

5/10 from Oval
To Who to handle?

NEC^S (Tyson)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

ORIGINALS
TO
TYSON

05/10/96

DATE: _____

TO: LAURA TYSON

FROM: Staff Secretary

The attached was sent to me from
the Oval Office by Nancy Hernreich.

For your appropriate handling.

Michael Armstrong
Jingles Corp CEO

Presidents
Export Export Council

Executive Board reached a decision
(May 23 full Board votes)

Hughes: "the most difficult deal by
far in Europe"

they faced unprecedented pressure
from the French lobby
and it was only because of
the intense activity by the
US Government that made it possible

Cited President's letter

Hughes is enormously indebted to US
Govt.

first 100,000,000 out of 500M
global venture

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG



LE PREMIER MINISTRE

*Jeffrey
Peters
Commence
Congratulate
In Kansas
Should
Know about the
Someone
Call
Julie A.*

The President of the United States

The White House

WASHINGTON, DC



LE PREMIER MINISTRE

Dear Mr. President,

I thank you very much for your letter dated February 28, in which you underlined the excellent business relations that exist between our two countries. I would like to assure you how much we appreciate the outstanding contribution American companies are making in favour of the economy of my country.

HUGHES has been an example of how American technology contributes to the development of Luxembourg, and more particularly to the Luxembourg-based company Société Européenne des Satellites (SES), as a successful operator in commercial satellites.

I can assure you that HUGHES technology will also be given in the future a fair treatment in the procurement procedures for the acquisition of future satellites.

Given the quality and reliability of the technology, the company will continue to be in a strong position for winning future contacts.

Furthermore I believe that the existing strong commercial and technological relationship between SES and HUGHES will be a fertile ground for exploring new forms of cooperation between the two companies in the future.

In the spirit of the excellence of our relations, I remain

Yours sincerely



Jean-Claude JUNCKER
Prime Minister

The President of the United States

The White House

WASHINGTON, DC

U
Brother HV
Paul

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 13, 1996

Mr. Robert V. Brothers
13881 Harris Road
Rogers, Arkansas 72756

Dear Rob:

David Matthews recently forwarded your heartfelt letter to me. I want you to know that I deeply appreciate the support you have given me over the years. I understand your distress about my veto of the bill banning the procedure commonly known as partial birth abortion. ~~Let me explain my position.~~

~~Let me~~ ^{first}
First, I should say that I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except, as the Supreme Court requires, where necessary to protect the life or health of the mother. You may recall that, as Governor, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health, and I would sign a bill to do the same thing at the federal level if it were presented to me.

The particular procedure aimed at in H.R. 1833 -- generally referred to by doctors as dilation and evacuation -- poses a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I studied and prayed about for many months. When I first heard a description of this procedure, I anticipated that I would support the bill. But after I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to believe that this rarely used procedure is justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious consequences to her health.

Last month, I was joined in the White House by five women who desperately wanted to have their babies and were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions and would not live. These women wanted anything other than an abortion, but were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best chance to avert the risk of death or grave illness which, in some cases, would have

In as much as my position on this bill has been widely misunderstood, I'd like to set it forth for you as clearly and directly as I can.

that you are

EDITS

(last
time I
hope)

11/10/96

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

²⁰
May 8, 1996

Mr. Robert V. Brothers
13881 Harris Road
Rogers, Arkansas 72756

Dear Rob:

David Matthews recently forwarded your heartfelt letter to me. I want you to know that I am deeply appreciative of the support you have given me over the years. And I want to do my best to explain to you the ~~real and genuine~~ basis for my veto of H.R. 1833, the ban on the procedure commonly known as partial birth abortion.

~~Let me say first that~~
~~First, a word of background.~~ I am against late-term abortions and have long opposed them, except, as the Supreme Court requires, where necessary to protect the life or health of the mother. You may recall that, as Governor, I signed into law a bill that barred third trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health, and I would sign a bill to do the same thing at the federal level if it were presented to me.

✓ The particular procedure aimed at in H.R. 1833 -- generally referred to by doctors as dilation and evacuation -- poses a difficult and disturbing issue, one which I studied and prayed about for many months. ~~Indeed,~~ when I first heard a description of this procedure, I anticipated that I would support the bill. But after I studied the matter and learned more about it, I came to believe that this rarely used procedure is justifiable as a last resort when doctors judge it necessary to save a woman's life or to avert serious consequences to her health.

Last month, I was joined in the White House by five women who desperately wanted to have their babies and were devastated to learn that their babies had fatal conditions and would not live. These women wanted anything other than an abortion, but were advised by their doctors that this procedure was their best chance to avert the risk of death or grave harm which, in some cases, would have

MAY 9 1996

included an inability to bear children. These women gave moving, powerful testimony. For them, this was ~~not about choice. This was~~ not about choosing against having a child. Their babies were certain to perish before, during, or shortly after birth. The only question was how much grave damage they were going to suffer. Here is what one of them had to say:

"Our little boy had . . . hydrocephaly. All the doctors told us there was no hope. We asked about in utero surgery, about shunts to remove the fluid, but there was absolutely nothing we could do. I cannot express the pain we still feel. This was our precious little baby, and he was being taken from us before we even had him. This was not our choice, for not only was our son going to die, but the complications of the pregnancy put my health in danger as well. If I carried to term, he might die in utero, and the resulting toxins could cause a hemorrhage and possibly a hysterectomy. The hydrocephaly also meant that a natural labor risked rupturing my cervix and my uterus."

Some have raised the question whether this procedure is ever most appropriate as a matter of medical practice. The best answer to this question comes from the medical community, which broadly supports the continued availability of this procedure in cases where a woman's serious health interests are at stake. In those rare cases, I believe the woman's doctors should have the ability to determine, in the best exercise of their medical judgment, that the procedure is indeed necessary.

The problem with H.R. 1833 is that it provides an exception to the ban on this procedure only when a doctor can be certain that a woman's life is at risk, but not when the doctor is sure that she faces real, grave risks to her health.

I do not, incidentally, contend that this procedure, today, is always used in circumstances that meet my standard. The procedure may well be used in situations where a woman's serious health interests are not at issue. But I do not support such uses, and I would sign appropriate legislation banning them.

At the same time, I cannot accept a ban on this procedure in those cases where it represents the best hope for a woman to avoid serious risks to her health.

I also understand that many who support this bill believe that any health exception is untenable. In a letter sent to me on April 16 by our leading Catholic Cardinals, they contend that a "health" exception for the use of this procedure could be stretched to cover almost anything -- for example, youth, emotional stress, financial hardship, or inconvenience.

have been

delete italics

3

That is not the kind of exception I support. I support an exception that takes effect only where a woman faces real, serious adverse health consequences. ~~Those who oppose this procedure may wish to~~ cite cases where fraudulent health reasons ~~are~~ relied upon as an excuse -- excuses I could never condone. But people of good faith must recognize that there are also cases where the health risks facing a woman are deadly serious and real. It is in those cases that I believe an exception to the general ban on the procedure must be allowed. Delete italics

Further, I reject the view of those who suggest that it is impossible to draft a bill that imposes real, stringent limits on the use of this procedure. ~~That is why I implored Congress, in a letter in February, to add a limited exception for the small number of compelling health consequences. Congress ignored my proposal, but I have continued to make it absolutely clear that if Congress will work with me to produce a bill that meets my concerns, I will sign it, the moment it reaches my desk.~~

~~To sum up, then,~~ ^{or as} ~~I do not support the use of this procedure on demand, I do not support the use of this procedure on the strength of mild or fraudulent health complaints. But I do believe that we cannot abandon women, like the women I spoke with, whose doctors advise them that they need the procedure to avoid serious injury.~~ ^{In short,}

I continue to hope that a solution can be reached on this painful issue. ~~I hope as well that the deep dialogue between my Administration and people of faith can continue with regard to the broad array of issues on which we have worked and are working together.~~

Again, thank you for writing and letting me know where you stand. I hope ~~that~~ you now at least have a better understanding of my own position.

Sincerely,

have

now

[not a new #]

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

86 MAY 10 06:00

OFFICE OF THE STAFF SECRETARY

Fax Transmittal Sheet

TO: Melissa Skolfield - HHS

Fax Number: 690-5673

Phone Number:

FROM: Phil Caplan/sew

SUBJECT: Presidential memo on Teen Parents

DATE: 05/10/96

NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover sheet):

2

MESSAGE:

If all pages are not received, please call 202/456-2702

The document accompanying this facsimile transmittal sheet is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. This message contains information which may be privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, dissemination, copying or distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 10, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SUBJECT: Welfare Initiative Regarding Teen Parents

This memorandum will confirm my directive to you to implement the plan I announced on Saturday, May 4, 1996, to help teen parents break free of the cycle of welfare dependency by living at home, staying in school, and getting the education they need to get good jobs.

I direct you to exercise your legal authority to take the following steps to implement that plan:

- (1) require States to submit plans describing how they will ensure that teen parents stay in school and prepare for employment;
- (2) require teen parents who have dropped out of school to sign personal responsibility plans that spell out how such teens are going to move towards supporting and caring for themselves and their children, including attendance at school;
- (3) allow States to reward with cash allowances teen parents who stay in school and graduate, as well as require States to sanction teens who do not;
- (4) challenge States to use the authority they have to require minor mothers to live at home; and
- (5) monitor State performance in the foregoing areas.

You have advised me that you have legal authority to take these actions under titles IV-A and IV-F of the Social Security Act.

The plan I have outlined will help assure that the welfare system requires teen parents to follow responsible paths to independence. Its swift implementation is vital to achieving our goal of further instilling the American values of work, family, and personal responsibility into our welfare system.

William D. Clinton

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

5-10-96

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

96 MAY 9 P9:12

May 9, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

CC: LEON PANETTA
EVELYN LIEBERMAN

FROM: HAROLD ICKES
JENNIFER O'CONNOR

RE: TEAM ACT

*What exactly
did Sawyer do?
Come in Panetta
in the South?
Stop it? - get
R*

This memorandum responds to your request for information about the TEAM Act debate on the Hill.

Section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act makes it illegal for an employer to dominate, interfere with or financially support a labor organization. As defined in the NLRA, a "labor organization" has the broad meaning of representatives of employees; it is not restricted to unions only. The purpose of section 8(a)(2) was to ensure that the representatives of employees are democratically chosen without interference of employers.

Section 8(a)(2) was enacted as part of the NLRA in 1934 because in the early part of this century, one of the most popular strategies among employers who wanted to prevent employees from unionizing was to create "company unions" or other forms of phony representation schemes. Employers would set up a "representation" system in which they hand-picked the employees to sit on the committee, maintained control over its discussions and decisions, but told employees that they didn't need a union because they were represented by the committee already and unions would lead to other negative impacts on them. Once section 8(a)(2) passed, these sham unions were illegal.

The House has passed and the Senate is considering a bill, the TEAM Act (Teamwork for Employees and Management Act) that would effectively repeal section 8(a)(2). The TEAM Act would amend the NLRA to permit employers "to establish, assist, maintain or participate in" organizations for their employees, so long as those organizations weren't actually engaged in collective bargaining.

This amendment is extremely troubling to the labor movement. The AFL-CIO argues that the amendment is unnecessary for all employers except those with the worst intentions. For well-

intentioned employers, teamwork between employers and employees is already permissible under 8(a)(2). It allows legitimate labor-management cooperation so that employees can play a role in increasing productivity, quality and innovation. Companies may let employees take the lead in identifying problems and finding solutions. Employees can work together in teams and make design and production decisions on their own. Today, 30,000 employee involvement plans are running. Ninety-six percent of large employers have such plans.

Thus, the AFL-CIO argues that the law already permits teamwork and the only result of changing it through the TEAM Act will be to permit employers who want to undermine their unions or organizing drives to succeed. They point out that there are only a small handful of 8(a)(2) cases brought to the National Labor Relations Board each year because employers are able to have teamwork without violating the Act. In the last 20 years, only 58 cases were brought; only 6 are pending at the moment.

On the other side of the issue, businesses argue that the law is somewhat unclear and they are "chilled" from being able to talk to their employees about routine matters. Some non-unionized employers, for instance, who would like to discuss issues with their employees but who don't have a union to talk to, claim they feel they will be violating 8(a)(2) if they sit down with a group of employees to hear their views. Some recent cases and decisions by the NLRB have confused the law and some businesses are unclear on what is and isn't permitted. These businesses, who legitimately want to be able to talk to their employees, plus presumably the businesses who would like to be able to quash organizing drives, are pushing hard for passage of the TEAM Act.

Based on the push for changes to 8(a)(2) and the need of some congressional members to be responsive to constituents, some Members of Congress have developed alternatives to the TEAM Act that would clarify the law without eviscerating it. In the House, Representative Sawyer introduced a substitute bill of this sort, which won wide Democratic support but lost 221-204. The Democrats voted for it instead of the TEAM Act, which passed. While the AFL-CIO didn't "support" the Sawyer amendment, they didn't oppose it because it drew Democratic votes away from the TEAM Act.

Now the TEAM Act is in the Senate. Again, there is discussion of whether there is a substitute which could be offered to give Democrats something to support which "clarifies" the law, but which doesn't repeal 8(a)(2). If such a substitute failed and the TEAM Act passed, then the Democrats and labor movement would look to you to veto it. They see the substitute strategy as a way to ensure a veto wouldn't be overridden. The Vice President announced in Bal Harbour, Florida in February, 1995, that you would veto the TEAM Act. Since then he and you have publicly said that you would veto attempts to repeal 8(a)(2) or legalize company unions. The Administration has not, however, stated that you would veto any changes to 8(a)(2).

There is not consensus within the Administration about what changes, if any, ought to be made to 8(a)(2). White House and Department of Labor staff are working to try to develop alternatives for a substitute to the TEAM Act.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 10, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR KATHLEEN McGINTY

FROM: HELEN HOWELL *HH*

SUBJECT: Follow-up to meeting with the Alaskans on
AMWR

Your office forwarded a newspaper article about comments POTUS made in Anchorage on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and a set of rebuttal points for the Alaska delegation's arguments on ANWR.

It would be very helpful for the President if your cover memo addressed what POTUS said in Anchorage that was incorrect or misleading, and how to correct any confusion the comments may have generated. I've attached two memos by Gene Sperling on follow-up to press attacks as examples FYI.

Also, Todd Stern suggests that the rebuttal points may be more useful to the President in the future prior to his next meeting on the subject.

Please call me if I can be of further assistance. I tried calling a number of times, but without much luck.

Thanks.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

160330 SS
BE004
THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

4-12-96

96 APR 6 P1:37

April 4, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: GENE SPERLING

SUBJECT: Response to RNC Critique of the Clinton Economy:
"Economy No April Fool's Joke"

On April 2, the Republican National Committee put out a statement about the current state of the economy. We prepared an immediate response correcting these inaccurate attacks. The DNC and Re-Elect distributed these responses to party activists, opinion leaders, validators, and media outlets across the country.

Attached is their attack on your record and our responses.

Response to the RNC's Critique of the Clinton Economy:
"Economy No April Fool's Joke"
April 2, 1996

On April 2, the Republican National Committee put out a statement about the current state of the economy. Their statement was filled with a compendium of errors. Here are their claims and the facts:

CLAIM: *The healthiest in three decades? Back from the brink? For America's working men and women, this economy is anything but healthy; it's tottering.*

FACTS: **HERE IS WHAT SEVERAL RESPECTED FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC ORGANIZATIONS HAVE SAID ABOUT THE CLINTON ECONOMY OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF WEEKS:**

Barron's, 3/18/96: "Clinton also rightfully boasted that, 'our economy is the healthiest that it has been in thirty years. We have the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. We have created eight million jobs, over a million of them in basic industries like construction and automobiles. America is selling more cars than Japan for the first time since the 1970s, and for three years in a row we've had a record number of new businesses started in our country.'"

DRI/McGraw-Hill, March 1996: "[T]he normal economic indicators suggest [the economy] is in its best shape in decades."

Washington Post, 4/2/96: "[T]he U.S. economy has created more new jobs over the past several years than all the other G-7 economies combined...Since January 1993, 8.4 million new jobs, swelling the number of job holders by 7.7 percent. No other G-7 economy comes close to matching that performance."

FULL TEXT OF THE CRITIQUE OF THE PRESIDENT'S RECORD IS ATTACHED TO THIS DOCUMENT

CLAIM: *The economy Clinton inherited from Presidents Bush and Reagan was far better than the one Clinton has produced.*

From the last quarter of 1994 to the last quarter of 1995, the GDP grew only 1.3 percent. The GDP was growing at a rate nearly three times faster when Clinton took office.

FACTS: **MOST AMERICANS WOULD NOT WANT TO GO BACK TO 1992.**

In 1992, the deficit was \$290 billion -- the highest dollar level in history.

Today, CBO projects the deficit to be \$140 billion this year -- more than cut in half in just four years and the lowest as a share of the economy of any major economy in the world. [CBO, *The Economic and Budget Outlook*, March 28, 1996, p. 1.]

In 1992, the unemployment rate was above 7 percent during every month.

Today, the unemployment rate is at 5.5 percent -- and has been below 6 percent for 18 consecutive months. There are two million fewer people unemployed today than when President Clinton took office. [Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Internet site: www.bls.gov.]

In 1992, the private-sector was barely even creating jobs and had suffered from one of the worst 4-year periods of job growth in history.

Today, the economy has created 8.4 million new jobs -- nearly 8 times more private-sector jobs per month than during the previous Administration (211,000 per month vs. 26,900 per month). [Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Internet site: www.bls.gov.]

As for economic growth, real GDP increased at a 1.3 percent annual rate during the previous Administration -- half as fast as under President Clinton. [Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, National Income and Product Accounts.]

Since President Clinton took office, the private sector of the economy has grown 3.2 percent annually -- a stronger record of private sector growth than either the Bush or Reagan Administrations. [Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, National Income and Product Accounts.]

Their interpretation of the 1992 number is deceptive. Growth for the entire year was 2.7 percent -- not 3.7 percent -- and was boosted significantly by a strong fourth quarter that benefited from a fall in interest rates and rise in consumer confidence brought on by the election of President Clinton. [Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, National Income and Product Accounts.]

- *New York Times*, 11/25/92: "The post-election rebound in consumer spirits entirely reversed a string of monthly declines in the measure [consumer confidence] since June... analysts attributed most of the jump in consumer confidence to Governor Bill Clinton's victory in the Presidential election."

CLAIM: *Industrial output averaged 4.2 percent from 1983-1989, but under Clinton, it dropped to a measely [sic] 1.2 percent last year.*

FACT: **Industrial Production Has Grown Faster Under President Clinton Than Under Either Reagan or Bush.** Since President Clinton took office, industrial production has grown 3.8 percent annually -- that's significantly faster than the 2.8 percent annual rate that Ronald Reagan achieved and four times greater than the 0.9 percent rate during the previous Administration. [Source: Federal Reserve Board data.]

CLAIM: *More than three million more new jobs would have been created had Clinton maintained the same rate of new job creation produced in previous economic expansion periods.*

FACTS: **IF THEY WANT TO TALK ABOUT JOB GROWTH, LET'S TALK. PRESIDENT CLINTON'S JOBS RECORD IS BETTER THAN THAT OF ANY REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT SINCE THE 1920s:**

1. **President Clinton Has A Better Jobs Record Than Any Republican Administration Since the 1920s.** Since President Clinton took office, the economy has added 8.4 million new jobs, with 7.8 million in the private sector -- that's a faster annual rate of overall and private-sector job growth than any Republican Administration since the 1920s. [Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Internet site: www.bls.gov.]
2. **Nearly 8 Times More Private-Sector Jobs Per Month Than Bush.** Since the President was inaugurated, the private sector has created 211,000 jobs per month, nearly 8 times as many jobs per month as were created under the previous Administration (26,900). [Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Internet site: www.bls.gov.]

CLAIM: *Last year alone, the typical family earned \$790 less than in 1992.*

FACTS: **THIS IS SIMPLY UNTRUE.** Family incomes fell under the previous Administration. They have increased since President Clinton took office.

1. **Median family income is higher now than in 1992.** Median family income in 1994 was higher than the year before President Clinton took office. In 1994, median family income was \$38,782, up from \$38,632 in 1992. [Source: Bureau of the Census, *Income, Poverty, and Valuation of Noncash Benefits: 1994*, Series P-60-189, Supplemental Tables: Families. By Total Money Income.]
2. **Median family income increased in 1994.** According to the Bureau of the Census, real median family income increased 2.3 percent in 1994 -- the first year following President Clinton's Economic Plan -- for the first time since 1989. (1994 is the most recent data available) [Source: Bureau of the Census, *Income, Poverty, and Valuation of Noncash Benefits: 1994*, Series P-60-189, Supplemental Tables: Families. By Total Money Income.]
3. **It's impossible to make a three-year estimate.** It is impossible to even make a three-year estimate since the Bureau of the Census hasn't even collected the data for the third year!
4. **Family incomes declined under the previous Administration.** It was during the previous Administration when family incomes slipped. From 1988 to 1992, median family income declined 4 percent. [Source: Bureau of the Census, *Income, Poverty, and Valuation of Noncash Benefits: 1994*, Series P-60-189, Supplemental Tables: Families. By Total Money Income.]

CLAIM: *The share of new jobs that are temporary instead of full-time, permanent jobs has nearly doubled on Clinton's watch.*

FACTS: **THIS IS FLAT WRONG.**

1. **Most of the new jobs have been full-time jobs.** Between January 1993 and December 1995, the economy added 7 million full-time jobs -- 89 percent of all the jobs added during that period. [Source: Council of Economic Advisers.]
2. **They claim that most of the new jobs were temporary, part-time jobs, suggesting that average hours should have fallen. HOWEVER, since President Clinton took office, average hours have ticked up.**
 - **Average hours are up slightly.** According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, average weekly hours have increased slightly during the Clinton Administration; from 1992 to 1995, they have increased from 34.4 to 34.5 hours per week. [Source: BLS Current Employment Statistics survey.]

Date: 04/02/96 Time: 19:06
SEconomy No April Fool's Joke

To: National Desk, Political Writer
Contact: Mary Mead Crawford of the Republican National
Committee,
202-863-8550

WASHINGTON, April 2 /U.S. Newswire/ -- Following is a statement
by RNC National Chairman Haley Barbour:

The Commerce Department today announced the economy is in even
worse shape than predicted. That bad news came on the heels of
April Fool's Day, but it's neither news nor a joking matter to the
working men and women of this country, who are working harder than
ever just to keep their heads above water.

The U.S. Commerce Department revised its report on gross
domestic product (GDP) growth for 1995, showing it grew at a yearly
rate of only 0.5 percent in the last quarter of 1995. From the last
quarter of 1994 to the last quarter of 1995, the GDP grew only 1.3
percent (Joint Economic Committee). The GDP was growing at a rate
nearly three times faster when Clinton took office. Yet this is the
economy Bill Clinton bragged in his State of the Union address is
"the healthiest it's been in three decades." This is the economy
his Labor Secretary Robert Reich says Clinton "has pulled...back
from the brink." (Investors Business Daily, April 2, 1996)

The healthiest in three decades? Back from the brink? For
America's working men and women, this economy is anything but
healthy; it's tottering. And it's not only near the brink -- it's
dangling over the edge of a recession.

On the campaign trail in 1992, Bill Clinton reserved his
harshest attacks for President Bush's record on the economy. Yet
the economy Clinton inherited from Presidents Bush and Reagan was a
far cry -- better -- than that Clinton has produced.

The economy Clinton bashed in 1992 grew 3.7 percent that year
-- more than three times faster than Clinton's 1995 economy.
Industrial output averaged 4.2 percent from 1983-89, but under
Clinton, it dropped to a measly 1.2 percent last year. Clinton's
favorite boast -- that eight million new jobs have been created
during his tenure in the White House -- leaves out two very
important facts: 1) the share of new jobs that are temporary
instead of full-time, permanent jobs has nearly doubled on
Clinton's watch (Investors Business Daily, April 2, 1996) and 2)
more than three million more new jobs would have been created had
Clinton maintained the same rate of new job creation produced in
previous economic expansion periods (Wall Street Journal, March 13,
1996).

Hard-working families know the consequences of this middle-class
squeeze all too well. Last year alone, the typical family earned
\$790 less than in 1992 (Census Bureau data).

For the working men and women of this country, these facts are
as hard and cold as reality can be, and all of Clinton's
election-year rhetoric won't soften their edges.

-0-

/U.S. Newswire 202-347-2770/
APNP-04-02-96 1910EST

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

4.8.96

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

95 APR 6 P 1:45

April 4, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: GENE SPERLING

SUBJECT: Response to Attacks on the Minimum Wage

As you know, Republican Members of Congress attacked your proposal to raise the minimum wage this week, citing a *Time* magazine article from 1995 that quotes you as saying in 1993 that you thought that raising the minimum wage was "the wrong way to raise the incomes of low-wage earners."

But, an exhaustive search of all your statements, speeches, and interviews, and comments as President confirms that you did not say any such thing,

Attached is our one-page response to this claim, accompanied by a chronology of your support for a minimum wage increase -- as governor, candidate, and President.

The DNC and Re-Elect are distributing variations of this response to opinion leaders and validators across the country. The DNC has also released a letter to wire services and news bureaus pointing out the inaccuracy of the *Time* magazine quote. Democratic Members of Congress are also using this paper to respond to these attacks.

Neil G. Grier

*What
law on
Pres
Cabinet
Nancy
Clinton*

**PRESIDENT CLINTON HAS ALWAYS SUPPORTED
A MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE AS A WAY TO MAKE WORK PAY**

SUPPORTED MINIMUM WAGE HIKE AS GOVERNOR. As Governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton supported two increases in the state minimum wage. And he changed state minimum wage law to cover more workers.

1992: CANDIDATE CLINTON CALLS FOR EXPANDING EITC AND RAISE MINIMUM WAGE TO MAKE WORK PAY. In 1992, President Clinton proposed expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit and raising the minimum wage to keep pace with inflation in order to ensure that no parent who was willing to work full-time would have to raise their children in poverty.

- **In *Putting People First*,** Presidential Candidate Clinton and Vice-President Candidate Gore proposed to "increase the minimum wage to keep pace with inflation." (p. 127)
- **In the Clinton/Gore Welfare Information packet,** Candidate Clinton and Vice-President Candidate Gore proposed to make the minimum wage a fair wage, and index it to inflation because "working people shouldn't have to lose purchasing power just because of inflation." [Clinton/Gore Welfare Information Packet, September 9, 1992]
- **On October 30, 1992,** the *Star Tribune* wrote that Candidate Clinton wants to "increase the minimum wage to keep pace with inflation and expand the earned income tax credit to guarantee no full-time workers lives in poverty." [Star Tribune, October 30, 1992]

AUGUST 1993: PRESIDENT CLINTON EXPANDS EITC AS FIRST STEP TO MAKE WORK PAY. In 1993, President Clinton took the first necessary step to achieving the goal of ensuring that anyone who worked full-time didn't have to bring up their children in poverty: he expanded the Earned Income Tax Credit to provide a tax break for 15 million of our most hard-pressed households.

- **In April of 1993, *The Washington Post* wrote that:** "Mr. Clinton's goal is ambitious: to make sure that in households with children where at least one person works full-time, the family won't fall below the poverty line. Under current law, the maximum EITC benefit for a family with two or more children was scheduled to rise to \$ 2,000 next year; Mr. Clinton would boost the maximum to \$3,370 by 1995. He would also raise the benefits for families with one child and establish a small new credit for workers without children....*On top of this, Mr. Clinton would try to boost the earnings of the working poor by hiking the minimum wage.*" [The Washington Post, April 20, 1993 -- emphasis added]

IN 1994 PRESIDENT CLINTON FOUGHT FOR UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE -- WHICH WOULD HAVE BEEN THE EQUIVALENT OF A MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE FOR MILLIONS OF LOW-WAGE WORKERS. NONETHELESS, HE STILL MAINTAINED HIS SUPPORT FOR A MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE.

- **JUNE OF 1994, *THE WASHINGTON POST* WROTE THAT:** "From health-care reform to *a higher minimum wage* to more training opportunities to increased earned-income tax credits to mandatory fringe benefits, the Clinton administration wants to increase dramatically the income security of the more than 6 million American adults whom it classifies as the 'working poor.'" [The Washington Post, June 26, 1994 -- emphasis added]

1995: PRESIDENT CLINTON PROPOSES MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE TO FULFILL COMMITMENT TO MAKE WORK PAY. On February 3, 1995, President Clinton put forward his proposal to increase the minimum wage from \$4.25 to \$5.15 over two years in two equal steps. This proposal would directly benefit 10 million American workers.

- **In his 1995 State of the Union, President Clinton called for Congress to raise the minimum wage:** "The goal of building the middle class and shrinking the underclass is also why I believe that you should raise the minimum wage. It rewards work. Two and a half million Americans -- 2.5 million Americans, often women with children, are working out there today for \$4.25 an hour. In terms of real buying power, by next year that minimum wage will be at a 40-year low. That's not my idea of how the new economy ought to work.

Now, I've studied the arguments and the evidence for and against a minimum wage increase. I believe the weight of the evidence is that a modest increase does not cost jobs, and may even lure people back into the job market. But the most important thing is, you can't make a living on \$4.25 an hour. Especially if you have children, even with the working families tax cut we passed last year. In the past, the minimum wage has been a bipartisan issue, and I think it should be again. So I want to challenge you to have honest hearings on this; to get together; to find a way to make the minimum wage a living wage.

Members of Congress have been here less than a month, but by the end of the week, 28 days into the new year, every member of Congress will have earned as much in congressional salary as a minimum wage worker makes all year long." [State of the Union Address to the Nation, January 25, 1995]

- **On February 3, 1995, President Clinton proposed raising the minimum wage from \$4.25 to \$5.15:** "Our job is to create enough opportunity for people to earn a living if they'll exercise the responsibility to work. That's why we fought so hard to expand the earned income tax credit - a working family tax cut for 15 million families - in 1993; precisely why we're calling on Congress today to raise the minimum wage 90 cents to \$5.15 per hour.

The only way to grow the middle class and shrink the underclass is to make work pay. And in terms of real buying power, the minimum wage will be at a 40-year low next year if we do not raise it above \$4.25 an hour. If we're serious- let me say this, too, emphatically- if we are serious about welfare reform, then we have a clear obligation to make work attractive and to reward people who are willing to work hard...

If in 1990, because the minimum wage had not been raised in such a long time, a Republican president and a Democratic Congress could raise the minimum wage, surely in 1995 - facing the prospect that work, full-time work, could be at a 40-year low in buying power unless we act - a Congress with a Republican majority and a Democratic president can do the same for the American people." [Announcement by President Bill Clinton of Minimum Wage Increase, February 3, 1995]

- **JUNE, 1995. At town hall meeting with Speaker Gingrich, the President reiterated his support for a minimum wage increase:** "The reason that I am for it is that I believe that -- first of all, I know that a significant percentage of people on the minimum wage are women workers raising their kids on their own. And I just believe that we shouldn't allow -- if we don't raise the minimum wage this year, then next year, after you adjust for inflation, it will be at a 40-year low...

And I believe, if you go back to when they did it when -- the last time it was done was, when, '89 or something, I think, on balance, we did fine as a result of doing it. And I think we should do it again. [Remarks by President Clinton, Speaker Gingrich at Senior Center in Claremont, N.H., June 11, 1995]

- **In May 1995, President Clinton calls for minimum wage increase:** "I believe it is especially important to women that we raise the minimum wage this year. Women represent three out of five minimum wage workers, but only half the work force. I have done everything I could to create a climate in which people are encouraged to be successful parents and successful workers. I believe that. That's what the Earned Income Tax Credit was all about in 1993... But it isn't enough. If we do not raise the minimum wage this year, next year it will be in real dollar terms, the lowest it has been in 40 years. Now that is not my idea of what the 21st century American economy is all about. [Remarks at Women's Bureau Reception, May 19, 1995]

- **On Labor Day 1995, President Clinton tells California that the minimum wage should be raised:** "I also think we ought to raise the minimum wage. Let me tell you, if we don't raise the minimum wage this year, on January the 1st of next year, our minimum wage in terms of what the money will buy will be at a 40-year low. I want a high-wage, high-growth, high-opportunity, not a hard-work, low-wage 21st century. And I think you do, too. And that's what we ought to do." [Remarks at the Dedication of California State University at Monterey Bay in Monterey, California, September 4, 1995]

1996 PRESIDENT REITERATES HIS CALL FOR AN INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE

- **Speech to Keene State College, New Hampshire.** "[A]mong the greatest heroes in this country are the people who work 40 hours a week and do their best to raise their kids and only make the minimum wage. If we do not raise the minimum wage, this year it will drop to a 40-year low in terms of what it will buy. There is always a lot talk in Washington about family values. It's hard to raise a family on \$4.25 an hour. Let's raise the minimum wage." [President Clinton, Keene, New Hampshire, February 17, 1996]

- **1996 State of the Union Address.** "More and more Americans are working hard without a raise. Congress sets the minimum wage. Within a year, the minimum wage will fall to a 40-year low in purchasing power. Four dollars and 25 cents an hour is no longer a minimum wage, but millions of Americans and their children are trying to live on it. I challenge you to raise their minimum wage." [President Clinton, State of the Union Address to Congress, January 23, 1996]



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

May 2, 1996

96 MAY 2 10:45

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT
THE VICE-PRESIDENT

FROM: KATHLEEN A. McGINTY

CC: LEON PANETTA
JOHN HILLEY

RE: FOLLOW UP TO MEETING WITH ALASKANS ON ANWR

I have attached a news article from an Alaskan paper about comments you made in Anchorage about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) that received considerable attention and created confusion about your position on this subject. My office already received many phone calls as a result of this article, and I was contacted personally by Governor Knowles about this.

In addition, I have prepared for your consideration a follow-up memo to the meeting you had with the Alaskan delegation which rebuts many of the issues they raised regarding opening ANWR to oil and gas development. I am concerned that we continue to have a clear, solid position on this issue because oil industry representatives will argue that we should open ANWR to development as a response to rising gasoline prices.

Fairbanks Daily News Miner 4/16/96

Clinton noncommittal on ANWR

The Associated Press

ANCHORAGE—President Clinton says oil and gas drilling on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and logging on the Tongass are at the top of his agenda as he tries to balance development with protecting the environment.

The president made the comments during a brief refueling stop early today at Elmendorf Air Force Base.

Clinton was beginning a week-long, round-the-world journey where he'll be dealing with a number of security problems involving the Korea, Japan and Russia.

The president was noncommittal when asked whether he would change his mind and allow oil and gas drilling on ANWR.

"I don't know," Clinton said, indicating that he had listened to the views of Alaska's congressional delegation.

"We have continued to work not only in Alaska but all across America on the whole issue of reconciling development and the environment. We continue to look for ways to do it.

"As you know right now, the more imminent issue in Congress is whether we can pass a budget for the Interior Department that deals with the question of the Tongass. And that is the one I think

that concerns Alaska that will be up on the plate in the next couple of weeks.

"And we work very hard out here to try to deal the legitimate interests of the small loggers and try to do some work there while preserving the old growth trees that are virtually irreplaceable," the president said. "I'm hoping that can be worked out."

Clinton also said during his news conference on the Elmendorf tarmac that the situation on the Korean peninsula was "much better than it was three years ago."

He was scheduled to arrive in Seoul later Monday for his first official stop on the foreign policy journey.

Reinforcing the administration's theme, the trip comes at a time of troubling tensions on the Korean peninsula and just weeks after China's menacing missile tests off the coast of Taiwan.

"We're working on ways not only to keep the nuclear problem under control and eventually eliminate it but also to try to do what we can to promote an ultimate reconciliation and an end to the (Korean) conflict," Clinton said. "If that could happen, then the world would be a much safer place—the whole world."

**REBUTTAL POINTS FOR ALASKA DELEGATION'S ARGUMENTS
ON THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE (ANWR)**

(April 26, 1996)

JOBS

1. The Alaska delegation and oil industry claim that opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil development would create up to 735,000 jobs. Isn't this important enough to justify opening the Refuge?

This claim of job growth is based on completely unrealistic assumptions contained in a study carried out by the American Petroleum Institute (API) . The Tellus Institute economists examined the API study, and found that drilling ANWR would have, at most, one-sixth of the employment benefit API forecasts, even if oil is found.

The API study assumes that 9.25 billion barrels of oil could be extracted from ANWR and that the oil would be economically recoverable because the price of oil would be \$38 a barrel, double today's price. In fact, the Department of Interior (DOI) estimates that there is only a 1% chance that this much oil would be extracted, and only a 19% chance of finding any oil at all. The Energy Information Administration estimates only a modest, if any, increase in the price of oil. Finally, more than 70% of the job creation claimed would result from a projected drop in oil prices following ANWR drilling -- unlikely, since ANWR's output would amount, at most, to just 0.7% of world production.

Finally, according to the Tellus Institute, conservation and efficiency programs, including pursuing renewable energy sources, could generate many more jobs than this oil exploration. For example, weatherization of all homes across the country could save as much energy as moves down the Trans-Alaska pipeline, and could create up to 6-7 million jobs over the next 8-9 years.

LABOR

2. Doesn't organized labor support drilling because of jobs?

The Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers have opposed drilling; the AFL-CIO has not taken a position on this issue.

FOOTPRINT IMPACT

3. Wouldn't the "footprint" of this development be less than the area of Dulles airport?

This comparison is misleading. The roads and pipelines would not be concentrated in a compact area. The existing Prudhoe Bay oil fields sprawl over an 800 square mile area even though the direct "footprint" of gravel fill and extraction is approximately 10-12,000 acres. In ANWR, the sprawling

complex would likely include 280 miles of roads, hundred of miles of pipelines, 11 production facilities 2 ports and housing and services for thousands of people. Up to 50 million cubic yards of gravel would be mined from stream beds and elsewhere for roads and well pads. In addition, the "footprint" argument ignores air and noise pollution.

WILDLIFE

4. How would the industrial complex necessary for development affect the "biological heart" of the Refuge?

This complex would invade a wilderness area unique to the North Slope. Unlike Prudhoe Bay or other areas in which drilling is permitted, the coastal plain is the nation's most important polar bear denning habitat on land; up to 300,000 snow geese feed there in the fall; and the Porcupine caribou calving ground is very concentrated. According to the Dept. of Interior, oil development would likely result in a decrease or change in the distribution of 20--40% in the caribou population, 50% in the numbers of snow geese using the areas; and 25-50% decrease in muskox populations.

In addition, we are obligated to uphold international agreements and treaties to protect this sensitive international habitat for porcupine caribou (1987 agreement with Canada); polar bears (1973 agreement with 5 nations); and migratory birds such as snow geese (4 bilateral agreements).

CARIBOU

5. What about the caribou? In Prudhoe Bay the herd has increased six fold since development began.

This ignores important differences between the Porcupine caribou herd using the refuge and the much smaller herd near Prudhoe Bay. The Porcupine herd of 152,000 animals is nearly 10 times the size of the caribou herd around Prudhoe Bay. The Porcupine herd's calving area is far more concentrated in the narrow coastal plain area, and the herd gathers in a spectacle reminiscent of Africa's Serengeti in an annual migration to the critical calving and post-calving area. A 1993 study by International Porcupine Caribou Board scientists concluded that there is no alternative to the sensitive habitats in the coastal plain used for calving and post-calving by this herd. Thus, disruption of this calving area would result in declining growth rate due to low calf production.

In addition, there is growing evidence of the effect of Prudhoe Bay development on that herd. In the last ten years the herd has been displaced from some preferred calving areas, and birth rates in the herd there have declined.

NATIVE AMERICANS

6. What is the position of Native Americans living in the region?

There are two distinct groups of Native Americans living in or near ANWR. The Gwichi'in Indians

retain a more traditional subsistence way of life, and support wilderness designation for ANWR. The North Slope Inupiat Eskimos receive oil taxes from Prudhoe Bay and support drilling in ANWR, although they oppose offshore drilling permitted by the Administration.

The Canadian government; the National Congress of American Indians; the Tanana Chiefs Conference; the Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments; over 40 tribes, Native and First Nations from the U.S. and Canada; and the Episcopal church and other religious organizations join the Gwich'in opposition.

GWICHI'IN OPPOSITION

7. What is the basis of the Gwichi'in opposition?

The 7,000 Gwichi'in Indians are one of the most traditional surviving native cultures today. They live in Arctic Village on the south side of the Refuge, just outside the boundary, and on the migratory path of the caribou to the ANWR calving grounds. Over the past decade they have subsisted on an average of 3,000-5,000 caribou per year. If the herd is disrupted many people may have to leave their villages to survive.

The bill has vague language about Native Alaskan hire, but contains no requirement. The Gwichi'in Indians view any such requirement as blackmail, and say "do not ask us to trade caribou for money." Even were such a requirement in place, there is no assurance on Native American jobs. The Trans-Alaska right of way lease agreement had a requirement for Native Alaskan hire that was violated for over a decade by Alyeska.

INUPIAT SUPPORT

8. Why do the Inupiat support drilling? Is their current share of oil revenues declining?

There are about 250 Inupiat in the village of Kaktovik on an island on the north side of the Refuge. They average about 100 caribous harvested a year. Unlike the Gwichi'in, the Inupiat are primarily dependent on marine resources such as the bowhead whale. Accordingly, they oppose offshore oil and gas drilling.

They are stockholders in the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation which owns nearly 5 million acres on the North Slope, most of which is available for oil leasing and development. The Corporation had net income of over \$96 million in 1994 to be divided among 6300 stockholders, so the income to the Inupiat is considerable. In 1993, the GAO found that the Trans-Alaska pipeline and its revenue to Corporation stockholders, may remain viable until 2021 and that a known oil field, West Sak, is considered to be potentially the largest discovery since Prudhoe Bay.

STATES RIGHTS

9. Why shouldn't Alaskans determine the use of land in the state?

All Americans have a stake in, and concern for, our national wildlife refuges and parks. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the crown jewel of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The Coastal Plain was part of the original wildlife range established by President Eisenhower in 1960.

The State of Alaska owns 104.8 million acres in Alaska and was granted more lands -- and higher proportion of lands within its state -- under the Statehood Act than any other state. The State owns the valuable Prudhoe Bay oil fields and many other known oil fields, including some huge ones that are in the vicinity and untapped, and the 85% of the North Slope that already is open for oil development.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

DATE: 5/10/96

TO:  Andy Sens

FROM: Staff Secretary

We want to be sure
that NSC approves
of this response letter.

Thanks.

Helen Howell

DRAFT

96 MAY 10 09:29

Dear Jay:

Thank you for writing regarding the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) 1996 report on Agent Orange. I share your concerns regarding the possible ill effects to the children of Vietnam veterans previously exposed to herbicides.

I concur with your view that the task force, as established by Secretary Jesse Brown to evaluate the report's findings, be comprised of non VA experts who can address the potential effects on children. This group reflects that priority - it is a broadly based and multidisciplinary collective.

The task force is scheduled to complete its review and provide Secretary Brown with its recommendations on June 13. Although the Agent Orange Act of 1991 does not authorize a service connection for diseases occurring in the children of veterans, I have instructed the Secretary to both carefully evaluate the evidence with respect to each disease covered by the NAS report and to solicit the views of veterans organizations and other interested individuals. In addition, I have requested that the task force fully consider your recommendation that the issue be addressed within the comprehensive context of potential government responsibility for children of parents affected by any government caused environmental exposure. Upon review of these recommendations, I am confident that Secretary Brown will formulate an effective response.

Thanks again for taking the time to write on this important issue. I look forward to continued work together on this and other matters of importance to your constituents.

Sincerely,

The Honorable John D. Rockefeller, IV
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

5/10
Helen,
Ple Review -
Sign off by
VA
Susan

JAN K. SIMPSON, WYOMING, CHAIRMAN

STROM THURMOND, SOUTH CAROLINA
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, ALASKA
ARLEN SPECTER, PENNSYLVANIA
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, VERMONT
BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, COLORADO
LARRY E. CRAIG, IDAHOJOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, WEST VIRGINIA
BOB GRAHAM, FLORIDA
DANIEL K. AKAKA, HAWAII
PAUL WELLSTONE, MINNESOTA
PATTY MURPHY, WASHINGTONTHOMAS E. HARVEY, CHIEF COUNSEL/STAFF DIRECTOR
JIM GOTTLIEB, MINORITY CHIEF COUNSEL/STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6375

March 14, 1996

96 MAR 27
AIO: 54

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The National Academy of Sciences today issued a report -- *Veterans and Agent Orange, Update 1996* -- which, among other things, found "limited or suggestive" evidence of an association between veterans' service in Viet Nam and spina bifida in their children. This is a watershed event, representing the first time that so clear a possible connection between military service and health effects in offspring has been found by an independent scientific entity, such as the NAS.

I am gratified by Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown's prompt appointment of a task force to review the NAS report and provide recommendations within 90 days on how VA should respond to it. However, I am concerned that the issue of the appropriate federal response to health effects in offspring that may result from parental exposure -- including both meeting the children's health care needs and compensating the affected families -- merits attention from entities outside of VA as well.

I take this position for a number of reasons. First, questions of how to deal with offspring of veterans is not an area in which VA has any particular expertise. The vast preponderance of the Department's work is directed to veterans, and deciding how to meet the needs of offspring may call for an entirely different perspective. I also anticipate there are many situations, other than those involving military service, in which this issue of governmental responsibility to the offspring of individuals exposed to environmental hazards arises.

Therefore, I urge that you promptly appoint a task force, made up of representatives from various departments and agencies, such as the Departments of Health and Human Services, Defense, the Environmental Protection Agency, and others -- including VA, of course -- to advise you on this issue.

11A10

The Honorable William J. Clinton
March 14, 1996
Page 2

The task force should be directed to make recommendations to you on what the federal government's response should be to offspring of individuals who may have been harmed by governmental actions. This should include, of course, the offspring of veterans exposed during their service to environmental hazards, such as dioxin, ionizing radiation, or any of the many hazards associated with service in the Persian Gulf. It should also look at other situations in which governmental action may have caused harm to the offspring of the individual exposed to the hazard.

Thank you for your attention to this request and for your deep commitment to the health of America's children, as well as your strong support for our Nation's veterans.

Sincerely,



John D. Rockefeller IV
Ranking Minority Member