Mr. Jon W. Rotenstreich

Chairman & CEO

TIG Holdings

New York, NY

TIG Holdings, a property-casualty insurance and reinsurance company formerly owned by Transamerica, is based on focused underwriting and expense management. Previously, Mr. Rotenstreich served as President and CFO of Torchmark Corporation, a life and health insurance holding company, and Vice President, Treasurer and Chief Investment Officer for IBM.

Mr. Steven Roth

Chairman

Vornado Realty Trust

Saddle Brook, NJ

Vornado owns and operates strip shopping centers. Mr. Roth also serves as co-founder and managing partner of Interstate Properties, a real estate development and investment company, and CEO of Alexander's, a well-known New York City department store chain.

Mr. Hu Weileng

Executive Director & Vice Executive President

Motorola-Asia

Hong Kong

As Director and Deputy General Manager of Town Kahn Limited, Mr. Weileng has the sole distributorship of Motorola products throughout Asia. His company is also in a joint venture with AT&T Asia. Mr. Weileng serves as a member of the Asian American Council of America.

Democratic National Committee:

Chairman Don Fowler

Finance Chairman Marvin Rosen

Finance Director Richard Sullivan

Wednesday, January 17, 1996

9:00 AM

Coffee

Distributed
Separately

10:30 AM

Memorial Service for
Ambassador Lawrence
and Remarks

TAB A

SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT

FOR

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1996

FINAL

69 JAN 16 8:24

APPOINTMENT SCHEDULER:

STEPHANIE STREETT

HOME: 202-332-5651

OFFICE: 202-456-7560

WHCA PAGER: 4033

CELL PHONE: 202-494-9855

EVENT COORDINATOR:

LUCIE NAPHIN

HOME: 202-328-8141

OFFICE: 202-456-5328

WHCA PAGER: 4076

PRESS DESK:

JEREMY GAINES

HOME: 202-362-5475

OFFICE: 202-456-5771

WHCA PAGER: 4191

WEATHER:

Washington, DC

Partly to mostly cloudy with morning fog.

Wind southeast to southwest at 5 to 10 knots.

Low 32 to 37. High 48 to 53.

**SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT
FOR
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1996
FINAL**

tba

MORNING RUN

9:00 am-
10:00 am

COFFEE
MAP ROOM
Staff Contact: Doug Sosnik

10:10 am

THE PRESIDENT departs the White House via motorcade en route
Arlington National Cemetery
[drive time: 15 minutes]

10:25 am

THE PRESIDENT arrives Arlington National Cemetery

10:30 am-
11:15 am

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR AMBASSADOR LAWRENCE
BURIAL SITE
Arlington National Cemetery
Remarks: Terry Edmonds
Staff Contact: Tony Lake, John Emerson
Event Coordinator: Lucie Naphin
CLOSED PRESS

- **The President**, accompanied by Shelia Lawrence, joins the processional to the grave site.
- **The President** makes brief remarks.
- Rabbi Michael Sternfeld makes remarks.
- There is a Military firing of three rounds.
- *Taps* is played.
- **The President** is handed the American Flag.
- **The President** hands over the flag to Mrs. Lawrence.
- Rabbi Michael Sternfeld makes closing remarks.
- **The President** departs the cemetery, briefly stopping at the grave to throw a handful of dirt on the casket.

11:30 am	THE PRESIDENT departs Arlington National Cemetery via motorcade en route the White House [drive time: 15 minutes]
11:45 am	THE PRESIDENT arrives the White House
11:45 pm- 12:30 pm	PHONE/OFFICE TIME OVAL OFFICE
12:30 pm- 1:00 pm	BRIEFING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Leon Panetta
1:00 pm- 2:00 pm	CONGRESSIONAL MEETING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Leon Panetta, Patrick Griffin CLOSED PRESS
2:00 pm- tba	CONGRESSIONAL MEETING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Leon Panetta, Patrick Griffin CLOSED PRESS
tba	PHONE/OFFICE TIME OVAL OFFICE
tba	BRIEFING/SPEECH PREP FOR STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Don Baer
	HOLD EVENING
BC RON HRC RON	THE WHITE HOUSE CHICAGO, IL

A

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 16, 1996

Ambassador Lawrence Burial

DATE: January 17, 1996
LOCATION: Arlington National Cemetery
TIME: 10:30 am
FROM: John Emerson 

I. PURPOSE

To attend and speak at the burial of M. Larry Lawrence, U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland.

II. BACKGROUND

After a long illness, last week Larry Lawrence died at the Ambassador's residence in Berne, Switzerland. He is survived by his wife Shelia, three children, and several grandchildren. Lawrence is being buried at Arlington National Cemetery due to his World War II service in the Merchant Marines. A memorial was held for Larry in San Diego on Monday, with more than 1,000 in attendance. Ron Brown and Richard Holbrooke spoke at the memorial, and your letter to the family was read.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Vice President (T), Secretary Christopher (T), selected White House staff, friends and family of the Lawrences.

IV. PRESS PLAN

Closed press.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- Arrive at the Cemetery with Mrs. Lawrence and join procession to gravesite.
- You deliver remarks at gravesite.
- Rabbi delivers remarks.

- Military fires 3 round salute.
- Taps is played.
- You are handed folded American Flag; present American Flag to Mrs. Lawrence.
- Rabbi closes the ceremony, tossing dirt onto the lowered casket in the grave.
- On departure, pass gravesite. Option: you may also throw dirt on the grave.
- Depart Cemetery.

VI. REMARKS

To be prepared by Terry Edmonds

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
AT THE FUNERAL SERVICE
FOR AMBASSADOR M. LARRY LAWRENCE
ARLINGTON CEMETERY
JANUARY 17, 1996

96 JAN 16 P7:07

[Acknowledgements: Mrs. Lawrence; the Lawrence family; Secretary Christopher; Rabbi Michael Sternfield; distinguished guests and friends]

We are gathered here today to celebrate the life of a great American. The Talmud teaches us that "Good men do not need monuments. Their deeds remain their shrines." Ambassador Larry Lawrence's life was a shrine to goodness, bravery, and generosity.

Ambassador Lawrence brought his abundant energy and fresh vision to every task he undertook. As our nation's Ambassador to Switzerland, he was a tireless and effective advocate of U.S. interests. But his service to his country did not begin with his diplomatic assignment. During World War II at the age of 18, he volunteered as a Merchant Marine. On a mission to help our allies, he was wounded when his ship was sunk by enemy torpedoes in arctic waters. Larry often said that that experience was a defining moment in his life.

Larry's civilian life showed the same courage and resolve. He rose from a humble childhood during the Depression to great heights as an entrepreneur, philanthropist, and patriot. One of his greatest achievements in business was the restoration and stewardship of California's grand Hotel del Coronado. His quiet philanthropy also touched many lives and reflected the spaciousness of his life. Whether it was a gift to the arts or to a hospital or to a university, he gave generously and always from the heart.

Larry's passion for politics was also legendary. He was a long-time supporter of progressive candidates and causes. I am especially grateful for the friendship and support Larry gave me. Long before I became President, he was there, in good times and tough times.

Ambassador Lawrence's life was a monument to the good. I know that he would want all of us to continue striving to do our part, as he always did, to make this world a better place for each other and for our children. This is the best and most lasting tribute that we can offer this remarkable man.

I am reminded of the words of William Faulkner, who once said, man "is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance." The generous soul of Larry Lawrence endures. May God now wrap him in the warm embrace of his eternal love. Thank you.

POTUS

SG

PANETTA

ICKES

~~BOWLES~~ Lieberman

NH

— 9:00 AM
bow 1/17 Coffee

ALAN J. PATRICOF

Alan Patricof is the Chairman of Patricof & Co, the U.S. member of Apax Partners, which has offices in New York, Palo Alto, Philadelphia, London, Paris, Zurich, Madrid and Munich. It is one of the largest international venture capital firms with over \$1 billion of funds under management from over 145 institutions in the U.S. and abroad. During the past twenty-three years the firm has participated in the financing and development of a large number of both public and private companies, many of which Mr. Patricof still serves as a member of the Board of Directors, including Cellular Communications, Inc., Cellular Communications International, Inc., Cellular Communications of Puerto Rico, Inc., Datascope Corp., Harman International Industries, Inc., and Bayou Steel Corporation which are public companies as well as R.E. Harrington Co., SCP Communications and Healthcare Direct Marketing, Inc., which are private.

Alan Patricof received a BS degree in Finance from Ohio State University in 1955 and an MS degree in Finance from Columbia University Graduate School of business in 1957.

His first position was with the predecessor investment counseling firm of Schroder, Nacss & Thomas. In 1958 he joined Lambert & Co., which was one of the forerunners of the venture capital industry. In 1960 he became Assistant Vice President, subsequently, Vice President of Central National Corp., a private family investment management organization. It was while he was at Central National Corporation that he participated in the founding of Lin Broadcasting, New York Magazine and Datascope Corp. He left Central National in 1968 to become Assistant to the Chairman of Northwest Industries, Inc., in charge of Acquisitions and Pension Fund Management.

In 1969, he formed Alan Patricof Associates, Inc., now Patricof & Co. Ventures, Inc., the venture capital arm of the MMG Patricof Group, now known as Apax Partners. Patricof & Co Capital Corp., the other division of our group, engages in international merger and acquisition, financial consulting and private placement activities. The common thread between both segments of the firm is to serve entrepreneurial companies, as either principal or agent, in their expansion plans. Alan Patricof is U.S. Chairman of Apax Partners.

Alan Patricof has frequently been a speaker at the U.S. National Venture Capital Association, Harvard Business School, McGraw-Hill's Business Week Conference, the Practicing Law Institute, Columbia University and the Young President's Organization (YPO) Conferences. He has written one of the basic sections, "Pitfalls in Venturing", in the Guide to Venture Capital, which is the leading publication on venture capital in the U.S., and the chapter on venture capital for the book on investing by Arthur Levitt, Jr., former Chairman of the American Stock Exchange. He was appointed Chairman of the White House Conference on Small Business in 1993 and served as Chairman of Entrepreneurs for Clinton/Gore during the the 1992 Presidential election campaign. He is a member of the Mid-Hudson Emergency Commission.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Mr. Patricof will also be attending the 9:00 AM Coffee on Wednesday. He is not listed on the briefing paper as a participant.

Thursday, January 18, 1996

10:45 AM	Congratulatory Phone Call to WMUR TV News Director, Jack Heath	TAB A
5:15 PM	Interview with U.S. News and World Report	TAB B
	- Background	TAB C

SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT
FOR
THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1996
FINAL

APPOINTMENT SCHEDULER: **STEPHANIE STREETT**
HOME: 202-332-5651
OFFICE: 202-456-7560
WHCA PAGER: 4033
CELL PHONE: 202-494-9855

PRESS DESK: **JEREMY GAINES**
HOME: 202-362-5475
OFFICE: 202-456-5771
WHCA PAGER: 4191

WEATHER: **Washington, DC**
Cloudy with light drizzle and fog with rain
showers starting late. Winds south to southeast
at 8 to 13 knots. Low 38 to 43. High 51 to 56.

**SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT
FOR
THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1996
FINAL**

tba	MORNING RUN
8:30 am- 9:30 am	MEETING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Stephanie Streett
9:30 am- 9:45 am	MEETING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Leon Panetta
9:45 am- 10:00 am	BRIEFING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Tony Lake
10:00 am- 10:15 am	BRIEFING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Tony Lake
10:30 am- 10:45 am	MEETING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Harold Ickes, Doug Sosnik
10:45 am- 10:50 am	CONGRATULATORY PHONE CALL TO WMUR TV NEWS DIRECTOR, JACK HEATH OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Michael McCurry
10:55 am- 11:00 am	MEETING OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Stephanie Streett, Anne Walley
11:00 am- 12:00 pm	BRIEFING/SPEECH PREP FOR STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS OVAL OFFICE Staff Contact: Don Baer
12:00 pm- 1:00 pm	LUNCH WITH VICE PRESIDENT GORE OVAL OFFICE
1:00 pm- 4:00 pm	PHONE/OFFICE TIME OVAL OFFICE

4:00 pm-
4:45 pm

MEETING
OVAL OFFICE
Staff Contact: Doug Sosnik

4:45 pm-
5:15 pm

BRIEFING
OVAL OFFICE
Staff Contact: Michael McCurry

5:15 pm-
6:00 pm

INTERVIEW WITH *US NEWS AND WORLD REPORT*
OVAL OFFICE
Staff Contact: Michael McCurry

EVENING OFF

BC RON
HRC RON

THE WHITE HOUSE
NEW YORK, NY

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

TELEPHONE CALL TO WMUR-TV

DATE: January 18, 1996
LOCATION: Oval Office
TIME: 10:45 a.m.
FROM: Mike McCurry

I. PURPOSE

You will call Jack Heath, WMUR-TV News Director, to congratulate him on the station's new studio in Manchester, NH.

II. BACKGROUND

You will talk to Jack Heath, WMUR News Director, who has interviewed you on several previous occasions. Your conversation will be recorded and aired this evening during the station's official ribbon cutting ceremony.

WMUR-TV is moving into their new studio and hosting an open house this evening to celebrate the occasion. Approximately 200 people are expected to attend, including Governor Merrill, the New Hampshire congressional delegation, representatives from the major Republican presidential candidates and New Hampshire print and radio reporters. Ann Lewis and Jake Siewert will attend on behalf of Clinton/Gore. Terry Shumaker and Joe Keefe will also be on hand for this event.

Your call sends an important signal about the significance of WMUR and New Hampshire. WMUR is the only network affiliate (ABC) in New Hampshire and wields considerable influence in the state's presidential primary. You last interviewed with WMUR in June after your commencement address at Dartmouth.

WMUR-TV's new studio is across the street from their old facility in the old mill building along the Merrimack River. It is also directly across the street from the Clinton/Gore 1996 New Hampshire campaign headquarters. WMUR is now in a brand new building, a state-of-the-art studio with high tech broadcast equipment. The station is very excited about the move and proud of their new facility. Tipper Gore visited New Hampshire yesterday and interviewed with WMUR.

III. SCHEDULE

Telephone call.

IV. PARTICIPANTS

- * The President
- * Jack Heath, WMUR News Director

V. PRESS PLAN

The telephone call is closed to press coverage but will be played during ribbon cutting ceremony. This call is not planned for air or press coverage, but it is a possibility given the audience.

VI. REMARKS

None.

VII. TALKING POINTS

Attached.

* [Greetings]

* I'm sorry I can't be in Manchester tonight at your open house to see your new studio in person. I remember the old studio where I spent many hours in 1992. I know your station has done a lot to help bolster the local economy by renovating that old mill building and now building this new, state of the art facility. Your old studio was in a beautiful location along the river, but I understand your new one is not too far away.

* I look forward to seeing the studio in person next time I'm in New Hampshire and I hope to visit you soon. I know the year ahead will keep you all very busy and bring a lot of news to break in your new headquarters.

* Give my best to Frank Imes (station owner), Larry Giltpin (station manager), Carl Cameron (political reporter) and all the hard working employees at WMUR. Congratulations on your new studio. I look forward to seeing all of you soon.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 17, 1996

INTERVIEW WITH *U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT*

DATE: January 18, 1996
LOCATION: Oval Office
TIME: 5:15 p.m.
FROM: Mike McCurry

I. **PURPOSE**

You will be interviewed by Ken Walsh, Bruce Auster, and John Walcott of *U.S. News & World Report*. This interview will preview the State of the Union speech, and examine the state of the Presidency in general. It will provide you with the opportunity to reflect on how far you have taken the country in the first three years of your Presidency and the direction you plan on taking the nation heading into the 21st century. The interview will be published in the January 29, 1996 issue.

II. **BACKGROUND**

You did a similar interview with *U.S. News & World Report* last January prior to the your 1995 State of the Union speech.

In addition to discussing the themes of this year's speech, you will also be asked to comment on the current budget negotiations. You should also anticipate questions on the upcoming election and the possibility of a second term, and your reflections on your presidency to date.

III. **PARTICIPANTS**

The President
Mike McCurry
Ken Walsh, Senior White House Correspondent
Bruce Auster, White House Correspondent
John Walcott, National Editor
Chick Harrity, *U.S. News & World Report* photographer
White House photographer
White House stenographer

IV. **PRESS PLAN**

Interview exclusive to *U.S. News & World Report*

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- 4:45 - 5:15 p.m. Briefing in Oval Office
- 5:15 - 6:00 p.m. Interview in Oval Office

VI. REMARKS

- None required.

Table of Contents

Briefing for Interview with *U.S. News & World Report*

1. State of the Union Talking Points
2. Budget Qs-and-As (to be forwarded)
3. Crime/Drugs Qs-and-As
4. Foreign Qs-and-As
5. Whitewater/Travel Office Qs-and-As (to be forwarded)
6. Transcript from Interview with *U.S. News & World Report*, January 1995

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S STATE OF THE UNION: AMERICA'S CHALLENGE

The American people should have a sense of realistic optimism about the progress America is making. We are moving in the right direction; we have more to do; and if we come together as a nation, we can meet our challenges.

The President will deliver the State of the Union next Tuesday, January 23, 1996 at 9:00 pm in the Capitol. He will challenge the American people to come together as a nation and face the future together. The President will talk about the big concerns facing our people, and show in concrete ways how Americans working together can meet our challenges.

Everyone must do their part. If we are going to seize the promise of our times, we must all work together. Not government alone. Not individuals alone. The President will talk about what we as a nation can accomplish together. He will call on every one of us: as parents and children, as employers and employees, teachers and students, community leaders and community members, as government and as citizens. We can only meet the challenges of this new time together.

The President will address a number of challenges we must meet together, including:

Balancing the budget. As the President prepares the State of the Union, he is working hard on the first of these challenges: a seven-year balanced budget that upholds our values. It is within our grasp. With his plan, certified by Congress' own economists, Democrats and Republicans have already agreed on enough cuts to balance the budget in seven years and give working families a modest tax cut.

Crime. Our progress: The crime rate is declining. Murders are down 12%, robberies are down 10% and car theft is down 5%. Over 45,000 fugitives and felons have been blocked from buying handguns because of the Brady Bill. The assault weapons ban outlawed 19 of the deadliest assault weapons. America's challenge: To keep all our citizens safe from crime, violence, and drugs.

Children and education. Our progress: More of our students are going to college and fewer students are dropping out of high school. America's challenge: To renew our schools so every American child has the chance to get the best possible education for the 21st century. At the same time, we must protect our children from violent and harmful influences.

Economy. Our progress: The lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation since 1968. 7.7 million new jobs in the last three years. Revitalized auto and construction industries: 700,000 new construction jobs after losing 800,000 jobs in the four years before President Clinton. America's challenge: To make sure hard work still pays, and all Americans have the tools to be winners of economic change.

The World. Our progress: From Haiti to Northern Ireland, from the Middle East to Bosnia, America is leading the world towards peace and freedom. America's challenge: To keep America the strongest force for peace in the world.

Community. America's challenge: To live up to the duty we owe one another. To come together around our values; to help our communities, our neighbors, and our country.

THE BUDGET Q's AND A's WILL BE FORWARDED

Q & A's

CRIME/DRUGS

Domestic Policy Council: Dennis Burke, 65568

Updated 1/09/96

COPS Program

Q: As a candidate for President, you proposed to provided funds for 100,000 new police officers. Last year, Congress passed and you signed a crime bill that contained this provision. Now, Congress wants to eliminate this program. How has this program worked and are you going to oppose congressional efforts to end this program?

A: After 6 years of political bickering -- on one of the most important issues to the American public -- Congress finally passed a comprehensive crime bill last year; and I proudly signed it. Every major law enforcement organization in America strongly supports this legislation -- because it is the toughest and smartest crime bill ever enacted.

In just its first year, the COPS program has already authorized funding for over 30,000 additional police officers. These officers are already making an impact, and for the first time in a long while, the violent crime rate in this country is actually going down. Yet, now, the Republicans want to eliminate this program and replace it with a block grant that would not require that even 1 new officer be hired.

There is absolutely no reason to abandon such a successful program.. Anyone on Capitol Hill who wants to play partisan politics with police officers for America should listen carefully -- I will veto, again, any effort to repeal or undermine the 100,000 police commitment -- period.

Drugs

Q: The Republicans have been attacking your drug policy. Now your Drug Czar is leaving office. Do you think you should be doing more to address the drug problem?

A: Fighting drug abuse should not, indeed, can not be a partisan issue. And yet at the same time that some Members of Congress were giving political speeches claiming we are not doing enough, they sent me a bill that eliminated my request for 100,000 community police officers, and cut my requests for DEA agents, federal drug task forces, drug prosecutors, and drug courts. I vetoed that bill, sent it back to them. We can not hurt law enforcement counter-narcotic efforts at this critical juncture.

Director Brown did a good job -- and we are going to continue his success. During

his tenure, we successfully cracked down on major international drug organizations, such as the Cali cartel of Colombian. Two years ago, they lived as billionaires, beyond the law; now many are living as prisoners behind bars.

With my crime bill, we have strengthened law enforcement and drug prevention and treatment efforts. And we have included the toughest punishment ever for drug traffickers, including capital punishment for drug kingpins.

And we are going to do more to end the cycle of crimes and drugs --- first of all, by cleaning out our criminal justice system. Last month, I signed a Directive to my Attorney General to start a policy in which we drug test every offender who enters the Federal criminal justice system. And you are going to get States to adopt this policy, too.

For the first time in as long as anyone can remember, we have actually reduced the crime and murder rate in this country. Overall drug use is down. Unfortunately, starting in 1991 we have witnessed an increase in adolescent drug use and juvenile crime.

That is why I am working to change the environment that kids grow up in today. That is why we have worked to reduce guns in schools, supported drug testing of high school athletes, and endorsed uniforms in public schools -- a simple measure that has lead to less violence and better grades in schools that have adopted this policy.

I also proposed the largest drug control budget ever. We are working to get hard-core drug users off the street; we are giving local communities the resources to fight drugs; we are working to stop drugs at their source before they get to our borders; and we are preventing drug use by teaching our children about the dangers drugs pose and de-glamorizing drug use in the minds of every child.

But while we are witnessing the rise of teenage use of marijuana, the Republican Congress plans to cut 23 million students from the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program. They are sending the wrong message to the youth in this country. We can not afford to turn our backs on our children.

Gun Control

Q: You have supported and signed both the Brady Bill and the ban on assault weapons. Have these measures worked? Why do you think gun control is the solution to the crime problem in this country?

A: I support both tougher penalties for the criminal use of firearms and I also support effective gun control -- and both these measures have proven to be effective.

In just its first 100 days, the Brady Law stopped the sale of handguns to thousands of convicted felons, fugitives from justice, and persons under restraining orders for alleged stalking, harassment or other forms of domestic threats or intimidation. Yet, at the same

time, honest law-abiding citizens were able to continue to purchase handguns for their own personal safety.

Military-style assault weapons were designed for one purpose only -- to kill humans beings as rapidly as possible. I strongly supported the assault weapons ban contained in last year's crime bill because we can not continue to witness innocent citizens and police officers gunned down with these weapons. This provision was tailored to go after the weapons of choice of criminal gangs, drug traffickers and mentally deranged persons -- and it did so without effecting the legitimate use of firearms by honest law-abiding citizens. For it also specifically exempted certain firearms traditionally used for hunting and other legitimate sporting purposes.

Terrorism

Q: In light of the World Trade Center bombing, the Oklahoma City bombing, and the closing of Pennsylvania avenue in front of the White House, are we losing to terrorists here in the United States?

A: The tragic bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on April 19th made clear the need to enhance the Federal government's ability to investigate, prosecute, and punish terrorist activity. I was pleased that the Senate acted quickly on the 2 anti-terrorism bills that I transmitted to Congress earlier this year -- passing them as one bill in June with over 90 votes.

Unfortunately, this important legislation, which passed the House Judiciary Committee sometime ago, has been languishing before the full House. Indeed, recently sponsors of the bill said they would not be able to pass it in the House because of opposition from Republicans who want to repeal the assault weapons ban.

I want to take this opportunity to urge the House leadership to move quickly on my Terrorism Bill so that I can sign it and increase our security from terrorist attacks. This is a bill that will save American lives and it should not be delayed any longer.

NATIONAL SECURITY TALKING POINTS

- America's challenge at the dawn of a new century is the same one we faced at the beginning of this century and at every decisive moment -- World War II, the Cold War -- in between: to make the future safer and more prosperous for every American, and to do it together.
- I have been guided by a central principle: America is the world's only superpower. If America doesn't lead, if America doesn't get the job done, it won't get done. That's why we have been leading the fight to reduce the nuclear threat, to spread democracy, to support peacemakers and to create jobs at home by opening markets around the world.
- Our leadership is making a real difference in the lives of the American people:
 - * Because we are lifting the dark cloud of nuclear fear that has hung over our heads for fifty years, every American is safer:
 - Russian nuclear missiles are no longer pointed at our cities and citizens and both our countries are cutting our nuclear arsenals.
 - We've persuaded Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus to give up the nuclear weapons left on their land when the Soviet Union collapsed and we convinced North Korea to end its nuclear weapons program.
 - We're working to make sure nuclear materials don't wind up in the hands of terrorists or international criminals;
 - We've secured the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, limiting the nuclear threat we will face and our children will face.
 - * We restored democracy in Haiti and stopped the flow of refugees to Florida. In the month before our intervention, 16,000 Haitians fled the military dictatorship for our shores and elsewhere. Three months after the intervention, the refugee flow was zero.
 - * We're bringing the nations of Europe closer together -- leading a mission of peace in Bosnia, modernizing NATO, working with Russia, reforming the economies of Central Europe and the FSU. Europe was the main battleground for the bloodiest century in human history. We're building an era of peace and progress so that our children don't have to fight another war there.
 - * Americans are safer because we're waging a tough counter-terrorism campaign with stronger laws, increased funding, manpower and training for law enforcement, sanctions against states that sponsor terrorism and closer cooperation with foreign governments.

- * And we're creating jobs at home by opening markets around the world so that Americans can compete -- and win -- in the global economy. 2 million more Americans already have jobs because we've made trade more free and more fair for America. These are good jobs that pay more and that will prepare our people for the 21st century.
- American leadership is also making a difference to people around the world. Children from Belfast to Jerusalem to Sarajevo can now hope to live in peace instead of fearing war:
 - * Because we gave Haiti another chance at democracy, the Haitian people aren't being gunned down in the streets of Port au Prince and they have the best chance in generations to defeat the poverty that has plagued them. Our forces have already commenced their scheduled withdrawal.
 - * Because we've worked persistently for peace in the Middle East and in Northern Ireland, Jews and Arabs, Catholics and Protestants can go about their lives with less fear of bombs and violence and war.
 - * The people of Kuwait are safer because we sent our planes, ships and troops to turn back a new Iraqi threat to the Persian Gulf.
 - * Because we helped the newly free nations of Central Europe get their economic house in order and feel more secure, they look to the West with hope, not the East with fear.
 - * And as we've most recently seen, because of the skill of American diplomacy and the firmness of NATO, today the people of Bosnia have the hope for a peaceful future and aggression has been checked.
- None of these things happen easily or automatically. They are the product of American leadership -- steady, pragmatic sometimes out-of-the-headlines leadership. They happened because we've kept our military strong, and we've known when and how to use it. They happened because we made the investments -- in time, energy, resources -- that it takes to make the world a safer place for our people.
- America must continue to lead:
 - Best way to insure a future in which our people can go about their lives free from the fear of nuclear war.
 - Future in which our sons and daughters won't be called to far away places to fight for freedom.
 - Future in which our borders won't be under assault from people fleeing tyranny.
 - Future in which markets around the world will be open to our products and provide our people with good, high wage jobs.
 - Future in which America remains at peace and our people prosper as never before.

BOSNIA

Why Bosnia

- U.S. leadership, so critical to achieving peace, is critical to implementation as well.
- Parties all recognize the need for an international implementation force to stabilize the situation and build confidence so that peace can take hold.
- Remain firmly convinced that only NATO can effectively enforce military aspects of settlement. NATO presence is essential to creating secure environment in which political and economic rebuilding can begin.
- As leader of NATO, U.S. has to be involved. Our interests are very much at stake: Our engagement essential to prevent spread of conflict, achieve lasting peace. The dangers of spillover are real.
- The United States was drawn into two world wars and a 50-year Cold War because of threats to security and stability in Europe.

Exit Strategy

- Accomplishment of military tasks will provide secure environment to begin to implement non-military aspects of agreement--reconstruction, elections, justice for war criminals, etc.
- U.S. and NATO military commanders believe military mission can be accomplished in about a year.
- Basic military tasks --separating forces, supervising withdrawal--should be accomplished in six months.
- 12 months will allow IFOR to complete tasks, while giving parties opportunity and incentive to assume responsibilities undertaken in Dayton agreement.
- During this time, military situation should have stabilized, free elections held under international supervision, and economic reconstruction launched.
- Want to create conditions that give parties opportunity to build a lasting peace, not to have NATO stay for extended period.

Trip

- Traveled to the Balkans to visit with the U.S. troops participating in IFOR or supporting the IFOR mission.

- Wanted to express support -- and that of the American people -- for their extraordinary efforts under difficult conditions and to gain a first-hand understanding from them and their commanders about the status of the operation.
- Held substantive discussions with Izetbegovic and Tudjman and spoke with Milosevic by phone. Underscored with them the importance of implementing peace accords.
- I brought together for first time people from across the spectrum in Bosnia, including mayors from Serb and Muslim cities, and leaders from 4 religious faiths (Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Moslem and Jewish). I also met with Serb, Croat and Muslim families.
- Important step forward in effort to bring people of Bosnia together. These meetings were symbolic of kind of Bosnia we want to see built.
- Stop in Hungary gave the opportunity to thank the Hungarians for the critical support they are providing for U.S. forces and to highlight the important role in IFOR that is being played by members of the Partnership for Peace.
- (If asked) I would have liked to have visited Sarajevo, but conditions have not reached the point to make that possible. I did not want to delay my visit with our troops to express to them personally my gratitude and admiration for the job they are doing.

Situation on the Ground

- Implementation is still at an early stage. Overall, things have been going well.
- Thus far, all parties have complied with the basic provisions of the Dayton agreement. The initial withdrawals in and around Sarajevo took place on schedule, seven days after IFOR assumed authority from UNPROFOR.
- We always knew this would be a complicated mission. That is why we insisted from the start that implementation had to be carried out by a well-armed NATO-led force with tough rules of engagement.
- Confident that IFOR will deal firmly with any challenge to its mission. Friday, January 19 deadline for separation of forces; early indications show parties moving to comply.
- Last week's announcement by President Izetbegovic of amnesty for Bosnian Serbs other than those guilty of war crimes was an important step in the right direction.

Q: Withdrawal of Foreign Forces deadline (Jan 13) met?

- We expect all foreign forces to depart. IFOR commanders still reviewing to assess compliance.
- Also expect the Bosnian parties to withdraw from zone of separation by January 19. Bosnian Serbs will have removed their forces from territories that are being transferred to the Federation within 45 days (of 14 Dec. - Paris signing).

Bosnia War Crimes and IFOR Mission

- We are concerned about the reports of war crimes sites, especially the one involving the mine site. We have noted previously the probable existence in Bosnia of from 15 to 20 such mass grave sites.
- We have consistently supported the efforts by the International War Crimes Tribunal and the ICRC to investigate war crimes, including the sharing of intelligence. We will continue these efforts.
- IFOR's principal task is to enforce the separation of forces called for in the Dayton Accords. IFOR is required to provide freedom of movement for its own units. Within the limits of its resources and if requested, IFOR Commanders also have the authority to provide assistance to international organizations in their humanitarian missions.
- IFOR commanders may also help create secure conditions for others to perform tasks associated with the peace settlement.
- We place a high priority on facilitating the investigations of the War Crimes Tribunal and ICRC. We will do what we can within the limits of our resources to facilitate the work of these institutions.
- However, before any of these supporting tasks can be assumed, we must have the Implementation Force in place. The force should be sufficiently deployed in the next few weeks to begin this work.

If asked re: other humanitarian organizations and civilians:

- By establishing its own freedom of movement and by removing barricades and check points, IFOR will enhance freedom of movement for all civilians.
- Once IFOR is in place, the local commanders have the authority, if asked, to provide assistance in the observation, security and prevention of the movement of interference with the movement of civilian populations and to assist in humanitarian missions.
- But IFOR does not have a separate mission to escort normal civilian movements.

If asked re intelligence activities:

- We continue to place the highest priority on gathering and sharing intelligence that might aid the War Crimes Tribunal in its investigations.
- We also are taking all necessary steps to protect our forces.

RUSSIA

Chechnya and Hostage-Taking Incidents

- Deeply regret intensification of hostilities, loss of life.
- Recent hostage-takings by Chechens, Chechen sympathizers do not contribute to search for peace. Hostage-taking is act of terror. Condemn it.
- As for broader Chechnya dispute, only reliable path to peace is negotiated settlement that takes interests of all parties into account. Cycle of violence must be broken.

Yeltsin Wrong to Use Force in Pervomayskoye?

- Russian leadership faced painfully difficult situation. Tragedy for all concerned. Regret loss of life, but not in position to second-guess Russian leadership's decision.

Personnel Changes Mean End of Reform/Cooperation?

- Will have to see impact of recent personnel changes, but fully expect Yeltsin to set policy.
- Have worked with Yeltsin to support political, economic reform in Russia. He has made clear his support for reform and that there is no turning back. Will continue to encourage Russia to pursue sound policies and integration with global market-place.
- Have also worked to advance common interests: nuclear disarmament; detargetting; new trade and investment opportunities. This strategy of engagement remains in strong interests of both countries.

ISRAEL -- PEACE PROCESS

- Negotiations at the Wye plantation have ushered in a new phase with the negotiations between Israel and Syria. They traded a new basis for genuine progress.
- We established a new effective mechanism for negotiations and for accelerated progress. A mechanism that includes intensive direct negotiations at the conference center in Maryland, followed-up by Secretary Christopher's visits to the region.
- President Asad and Prime Minister Peres had agreed that the negotiations in Maryland will resume January 24.
- The two leaders have agreed that the core group in the negotiations in Maryland could be expanded by appropriate experts as necessary.
- The original negotiating group will be augmented by military experts on both sides.
- The leaders of both countries have recognized that if peace is to be durable, it must be comprehensive in nature.
- We have crossed an important threshold in these negotiations. I do not want to minimize all the difficulties and challenges that lie ahead, there is much work to be done. At the same time, I believe that both President Asad and Prime Minister Peres are determined to see that the work is completed.
- We will continue to make every effort to try to achieve an agreement between the parties before the end of the year.

THE WHITEWATER/TRAVEL OFFICE Q's AND
A's WILL BE FORWARDED

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

Internal Transcript

January 20, 1995

INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT
BY U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT

The Oval Office

2:15 P.M. EST

Q What do you think are the most likely prospects for progress on your agenda -- and where are you going to have to draw some battle lines to make clear that you're not going to accept some more extreme Republican positions?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, I think there are some real opportunities for working together, particularly in light of some of the things the Republicans -- the last couple of weeks. They say that they want tax relief for Americans, but they don't want to explode the deficit. That's my position.

I will give them a budget which provides for the funding of the Middle Class Bill of Rights that I've outlined, which is focused heavily on tax relief to the broad middle class -- broadly defined -- concentrating on education and child-bearing and families, and fully paid for.

So we may have differences there. I want to have, probably, a stronger middle class focus and they'll want to give, I think, one hundred percent of the people some tax relief. But that's a framework in which we can work. So I'm encouraged by that. And I very much hope that they will agree to incorporate into their plans, and share the credit for it, the essential elements of the Bill of Rights, especially the education tax reduction, which I think is very important for our future.

I think that, obviously, we can cooperate on some of the reform measures like the line-item veto. I would hope that they would go forward and embrace the lobby reform, the gift and travel ban and the disclosure provisions in campaign finance reform. But at least we know we're going to have some agreement on the line-item veto.

I'm more hopeful than I was a couple of months ago that we'll be cooperating on welfare reform. We still have some differences on our approach, but there is a common desire to move from a system of dependence to one of independence; one from just child-bearing to one of responsible parenting. And so I'm hopeful that we can find common ground there.

And based on what Senator Dole and some others said last time, I think we can make some progress on health care reform in a step-by-step fashion. I am looking at now -- I've been working very hard on this for the last several days -- what kinds of things we could do where we could move together on. So those are some of the areas where I think we've got a real shot.

Q Any specifics -- if I could stay with welfare for a moment -- I mean, does the idea of moving responsibility back to the states and giving them more authority, is that where the areas of

MORE

agreement might be?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. We can certainly get a lot of agreement on that. I have always been for that. When I was working on this bill, the family support act, the first welfare reform act back in 1987, when then governor, now Congressman Castle and I were doing that and we were working with the Reagan White House and with the Democrats in the Congress and with some Republicans in the Congress -- I wanted then more state flexibility. When I became President I just did it by executive order, in effect, and we have given 24 states now freedom from federal rules and regulations to pursue their own welfare reforms. So I would be in favor of a lot of state flexibility in a lot of these matters.

I do think we ought to make sure that young children are taken care of, and I do think we ought to have some baseline requirements for welfare recipients. But I think there can be a lot of flexibility for the states. As long as we're interested in independence, work and responsible parenting, I think we can go a long way.

Q On health care, any specifics on where you think the most likely areas of progress will be?

THE PRESIDENT: I have some ideas that I'm still working on, but I think we could begin with some of the things that Senator Dole proposed last time -- the insurance reforms; that's a good place to begin. I think there may be some other areas that we could cooperate on if we could find a way to finance them without a tax increase. And I'm working on that now.

Q One related theme -- the Congress is getting off to a rather rancorous beginning. You have a lot of attacks on Speaker --

THE PRESIDENT: It's the Congress. (Laughter.)

Q Right -- attacks on Speaker Gingrich over the book deal, and then an effort to tie the attacks on him and the book deal to the Mexico assistance package. Are you concerned that the atmosphere is already becoming contaminated and that extraneous issues are interfering with real substantive decisions on important issues?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't think that can be allowed to happen. This country is -- we've got a lot of things going on, a lot of challenges facing us. We have this unusual situation where the -- in the aggregate statistics the economy is booming, the Misery Index, so-called -- the combination of unemployment and inflation -- is the lowest it's been since 1968, almost 30 years. But unlike the 1960s, an awful lot of people are still more unsettled, more insecure, and not getting any economic benefit from this recovery. We have a lot of social problems we have to deal with. We just talked about welfare reform.

We've got to work through this. And so, I think the Congress -- they've always had differences about their own rules and regulations, differences between the parties. There's always been some rancor there. But it must not be allowed to interfere with the business of the country. I think the Mexican debt crisis is a classic example. I don't believe it will be permitted to interfere. I think the Congress will do its duty, and I think that they will do it in a prompt fashion. I'm optimistic and hopeful.

Q Do you have any advice for Democrats in dealing with Gingrich's book deal? I mean, is it time to sort of cool it on that or is it --

THE PRESIDENT: No, I don't want to get into -- my advice

MORE

is say whatever -- there's a lot of pent-up feelings, I think, maybe based on what's happened in years past. But my advice would be organize the affairs of the Congress so that whatever legitimate differences exist over the rules of Congress, rules of ethics and other matters can be properly aired in a way that does not interfere with doing the business of the country. We've got to keep going forward. The country plainly wants us to work together on these big issues.

One other thing I think -- I think there's a plain -- there's a real basis for cooperation in the desire to reduce the size and regulatory reach of the federal government. I think we can cooperate there.

Now, there will be areas where we don't agree within each of these categories, but I think that we've already taken this government down in size by over 100,000 now. And we've got a -- the budget in place would take it down by 270,000. And the proposals I will make in our second round of reinventing government that the Vice President and I have been working on for months and months now -- since long before the election -- will take it down some more. And we're working on the regulatory issue as well. So I think there will be real opportunities to cooperate there.

There will be differences, and we will state them firmly and strongly, and I hope and believe that I can persuade the American people that the position that I will take is in the best interest of our people and our future. But I will do it all within the context of trying to work with them and to get something done and to move forward, and then to be very clear where there are differences.

One of the things that I think I can say with a great deal of confidence that bothered me about the last two years is that very often when we were moving forward, our difference would be in 10 percent of the area, and it would become 90 percent of what people thought was happening, so that we find the voters are absolutely astonished in any of these -- I see these surveys, in the two years previous, it was only the third Congress since World War II where more than 80 percent of a President's initiatives were adopted, or we put out our report yesterday on the first two years.

I think somehow I have to find a way to communicate with the citizens of our country. And so do the members of Congress in both parties, so that they understand both where we disagree and what the nature of those disagreements are, because that's healthy and good for a democracy; and where we agree and what we're doing to move the country forward, because that's the pivotal, critical, essential thing. And then a judgment can be made at the appropriate time about all of us -- and will be made -- by our bosses, by the people of this country. But I think that we have to keep in mind our job is to move forward, to work together when we can, and then when we disagree, to be as clear and specific and forceful as we can so that there can be a judgment made there. That's what I'm really going to work on.

Q We've got a big story in this week's U.S. News about lawyers. We took a survey, and, not surprisingly, found something like 70 percent of people think the system is unfair, rigged to the rich. I wanted to ask you --

THE PRESIDENT: Too many of them.

Q Too many of them. I wanted to ask you a couple of things about that. One is, as an attorney yourself, an attorney general as well, what the legal profession can do to kind of restore more faith out there itself? And also, about the tort reform provisions in the contract, what you'd be willing to sign in terms of plaintiff damages or any kind of loser pay mechanism.

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: First of all -- let me answer the first question. First of all, I think that people have kind of mixed feelings about lawyers and the legal system. On the one hand, they must feel that it's a little rigged in favor of people who have more money and more influence. On the other, they don't like the system itself, and so they may want reforms which would further erode the position of just individuals of modest means in the legal system.

If I were practicing member of the bar today, I'd be out there working on ways to make the society less lawsuit-dominated, more ways to solve problems without ultimately going to court and trying a case in full, more ways to give people a very modest means of access to some way of resolving their disputes.

And I would be looking at ways to reduce the overall cost of the legal system to society in ways that still left people free to pursue their claims. I mean, I think that's really what we've got to do. And in the tort reform debate or the legal reform debates that may come in the Congress this year, I hope that that will be the focus.

And, again, there's a lot of emotion about this issue, but we really need to minimize the emotion and look at the facts: How does this system work? How will the changes affect it? Who will benefit? Who will be disadvantaged? Does it matter? Lawyers should see themselves primarily as facilitators and advocates of other people's interests.

And our legal system does have some problems, but it's served us pretty well over more than 200 years. And I think that --nearly every American knows that we have a higher percentage of lawyers in our country than our competing countries; that we've resolved more of our disputes in court than other countries do; that a lot of people pay very high rates for insurance to protect themselves against the possibility of various kinds of lawsuits. They know we don't live in a risk-free world. But on the other hand, people -- if somebody's got a legitimate claim, I think every American lives with the idea that if you can get there, you can have your day in court.

So I think this could be a very useful debate for us, but I think the main thing I would say is that the lawyers of the country themselves are in the best position, if they'll do it, to come out with a whole series of initiatives to promote reform. And whatever we do here, we need to do it with great care because we don't want to capitalize on the public frustration with the problems of the legal system in ways that ultimately deny people their day in court.

Q I want to ask you a question, it sort of relates to that, about the death penalty. I mean, a lot of people have been focused on the O.J. trial and the Susan Smith case that's coming to court. Prosecutors asked for the death penalty in Susan Smith's case, not in O.J.'s. I'm wondering -- obviously, you support the death penalty, but I'm wondering whether you're comfortable that's it's being fairly applied around the country, and if you're not, if you think there's anything that can be done about it at the federal level.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't think you can do anything about the obligation that a prosecutor has to make a judgment. If the deliberate killing of another person, based on the facts of the case as evaluated by a jury of 12 ordinary Americans, can result either in capital punishment or life imprisonment, but the prosecutor has a right not to ask for capital punishment -- the only way you could change that is if you said that the jury should always have that option on the table. No matter how much you try to standardize the system, the facts of every case will be different, and also, the evidence and the strength of it in different cases will be different.

And the prosecutor has to make those judgments. You know, if I ask for the death penalty, I'm sure this person is guilty, but does that make it harder to get a conviction in the first place? I mean, there are all these things that are there, these judgments.

So I think that -- the thing that I would like that maybe the prosecutors' group could do is to try to set some -- in working with others -- some sort of general standards by which these judgments should be made. The most disturbing thing about the death penalty in America that I've seen in the last several years -- and I've been dealing with this as a law professor, an attorney general and a governor, as well as president, for a long, long time now -- the most disturbing thing that I have seen was the evidence submitted to the Supreme Court a few years ago indicating that the request by prosecutors for the death penalty and the imposition of it by juries tend to vary rather dramatically not by the race of the defendant, but by the race of the victim. That's the sort of thing that could be easily dealt with, or at least much more easily -- more easily dealt with if there were some standards that the National Association of Prosecutors or the judges or some other appropriate group said ought to be adhered to in making these judgments.

Q I mean, you obviously dealt with those decisions with enormous gravity in it. As I recall, you always went back to the state -- I mean, you always in the state when there was an execution.

THE PRESIDENT: Never out of the state when there was -- when I ordered -- had permitted an execution. And I always very carefully reviewed the record of all those cases. I mean, that's one of the things I could tell you, you can't -- you just can't escape -- in a case in a matter of life and death, if you believe in capital punishment, you cannot escape becoming immersed in the facts of the case. And you make the best judgment you can. And I've dealt with some very difficult claims in a couple of my cases.

Q I wanted to ask you about the unfolding debate on affirmative action, gender and racial preferences. We have a California initiative that probably will be on the ballot in '96. You have moves on the Hill to roll back some affirmative action rules. I wonder, your sort of guidelines on whether you think affirmative action has outlived its usefulness, how you judge how much affirmative action is appropriate these days, and if you're concerned that the debate on this might become a very divisive debate as immigration has become in some places?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm certainly concerned that it could become divisive. On the other hand, it need not be a bad debate. I think that what we ought to ask ourselves is, number one, how can we achieve the two objectives we ought to be working for every day here; how can we open more opportunity to all Americans; and how can we bring the country together.

So on the -- and there are many different kinds of affirmative action programs. We're litigating one before the Supreme Court and how it goes back to President Nixon's administration. So the views on this also have been different over time in terms of what Republicans and Democrats thought.

But if the goal is to offer more opportunity to everyone and to bring the country together, then you have to ask, is it fair; does it work; what are the costs; and are there other options? And it will be interesting -- so that what I hope we don't have here, and what I hope they don't have in California, is a vote that's structured in such a way as to be highly divisive, where there have to be winners and losers and no alternatives can reasonably be considered.

So that's about all I have to say about it right now. I

expect to spend -- I expect, like all other Americans in public life, we'll spend a lot of time on it over the next year. But my standard's going to be, what is necessary to give all Americans more opportunity and to bring our country together. And this can be a useful debate, but if it is -- it needs to be entered into in the spirit of coming out of it with those things intact, not trying to find a political issue that at a time of high anxiety for Americans can further divide us. I think that would be a big mistake.

It's not a bad thing to discuss and to work through and to reexamine. I've had a lot of people, different kinds of people, wanting to talk about it to me, just spontaneously as I've -- and just in the last month or so. But we ought to keep it in the right perspective.

Q I think the core of the California initiative is banning discrimination based on race, gender, national origin. So as a blanket premise, is that going too far?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we have argued in court that the Nixon plan is constitutional, and that the scholarships, minority scholarships, were constitutional. So I don't think there is a constitutional problem with it. I think the real question is, is this the right policy; does it work; is it fair; what's the alternative. I think that there's no question that a lot of people have been helped by it. Have others been hurt by it? What is the degree of their harm? What are the alternatives? That's a discussion we ought to have.

One thing I liked about -- so much about the empowerment zone legislation that we passed in the economic program last year is that it was focused on clear need. It used the government's designation of certain areas that were economically deprived to get people together across racial lines and across income lines, to bring more opportunity to bring people together. That's what we ought to be doing. In the context in which affirmative action programs were first proposed, and in which they have largely operated, I think that they often did that. So I think that if there's going to be a debate about it, and there will be, we ought to just keep that in mind. We should not let this debate become a political exercise in the further division of the American people. There are ways to talk about this and to deal with it that will increase opportunity and bring us together. That's what I'm going to work on.

Q I want to ask you -- I just wanted to do one on health care real quickly. You had mentioned that some of the start -- one starting point might be insurance reforms that Senator Dole suggested. Is that -- I mean, are you looking now in moving the health care debate based on what has been out there from the Hill that the Republicans have suggested as the starting point, or in a process sense, how will the issue be joined from your point of view?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think -- well, first of all, I will be advocating certain things both in the State of the Union and beyond, and I will be willing to work with them on it. But it's going to be up to the Congress to pass it. That is, this requires affirmative action by Congress. I think it would be an error for the Congress to assume that because the program was defeated last year, in a highly political atmosphere and from intense lobbying, that the American people don't want us to move on this. I think they do.

We have another 1,100,000 Americans in working families lost their health insurance last year. The inflation rate is down thanks to a lot of increased competition and economic forces, and some of things that I think we did, but it's still going up. Medical costs are going up by more than the rate of inflation. There are millions and millions of small business people, self-employed people, farmers

who have health insurance that, in effect, is just insurance that says if you get real sick, you don't lose your home and your business, because the deductibles and the co-pays are so high.

So this is a very big issue in America. And I think the American people thought I probably tried to do too much at once, that that it's such a complicated thing. But I don't think the American people think that we shouldn't deal with it. I think they will be very disappointed if this Congress and I don't get together and work out something and make some real headway on this.

Q I want to ask you about the '60s. Speaker Gingrich and Bill Bennett and others -- other conservatives, have sort of pointed to the '60s as the beginning of the long, steep morale decline for the country. And I'm just wondering, how should Americans think about the '60s: its good, its bad sides -- how should be regard that period?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think -- first of all, I think it is easy to oversimplify all these decades. You could also take a hard shot at the '70s and a hard shot at the '80s and say that they all -- that in their different ways, they aggravated the dilemmas that we face today. I don't think there's any question about that.

I think that the good -- let's start with the good things about the '60s. The good thing about the '60s were that there was a time of strong economic opportunity, where the middle class was growing, the under class was shrinking, America was robust and self-confident. It was a time we faced with real courage our long-delayed obligations to equal opportunity. It was a time when young people believed that they could make a difference as citizens in -- whether it was active participants in an election, or contributing in the military service, or engaging in peaceful and lawful protests. It was a time when things seemed possible, and when people cared and believed, and there was a -- and weren't cynical, and when we were really trying to march on our common problems. And I think that none of that should be denigrated.

It was also a time, I think, of some excess. A time when we became so fixated on the need to extend certain rights to people who didn't have them, mostly racial minorities, mostly blacks, and a time when we wanted so much to have individual expressions of political opinions, or lifestyles, or whatever, that there might have been too much deemphasis on responsibilities, which are the flip side of rights. You can't have a successful democracy without both; without both the opportunity to do what you wish to do, and the responsibility to do it in a way that is appropriate.

But on the other hand, in the '70s, there was a sort of a shrinking away from a lot of public engagement and citizenship, and a lot of personal excesses in the '70s. And in the '80s, there was a kind of a radical individualism that had even more personal excess in many ways by many people who were in positions of privilege as well as people who weren't.

So I think that the '60s in some ways have gotten a bum rap. There is no question, however, that the decline in the coherence of our family structures has been going on for about 30 years. But it's not -- again, it's not just in America. These things are happening everywhere else. So I would say that the great thing about the '60s was that it was a time of optimism of hope. And when we had tough things like the racial problems, the controversy of the war in Vietnam, most everybody thought that they could make a difference and that they mattered and their opinion mattered and they were engaged in the action and passion of their time, to use Justice Holmes' famous phrase.

But I think that there was a -- that people and the collective obsession with our public matters, maybe we underestimated our private responsibilities. That's my take on it. I don't agree with Speaker Gingrich's idea that the '60s were the source of all the evils that society is facing today. Hell*, some of our problems started then; some of them were made much worse.

And a lot of the problems we have today basically occurred in the last 20 years. Our economic standing, relative to the rest of the world, peaked in about '73 and since then, a lot of middle-class Americans have worked harder and harder and harder as the social contract has broken down; as they weren't rewarded for working hard and playing by the rules. And then the response in the '80s was to say that government was the problem and so we would go to kind of the trickle-down economics and walk away from the social problems approach. And that didn't work very well, either.

So I think in each decade there were great strengths and significant problems. So I just don't buy that. I think the problem of America today is that the world we're living in is not working very well for a lot of people. So it's a good new-bad news story. For those who are able to compete and win in the global economy, for those who are fortunate enough to have coherent families and live in good communities, this is an exciting time to be alive, with a very bright future. For others, even though we're in the middle of an economic recovery and our country is at peace and we are the leading force for peace and prosperity around the world, the social contract has broken down. And for others, the very basic conditions for human civilized life are not possible because of the level of violence and social breakdown they deal with.

And I think we have to look at America in that way. What we have to do is to try to make more good news stories and fewer bad news stories. We have to try to grow the middle class, shrink the underclass and bring the country together to reinforce family and community. And we have to acknowledge that there were problems in each of those three decades that we still are living with the consequences of today. But there were also great achievements in those three decades, which helped us to get to where we are today.

And so I think to put that kind of negative spin on the '60s, in my judgement, is a mistake.

Q You've talked about Mrs. Clinton as such an important advisor. I wonder if you can tell us what you feel she's going to be doing to help you and to help the administration and to deal with the problems of the country in the next two years.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think I should let her talk about that. She can speak for herself. But we have always had a kind of a wonderful way of working and talking together and mostly she would, for almost all of our married life and long before I was even an elected official and even when we were just going together, we did a lot of things together, we talked a lot about a lot of different things.

What she did on the health care project was unusual, really, and had only one precedent in our relationship; and that was when she headed an education task force for me when I was governor. But she'd always, before, when she was out working, when I was governor, she'd always pick one or two things a year that she tried to do to make a contribution. And I expect she will continue to do that; and that's what I hope she'll do.

Q Okay. We wanted to ask you put your hat on as a --

THE PRESIDENT: I will say this, I know that she's taken

a few licks on the health care issue, too. But there are worse things to do than to get caught red-handed trying to give health care to 40 million Americans who don't have it, almost all of whom live in working families. And I still think that she's a person of great energy and she can make a real contribution to the things that she cares about.

She's always -- she's a project-oriented person. She's never wanted, for example, to be involved in how the system operates -- how the White House operates, how the governor's office operated. She never was -- she was always somewhat involved in my campaigns more or less at the end, more at the end than at the beginning, except to make appearances and make talks.

But as long as I've known her, she's always tried to focus on one or two things that were problems that she deeply cared about, where she thought she could help people, and she tried to make a difference. And I think she'll continue to do that.

Q As we approach the end of our time here, we wanted to ask you to put your sort of sports and movie fan hat on. Who do you like in the Super Bowl, and what do you make of this tremendous cultural experience that Super Bowls have become? I mean, does that tell us something about what the country is all about, or sort of the need for some kind of rights or something of that kind?

MR. MCCURRY: Seventeen electoral votes. (Laughter.)

Q I know your team isn't in the Super Bowl.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think I should be picking Super Bowl winners. I think it's rather interesting how these teams got there, though. On the cultural significance of it, I think American people -- they like football, they like excellence, and they like drama. And the Super Bowl has football, excellence and drama. I think it's not very complicated. And I'm one of them; I'm always there.

I think that -- you know, I'm not one of these people that thinks that our joy in spectator sports is a bad thing. I was watching the basketball game last night, late while I was working. My eyes were burning out working on the State of the Union address, so I watched California and Stanford play basketball real late last night. But I think the trick is not to let your -- the spectators part of our life take over the active part of our life. Because I think it's really quite a great thing that we can all participate in these spectator sports, especially with cable TV and satellite and all this stuff. I think it's wonderful. I just think -- we have to also be more active citizens. That's one of the things that I worry about all of the time, is that none of us can afford to define our lives so much -- totally as consumers; we have to also be actors.

I like it when a business considers their customers not only their consumers, but their partners, sort of. I like it when -- when I talk to the American people, that's why I try to stress this responsibility thing. People can be consumers of the policies that I advocate or that the Republicans advocate, but in the end, the strength of our country is the active work of citizenship. That's what really makes the thing go.

Q I understand you talked about this over the weekend with a group of academics and philosophers and so on about this idea of participation, and if we're too isolated, sort of solitary in the culture these days.

THE PRESIDENT: That was one of the things we talked about. Because I've been very concerned about it. And I've been a

participant in it. I've been in all these campaigns. I've been running for office. I'm not blameless; none of us are, who hold public office. But there has been this tendency with the overreliance on polls to try -- that's why I answered you the way I did on the affirmative action question, to try to segment the electorate and then segment issues, and then segment the policies you advocate, and usually with the best of motives.

Most politicians, contrary to public belief, are honest people and most of them try to do what they say they're going to do, and most of them believe what they say. I know that's not the perception, but that's true -- including my strongest opponents in the Congress. Most of them are honest, most of them believe what they say and most of them try to do it.

But there is a tendency in the modern world to treat citizens as if they are just consumers of our policies, you know? They will consume, they will receive the benefits of economic reform or political reform or whatever. But in a democracy, they're partners. And the policies work unevenly throughout the country based on how strong the civic life is in various places. And this is not just by income. I was just in -- just to give you one example, I was just in Los Angeles where I went on Martin Luther King Day to this Community Build project which the federal government invested some of our education and training money in, to try to make -- to get kids out of gangs and into successful lives, and to try to use former gang members to help get present members out and to stop young people from going into gangs.

Now, there has been a substantial decline in gang-related homicides in Los Angeles in the last year. One reason is that the community is beginning to come to grips with this itself. Yes, they may have used some program I helped to create in one part of what they did. But they were participants, they were actors, they were alive to the possibility of it.

One of the reasons I like the way I formulated the Middle Class Bill of Rights is, it ought to be called "Rights and Responsibilities," because if you give somebody an education tax deduction, they can't get it unless they get an education. And if they get -- you still can't -- you can't force someone to learn. It's about their active participation, their involvement, their doing things. And I think that is really the great challenge of our country as we move into this new century.

There are all these pressures that will tend to let us be alone more and isolate us more. A lot of it's exciting. You know, we can be on the Internet and do E-Mail, and we can work at home and we can do all these things. We can isolate ourselves from one another even more.

But in the end, unless we are citizens, unless we have certain networks in our local community, unless there is a certain level of trust we have with our neighbors, unless we're constantly struggling to come in contact with people who are different from us and listen to them and learn from them and make sure they understand us, it's going to be very difficult for what we do here in Washington to explode in a positive way across the country.

So I've been very worried about that; I've been worried about it for years. And I was so happy that, in '92, we got this huge turnout in the election, reversing all of these historical trends, in part because through the town meetings or whatever, we were able to give people a sense that it was their deal, not our deal. They were more than consumers of politics. And so I don't want to denigrate the consumer movement, because to some extent they have to consumer our politics. But the work of citizenship is more than being consumers,

and that's what I wanted to talk to those folks about. Because both parties now agree that the role of government, that the size of government should be reduced. Both parties agree

MORE

that we have to devolve more responsibility to state and local government, both parties agree that there needs to be less burdensome regulation.

I never did answer your question, but I will, and I'll answer some of it during the State of the Union about where we disagree. But what I think is most important to me is that I believe that individuals find their fullest expression as citizens by being part of a community where the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. You see it in the saddest of times.

I went to Rio Linda, California, an unincorporated community where Rush Limbaugh had his first radio show, right. And I saw all of these -- a lot of folks there who were of very modest means. And they were dealing with -- I went to a little Methodist church where all the volunteers had been working on the flood. And we were standing in a circle and they were taking a picture. And this lady came up to me and hugged me, and she said, "I'm a Republican." We were all standing here talking about this thing, you know. It was like, yes, she's a Republican and she didn't vote for me last time, probably won't vote for me next time, but we're both Americans and we're here, and this flood has somehow bound us together. All of a sudden, we're citizens, you know, we're united, we're one. The celebration, the pride the people in California have about the work they've done in the aftermath of that earthquake is stunning.

Now, how do we recapture at least a smidgen of that, enough of that on a daily basis to be united as a country and hopeful as a people and alive to the pain and the frustration and the difficulty of people who are different from us so that we've got enough glue together to be real citizens, to generate energy, to do things together so that we're more than just consumers. That's what I wanted those people to talk about. Because I think that's the great question facing us, really.

Q Well, thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thanks.

END

3:15 P.M. EST

WHITEWATER/TRAVEL OFFICE

Questions and Answers

Q: What is your reaction to the ongoing Congressional Whitewater hearings?

A: The First Lady and I have cooperated fully with all legitimate requests submitted by Congress relating to this inquiry because we believe that the Whitewater allegations are steadily evaporating as all the facts are known. We intend to continue our cooperation. This is all we can really do.

Whitewater has now been examined for four years by an unprecedented number of reporters, two Independent Counsels, Congress and the Resolution Trust Corporation at a total cost of over \$27 million. We have cooperated fully with every legitimate inquiry. 50,000 pages of documents have been given to Congress. Full access to witnesses has been given to Congress during each of the 40-plus days of its hearings over the last four months.

The bottom line is this: The Resolution Trust Corporation paid nearly \$4 million to a major law firm -- a firm with strong Republican ties -- to write a thorough report on our Whitewater investment. That final report, which was issued in December, confirms what we have said all along: we invested money in Whitewater, and we lost more than \$40,000; we were fully liable on the loans we took, and we paid those loans back; we were passive investors, not actively involved in the management of the investment; and we did not pressure anyone to make loans that benefited Whitewater Development or Madison Guaranty.

Q: Are you concerned about the Independent Counsel's investigation?

A: Quite simply, no. I hope that the work of the Independent Counsel will be concluded as fairly and quickly as possible. The First Lady and I have given our full and complete cooperation to the Independent Counsel.

Q: What do the recently released Rose Law Firm billing records show?

A: The billing records confirm what we have said all along about the nature and amount of the First Lady's work at the Rose Law Firm -- that she was the billing partner on a securities matter for Madison Guaranty but that the great bulk of the work was performed by a young associate at the firm. With the public release of these records, yet another set of baseless allegations about Whitewater can now be laid to rest.

The billing records show that the First Lady spent about 60 hours total over the course of fifteen months on various Madison matters, which average out to be less than one hour each week.

Q: Republicans are charging that the White House failed to produce documents in a timely manner and are questioning the chain of custody of the billing records. What is your response?

A: For weeks, Republicans on the Committee stated that these billing records would serve as the Rosetta Stone for Whitewater. However, now that these records are available and support what we have said all along, the inquiry has shifted yet again. We will cooperate with the Independent Counsel and the congressional committees looking into this, at the same time, emphasizing to the staff the importance of complete and prompt compliance with all requests for documents and records.

Keep in mind, Whitewater has now been examined for four years by an unprecedented number of reporters, two Independent Counsels, three Congressional Committees and the Resolution Trust Corporation at a total cost to taxpayers of over \$27 million. After all of this, including 40-plus days of Congressional hearings, there has been absolutely no showing of illegal or even unethical conduct. Through it all, my political opponents have constantly hopped, skipped and jumped from one charge to another. No sooner is one charge batted down than another one pops up.

Why is this? The answer is simple: 1996 is a presidential election year, and my partisan opponents are bound and determined to inflict political damage. Despite these nakedly partisan motives, we have offered our full cooperation, including producing more than 50,000 pages of documents and making all necessary witnesses available, because we are certain that the facts -- presented fairly -- will continue to show that these vague and ever-shifting Whitewater allegations have no merit at all.

Since the mid-term election, the White House has been asked by congressional committees and independent counsels to search its files for various records nearly a dozen different times. Each of these requests is different and requires its own search by each member of my staff -- close to 500 people. I expect my staff to respond to these requests with care and diligence and they have worked hard to locate the records. As a result, the White House has produced tens of thousands of pages of documents that have been found by searching through hundreds of thousands of pages of material.

Q: Did Vince Foster work with these billing records while in the White House and were these files removed from his office on the night of his death?

A: The handling of Vince Foster's files has been looked at time and time again. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the files were handled in anything but a proper manner.

The facts in the public record already reflect that Mr. Foster worked on this issue

during the 1992 campaign. This is not in dispute. Mr. Foster did this work in response to media questions being generated at that time. There is no evidence that Mr. Foster worked on the material at any time while he was at the White House.

Q: The White House recently made public a memo written by David Watkins which asserted that Mrs. Clinton ordered him to fire the employees of the White House Travel office. What are your thoughts on this memo?

A: The First Lady has always maintained that her concern was with the fiscal mismanagement at the Travel Office. The First Lady's concern about financial mismanagement in the Travel Office -- a concern that in the end proved fully justified by a big six accounting firm's audit of the office -- has already been well-documented. She expressed that concern to those who had responsibility for this area. And I am glad she did.

This two-and-one-half year old incident has now been examined at least seven different times. There have been very thorough reviews published. All the information has been made public.

As to how the White House handled the matter, the White House did conduct its own internal review of the Travel Office. This review was comprehensive, complete and rigorous, concluding that things could have been done differently.

Q: What is your response to the Paula Jones ruling by the Eight Circuit?

A: Robert Bennett, my personal counsel on this issue, has stated that he disagrees with the split decision of the Eight Circuit panel. Mr. Bennett has said that he intends to seek review by the full Court of Appeals and if need be the Supreme Court. Judge Ross, a member of the Eight Circuit panel, wrote a very persuasive dissenting opinion which many believe will ultimately prevail.

Our intent is not to be above the law. We have maintained that we will address this suit once I am no longer in office. My concern is with protecting the ability of the Office of the Presidency to govern effectively.

Q: Senate Republicans are comparing these events to Nixon and Watergate. How do you respond to this?

A: Senator D'Amato and other Republicans are making this charge in an attempt to gain bigger headlines. There is no comparison between the two issues. In Watergate, the

Nixon administration conducted illegal wiretaps, misused the C.I.A. and engaged in felonious activities such as the breaking and entering into the Democratic National Committee headquarters. In this so-called Whitewater matter, after conducting 40-plus days of hearings over five months in which the White House has cooperated fully, the Republicans on the Committee have come up with absolutely no showing of illegal or even ethical misconduct. In a desperate attempt to create a confrontation, Senate Republicans have sought to create headlines by engaging in a political fishing expedition.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 18, 1996

TAPED NATIONAL RADIO ADDRESS

DATE: January 19, 1996
LOCATION: Oval Office
TIME: 4:45 PM EST
FROM: Rica Rodman

I. PURPOSE:

You will ask Republicans to come back to the negotiating table in order to balance the budget and prevent another government shutdown.

II. BACKGROUND:

There will be a cough button on your desk should you need it.

III. PARTICIPANTS:

1. Senior Staff, Rica Rodman.
2. White House Communications Agency (WHCA) staff, video taping staff, staff photographer.
3. Please see attached for special guest list.

IV. PRESS PLAN:

The ABC, CNN, AP, C-SPAN, CBS, NBC, Mutual, UPI, USA, American Urban Radio Network, and Standard News radio networks will carry the address in its entirety to their collective thousands of stations across the country as if it were live Saturday at 10:06 AM EST.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS:

- Briefing.
- Tape radio address.
- Greet guests.

VI. REMARKS:

The speech text will be provided by Carolyn Curiel in the Office of Speechwriting.

RADIO ADDRESS

January 20, 1995

1. **Craig Livingstone** - WH Office of Personnel Security
2. **Steve Livingstone** - brother, Dept. of Energy
3. **Jim Werner** - Dept. of Energy
4. **Victoria Schaefer** -OMB
5. **John Schaefer** - husband
6. **Howard Reed**
7. **Kelly Reed** - daughter
8. **Secretary Glickman**
9. **Rhoda Glickman**
10. **Sam Yura** - Rhoda's father
11. **Mildred Yura** - Rhoda's stepmother
12. **Diane Klein** - Rhoda's sister
13. **Emery Klein** - brother-in-law
14. **Mark Yura** - Rhoda's brother
15. **Amy Glickman** - daughter
16. **Frances Cook** - US Ambassador to Oman
17. **Aaron Rappaport** - NEC Policy Assistant
18. **Amy Liu** - Special Assistant to Secretary Cisneros
19. **Mary Beth Donohue** - Deputy Chief of Staff, HHS
20. **Bob Healy** - Manager of Government Relations at ARCO, Political Office request
21. **Robert Barrie** - O'Connor & Hannan, Political Office request
22. **Peter Prowitt** - Manager of Federal Relations for General Electric, Political office request
23. **Lawrence Harris** - MCI Corp., Political Request
24. **Liz Arky** - Deputy Director of Legislative Affairs, USTR
25. **Bob Drake** - President, National Cattlemen's Association
26. **Kay Drake** - wife

27. **Bibb Hubbard** - Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary
28. **Elizabeth Hubbard** - sister
29. **Lori Davis** - HHS Legislative Affairs
30. **Rich Marcus** - VP of Ogilvy, Adams & Rinehart, Political Office request
31. **Rich Michalski** - Legislative Director for the Machinists Union, Political Office request
32. **Debbie Jardot** - works for Disney, good friend of Mike Synar's, Political Office request
33. **Leo Jardot** - VP of American Home Products
34. **Norman Levin** - Debbie's father
35. **Shirley Levin** - Debbie's mother
36. **Natalie Merchant** - performing tonight at "Voters for Choice"
37. **Jimmie Dale Gilmore** - performing tonight at "Voters for Choice"
38. **Bruce Hornsby** - performing tonight at "Voters for Choice"
39. **Caroline Thompson** - producer

President William J. Clinton

Saturday Radio Address to the Nation

January 20, 1996

(taped January 19, 1996)

Good morning. [Before I talk about the budget, I want to take a moment to remember someone very special, who our nation lost this week: former Texas Congresswoman Barbara Jordan. In her years in public service and after, she gave voice to our national conscience and brought reasoned thought and eloquence to even the most emotional debates. We have lost a great American, stateswoman and representative of the people. And many of us lost a friend and an inspiration. We the people will greatly miss her.

[pause a brief moment]

Now I'd like to talk about our efforts to reach common ground on a balanced budget. The talks are suspended because the Republican congressional leaders walked away from the table. I wish they hadn't. I hope they come back -- and soon -- because I believe our goal can be met. And we simply should not delay in getting on with the business of the people.

In less than one week, the Republican Congress could once again shut down the government -- for the third time in 2 months. I urge the Congressional Republican leaders to consider the consequences before they act.

Another shutdown means a grinding halt to vital services.

In the last shutdown alone, the Federal Housing Administration was unable to insure single-family home loans for tens of thousands of deserving applicants. Our citizens could not get passports; some veterans could not get benefits; many Medicare claims could not be processed; small businesses could not get loans; environmental cleanup actions were halted.

Also halted were building inspections. One building in Chicago had been scheduled twice for inspection of smoke detectors during the shutdowns. Two days ago, it went up in flames; four people died. That fire might have happened anyway but surely we should have done everything we could to prevent it.

The shutdowns also put hundreds of thousands of Federal workers with families to support under a horrible strain. Most live paycheck to paycheck: they can't afford a third shutdown. None of us can.

Two government shutdowns so far have cost taxpayers about one-and-a-half billion dollars -- one-and-a-half-billion dollars! That's not Monopoly money. Shutting down the government again would be unbelievably irresponsible. I urge the Republican Congress: Don't do it. We can't afford to bleed money and productivity at a time when we should be putting all our efforts into saving money and serving the American people.

I also urge the Congress to deal responsibly with the Federal debt ceiling. Congress should never threaten default.

... I am encouraged that Republican leaders have acknowledged that Congress should not put the creditworthiness of the United States at risk in our budget negotiations. We look forward to working with the Congressional leadership to draft a clean debt limit increase, to allow the United States to continue to meet our obligations and maintain our integrity.

I am committed to finishing the job on a balanced budget. I have gone the extra mile in our talks. The Republicans asked for a 7-year plan to balance the budget: I gave them that plan. They asked that we use figures from the Congressional Budget Office. I did that, too. I have tried every way I can to accommodate Republican demands and bargain in good faith.

But there are areas of disagreement, and they involve more than money. They involve our values. The Republicans insist on deep, unwarranted reductions in Medicare, Medicaid, as well as cuts in education and protections for the environment.

Among other things, they would: Raise Medicare premiums... repeal Medicaid's guarantee of adequate medical coverage for pregnant women, people with disabilities, children and older Americans... they would cut our efforts to keep drugs and violence out of public schools... and dramatically cut the enforcement of environmental laws that keep our air and water clean.

My budget shows we don't need these drastic steps, and we can still give a modest tax cut to the people who need it.

But I believe there's another reason for these Republican budget cuts: They don't like these programs, and they want to cut them unreasonably to give wealthy Americans a big tax cut.

Still, I believe we can end this budget stalemate.

Both the Republican leaders and I have already agreed to more than \$700 billion in savings, more than enough to balance the budget in 7 years. That's significant, and that's what the American people want. We can give them a balanced budget and a modest tax cut, and we should -- immediately.

So I say to the Republicans: We don't agree on everything, but we agree on a lot, and we agree on enough to balance the budget. Let's do it. Come back to the table. And don't shut down our government. Don't make America default on its debt. Let's do the responsible thing. My door is open. Let's talk. Let's get the job done for the American people. They deserve no less.

Thanks for listening.

Todd -

Per Michael Waldman -
the President has seen.

C.

—

DRAFT OPENING FOR STATE-OF-THE-UNION

to replace pages 1-3 of 1/18/96 draft

96 JAN 19 P1:43

Tonight, I speak not only to you gathered here in this chamber and those across America, but to the men and women of our armed forces who stand sentry around the world -- and particularly those who are helping peace take root in Bosnia. To our warriors for peace, I say: we are proud of you.

My duty tonight is to report on the State of the Union. Not on the state of our government, or even the state of individual Americans, but of our national community -- how we as Americans together are creating a more perfect union.

The State of our Union is strong -- as strong as it has ever been.

Our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades. We are keeping the American dream alive.

We are coming together as a nation again around our most fundamental values: family, future, responsibility, opportunity.

And there is new hope for peace tonight -- from the cobblestone streets of Northern Ireland to the sands of the Middle East to the mud of Bosnia. Because America remains the

world's strongest force for peace and freedom.

But for all our blessings as a nation, we know that this is a time of great change and challenge -- a transformation as profound as any we have had in a century. A hundred years ago, we moved from farm to factory, with all the change in our lives and our dreams which that meant. Today, we are moving from the Industrial Age and the Cold War into a new age of information and the global village. This is a moment of extraordinary opportunity for all of us -- an age of possibility. But Americans, working hard, holding fast to their values, and looking ahead to a new century, are concerned about whether we are prepared to seize this moment and be the winners of change. We are concerned about whether the values that have sustained us for so long can remain strong in the face of change. And we are concerned about whether the next generation of Americans -- our children -- could be the first generation of Americans to be worse off than their parents.

// recast as
a positive

As great as we know our challenges are, my fellow Americans, tonight I am as convinced as I have ever been that we will seize this age of possibility. I believe it because of everything I see and know about this country and its people. I believe it because I know that we have faced every moment of change in our history with the fundamental conviction that there is more that unites us than divides us, and that we can move toward the future strong and secure when we move there together.

Exactly 200 years ago, President George Washington stood before the 4th Congress of

the United States to deliver his annual message. A young nation faced great uncertainty about a new century, a new economy and competing visions for how best to move into the future. President Washington could have spoken about what divided America. But instead, he chose to talk about all that held us together -- in his words, of our mission to "unite our efforts to preserve, prolong and improve our immense advantages."

That vision has rescued our nation every time we have been seriously tested. And from the moment our Founders pledged to each other their "lives, their fortunes and their sacred honors," Americans have been bound to one another not by blood, not even by geography, but by common ideals: The love of liberty. The belief in progress -- that every American can dream of a better future, and that their hard work can make those dreams come true. And the constant struggle to find common ground -- in the words of our national motto, e pluribus unum, out of many, one.

Now, at another moment of great change, our challenge -- America's Challenge -- is to preserve these old American ideals in new times. We must renew our public schools for a new century and open wide the doors of college, provide for health care and economic independence so that Americans can be the winners of change, win the war on crime, protect the environment, and more.

The answers will not come from here in Washington alone, or from individuals acting alone. They will come from all of us, acting together, as a team for the sake of our people

and our country -- in our communities, our families, our churches, our businesses, our neighborhoods, and, yes, acting together . . . through our government. We must ask more of ourselves and expect more of one another. For America was built not on promises but on challenges.

If we meet these challenges we will have the confidence and the security to know that that this age will be America's greatest age of possibility. We will not fear change; we will conquer.

We will only rise to our challenges by speaking honestly about the duties we owe one another and the possibilities of what we as a nation can do together. So tonight, I want to speak directly about [TK] great challenges that America must meet as we move into the next century.

America's first challenge is

[In addition to the current challenges, we recommend that the budget be the first challenge; and that the environment and political/governmental reform be separate challenges.]

1/19/96 1:23pm

PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON 96 JAN 19 PM 1 : 34
DCCC FUNDRAISER
HAY-ADAMS HOTEL
JANUARY 19, 1996

Acknowledgments. Minority Leader Gephardt, DCCC Chair Martin Frost.

DCCC. The Democrats can take back the House in 1996, but we need your help. Make a commitment to help us by joining the Speaker's Trust -- and help Dick Gephardt to become Speaker of the House in the process. It's more important than ever.

CHANGE/VALUES

Time of change. New era, new century. Industrial → information. Cold War → global village.

America is ready. Age of immense possibility, but also great challenges.

Debate in Washington about: what it is to be an American. Chance to renew commitment to:

Ideas America always about: Love of liberty, belief in progress, search for common ground. All depend on each other.

Ran for Pres: Am Dream; Am Community; Am Leadership.

How? Economic growth; smaller, better gov't; mainstream values.

Values: Resp, opp; value of work; families stay strong, stick together; sense of community, all stronger when we work together; obligations to each other.

PAST 3 YEARS/CHALLENGES AHEAD

Economy: Cut deficit, expand trade, invest in Am people. Results: Def ½, almost 8M jobs, 15yr home, record sm biz formations 3yrs, lowest inflt/unempl 27yrs.

Still challenges: Too many working hard, not getting ahead.

Changes bring insecurity. Great challenge: Restore Am Drm and security for all families. Should we walk away from them? Or build on successes of last 3yrs?

Gov't: 200,000 ppl. Smallest % since before New Deal. Dems did it. Right way. 100s federal progs. 16,000 pages while improving environmental protection and public health.

Still challenges: Still more to cut, but we're doing it, not just talking about it.

Values: Crime ↘, Welfare ↘, Food stamps ↘, Poverty ↘, Teen preg ↘ 2yrs. We didn't do all that, the Am people did it. But our policies helped. NYC: largest drop in crime since 1972. I believe our Crime Bill, 100K police, is helping.

Still challenges: Crime ↘; youth crime ↗. Drugs ↘; youth drugs ↗. Too many kids raising themselves. Should we walk away? Or we should we build on last 3yrs?

World: Am is leading the world toward peace and freedom. Haiti: elections. N. Ireland, Middle East and Bosnia.

Still challenges: Forces bring together, also unleash forces who want keep us apart. Rabin. Here at home: OKC. US must lead, at home and around world.

BUDGET

Progress/challenges. America is on move, but challenges lie ahead. Lib, prog, com grnd. That's what budget debate is all about.

Budget. I am confident we can balance the budget in 7yrs in a way that is consistent with our values. Already identified enough cuts that D&R agree on. Not about \$\$ and ¢¢: about what Am should look like, 10/20/30 yrs.

Not about cuts: About policy. Republicans want to dismantle our commitments. Medicare: choice of doctor. Medicaid: aid to poor children, disabled. Education: school safety, Goals 2000.

Environment: Toxic waste since 1987, make taxpayers pay.

I believe: Medicare/Medicaid. Education. Environment. Working families tax cut.

Common ground. I believe we can succeed. After 50 hours, I know we can find common ground. I know it exists. If we put politics aside, and ask ourselves what's the right thing for America, what's the right thing for our children, we will succeed. Our choice: Society where everybody wins, or winner-take all?

MY STORY, CONCLUSION

Most people our age have already been given great gifts by America. Grew up in poor town. Grandfather 6th grade education. 1st to college. I had the privilege to become President of the United States -- not because of some extraordinary, innate talent; I became President of the United States because America gave me the chance. And that chance -- the chance for every child born in America to be the very best that they can be -- that's what we're fighting for. That's why it's so important that you do everything you can. In the coming month, talk to your friends and neighbors. Tell them why this matters. Tell them we're fighting for the future, and its can be better than you've ever dreamed.

Thank you and God bless you all.

If call is
made
Hagerman call

PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
SIGNING OF EXECUTIVE MEMORANDUM ON MISSING CHILDREN
OVAL OFFICE

JANUARY 19, 1996 96 JAN 19 A 9: 21

[Acknowledgements: Attorney General Janet Reno; Secretary Shalala; Sen. Biden; Rep. Peter Deutsch; Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen [ILL-e-on-a Ross-LAY-ten-en]; Rep. Lincoln Diaz-Balart; Rep. Lynn Woolsey; former Sen. Dennis DeConcini]

Every parent knows that their children are the most important thing in their lives. We cherish them, we invest our hopes in them, and when they fall victim to harm, it can be the most wrenching experience of all. For every parent, one of the most horrible things imaginable is the disappearance of a child. We must do whatever we can to help parents in these situations find their children.

Every year, approximately 300 children are abducted by strangers. This morning, I spoke with the parents of Amber Renee Hagerman, of Arlington, Texas, who learned yesterday that their daughter had been found murdered, after she had been missing for ~~eight~~ ^{five} days. Our hearts and prayers go out to this family as they try to cope with this terrible tragedy.

We must do everything we can to stop this from happening again. Time is the enemy in abduction cases -- and the most important tool we have against it is making sure information gets out to the public.

The federal government, through the FBI and other law enforcement agencies, is doing its part to help state and local law enforcement investigate these cases and disseminate information as quickly as possible.

But it is critical that the FBI be notified within 48 hours of the abduction. In six out of ten recent cases, the FBI learned of the abduction from TV reports. We've got to do better. And we will.

Nearly all 16,000 police departments around the country have the capacity, through a state-of-the-art computer system, to report missing persons to the FBI. I have asked the Attorney General to make it the highest priority to make sure this system works as quickly as possible.

The federal government already works with states to establish clearinghouses for information on missing children. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, funded by the Justice Department, has helped establish clearinghouses in forty-seven states plus the District of Columbia. The Center also funds Project Alert, which uses the expertise of volunteer retired police officers to help search for missing children.

Now, it is time to do more to help families beat the race against time in searching for their missing children. Federal offices come into contact with thousands of citizens and workers every day. That gives the federal government a unique role to play in the search for missing children.

Today, I will sign an Executive Memorandum directing all agency heads to take the necessary actions to allow the posting of photos of missing children in federal buildings. This presidential action also directs agencies to appoint an action officers to maintain the space for these notices.

This Memorandum is just one step -- but it's a step in the right direction. There is more we can do -- and we will.

The federal government is doing its part. But we know that the key to finding missing children is within their own communities. When these terrifying abductions occur, we have seen communities band together to distribute flyers, interview potential witnesses and support the families. Unfortunately, sometimes a terrible tragedy brings out the very best in our communities and our country.

I'd like to especially thank two families for joining me today. Mark Klaas and Claudine and Don Ryce both lost a child to abductors. These individuals have now dedicated their lives to ensure that other families will not have to suffer as they did.

[Hold up photo] I'd also like to thank Colleen Nick for joining me today. Her daughter, Morgan Chauntel Nick, was abducted from a ballpark in Alma, Arkansas, on June 9. Anyone who has any information about her whereabouts should call 1-800-THE-LOST [843-5678].

If we love our children, then we must do everything we can to help when they are in harm's way. Every one of us must take responsibility to do what they can to help find our missing children. Please look twice at the photos of missing children you see in the mail, on your milk cartons, and now, in federal buildings across the country. Everyone can make a difference -- and everyone has an obligation to try.

P. 1254

SG

Friday, January 19, 1996

10:00 AM Signing Ceremony for
the Presidential Directive
on Missing Children

TAB A

- Remarks

To be forwarded

4:45 PM Tape Radio Address
and Remarks

Both to be
forwarded
TAB B

5:30 PM Meeting at the
Hay Adams Hotel

TAB C

- Remarks

To be forwarded

January 18, 1996

RECEPTION WITH SUPPORTERS OF THE
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

DATE: JANUARY 19, 1996
LOCATION: HAY ADAMS HOTEL
TIME: 5:30 PM
From: Doug Sosnik

- I. PURPOSE
Attend a reception for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.
- II. BACKGROUND
This event will aid in the DCCC in their fundraising efforts. Those attending are being recruited for the Speaker's Trust Program, the DCCC's most prestigious program.

This event was a priority for Leader Gephardt.
- III. PARTICIPANTS
Please see attached list.
- IV. PRESS PLAN
Closed press.
- V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS
Deliver remarks, have photographs taken with participants, depart.
- VI. REMARKS
To be provided.

POTUS
SG
PANETTA
ICKES
~~BOWLES~~ Lieberman
NH

**MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ATTENDING RECEPTION
FOR THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE**

- ♦ Dick Gephardt (MO)
- ♦ Martin Frost (TX)
- ♦ Vic Fazio (CA)
- ♦ David Bonior (MI)
- ♦ Chet Edwards (TX)
- ♦ Barbara Kennelly (MD)
- ♦ John Lewis (GA)
- ♦ David Obey (WI)
- ♦ Nancy Pelosi (CA)

**GUESTS ATTENDING DEMOCRATIC VICTORY
CAMPAIGN STRATEGY MEETING
JANUARY 19, 1996
THE HAY ADAMS HOTEL**

Peter Angelos
Law Offices of Peter Angelos
Baltimore, MD

Gary Barron
Vitas Healthcare
Miami, FL

John Bowers
International Longshoremen's Association
New York, NY

John Connelly & Audree Connelly
J. Edward Connelly Associates
Pittsburgh, PA

Dr. James D'Orta
International Medical Consulting, Inc.
Washington, DC

Al Decotiis
Decotiis, Phillips, Landsten & Bronster
Roseland, NJ

Robert Gleason
International Longshoremen's Association
New York, NY

Steve Grossman
Massachusetts Envelope Company
Newton, MA

Richard Hailey
Ramey & Hailey

Robert Johnson
Black Entertainment T.V.
Washington, DC

Walter Kaye
Walter Kaye Associates
New York, NY

Maxine Leftwich

Ellen Malcolm
Emily's List
Washington, DC

Mark Mandell
Mandell, DeLuca, & Schwartz
Providence, RI

Jack McConnell
Ness, Motley, Loadholt & Richardson
Providence, RI

Gerry McIntee
AFSCME
Washington, DC

Jack Moore
IBEW
Washington, DC

Brian O'Neill
CRW Financial
Philadelphia, PA

Carlos Portes
The Portes Group
New York, NY

John Powers
The Portes Group
New York, NY

Dennis Rivera
New York, NY

Phil Rollhaus
Quixote Corporation
Chicago, IL

Jack Rosen
Continental Health Affiliates, Inc.
New York, NY

Willie Runyon
American Ambulance and Oxygen Service Company
Baltimore, MD

Alan Solomont
ADS Management
Andover, MA

Larry Stewart
Stewart, Tilghman, Fox & Biachi, P.A.
Miami, FL

Bob Sommer
MWW Strategic Communications
Miami, FL

Rich Trumka
AFL-CIO
Washington, DC

Howard Twiggs
Twiggs, Abrams, Strickland, & Trehy, P.A.
Raleigh, NC

Hugh Westbrook
Vitas Healthcare
Miami, FL

Friday, January 19, 1996

10:00 AM	Signing Ceremony for the Presidential Directive on Missing Children	TAB A
	- Remarks	To be forwarded
4:45 PM	Tape Radio Address and Remarks	Both to be forwarded TAB B
5:30 PM	Meeting at the Hay Adams Hotel	Distributed Separately
	- Remarks	To be forwarded

SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT

FOR

FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1996

FINAL

APPOINTMENT SCHEDULER: **STEPHANIE STREETT**
HOME: **202-332-5651**
OFFICE: **202-456-7560**
WHCA PAGER: **4033**
CELL PHONE: **202-494-9855**

EVENT COORDINATOR: **PATRICK STEEL**
HOME: **202-462-1544**
OFFICE: **202-456-2920**
WHCA PAGER: **4786**

PRESS DESK: **JEREMY GAINES**
HOME: **202-362-5475**
OFFICE: **202-456-5771**
WHCA PAGER: **4191**

WEATHER: **Washington, DC**
Cloudy with rain showers, heavy at times.
Winds southeast at 10 to 15 knots. Low 37 to 42.
High 40 to 47.

**SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT
FOR
FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1996
FINAL**

tba

MORNING RUN

9:00 am-
9:30 am

MEETING
OVAL OFFICE DINING ROOM
Staff Contact: Leon Panetta

NOTE: Set-up in the Oval Office for the Signing of the Presidential Directive on Missing Children is from 9:15 am - 10:00 am.
--

9:30 am-
9:45 am

COMBINED BRIEFING
OVAL OFFICE DINING ROOM
Staff Contact: Tony Lake

9:50 am-
10:00 am

BRIEFING
OVAL OFFICE DINING ROOM
Staff Contact: Rahm Emanuel

10:00 am-
10:20 am

**SIGNING CEREMONY FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVE
ON MISSING CHILDREN**
OVAL OFFICE
Remarks: Gabrielle Bushman
Staff Contact: Rahm Emanuel
Event Coordinator: Patrick Steel
POOL PRESS

-- The President reads a statement.

-- The President signs the Presidential Memorandum.

-- The President departs.

10:45 am-
1:00 pm

**BRIEFING/SPEECH PREP FOR STATE OF THE UNION
ADDRESS**
OVAL OFFICE
Staff Contact: Don Baer

1:00 pm-
1:15 pm

MEETING
OVAL OFFICE
Staff Contact: Stephanie Streett, Anne Walley

1:15 pm-
4:45 pm

PHONE/OFFICE TIME
OVAL OFFICE

NOTE: Set-up in the Oval Office for the radio address is from 4:00 pm - 4:45 pm.
--

4:45 pm-
5:15 pm

TAPE RADIO ADDRESS
OVAL OFFICE
Remarks: Carolyn Curiel
Staff Contact: Rica Rodman

5:25 pm

THE PRESIDENT departs the White House via motorcade en route
the Hay Adams Hotel
[drive time: 5 minutes]

5:30 pm

THE PRESIDENT arrives the Hay Adams Hotel

Greeter: Representative Martin Frost

5:30 pm-
6:30 pm

MEETING AT THE HAY ADAMS HOTEL
JOHN HAY ROOM
The Hay Adams Hotel
Remarks: Jonathan Prince
Staff Contact: Doug Sosnik
Event Coordinator: Patrick Steel
CLOSED PRESS

-- Representative Richard Gephardt makes remarks and
introduces **the President**.

-- **The President** makes remarks.

-- Upon conclusion of remarks, **the President** mixes and mingles
with supporters.

-- **The President** departs.

6:40 pm

THE PRESIDENT departs the Hay Adams Hotel via motorcade en
route the White House
[drive time: 5 minutes]

6:45 pm

THE PRESIDENT arrives the White House

EVENING OFF

BC RON
HRC RON

THE WHITE HOUSE
BOSTON, MA

A

-

-

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 18, 1996

SIGNING OF PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM ON MISSING CHILDREN

LOCATION:	Oval Office
DATE:	January 19, 1996
TIME:	10:00 am - 10:20 am
FROM:	Rahm Emanuel <i>RE</i>

I. PURPOSE

To demonstrate your commitment to the search for missing children by strengthening the role of federal agencies. The Memorandum directs the heads of Executive Departments and Agencies to permit photos of missing children to be posted in federal facilities.

II. BACKGROUND

This Memorandum was prompted by the Jimmy Ryce case, which lead members of the Florida Congressional Delegation to introduce legislation that would accomplish what this Memorandum accomplishes much sooner. 10-year-old Jimmy Ryce was abducted and brutally murdered while walking away from his school bus. Jimmy Ryce's parents have been consulted and we have incorporated some of their recommendations in the Memorandum. However, we expect that they will continue to urge the Administration to do more on this issue.

The Memorandum will affect, at a minimum, the 8,500 buildings owned and leased by GSA. In addition it covers any DOD building and federal park. It does not affect post offices, because they are separate entities, but we have made contact with the Postmaster General's staff to notify them.

The Memorandum is effective immediately and requires that there be a federal official designated at each federal building to respond to requests to post missing children photos and ensure the bulletin board is properly maintained. The parents provide the photos.

The federal government, through the FBI, has always had a law enforcement role in missing children cases. This is an additional step we can take to assist families who become victims.

Currently, Justice Department partially funds the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC), which is the premiere organization that tracks and publicizes missing children cases. The NCMEC is very supportive of this directive and their executive board members will be attending.

Also attending are volunteers from Project ALERT, former police officers who volunteer at the NCMEC to help track children who have been abducted.

Although there has been significant attention paid to missing children cases in this last week, this memorandum was prepared in December. The case of an abducted nine-year-old girl in Texas has received significant national coverage. The girl, Amber Hagerman, was found dead this morning and I have submitted the phone numbers under separate cover for you to call her parents if you so desire. Her parents were planning to attend this event, but they withdrew after the news this morning.

III. PARTICIPANTS

ADMINISTRATION:

The President
Attorney General Reno
Thurman Davis, Deputy Administrator of GSA

CONGRESSIONAL

Sen. Joe Biden (D-DE)
Rep. Peter Deutsch (D-FL)
Rep. Ilieana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL)
Rep. Lincoln Diaz-Balart (R-FL)
Rep. Lynn Woolsey (D-CA)

FAMILIES: (biographical information attached)

Colleen Nick
Linda Koerner
Adam Croote
Mark Klass
Claudine Ryce
Don Ryce

PROJECT ALERT VOLUNTEERS

Deborah Linnell
Kenneth Lucas
Charles Pickett

NCMEC BOARD MEMBERS

Robert Callaway
Arnold Burns
John Libonati
Senator Dennis DeConcini
John Kelly

DADE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Arthur Teele, Jr., Chairperson
Alex Panelas
Kathryn Ann Sorenson, Ryce's district

IV. PRESS PLAN

Pool Press.

V. SEQUENCE OF PROGRAM

- Deliver statement. [hold photo of Colleen Nick as referenced in prepared remarks.]
- [family members and NCMEC will stand behind you.]
- Sign Memorandum.

VI. REMARKS

Prepared by Speechwriting.



2101 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 550 • Arlington, VA
22201-3052

Telephone 703-235-3900
Facsimile 703-235-4067

Branches:
California
Florida
New York
South Carolina

Adam Walsh Children's Fund

Attendees: White House Ceremony
Friday, January 19, 1996

FAMILIES:

Colleen Nick is the mother of missing child Morgan Nick, missing from Alma, Arkansas. Colleen has advocated for enhanced national media attention and federal assistance in missing child cases. Nine year-old Morgan was kidnapped by a stranger on June 9, 1995 while she was playing in a ballpark.

Linda Koerner is the paternal grandmother of **Adam Croote** a safely-recovered child who had been missing for three years. Adam was abducted by his maternal grandparents in February, 1992 from Dormansville, New York. A school supplies company working with NCMEC had sent a poster of Adam to schools all over the country. In February 1995, a teacher in a small school in Mildred, Kansas saw the poster and recognized the abductor as a resident of the town. The FBI in New York were called, and the child, separated from his custodial grandmother since the age of three, was taken into protective custody and returned home shortly thereafter.

Claudine and Don Ryce are the parents of the abducted and murdered child, **Jimmy Ryce**. Jimmy's tragic case unfolded over a three-month period as investigators and support organizations assisted in the search for the 9-year old boy missing from Homestead, Florida. The Ryce family's advocacy for enhanced child protection has resulted in the introduction of the Jimmy Ryce ASAP Child Assistance Act, legislation designed to improve the dissemination of missing child posters to federal buildings throughout the country.

PROJECT ALERT VOLUNTEERS:

Deborah Linnell was a police officer with the Prince Georges County (Maryland) Police Department for 5 years until a line-of-duty disability ended her career. She has received a joint M.A. degree in Criminal Justice and counseling and Personnel Services and is pursuing a doctoral degree in Counselor Education at the University of Maryland. She volunteers on-site at NCMEC, donating hundreds of hours every year on case work. As a Project ALERT volunteer, she has assisted the Alexandria (Virginia) Police Department in their investigation and search for a child rapist.

Kenneth Lucas was a Sergeant Police Supervisor with the Takoma Park (Maryland) Police Department until his retirement in 1985. Awarded the Maryland Governor's Award for Crime Prevention, Mr. Lucas was on the Board of Directors for the International Crime Prevention Coalition. He has served the Kalkaska County (Michigan) Sheriff's Office as a Project ALERT volunteer for two years, assisting in the development and tracking of new leads in the search for a child abductor and molester.



2101 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 550 • Arlington, VA
22201-3052
Telephone 703-235-3900
Facsimile 703-235-4067

Branches:
California
Florida
New York
South Carolina

Adam Walsh Children's Fund

Charles Pickett is a former Trooper with the Virginia State Police. He is an academy-certified polygraphist, and has investigated cases of child molestation and sexual assault. He was appointed a technical advisor to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children when the agency was first established in 1984, and has continued to manage cases and assist parents and law enforcement on some of the most difficult and long-term missing child cases.

NCMEC BOARD MEMBERS:

Robbie A. Callaway played a key role in creating and developing the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children where he currently serves as Vice Chairman of the Center's Board of Directors. He is the Senior Vice President of Boys and Girls Clubs of America, and has had an instrumental role in significantly expanding the number of Boys and Girls Clubs located within public housing facilities and on Native American Reservations. Amongst his numerous awards, he has received the FBI Director's Community Leadership Award for his successful efforts in partnership with the FBI to develop and implement a drug demand reduction program aimed at inner-city youth.

Arnold L. Burns, formerly Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, is the Chairman of the Law Enforcement Committee of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's Board of Directors. He is currently a Senior Partner of the law firm Proskauer Rose Goetz and Mendelsohn, and is also Vice Chairman of the National Board of Directors of Boys & Girls Clubs of America. Mr. Burns served his country in the U.S. Army from 1953 to 1957 in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. He is the recipient of numerous awards including the Ellis Island Medal of Honor and the Anti-Defamation League Human Relations Award.

John J. Libonati is a 20-year veteran of the United States Secret Service. John has held numerous assignments including a four-year assignment to the Presidential Protection Division. In 1992, while serving a legislative fellowship on a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, John proposed the idea of utilizing retired law enforcement personnel to assist in the recovery of missing children. The project was proposed to Senator Dennis DeConcini, then chairman of the committee, who provided necessary funding for what is now the highly-acclaimed "Project ALERT" program at the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. John was recently promoted to Staff Assistant to the Director in the Secret Service Office of Congressional Affairs and has been an active member on NCMEC's Board of Directors since 1994.

Senator Dennis DeConcini is the former U.S. Senator from Arizona and a long-time advocate and supporter of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Currently a member of NCMEC's Board of Trustees, Senator DeConcini was instrumental in securing funding to launch NCMEC's Project ALERT program.



2101 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 550 • Arlington, VA
22201-3052

Telephone 703-235-3900

Facsimile 703-235-4067

John P. Kelly, Jr. serves as the Treasurer of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and is a long-time member of the Center's Board of Directors. One of the nation's most prominent minority bankers, he is currently the President and Chief Executive Officer of Enterprise Federal Savings Bank in Landover, Maryland and was previously the President and Chief Executive Officer of Founders National Bank of Los Angeles. He is also the former Chief Executive of the National Bankers Association.

NCMEC STAFF MEMBERS:

Ernie Allen is President and Chief Executive Officer of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. He came to NCMEC in 1989 following public service in his native Kentucky, where he was Director of Public Health & Safety for the City of Louisville and Chief Administrative Officer of Jefferson County in the administrations of former Louisville Mayor and Jefferson County Judge/Executive Harvey Sloane.

Marjorie Kazdin is the Public Liaison for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. She has been with NCMEC since 1991 following her public service as a VISTA Volunteer with an at-risk youth program in Longmont, Colorado.

Branches:
California
Florida
New York
South Carolina

Adam Walsh Children's Fund