Chron

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Date 7/9

To: Chris Jennings

From: The Staff Secretary

I think you should probably put a cover note/memo on this before I forward it to POTUS. Give me a call.

Phil Caplan

ID# 225159

THE WHITE HOUSE
CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

INCOMING

DATE RECEIVED: JULY 02, 1997

NAME OF CORRESPONDENT: THE HONORABLE DONNA E. SHALALA

SUBJECT: ENCLOSES BRUCE VLADECK'S MEMO ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE NIGHTMARE CREATED BY THE ROTH --MOYNIHAN INCOME RELATED PREMIUM

ROUTE TO: OFFICE/AGENCY (STAFF NAME)	ACTION: ACT CODE	ACTION: DATE YY/MM/DD	DISPOSITION: TYPE RESP	DISPOSITION: C COMPLETED D YY/MM/DD
KATHRYN "KITTY" HIGGINS	ORG	97/07/02		/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:				
		/ /		/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:				
		/ /		/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:				
		/ /		/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:				
		/ /		/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:				

COMMENTS: ENCCLOSURES

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENTS: MEDIA:L INDIVIDUAL CODES:

__ MAIL USER CODES: (A)__________ (B)__________ (C)__________

*ACTION CODES:	*DISPOSITION	*OUTGOING *CORRESPONDENCE:
*A-APPROPRIATE ACTION	*A-ANSWERED	*TYPE RESP=INITIALS OF SIGNER
*C-COMMENT/RECOM	*B-NON-SPEC-REFERRAL	CODE = A
*D-DRAFT RESPONSE	*C-COMPLETED	*COMPLETED = DATE OF OUTGOING
*F-FURNISH FACT SHEET	*S-SUSPENDED	
*I-INFO COPY/NO ACT NEC		
*R-DIRECT REPLY W/COPY		
*S-FOR-SIGNATURE		
*X-INTERIM REPLY		

REFER QUESTIONS AND ROUTING UPDATES TO CENTRAL REFERENCE (ROOM 75,OEOB) EXT-2590
KEEP THIS WORKSHEET ATTACHED TO THE ORIGINAL INCOMING LETTER AT ALL TIMES AND SEND COMPLETED RECORD TO RECORDS MANAGEMENT.

8

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

THE SECRETARY

JUN 27 1997

NOTE TO THE PRESIDENT

I am enclosing Bruce Vladeck's memo on the administrative nightmare created by the Roth-Moynihan income related premium.

Donna E. Shalala

Enclosure

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Health Care Financing Administration

The Administrator
Washington, D.C. 20201

JUN 24 1997

225159

To: Nancy-Ann Min DeParle
Associate Director for Health
Office of Management and Budget

From: Bruce C. Vladeck
Administrator
Health Care Financing Administration

Subject: Income-Related Premium Proposals

An income-related premium proposal for Part B of Medicare is being considered during the Senate Budget Reconciliation discussions. Apart from whether the Administration supports such a policy, there are a few issues about how the policy should be designed. This memo discusses two critical design issues: (1) the administration of an income-related premium, and (2) the maximum beneficiary contribution.

The Senate amendment, offered by Roth-Moynihan, would be administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The income-related premium would begin for single beneficiaries at $50,000 and be phased-in between $50,000 and $100,000 and begin at $75,000 for couples and be phased-in between $75,000 and $125,000. Of the savings from the proposal, $1.5 billion will be used for block grants to states to protect low-income beneficiaries against Part B premium increases.

<u>Administration of an Income-Related Medicare Part B Premium</u>

An income-related Medicare Part B premium proposal should be administered by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), rather than HHS. The income-related premium in the Administration's Health Security Act was administered by the IRS. In addition, the income-related premium was administered by the IRS in the 1988 Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act (before that law was repealed).

<u>Collection of the income related premium through the income tax system is much simpler than administration by HHS.</u> IRS could administer it by adding one line to the 1040 tax form for the beneficiary's specific liability and some language to the instructions for the beneficiary to calculate their liability. It would be more convenient for beneficiaries for IRS, rather than HHS, to administer the income related premium.

<u>In contrast, administration by HHS would be a formidable undertaking.</u> HHS does not now collect information on beneficiary income. In addition to serious concerns about the privacy of information regarding income, there would be a 2 or 3 year delay in information provided by the

JUL 1 - 1997

IRS. In fact, these problems in administration of an income-related premium by HHS have led CBO to use estimate that at least 30 percent less would be collected if administered by HHS, rather than IRS. Among the issues are:

(1) IRS would have to provide HHS with beneficiary income information since HHS does not have such information. And IRS would need to supply beneficiary income information for a year to HHS twice, first to estimate income and then to reconcile actual and estimated income.

(2) The income information provided by IRS would be two or three years old, depending on how quickly IRS could supply income data to HHS. For example, tax return information from 1996 may not be available early enough in 1997 to give HHS enough time to estimate 1998 income, give beneficiaries an opportunity to challenge the estimate, and get billings systems ready before 1998. As a result, 1995 IRS income data might be needed to estimate 1998 beneficiary incomes.

(3) Use of income data two or three years old is problematic. It would be inherently confusing. In addition, past income is not a good indicator of a Medicare beneficiary's future income. For example, if a beneficiary had a capital gain in 1995, that gain would be included in the beneficiary's 1995 income used to project 1998 income. Similarly, beneficiaries' earning prior to retirement would result in overstated estimates of current income in many cases.

(4) Since beneficiaries would have to be given an opportunity to refute the HHS estimate of their income, beneficiaries could be confused about why they had to supply income data to two government agencies, IRS and HHS. And they might be confused about why income projected by HHS was based on an earlier year than the income for which they had several months earlier filed a tax return.

(5) HHS would have to bill and collect income-related premiums quarterly from as many as 2 million high-income beneficiaries. If high-income beneficiaries did not make payments, they would be terminated from Medicare Part B coverage. It is unlikely that HHS could give SSA information on beneficiary's income related premium status and ask SSA to withhold the right amounts from monthly benefits.

(6) IRS would have to send HHS each high income beneficiary's income after the beneficiary filed their tax returns and HHS would have to reconcile estimated and actual income and collect underpayments from or refund overpayments to beneficiaries. If a beneficiary had died, collections and refunds would have to be made to the surviving spouse or estate. All these issues could likely lead to contention between beneficiaries and HHS.

The somewhat analogous administration of the retirement earnings test through the Social Security Administration (SSA) has provided a disproportionate share of the administrative workload of that agency and is one of the primary sources of beneficiary confusion and dissatisfaction with SSA.

Collecting and reconciling information about beneficiary incomes would be an entirely new function for HHS, one that some beneficiaries may not find appropriate, given the sensitivity of such information. In an era of ever more constrained funding for program administration, requiring HHS to take on these administrative functions without a significant increase in administrative funding and number of employees (FTEs) would be nearly impossible.

Requiring HHS to take on these new duties, which are well beyond the scope and capabilities of the agency at present, would also subject HHS to harsh and unwarranted criticism. This would be particularly counterproductive for HHS, which has devoted considerable effort in recent years to increasing beneficiaries' trust in the agency.

The Maximum Beneficiary Contribution

The Administration's Health Security Act proposed that beneficiaries pay a maximum contribution of 75 percent at or above the top income level. We proposed a 25 percent subsidy for the highest income beneficiaries.

There is an important rationale for this policy. If the entire subsidy is removed, the younger and healthier persons among highest income beneficiaries would have strong incentives to drop out of Part B coverage. On average, Medicare spending for high-income beneficiaries is about 15 percent lower than for all beneficiaries. Since their average expenses would be considerably less than their Part B premium contributions, they could probably purchase a Part B benefit package privately, at less cost than a Medicare premium equal to 100 percent of the average cost for all aged beneficiaries. If a significant number of high-income beneficiaries dropped out, it would raise costs for those who remain.

cc: Secretary Shalala
Chris Jennings

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 9, 1997

TO: Erskine Bowles
John Podesta
Rahm Emanuel

FR: Phil Caplan Phil

RE: FYI - NAFTA report to Congress

The NAFTA legislation requires the President to submit to Congress a comprehensive report on the operation and effect of NAFTA. Attached is a *draft* NSC/NEC memo to the President asking for his approval to send the report to Congress (a letter and executive summary of the report is attached). Sandy has not signed off on the memo yet, but I expect he will.

I don't think you need to do much here, but I just wanted to give you a heads-up that this is happening.

According to the cover memo, NSC/NEC expects a "skeptical reception" by the press as we have been accused of overselling NAFTA during the legislative fight. The press will be looking for signs that the Administration is trying to downplay NAFTA in response to a backlash among Democrats. NSC/NEC says the report provides a credible defense of NAFTA and carefully avoids either overselling NAFTA's success or being defensive.

Once I get a final memo, I'll send this to the road for the President's approval. It's my understanding that NSC/NEC intends to release the report publicly on Friday.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL R. BERGER
GENE SPERLING GBS
DANIEL K. TARULLO
JOHN HILLEY

SUBJECT: Report to Congress on the Operation and Effect of NAFTA

Purpose

To transmit to Congress a report on the operation and effect of NAFTA, as required by the NAFTA Implementation Act.

Background

The NAFTA implementing legislation requires you to submit to Congress a "comprehensive study on the operation and effect" of NAFTA, including on U.S. income, employment, trade, wages and investment at the aggregate and industry levels. The study must also review NAFTA's effect on the Mexican economy, Mexico's enforcement of labor and environmental laws, wages and working conditions in Mexico and pollution abatement along the southwest border. The deadline for the report was July 1, 1997, but the release was delayed pending Members' return this week.

The report is certain to attract extensive public scrutiny and comment. A coalition of NAFTA opponents held a press conference to release their own three-year review of NAFTA, which was informatively entitled, *The Failed Experiment*. Opponents of fast track are looking for evidence of NAFTA's alleged failure to bolster their case against further trade opening south of the border.

We expect a skeptical reception by the press. Although the elite media has been generally supportive of NAFTA, recent reporting has criticized the Administration for "overselling" NAFTA during the fight over its passage. Moreover, the press will be looking for signs that the Administration is trying to downplay NAFTA in response to a backlash among Democrats.

cc: the Vice President
the Chief of Staff
Mack McLarty

Against that backdrop, we plan a solid but low-key roll-out. The report provides a credible defense of NAFTA and carefully avoids either overselling NAFTA's success or being defensive. The core findings are:

- Controlling for the effects of the peso crisis, NAFTA has had a modest positive effect on the U.S. economy. DRI's estimates suggest that NAFTA contributed roughly $13 billion to U.S. income in 1996, controlling for the peso crisis.

- Mexico's recession is the culprit on the bilateral trade deficit -- not NAFTA. Indeed, outside studies estimate that NAFTA boosted exports to Mexico between $7 and $12 billion, compared to an increase in imports of $3 to $5 billion.

- NAFTA has boosted jobs supported by exports to Mexico by 95,000 to 165,000.

- At the sectoral level, the U.S. and Mexican markets have become increasingly integrated under NAFTA. American companies have captured 82 percent of Mexico's motor vehicle import market, an increase of over 11 percentage points since 1993; 92 percent of Mexico's cash grain import market, an increase of 5 percentage points; and 81 percent of Mexico's electronic components imports.

- Indeed, if current trends continue, Mexico is on track to surpass Japan as our second largest export destination -- even though Mexico is one twelfth the size of Japan.

- Apparel and textiles is the only sector where NAFTA has been associated with dislocation, but imports from Mexico have largely displaced imports with lower U.S. content from other regions. Similar to the footwear industry, apparel employment has been on a downward trend that started long before NAFTA was signed.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign an introductory letter for publication with the report and a letter transmitting the report to Congress.

Attachments

Tab A	Introductory Letter
Tab B	Transmittal to the Congress
Tab C	*Study on the Operation and Effect of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)*

Letter from President Clinton:

I am pleased to transmit the enclosed Study on the Operation and Effect of the North American Free Trade Agreement, as required by the NAFTA Implementation Act. The Congress and the Administration are right to be proud of this historic agreement. This report provides solid evidence that the NAFTA has already proved its worth to the United States during the three years it has been in effect. We can look forward to realizing NAFTA's full benefits in the years ahead.

NAFTA has also contributed to the prosperity and stability of our closest neighbors and two of our most important trading partners. NAFTA aided Mexico's rapid recovery from a severe economic recession, even as that country carried forward a democratic transformation of historic proportions.

NAFTA is an integral part of a broader growth strategy that has produced the strongest U.S. economy in a generation. This strategy rests on three mutually supportive pillars: deficit reduction, investing in our people through education and training, and opening foreign markets to allow America to compete in the global economy. The success of that strategy can be seen in the strength of the American economy, which continues to experience strong investment, low unemployment, healthy job creation and subdued inflation.

Export growth has been central to America's expansion. NAFTA, together with the Uruguay Round Agreement, the Information Technology Agreement, the WTO Telecommunications Agreement, 22 sectoral trade agreements with Japan, and over 170 other trade agreements have contributed to overall U.S. real export growth of 37 percent since 1993. Exports have contributed nearly one third of our economic growth -- and have grown three times faster than overall income.

Workers, business executives, small business owners and farmers across America have contributed to the resurgence in American competitiveness. The ability and determination of working people across America to rise to the challenges of rapidly changing technologies and global economic competition is a great source of strength for this nation.

Cooperation between the Administration and the Congress on a bipartisan basis has been critical in our efforts to reduce the deficit, to conclude trade agreements that level the playing field for Americans abroad, to secure peace and prosperity along America's borders and to help prepare all Americans to benefit from expanded economic opportunities. I hope we can continue working together to advance these vital goals in the years to come.

William J. Clinton

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) entered into force on January 1, 1994. In accordance with Section 512 of the NAFTA Implementation Act, 19 U.S.C. section 3462, this report provides a comprehensive study of the operation and effects of the NAFTA, including the economic effects in aggregate and in selected manufacturing, service, and agricultural sectors and implementation of the NAFTA environmental and labor agreements. This report reviews the findings from a variety of outside studies and analyzes Mexican and U.S. data, attempting wherever possible to isolate the effects of the NAFTA from other factors, as stipulated in the statute.

TRADE IN NORTH AMERICA

U.S. trade with Canada and Mexico is much larger relative to the size of these economies than with any other trading partners, in large part reflecting shared land borders and geographical proximity. Since NAFTA has been in effect, the trend toward North American integration has accelerated.

- In 1996, nearly one-third of U.S. two-way trade in goods with the world was with Canada and Mexico ($421 billion). Two-way trade with our NAFTA partners has grown 44 percent since the NAFTA was signed, compared with 33 percent for the rest of the world.
- Canada was in 1993 -- and remains today -- our largest trading partner, accounting for $290 billion in two-way trade. U.S. goods exports to Canada were up by 34 percent to a record $134.2 billion in 1996.
- U.S. exports to Mexico grew by 37 percent (or $15.2 billion) from 1993 to 1996, despite a 3 percent contraction in Mexican domestic demand over the same period.
- Exports to Mexico were up by 55 percent in the first four months of 1997 relative to the same period in 1993. If 1997 export trends continue, Mexico is on track to surpass Japan as our second largest export market -- even though Mexico's economy is one twelfth the size of Japan's economy.

TRADE BARRIERS UNDER NAFTA

Under NAFTA, Mexico has reduced its trade barriers on U.S. exports significantly, while the United States -- which started with much lower tariffs-- has made smaller reductions.

- Before NAFTA was signed, Mexican applied tariffs on U.S. goods averaged 10 percent. U.S. tariffs on Mexican imports averaged 2.07 percent, and over half of Mexican imports entered the United States duty-free.

- Since NAFTA was signed, Mexico has reduced its average applied tariffs on U.S. imports by 7 percentage points, compared with reductions of 1.5 percentage points in the United States The United States would have made some of these tariff reductions under the Uruguay Round even in the absence of NAFTA.

- Because of NAFTA, U.S. exporters face an average tariff of 2.9 percent in Mexico's market, approximately 10 percentage points lower than the average tariff Mexico applies to other countries.

NAFTA'S EFFECTS ON THE U.S. ECONOMY

Several outside studies conclude that NAFTA contributed to America's economic expansion. NAFTA had a modest positive effect on U.S. net exports, income, investment and jobs supported by exports.

- Several outside studies conclude that NAFTA has resulted in a modest increase in U.S. net exports. DRI estimates NAFTA boosted real exports to Mexico by $12 billion in 1996, compared to a smaller real increase in imports of $5 billion, controlling for Mexico's financial crisis. A Dallas Federal Reserve study finds that NAFTA raised exports by roughly $7 billion and imports by roughly $4 billion. The relatively greater effect on exports partly reflects the fact that Mexico has reduced its tariffs roughly 4 times more than the United States under NAFTA.

- DRI estimates that NAFTA contributed $13 billion to U.S. real income and $5 billion in business investment in 1996, controlling for Mexico's financial crisis.

- These estimates suggest that NAFTA has boosted jobs associated with exports to Mexico between roughly 90,000 and 160,000. The Department of Commerce estimates that the jobs supported by exports generally pay 13 to 16 percent more than the national average for nonsupervisory production positions.

NAFTA'S EFFECTS ON THE MEXICAN ECONOMY

In 1995, Mexico experienced its most severe economic recession since the 1930's. This report examines the effects of NAFTA on Mexico's economy by comparing Mexico's recovery in 1996 with Mexico's recovery from its last financial crisis in 1982, when NAFTA was not in effect. It finds that both the Mexican economy and American exports recovered more rapidly following the

1995 crisis than the 1982 crisis, in part because of the economic reforms locked in by NAFTA and Mexico's strong economic adjustment program.

- Following Mexico's 1982 financial crisis, Mexican output drifted down for nearly two years before rising again and did not recover to pre-crisis levels for five years. Although Mexican economic output dropped more quickly in 1995, it also rebounded more quickly, reaching pre-crisis peaks by the end of 1996. Similarly, following the 1982 crisis, it took Mexico 7 years to return to international capital markets, while in 1995, it took 7 months.

- Following Mexico's 1982 financial crisis, Mexico raised tariffs by 100 percent, and American exports to Mexico fell by half and did not recover for seven years. In 1995, Mexico continued to implement its NAFTA obligations even as it raised tariffs on imports from other countries. As a result, American exports recovered in 18 months and were up 37 percent by the end of 1996 relative to pre-NAFTA levels, even though Mexican consumption is down 3 percent.

NAFTA'S EFFECTS IN KEY SECTORS

Under NAFTA, Mexico has made large reductions in tariff barriers in many sectors, compared with smaller U.S. reductions. Although analysis by the International Trade Commission (ITC) suggests it is hard to isolate the effects of NAFTA in many sectors, several sectors have experienced strong growth in trade with Mexico. In addition, U.S. exporters have expanded their share of Mexico's import markets in several large sectors.

- Since NAFTA went into effect, the U.S. share of Mexico's import market has grown from 69 percent to 75 percent. At the same time, Mexico's share of American imports has risen from 6.5 percent to 9.5 percent.

- American companies have captured 82 percent of Mexico's motor vehicle import market, an increase of over 11 percentage points since 1993; 92 percent of Mexico's cash grain import market, an increase of 5 percentage points; and 81 percent of Mexico's electronic components.

- Under NAFTA, Mexico tariff reductions of 9.0 percentage points on electronics products are more than 4 times greater than U.S. reductions; Mexican tariff reductions on transportation equipment of 10.2 percentage points are 10 times greater than U.S. reductions; and Mexican tariff reductions of 6.2 percentage points in the chemicals industry are more than 12 times greater than U.S. reductions.

- Reductions in trade barriers have contributed to significant gains in U.S. exports, despite the severe Mexican recession. The U.S. motor vehicle industry increased its exports to Mexico by over 550 percent between 1993 and 1996. U.S. manufacturing exports to Mexico were up by 156 percent in the electronic components industry, by 50 percent in the chemicals industry, by 58 percent in computers, and by 79 percent in textiles and apparel. The agriculture sector posted strong export gains of 43 <ck> percent to Mexico.

- In several industries that have experienced strong import growth from Mexico such as textiles and apparel, Mexican imports have largely displaced imports from other regions such as Asia, which have lower domestic U.S. content.

- In industries such as autos, chemicals, textiles and electronics, growing North American integration has taken place against the backdrop of strong growth in domestic employment, production and investment.

LABOR PROTECTION

The North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation (NAALC) established by the NAFTA for the first time provides a framework for North American cooperation on fundamental labor issues and enhanced enforcement of labor laws. Since the NAALC has been in effect, there is some that Mexico has made improvements on labor law enforcement.

- The NAALC submission process subjects member governments to public and international scrutiny for alleged violations of labor laws. In several cases, the submission process has led to meaningful changes in Mexico, including recognition of a union previously not recognized and permitting secret union ballots at two companies where union votes had previously been monitored.

- Between 1994 and 1996, Mexico's Secretariat of Labor and Social Welfare increased funding for enforcement of labor laws by almost 200 percent.

- Mexico reports a 30 percent reduction in the number of workplace injuries and illnesses between 1994 and 1996.

- Under the NAALC, the Canadian, Mexican, and U.S. governments have initiated cooperative efforts on a variety of labor issues, including occupational safety and health, employment and training, industrial relations, worker rights and child labor and gender issues.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

NAFTA includes mechanisms to address environmental problems that have long challenged communities along the 2000-mile shared border with Mexico. NAFTA's environmental agreements are also encouraging regional cooperation on broader environmental issues and improved enforcement of Mexican environmental laws.

- The United States and Mexico have launched a Border XXI program establishing five-year objectives for achieving and sustaining a clean border environment, confronting such challenges as pollution prevention, hazardous waste, and improved air and water quality.

- In addition, environmental institutions established under NAFTA have begun certifying and financing infrastructure projects designed to improve the environment along the border. To date, 16 projects have been certified. Construction has begun on a water treatment facility in Brawley, California a water supply project in Mercedes, Texas.

- The NAFTA Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) has strengthened trilateral cooperation on protection of health and conservation of the environment, in part by providing funding for projects to promote these objectives.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Date 7-9-97

To: Pete Selfridge

From: The Staff Secretary

The attached is forwarded to you for information.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
20250-0100

2/12/97

Mr. President —

You have been invited to address the Landon Lecture at Kansas State University. In my judgment, this is the leading University lecture series in America. All five of your predecessors have at one time given an address there (I even attempted a lecture there myself). I urge you to consider this forum.

Dan

KSU
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of the President

110 Anderson Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506–0112
913-532-6221
FAX: 913-532-7639

February 10, 1997

The Honorable Bill Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

Dear President Clinton:

On behalf of the students, faculty and alumni of Kansas State University, it is my pleasure to extend an invitation to you to appear as an Alfred M. Landon Lecturer on Public Issues. The Landon Lecture Series was inaugurated in 1966 as a tribute to the late Governor Alf Landon. President Bush, on the occasion of his Landon Lecture in 1985, called the Landon Lectures "America's most distinguished lecture series." The list of prominent individuals who have honored Kansas State University with their thoughts includes five U.S. Presidents, a Chief Justice, many cabinet officers, and members of the U.S. House and Senate. Some of the nation's leading economists and labor, business and theological leaders also have participated. The enclosed brochure includes a listing of earlier speakers in the Series.

Since the Landon Lecture of President Richard Nixon in 1970, every previous U.S. President has given a Landon Lecture. We hope you will join the list of distinguished speakers with your predecessors. In addition to U.S. Presidents, President Arias, President Duarte, and President Chamorro were Landon Lecturers during their presidencies.

As you can tell from the long list of Landon Lectures since 1966, we are prepared to handle all of the arrangements on very short notice and to accommodate your schedule.

Sincerely,

Jon Wefald

Jon Wefald
President

cc: U.S. Senator Pat Roberts
Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman
National Archivist John Carlin
Nancy Landon Kassebaum-Baker