

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Richard B. Bavier (BAVIER_R) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-AUG-1993 17:23:00.00

SUBJECT: One-pager from framework game

TO: Bonnie L. Deane (DEANE_B) (OPD)

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Sorry it took so long. Here's my one page summary.

Since the questions were first asked, back in the 1930s, the public has consistently told opinion surveys that it wants work-for-welfare. Long-term public support for spending on programs for low-income people depends on increasing the legitimacy of that spending in the mind of the electorate. For this and other reasons, a two-year transitional program followed by a something-less-than-full-time work requirement is the one essential piece of welfare reform. It would be so difficult to implement that all other reform elements should be designed to support work-for-welfare.

So, in addition to a two-year transitional program (with a mandatory job search requirement), National Programs over the foundation would include:

- a) a strong prevention campaign, with family planning at the core;
- b) more federalization of child support enforcement, along with changes to improve paternity establishment through both voluntary acknowledgement programs in maternity hospitals, and lower federal match of AFDC benefits in cases where states had not established paternity;
- c) a sub

-minimum wage for AFDC parents who go through the transitional program and end up in the post-transitional work-for-welfare program, supplemented with transfers to the family to make up the difference between the sub-minimum and minimum wage (the sub-minimum wage would be appropriate in light of their demonstrated inability to succeed in the regular labor market, and would be more likely to interest employers who are unwilling to participate in job subsidy programs with higher administrative costs).

Experimental add-ons would include Empowerment Zones, with some public sector jobs for very hard cases, and an experimental means-tested child support assurance that would be offered as an alternative to EITC for AFDC families.

There would be some significant costs associated with the post-transitional work-for-welfare and the child support federalization. I would try to design a phase-in plan, dealing first with applicants and only later (if ever) with recipients that could keep the costs around where the transition document said they might be.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Catherine R. Zoi (ZOI_C) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1994 10:26:00.00

SUBJECT: press q&a for POTUS

TO: William W. Stelle (STELLE_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Wesley P. Warren (WARREN_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Linda K. Breggin (BREGGIN_L) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Keith E. Laughlin (LAUGHLIN_K) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel P. Blank (BLANK_D) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew M. Riordan (RIORDAN_MM) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

CC: Kathleen A. McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

WH communications needs our assistance w/ Q&A. Please submit your Q&As to me by 3:00 at the latest. Think broadly. Thanks.

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

ATT CREATOR: Richard L. Siewert (SIEWERT_R)

ATT CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1994 08:56:00.00

ATT BODY PART TYPE: B

ATT SUBJECT: TALKING POINTS

ATT TO: Catherine R. Zoi (ZOI_C)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TEXT:

Cathy

Could you please have someone at OEP write up Q & A for a briefing book we are putting together for a possible press conference tomorrow? At a minimum, you might want to include Q & A on the California desert bill, the US position on family planning in

the UN action plan on population, the status of the Northwest Forest plan, feedback on the new grazing regs and the outlook for the water and drinking water bills. Anything else that you think may come up would be helpful. The Q & A itself should be fairly short, but feel free to send any back-up materials as well. Please send it to Mark Gearan's office by about 4:00 p.m. today. Thanks.

Jake Siewert X62100

The press conference itself is still tentative. I will let you know if they decide not to go forward.

Also have a suggested response to a possible overarching question on environmental policy. E.g. "As Earth Day approaches, this Administration has yet to demonstrate a firm commitment to protecting the environment. Please defend your record." Or something to that effect.

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 27-APR-1994 09:28:00.00

SUBJECT: Welfare Reform Decisions

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

CC: Kathryn J. Way (WAY_K) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

If you talk to the President this a.m. about welfare reform, you can explain the remaining issues to him much more concisely than the memo from HHS does. There are two main questions:

1. Family Cap
2. Teen Pregnancy

HHS's argument for leaving out the family cap is that it will anger the left. This is true, although we have no evidence that leaving it out will be near enough to get them to like our package.

Kathi and my argument for making the family cap a state option is that many Democratic govs really want us to do this for them, they don't want to have to beg for waivers from Mary Jo who hates the family cap, and this is certain to be part of what Congress passes so the President might as well get the credit on a very symbolic issue. At our last mtg with him 2 weeks ago, he said he thought we should give states flexibility on this.

There is a compromise position: we could make the family cap an explicit demonstration in the bill, and say that we were going to let the 10 states with the best proposals for teen prevention and family planning test the idea. This would calm the left a little (not a lot), but allow us to draw a defensible line: we don't know whether this idea works, but we think it's worth finding out. Mary Jo doesn't mind this compromise; David hates it.

The related issue is that if you do a state option family cap (or a demonstration option), how should you spend the approx. \$220 million it saves in the first 5 years? One option would be to spend it on additional working poor child care; the other option would be to spend it on teen pregnancy prevention.

In any event, we will have to deal with concerns from Galston, Belle, Edelman, Sperling, and many others that we need to spend more on teen pregnancy.

Thanks.

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

CREATOR: Isabel Sawhill (SAWHILL_I) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-OCT-1994 11:37:57.70

SUBJECT: A successful program - fyi

TO: Sheryll D. Cashin (CASHIN_S) (OPD)

READ: 3-OCT-1994 11:39:17.51

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 3-OCT-1994 10:31:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Richard B. Bavier

ATT SUBJECT: Quantum Opportunities Program

ATT TO: Isabel Sawhill (SAWHILL_I)

ATT CC: Marti E. Easton (EASTON_M)

ATT CC: Douglas L. Steiger (STEIGER_D)

ATT CC: Bernard H. Martin (MARTIN_B)

ATT CC: William A. Galston (GALSTON_W)

ATT CC: Paul R. Dimond (DIMOND_P)

ATT CC: Larry R. Matlack (MATLACK_L)

ATT CC: FAX (92053598,Howard Rolston) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:92053598\C:Howard Rolston

TEXT:

Larry shared with me the evaluation summary he mentioned in the urban youth meeting in your office the other week. The summary claims that the Quantum Opportunity Program produced statistically significant impacts on dropping-out, high-school completions, post-secondary education and training, volunteer activity, and childbearing!

The treatment targeted children in welfare families who were entering ninth-grade. A multi-service, year-round, program ran for four years. Activities included educational services (tutoring, computer-based instruction, and others), community service activities, and development activities (described as "health, alcohol, drug abuse, sex, family planning, arts, career, and college planning"). Participants received payments and bonuses for attendance and completion, and staff received incentive payments as well. I've described the Teen Parent

Demonstration and New Chance as Cadillacs. QOP was a Mercedes. An experimental evaluation design was followed, with a sample of welfare children assigned at random to treatment and control, and program staff told to get the treatment group to volunteer. The impacts were large. 21 percent lower dropout rates. 14 percent fewer children born.

Unfortunately, the samples were very small - only 25 treatment eligibles in each site. Moreover, sites varied a lot in their success at implementing the design, and participation varied a lot within sites too. I'm trying to get a copy of the full report to get a clearer picture. All the same, this is the most promising intervention I've seen.

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

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

CREATOR: Richard B. Bavier (BAVIER_R) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-OCT-1994 11:22:18.60

SUBJECT: Quantum Opportunities Program

TO: Isabel Sawhill (SAWHILL_I) (OMB)
READ: 3-OCT-1994 11:38:01.52

CC: Marti E. Easton (EASTON_M) (OMB)
READ: 3-OCT-1994 11:31:06.21

CC: Douglas L. Steiger (STEIGER_D) (OMB)
READ: 3-OCT-1994 11:23:56.96

CC: Bernard H. Martin (MARTIN_B) (OMB)
READ: 3-OCT-1994 11:38:38.51

CC: William A. Galston (GALSTON_W) (OPD)
READ: 3-OCT-1994 15:23:16.39

CC: Paul R. Dimond (DIMOND_P) (OPD)
READ: 3-OCT-1994 14:01:46.36

CC: Larry R. Matlack (MATLACK_L) (OMB)
READ: 3-OCT-1994 11:49:37.24

CC: FAX (92053598,Howard Rolston) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:92053598\C:Howard Rolston READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Larry shared with me the evaluation summary he mentioned in the urban youth meeting in your office the other week. The summary claims that the Quantum Opportunity Program produced statistically significant impacts on dropping-out, high-school completions, post-secondary education and training, volunteer activity, and childbearing!

The treatment targeted children in welfare families who were entering ninth-grade. A multi-service, year-round, program ran for four years. Activities included educational services (tutoring, computer-based instruction, and others), community service activities, and development activities (described as "health, alcohol, drug abuse, sex, family planning, arts, career, and college planning"). Participants received payments and bonuses for attendance and completion, and staff received incentive payments as well. I've described the Teen Parent Demonstration and New Chance as Cadillacs. QOP was a Mercedes. An experimental evaluation design was followed, with a sample of welfare children assigned at random to treatment and control, and program staff told to get the treatment group to volunteer. The impacts were large. 21 percent lower dropout rates. 14 percent fewer children born.

Unfortunately, the samples were very small - only 25 treatment eligibles in each site. Moreover, sites varied a lot in their success at implementing the design, and participation varied a lot within sites too. I'm trying to get a copy of the full report to get a clearer picture. All the same, this is the most promising intervention I've seen.

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-OCT-1994 20:20:40.50

SUBJECT: Women

TO: Christine M. Heenan (HEENAN_C) (OPD)

READ: 5-OCT-1994 09:19:48.39

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

Christine:

-- I would not make welfare a separate heading. I would try to include it under Children and Families or in the section on work/jobs/economic development.

-- I don't know what tense you are using. Mine is a little mixed. See if it works.

HEALTH CARE

? Women have a harder time getting health coverage than men. They are more likely to work part-time and in service, sales and household jobs without health insurance. Of the 16 million women without health insurance as of 1990, half of them had jobs. And those lucky enough to have insurance at all pay more; women ages 15 to 44 pay 68 percent more out-of-pocket for health care than their male counterparts.

President Clinton introduced his Health Security Act to guarantee affordable, secure health insurance to every American. The legislation covered a range of benefits that are essential for women -- like preventive services including mammograms and Pap smears, reproductive services, and prenatal care -- and invested in a new federal long-term care program. While the Congress will not pass health reform legislation this year, we have come further than ever before in the effort to reform our health care system. We will continue to fight next year for health security for all American families.

? The lifetime risk of developing breast cancer has risen from 1 in 20 women twenty years ago to 1 in every 8 today. It is estimated that in this decade, 1.5 million new cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed, and breast cancer will be responsible for nearly 500,000 deaths.

The Clinton Administration has taken unprecedented action to combat this deadly disease. Since President Clinton took office, federal funding for breast cancer research and prevention has increased substantially -- totaling \$650 million in fiscal year 1994 alone. In addition, the National Action Plan on Breast Cancer provides a blueprint for a partnership between government and the private sector to work to prevent, diagnose, treat and ultimately eradicate breast cancer.

? AIDS is spreading more rapidly among women than men. From 1989 to 1990 alone, there was a 34 percent increase in the number of women diagnosed with AIDS. In New York City, AIDS is the leading cause of death among women age 24 to 44.

The Clinton Administration has created the National Task Force on AIDS Drug Development that is charged with expediting the search for new therapies against AIDS and HIV, increased funding for the Ryan White CARE Act for outpatient AIDS care, increased the National Institutes of Health's spending for AIDS research, and increased funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. In total, the President's fiscal year 1995 budget increased AIDS-related spending by \$600 million over the 1994 budget.

TAKING CARE OF OUR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

? President Clinton signed the comprehensive Child Immunization Plan so that every child, regardless of family income, will be immunized against disease.

? By the end of 1996, all eligible children between the ages of one and four will be served by the Women, Infants and Children Program (WIC). That means that an additional two million children will have access to the WIC program, a nutrition program that serves pregnant and post-partum women and their children.

? Under the Clinton Administration, American workers are no longer forced to choose between their job and their family at times of crisis. The Family and Medical Leave Act allows workers to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave to care for an infant or a loved one without losing their job.

? The Administration funded the Family Preservation and Support Initiative to prevent child abuse and help parents learn the skills and tools they need to raise their children.

EDUCATION

? The President's dramatic increase of Head Start funding will allow 840,000 children to participate in this preschool education program next year, up from 621,000 in 1992.

? The Goals 2000: Educate America Act sets world-class education standards and gives resources to states and communities to implement comprehensive education reforms.

? The Student Loan Reform Act greatly increases access to higher education -- 20 million students can take advantage of low-interest loans and better repayment terms.

? National Service also helps students further their education; those who want to contribute to their communities through public service can receive college tuition assistance.

? The School-to-Work Opportunities Act invests in training and education programs to give students the tools they need to enter the workforce successfully or continue their education.

THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN

? The President continues to protect the right of women to make their own reproductive choices. He repealed the "Gag Rule" that restricted abortion counseling at federally funded family planning clinics; revoked the import ban on RU-486; reversed the ban on abortion services at military hospitals; repealed the Mexico City policy that banned

funding to international organizations that promoted comprehensive family planning; and signed the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act to ensure that women and their doctors can enter clinics without fearing intimidation and violence.

? The United States delegation to the International Conference on Population and Development, led by Vice President Gore, successfully advocated a global approach to improving the status of women and stabilizing the world's population. The conference emphasized the importance not only of increased access to contraceptives, but also of sustainable economic development, a reduction in child and maternal mortality, and the empowerment of women through increased educational and economic opportunities.

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

CREATOR: Ingrid M. Schroeder (SCHROEDER_I) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-FEB-1995 19:35:43.64

SUBJECT: More comments

TO: Lin C. Liu (LIU_L) (OMB)

READ:15-FEB-1995 08:28:45.65

TO: Stephen C. Warnath (WARNATH_S) (OPD)

READ:14-FEB-1995 19:38:58.97

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:14-FEB-1995 14:48:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Barbara E. Washington

ATT SUBJECT: Comments on LRM 308 - Immigration Amendments

ATT TO: Ingrid M. Schroeder (SCHROEDER_I)

ATT CC: William G. White (WHITE_W)

ATT CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)

ATT CC: Mark E. Miller (MILLER_ME)

ATT CC: Stacy L. Dean (DEAN_S)

TEXT:

The Health Division has the following comments on the Immigration Amendments. These comments have not been cleared by Nancy-Ann Min.

Section 701: Limitations on Eligibility of Certain Aliens for Public Programs

"Section 250A (a) Ineligibility for Federal and Federally-Assisted Benefits and Services"

The bill prohibits all aliens (other than qualified aliens) from receiving any Federal or Federally-assisted benefit or service, with exceptions. These exceptions include benefits or services necessary generally to protect the public health of the U.S. as specified by the Attorney General.

Under the bill, as it is written, the Attorney General, not the Secretary of HHS, would have the power to designate which programs in the Public Health Service meet the definition of "necessary to protect the public health or safety of residents of the U.S."

There is no common or statutory definition of public health or

safety. Therefore, PHS grants for community/migrant health centers, family planning clinics, sexually transmitted disease or tuberculosis clinics, HIV prevention centers, and drug abuse treatment centers may or may not be exempted in whole or in part as contributing to public health and safety.

HD staff believe that verifying immigration status in these programs would be administratively burdensome.

HD staff suggest removing the blanket prohibition of benefits for other than qualified aliens. We suggest instead considering the approach taken in the Administration's welfare reform bill, which is to insert the eligibility definition in each affected program's authorizing legislation (Medicaid, SSI, AFDC). The Attorney General could be directed to work with each department to re-evaluate their programs' eligibility requirements with regard to the new definition of a qualified alien.

We understand that HHS also has concerns about this language. We believe that their efforts to draft compromise language, that was submitted to us tonight, merits further consideration.

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

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

CREATOR: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ) (CEQ)

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-MAR-1995 10:06:02.62

SUBJECT: here's chapter 9

TO: Theo Lubke (LUBKE_T) (OPD)

READ:20-MAR-1995 10:28:44.07

TEXT:

It's all here; no inserts coming later. (except I want to review the quotes over the next day or two; POTUS has had a couple of good speeches on envt/reform since I did this -- I imagine that I can do things like that if I need to as the review is going, right?).

Also, for some reason, the formatting isn't quite consistent. Most of the quotes are in boxes, but some are not. I imagine that you'll have someone go through the whole thing after the review for things like that.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:20-MAR-1995 10:02:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Brian J. Johnson

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

TOP ALL

[DRAFT 3/13/95]

9. ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Introduction

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 9

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

#8

"Over 25 years ago, I had a professor at Georgetown who taught me that America was the greatest country in history because our people believed in and acted on two simple ideas: first, that the future can be better than the present; and second, that each of us has a personal, moral responsibility to make it so."

Candidate Clinton

Announcing his run for the Presidency

October 3, 1991

? Reinventing Environmental Regulation. On March 16, 1995, the President announced a comprehensive set of 25 actions to make environmental protection work better and cost less, including a 25 percent cut in paper work to comply with environmental standards and a 6 month enforcement grace period for businesses who act in good faith.

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 11

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

? Northwest Forest Plan. Putting Northwest communities back to work again, while conserving ancient forests for future generations.

? Common Sense Initiative. Launched an effort to make health protection cleaner, cheaper and smarter by focusing on results rather than one-size-fits-all regulations.

? California Bay-

Delta Water Agreement. Negotiated a consensus plan that will protect the most valuable economic and environmental resource of the state of California. The San Francisco Bay and Delta estuary supplies drinking water to two-thirds of the state's people, provides irrigation for 45% of America's fruits and vegetables, and supports 300 aquatic species.

? Recycling. Signed an executive order to promote recycling, cut solid waste and create jobs.

? Community-

Right-

to-

Know. Expanded requirements that companies disclose information about toxic releases in their area, putting power back into the hands of the people.

? Protection for the California Desert. Fought for and then signed the California Desert Protection Act, the largest single designation of parks and wilderness areas ever in the lower 48 states.

? Environmental technology. Supporting initiatives that are creating jobs for American workers and encouraging innovative new solutions to tough environmental problems.

? Fisheries Management. Responded to developing fisheries crises on both coasts with improved management programs and economic assistance to families whose livelihoods are threatened by falling fish stocks.

? Air Pollution. Implemented an unprecedented measure to reduce by 90 percent the toxic air pollutants emitted from chemical plants by 1997.

? Restoration of the Everglades. Formed a partnership with the State of Florida that broke a six

-year legal logjam and allows the country to get on with the task of restoring the unique Everglades.

? Wetlands Reform. Reformed the wetlands program to cut red tape, increase fairness and flexibility for landowners, and protect and enhance the nation's wetlands.

President Clinton is continuing to fulfill his commitment to the American people, protecting our families' health and conserving our country's natural heritage for generations to come. Priorities this year include:

? Reinventing Government. Following through on a top-to-bottom reform of environmental regulation to create a new system based on achieving environmental results, not just complying with bureaucratic procedures.

? Superfund. Building on a historic coalition that included everyone from the Chemical Manufacturers to the Sierra Club, to work with Congress again this year to reform Superfund to clean up toxic sites faster, more fairly and more efficiently.

? Safe Drinking Water. Reforming the Safe Drinking Water Act to help local water systems protect their citizens' health and give people tap water they can trust, while

ensuring that the law that governs our drinking water supply is as affordable as it is effective for our communities.

? National Parks. Returning the Park Service to a sound financial footing and making the parks the best that they can be without burdening taxpayers, by reforming concessions practices and revising fee policies.

9A. PROTECTING PUBLIC HEALTH

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 7
PRINTER FONT 18_POINT_ROMAN

#8

"Preserving the environment is at the core of everything we have to do in our own country. Building businesses, creating jobs, fighting crime and drugs and violence, raising our children to know the difference between right and wrong, and restoring the fabric of our society."
President Clinton

#9

\$8

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 9
PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

#8

Actions to Date

In his first two years in office, President Clinton took the following actions:

- ? Reinventing Environmental Regulation. On March 16, 1995, the President announced 25 actions to make environmental protection work better and cost less, including a 25 percent cut in paperwork to comply with environmental standards and a 6 month enforcement grace period for businesses who act in good faith.
- ? Expanded Community-

Right-

to-

Know reporting to
require companies to tell people about toxic releases in their area. People will have information about nearly twice as many chemicals as before.

- ? Common Sense Initiative. Launched an effort to make health protection cleaner, cheaper and smarter by focusing on results rather than one-size-fits-all regulations.
- ? Promoted recycling, with actions such as an executive order directing the Federal government - the largest purchaser in the world -- to buy recycled.
- ? Cut toxic air pollution. The Clinton Administration took an unprecedented action to reduce by 90 percent the toxic air pollutants

#9

\$8

Background

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"I want to see a different approach. I want a government that is limited but effective, that is lean but not mean, that does what it should do better and simply stops doing things that it shouldn't be doing in the first place, that protects consumers and workers, the environment, without burdening business, choking innovation or wasting the money of the American taxpayers."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

President Clinton

Announcing "Reinventing Environmental

Regulation"

March 16, 1995

Twenty-five years ago our nation created from scratch the most advanced system of environmental protection in the world. The result is a system that is envied and copied around the globe. Where 25 years ago the roads were littered with boxes and beer cans, today we find 5,000 community recycling programs. Lead levels in our children's blood are down 70 percent. And the bald eagle soars again.

But much remains to be done, and while the current system of environmental protection has accomplished a great deal, it is reaching its limits. Over the years, environmental programs evolved into a complex and court-driven system of prescriptive regulation that often leaves little room for common sense. Increasingly, we pay too much for too little protection.

The answer is not to roll back health and environmental standards and return to the smoke and smog of yesteryear. The answer is not to add another layer of complex and inflexible requirements on top of the existing system -- or to create even more opportunity for lawsuits. People don't want a government that spends more of their money in order to get less done. People want a government that works better and costs less.

It is time to draw upon the lessons we have learned over the last 25 years and reinvent environmental protection. We have learned that the American people are deeply committed to a clean and healthy environment for their children and communities. We have learned that pollution is often a sign of economic inefficiency and business can make money by preventing it. We have learned that better decisions result from a collaborative process with people working together, than from an adversarial process that pits them against each other. And we have learned that standards that provide flexibility -- but demand accountability -- can provide greater protection at a lower cost.

To meet the challenges of the next 25 years, President Clinton is making common sense reforms to environmental programs to make them work better and cost less. He is working hard to protect our families' health and to provide lasting economic opportunities for generations to come. He is cutting through the bureaucracy to focus on results -- and allowing flexibility along the way. He is moving toward a system based on performance standards, flexibility and accountability. He is encouraging

innovation and common sense.

The Initiatives

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 9

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"Just as we yearn to come together as a people, we yearn to move beyond the false choices that the last few years have imposed upon us. For too long we have been told that we have to choose between the economy and the environment; between our jobs; between our obligations to our own people and our responsibilities to the future and to the rest of the world; between public action and private economy."

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

President Clinton

Earth Day 1993

The Clinton Administration is making environmental programs work better and holding the line against those who would eliminate them. President Clinton is expanding the Community-Right-to-Know program to put power back into the hands of the people, promoting recycling, cutting air pollution and increasing job-creating investments in "green" technologies. He is moving away from the prescriptive regulations of yesterday to the results-oriented programs of tomorrow.

Reinventing Environmental Regulation. On March 16, President Clinton announced a sweeping set of 25 reforms to make environmental protection work better and cost less. With this package, the President will expand the use of market-based emissions trading programs, make a 25 percent cut in the paperwork associated with meeting environmental standards -- a move that will save businesses and communities 20 million hours of work, cut the reporting system down to one step, create centers to help small businesses comply with environmental programs and give them a 6 month enforcement grace period when they act in good faith, give more responsibility to states, tribes and local governments, and save taxpayers billions of dollars by refocussing priorities for safe drinking water and hazardous waste. In addition to improving the current system, the President proposed fundamental reforms -- environmental protection for the 21st century. These reforms include Project XL -- for eXcellence and Leadership -- a pilot project where EPA will allow 50 companies or communities to replace current regulatory requirements with an alternative system of the company's design if the company can do it cleaner, cheaper. In other words, if you've got a better way to do it, you can throw out the EPA rulebook.

Common Sense Initiative. The Environmental Protection Agency's Common Sense Initiative is both the name of a major program and a reflection of President Clinton's environmental philosophy. It is a reform to move from one-size-fits-all regulations to a system based on real results, the first program in the next generation of environmental protection. The approach will achieve results that are cleaner, cheaper and smarter -- cleaner for the environment, cheaper for business and taxpayers, and smarter for our children's future.

Community Right-

To-

Know. President Clinton expanded Community Right-to-Know laws to protect public health by requiring companies to disclose information about toxic chemical releases to the public. EPA added 286 harmful chemicals -- nearly doubling the current amount -- to the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI). The TRI program lists chemical releases and makes the data available to the public through outlets such as public libraries. At the same time, EPA made it easier for small businesses to provide information by creating a shorter, less time-consuming reporting form. The Community Right-to-Know program puts power back into the hands of the people.

Environmental Technology. The President's environmental technology initiatives are helping American business compete more effectively in the fast-growing global markets for "green" technologies, creating jobs for American workers, and encouraging innovative new solutions to tough environmental problems. Vice President Al Gore recently unveiled a new Rapid Commercialization Initiative to test and verify the performance of innovative technologies and get them to the market faster.

Air Pollution. The 100 million Americans who live in areas with polluted air will be able to breathe more easily. The President is working with States to develop common sense solutions to our nation's air quality problems and to implement strong new rules under the Clean Air Act, such as an unprecedented action to cut toxic air pollution from chemical plants 90 percent by 1997.

Leadership on Risk Analysis. The Clinton Administration is committed to basing its regulatory decisions on sound scientific evidence and ensuring that the benefits of its actions justify the costs. The President's executive order on Regulatory Planning and Review is the cornerstone of these efforts. The President recognizes that there is an important role for regulation in protecting public health, safety, and the environment for the American people; at the same time, he insists that government has a basic responsibility to govern wisely and carefully, regulating only when necessary and only in the most cost-effective manner.

Enforcement. President Clinton reversed previous Administrations' attempts to weaken EPA's enforcement capabilities. EPA reformed its environmental enforcement program to get tough with polluters who threaten public health, but work with those who act in good

faith. The reforms include small business assistance centers and a 6 month enforcement grace period for small businesses who move quickly to correct violations.

Recycling. To boost recycling, promote environmental technologies, save taxpayers money and reduce the burden on landfills, President Clinton signed an executive order directing Federal agencies to purchase recycled and environmentally preferable products. The Federal government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the world, and the Clinton Administration is putting that enormous purchasing power to work for recycling.

Leading by Example -

-

Toxics Reduction. President Clinton signed an executive order directing Federal agencies to cut their use of toxic

substances 50% by 1999 and report those remaining emissions under Community Right-to-Know laws -- a move to open government that previous Administrations refused to make.
Leading by Example -

-

Energy and Water Efficiency. President Clinton signed an executive order directing Federal agencies to improve energy and water efficiency wherever it is cost-effective -- a move that will cut the government's taxpayer-funded utility bills \$1 billion a year.

Clean Cars. The Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles is a historic new partnership between government and industry. This strategy will strengthen U.S. competitiveness by developing technologies for a new generation of vehicles up to three times more fuel efficient than today's - a technological challenge comparable to the Apollo project. This initiative will create jobs, spur economic growth and help Detroit continue to lead the world in auto technology.

#8

Case Study: Reinventing Environmental Protection

The Clinton Administration has launched an ambitious new pilot program that is revolutionizing the way we approach environmental protection. The current system of environmental regulation has accomplished a great deal, but it is reaching its limits. EPA is initiating a pilot program to develop a common sense system for the next generation of environmental protection.

Through EPA's Common Sense Initiative, we are bringing business, community groups, state and local representatives and local environmental leaders together to find common sense, consensus strategies for addressing environmental problems.

This program will help us move beyond confrontation to consensus in solving this nation's environmental problems. Instead of a focus on specific problems caused on specific problems cause by individual pollutants, we are comprehensively looking at the overall environmental impacts of entire industries.

The six industries participating in the first phase of the Initiative -- automotive, computers and electronics, iron and steel, metal finishing, petroleum refining and printing -- form a sizable piece of the American economy. Comprising over 11% of the U.S. Gross Domestic Product and employing nearly 4 million people these industries also account for 12.4% of the toxic releases reported by all American industries in 1992. The six industries share a key attribute: each is committed to working with the EPA and with national and grassroots environmental groups to

find cleaner, cheaper, smarter ways to protect public health and our environment.

The Common Sense Initiative reflects the Clinton Administration's commitment to setting strong environmental standards while encouraging common sense, innovation and flexibility in how those standards are met.

This new approach to environmental protection is designed to achieve results that are cleaner, cheaper and smarter. Cleaner for the environment, cheaper for business and taxpayers and smarter for America's future.

#9

\$8

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 10

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"We seek to set our course by the star of age-old values, not short-term expediencies; to waste less in the present and provide more for the future; to leave a legacy that keeps faith with those who left the Earth to us. That is the American spirit."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

President Clinton

Earth Day 1994

Incineration. The Clinton Administration announced a tough new incineration policy that makes safety the number one priority, encourages industry to reduce waste, strengthens oversight of existing combustion facilities and tightens requirements for permitting new ones. New standards for municipal incinerators will result in a 95 percent reduction in emissions of dangerous pollutants.

Pesticides and Food Safety. The President is taking aggressive action to protect children and reduce the use of pesticides on food. At the same time, his Administration is working to move safer substitutes onto the market more quickly.

Greening of the White House. The President's initiative is making the White House a model for all Americans to follow -- demonstrating practical steps people can take to protect the environment, improve the comfort of their surroundings and save money. Specific actions include energy-efficient lighting, appliances, heating and cooling, as well as recycling and water conservation -- each of which improve the local environment and save taxpayers money.

Superfund. President Clinton proposed a major reform of Superfund, the bill that cleans up toxic dumps. One in four Americans still lives near a toxic dump site 14 years after Love Canal. Contaminated, neglected land costs communities jobs,

development and their tax base. In the past, too much money that should have gone to clean up toxic dumps was spent on lawyers instead. Last year, President Clinton brought together in support of his Superfund reform an unprecedented array of interested parties, from environmental groups, insurers, businesses and communities. The Administration will work with Congress again this year to strengthen the Superfund law based on the following principles: cleanups must be faster, fairer and more efficient; we must promote economic redevelopment in our communities; less money should go to lawyers and more money should go to cleanups; and the polluter should pay.

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 9
PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

#8

Case Study:
EPA's Brownfields Program -

-

Bill Robinson

"Poor neighborhoods in our cities suffer most from toxic pollution. Cleaning up toxic waste will create new jobs in these neighborhoods for those people and make them safer places to live, to work, and to do business."

President Clinton
Earth Day, 1993

In his first Earth Day message, President Clinton committed to revitalize urban communities by cleaning up abandoned pieces of contaminated land that are a blight to our communities, a threat to our health, and a terrible obstacle to economic growth.

The EPA Brownfields program is an innovative Administration initiative that awards grants to cities to redevelop contaminated land -- creating jobs and returning the land to productive community use. With the money provided by the grants, cities can promote economic development the way the local community believes it will work best. The program brings together people who live near contaminated land, businesses that want to get land cleaned up, community leaders, investors, lenders and developers.

Like many hard working Americans, Bill Robinson had a difficult time when his company relocated and he was unemployed for eight months. A forty year old man with three children depending on him, Mr. Robinson felt discouraged and had few prospects in Cleveland's depressed economy.

As part of a Brownfields grant to the City of

Cleveland, Mr. Robinson now works as a Warehouseman Order Selector at Dedicated Transport, Inc. He is filling one of one hundred new trucking and warehouse jobs created by the redevelopment of contaminated, abandoned property in Cleveland. Dedicated and its sister company hope to employ another 100 people within the next year.

This initiative captures the best of what we can do together to revitalize the cities of this country. It is a common sense, cost-effective way to redevelop contaminated land and return it to productive community use, create jobs and preserve the green area outside our cities.

#9

\$8

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 10

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

Safe Drinking Water. Safe drinking water is easily the biggest environmental concern of America's working families. Across the country, people are worried that they can no longer take the safety of their drinking water for granted. A year ago, millions of residents of

major U.S. cities -- such as Milwaukee, New York and Washington, DC -- were ordered to boil their water. One year after thousands of people got sick and 100 died after drinking contaminated tap water in Milwaukee, President Clinton proposed to reform the Safe Drinking Water bill to help local water systems protect their customers' health and give people tap water they can trust. The Administration will work to ensure that the law that governs our drinking water supply is as affordable as it is effective for our communities. The President will work with Congress again this year to improve the Safe Drinking Water Act and provide resources to communities so that they can do the job of keeping their citizens safe.

"We can have common sense and still provide for safe drinking water. We can have fairness and still clean up toxic dumps, and we ought to do it."

President Clinton
State of the Union
January 1995

9B. TAKING RESPONSIBILITY
FOR OUR LAND AND WATER

#8

"All across this country, there is a deep understanding rooted in our religious heritage and renewed in the spirit of this time that the bounty of nature is not ours to waste. It is a gift from God that we hold in trust for future generations. Preserving our heritage, enhancing it, and passing it along is a great purpose worthy of a great people."

President Clinton
Earth Day 1993

#9

\$8

HORIZONTAL PITCH 9
PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

#8

Actions to Date

During his first two years in office, President Bill Clinton:

- ? Developed a Northwest Forest Plan to put communities back to work again and conserve ancient forests for future generations.
- ? Developed reforms to exempt small landowners from wetlands and endangered species laws.
- ? Reached an agreement with the state and water users over California Bay-

Delta Water, the most valuable environmental and economic resource in the State of California.

- ? Reached an agreement with the State of Florida to restore the Everglades, home to more than 50 threatened or unique species, including the Florida Panther.
- ? Signed the California Desert Protection Act, the largest single designation of parks and wilderness areas ever for the lower 48 states.

? Reformed the Wetlands Program to cut red tape,
increase fairness and flexibility for landowners,

#9

\$8

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 11
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
Background

HORIZONTAL_PITCH 9
PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"If there is one commitment that defines our people, it is our devotion to the rich and expansive land we have inherited. From the first Americans to the present day, our people have lived in awe of the power, the majesty, and the beauty of the forest, the rivers, and the streams of America."

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

President Clinton

Earth Day

April 21, 1993

The American conservation ethic dates back to the very first days of our country's history and to the farmers, hunters and fishermen who made our country great. Americans have always understood that if they want their children to continue farming or fishing at a living wage, they must look after the land and the water. And we have always felt a deep, moral duty to be responsible caretakers of the Earth for those who come after us.

A century ago, Congress created the world's very first national park at Yellowstone. As American as baseball and jazz music, national parks are an idea that virtually every nation has since copied. The national parks are one of America's greatest treasures; their beauty is unsurpassed.

A century later, resource management of our land and water requires a new approach beyond simply setting it aside. We can use our resources both for economic development today and to fulfill our responsibilities to the future, but only with careful planning and commitment. Where economic needs and environmental imperatives come into conflict, it is usually the result of poor management or a failure to make tough decisions until a situation gets so bad it can no longer be ignored.

When Bill Clinton came into office, he inherited a number of these poorly managed situations -- looming crises brought on by the Federal government's refusal to assume its share of the responsibility for looking after our nation's land and water. In the Pacific Northwest, the Federal government failed to set up a responsible old-growth forest management plan, and a judge blocked all timber cutting on those lands -- a drastic blow to timber-dependent families. In New England and the Northwest, fisheries collapsed following years of pollution, overfishing and changes in climate patterns -- a drastic blow to the men and women who were

dependent on the industry.

President Bill Clinton is standing up for those families. Rather than ignoring these crises, President Clinton went to work and addressed them directly. Issue after issue --from California water use to the Florida Everglades -- he is finding solutions where others had seen only problems.

The Initiatives

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"If we have the vision, the will and the heart to make the changes we must, we can still enter the 21st century with possibilities our parents could not even have imagined and enter it having secured the American Dream for ourselves and for future generations."

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

President Clinton

February 17, 1993

President Clinton promised that he would take responsibility for our places of natural beauty and ecological significance; that he would look out for our national parks, wilderness areas, old growth forests and wetlands; that he would support programs that put people to work today and contribute to a better world tomorrow. During his first two years in office the President developed a forest plan for the Northwest, helped fishermen get back on their feet again, reached a historic agreement to manage California water and signed the California Desert Protection Act. Northwest Forest Plan. For years, mismanagement and conflict over timber cutting in public forests threatened the livelihood of people in the Pacific Northwest. To put an end to the gridlock and put people back to work, President Clinton convened the Forest Conference in Portland, Oregon, shortly after taking office. For the first time, he called environmentalists, timber companies and citizens as well as states, tribes and local governments came together around one table to hammer out a solution. The President's Northwest Forest Plan is forcing government agencies to work together to restore the economic health of the region's communities and the vitality of the region's ancient forests. The Administration is awarding more than \$1.2 billion in grants and loans over five years to more than 100 communities throughout the region to help people through their period of transition, and putting people to work with more than 600 watershed restoration projects to protect the environment for years to come. The President's Forest Plan was recently upheld by the judge who earlier blocked all cutting. That means that for the first time since 1991, forest management is out of the courtroom and back in the communities where it belongs.

California Bay-

Delta Water Agreement. In a triumph of common sense over politics-as-usual, the President recently reached an agreement with the State of California and farmers, urban interests and environmentalists to protect the San Francisco Bay and Delta. Under the agreement, the state will set water quality standards to protect the health of the natural environment and the health of the region's communities. The agreement is a boost for the regional economy, bringing a reliable water supply to water users across the state. The agreement comes after decades of conflict over

water, most critical of Western resources. The Bay-Delta estuary supplies drinking water to two-thirds of the state's population, provides irrigation water for 200 crops, including 45 percent of the nation's fruits and vegetables, and supports 300 aquatic species in the largest wetland habitat in the West.

Restoration of the Florida Everglades. The Administration and the State of Florida launched an unprecedented partnership in 1993 to restore the Everglades, Big Cypress, and Lake Okeechobee. The tourism-based economy of South Florida depends significantly on the health of this natural environment. The area is home to five million people and more than 50 endangered or threatened plants and animals, including the Florida Panther, the Bald Eagle and Audubon's Crested Caracara. In recent decades, wetland habitat areas have declined 50 percent and populations of wading birds such as the Snail Kite and Wood Stork have declined 90 percent. Public water supplies along the coast are increasingly vulnerable to salt water intrusion due to losses of fresh water. Commercial and recreational fisheries in Florida Bay have declined dramatically in recent years. This partnership ends years of litigation and will improve both the quality and the quantity of water -- helping to preserve these national treasures and keep the Florida economy strong.

California Desert Protection. In October 1994, the President signed the historic California Desert Protection Act, to preserve for future generations a resource of extraordinary and inestimable value. It is the first time since 1980 that the United States has set aside so rich and vast an area -- public desert lands that include broad vistas, rugged mountain ranges and unique archeological sites. The Act designates 7.7 million acres of federal lands as wilderness and adds three million acres to the National Park System, including magnificent lands next to the Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Monuments, both of which now become National Parks.

Building Sustainable Fisheries. President Clinton responded rapidly to developing fisheries crises in New England and the Pacific Northwest. To help communities in the short run, he is taking the unprecedented step of providing economic adjustment assistance to several thousand people whose jobs are affected by the crises. For the long run, the effort includes an improved fisheries conservation program to manage the stocks and ensure lasting work for fishermen.

Wetlands Reform. The President developed a bold reform package for the nation's wetlands protection program that reflects the vital need for effective protection and restoration of the nation's wetlands, and includes much needed reforms to increase the fairness and flexibility of Federal regulatory programs for landowners. Significantly, the reforms essentially relieve homeowners of the need to apply for wetlands permits to build or modify their homes. The reform also includes a more active role for states, tribes and local governments. Finally, the Administration set a goal not only of "no net loss" of wetlands, but also of restoring wetlands that had been previously lost. Wetlands filter and cleanse water, buffer against flooding, and are the most prolific ecosystems in the world; we have lost more than one-half of the wetlands in the lower 48 states since Colonial times.

Case Study:
Northwest Forest Plan -

-

Economic Revitalization

"It is time to break the gridlock that has blocked action and bring all sides together to craft a balanced approach to the economic and environmental challenges we face."

President Clinton

March 10, 1993

When President Clinton convened the Forest Conference in Portland, Oregon in April 1993 he did it to break the gridlock over forest management that had tied up the region's economy for years. His forest plan is protecting public forests for future generations and giving new life to local communities. With the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative of the forest plan, he is helping people hurt by the forest crisis get back on their feet.

The Initiative is comprehensive. President Clinton's program is putting people to work, providing worker training, and giving assistance to families, communities and businesses. The result is better government that works for people:

In Sweet Home, Oregon, dislocated timber workers are receiving training, on-the-job experience, and family wages as they work to restore valuable watersheds.

In Weaverville, California, Federal grants and loans are at work building a new sewage treatment system that will protect the community's health and provide for a more certain economic future.

In Forks, Washington, money from state sources and Federal agencies is helping to build a secondary wood products manufacturing center that will breathe new life into this traditionally timber-dependent community's economy.

In Douglas County, Oregon, an area hit hard by the decline in timber harvests, the Roberts Creek Water District has lacked an adequate supply of treated water. As a result, the District placed a moratorium on new development in 1992, making it hard for people to go back to work in new jobs and making it hard for the District to provide acceptable fire protection to the area. With assistance from the forest plan and from the state the District will now be able to fund the water treatment plant expansion. Already, the Ingram Book Company has committed to locating in the District -- a

AmeriCorps -

-

National Service and the Environment. Young people in AmeriCorps, President Clinton's national service program, are giving more than 10 million hours of direct service in environmental protection. Nearly one-third of the 20,000 AmeriCorps members are working in urban neighborhoods and rural landscapes to eliminate environmental hazards and conserve natural resources.

Recovery of the Bald Eagle. On July 4, 1994, the Administration proposed to take the bald eagle off the endangered species list. This success story reflects 30 years of hard work to save the bald eagle -- the symbol of America's freedom.

Strengthening the National Parks. The President is taking strong action on behalf of America's National Parks. He proposed a funding increase of 18 percent for the Park Service in his first budget, and is pushing to reform concession contracts to give taxpayers a fair share of the profits made by vendors in the parks. Currently, the average concessionaire pays less than 3 percent of revenues for the exclusive right to sell products to park visitors -- a rate far below what most businesses would be willing to pay. Raising that rate by a small amount would bring millions into the parks.

Reform of Endangered Species Protection. Our Nation's plants and animals are treasures we hold in trust for future generations. When environmental protection has collided with economic growth, the cause has often been poor administration of laws such as the Endangered Species Act. The President is committed to innovative administration of these laws to avoid crisis management and make them work, without burdening small landowners. For instance, the Administration recently announced general exemptions from ESA enforcement for most activities on single home residential tracts and for other activities that affect less than five acres.

#8

Case Study:
Ruben Alarcon -

-

AmeriCorps

"In our own lives, in our own ways, each of us has something to offer to the work of cleaning up America's environment.

And each of us surely has something very personal to gain."

President Clinton

Earth Day 1993

Luis Ruben Alarcon is working in low-income areas in and

around El Paso, Texas, along the Mexican border. He is joining other AmeriCorps members and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program to clean up the area's water and protect his neighbors' health.

"AmeriCorps has provided me a great opportunity to get hands-on training in the field of environmental protection," he says. "It also allows me to participate in our community, something I believe in firmly."

Ruben turned down a full scholarship at M.I.T. in order to stay in El Paso and help provide for his mother, a new U.S. citizen with a third grade education, who works at a maquiladora for the minimum wage. He studies chemistry and engineering full-time at the University of Texas El Paso, dedicates himself to serving his community through AmeriCorps and holds down an additional job to provide for his mother.

"I can't thank AmeriCorps enough for this opportunity," he says. "I feel like I belong to something that's very important, something that's much bigger than me."

The region's two million people rely on groundwater sources of drinking water that are increasingly contaminated. According to local health officials, a large number of the health problems they see appear to be caused by polluted water. Ruben and the AmeriCorps members are working to change that and to protect the health of his community.

#9

\$8

Flood Prevention. The Administration is examining new approaches to flood control and flood plain management, the need for which was highlighted by the recent floods in the Midwest, the South and California. Our goal is to protect the health and safety of all Americans in flood-prone areas and reduce the loss of natural resources associated with floods and flood control projects. The loss of flood plain wetlands has substantially increased flooding problems in many areas.

9C. INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP

#8

"The nations of the world are working together to achieve what is now called 'sustainable growth' -- growth that meets the needs of the present without sacrificing the needs of the future. It's an ethic as modern as microprocessors and as old as the Scriptures."

President Clinton
Earth Day 1994

#9

\$8

#8

Actions to Date

During his first two years, the President:

- ? Expanded U.S. environmental technology exports to put Americans to work cleaning up the global environment.
- ? Helped forge international consensus on a global plan to slow population growth.
- ? Created the GLOBE program to give students a better way to learn about science.
- ? Signed the Biodiversity Treaty to preserve irreplaceable genetic resources from the world's plants and animals.

#9

\$8

Background

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"We have to work to stop famine and stabilize population growth and prevent further environmental degradation . . . None of us can live without fear as long as so many people must live without hope. That's why we're working around the world to protect fresh water resources, to preserve forests, to protect endangered species, leading a fight for strong environmental protection in our global negotiations on trade."

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

President Clinton
Earth Day 1994

With the end of the Cold War, tension over scarce natural resources and environmental degradation is increasing, threatening to erupt into regional conflict that harm US interests. While computers move more than a trillion dollars through the world's financial markets every day, one billion of the world's citizens live in abject poverty, more than two billion people have no access to sanitation, and every day 40,000 human beings -- mostly children -- die of hunger, malnutrition or unsafe drinking water.

At current rates, 90 million people will be added to the world every year -- the equivalent of a New York City every month. Although we have made great strides in protecting our natural environment, air and water pollution, deforestation, declining fish catches and the loss of biodiversity continue to be grave problems. If the poorer nations of the world grow to match resource-use patterns of the developed world, we would need 10 times the current amount of fossil fuel and approximately 200 times the mineral wealth. Meanwhile, soil scientists have estimated that an area equal in size to China and India combined have experienced soil deterioration since World War II. In a world of increasingly scarce basic resources, conflict is more likely. It is in every American's best interest for the United States to assume a position of global leadership in protecting the international environment.

The Initiatives

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"Working together, we can ensure that the world we leave to the future holds the same promise and opportunity as the one we inherited from the past."

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

President Clinton

March 14, 1994

President Clinton and Vice President Gore have helped ensure that America lead the world, not follow, on global environmental issues. Environmental Technologies Export Strategy. For the first time, U.S. firms can rely on support from the Federal government in opening overseas markets for environmental technologies. The President's strategy is to work with business, accelerate technology development, improve export financing, and coordinate the 20 or so federal agencies who currently have roles in this area. The strategy targets specific markets such as Mexico, where the elimination of 20 percent tariffs on environmental technologies through NAFTA and an urgent need for environmental solutions are creating strong demand.

Population. At the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, the United States helped forge a historic consensus on a global program to slow population growth. The approach includes increased availability of family planning services, a commitment to improving women's health, the empowerment of women, and a reduction in infant and child mortality.

GLOBE. Vice President Al Gore launched the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) program to give schoolchildren a better way to learn about science. GLOBE will create a worldwide network of K-12 students who will work under the guidance of

teachers to make environmental observations near their schools, report their data to a GLOBE processing facility and view images created from worldwide GLOBE data in their classrooms.

#8

Case Study:
Environmental Technology Exports

"There is now a \$200 billion to \$300 billion market for environmentally-conscious products . . . Last October, we started our strategy to help American companies, large and small, get their share of that market. If your company makes a product or offers a service that will protect the environment all over the world, you can find capital, customers and expert advice."

President Clinton
Earth Day 1994

On September 28, 1994, Radian Corporation won a \$2.5 million contract in Thailand, thanks in large part to the President's initiative to promote environmental technology exports. With the bid, Radian will provide equipment, systems integration and support services for the first eight ambient air monitoring stations in Thailand.

Radian won the contract with effective export promotion assistance -- six Federal agencies combined to provide key promotional, financial and advocacy to help them close the deal. As a result of the contract, Radian may be able to open a Southeast Asia regional office to expand its Asia sales.

#9

\$8

Whale Conservation. The United States succeeded in gaining support to create a whale sanctuary in the Southern Ocean around Antarctica, where commercial whaling will be prohibited. The 11.8 million square mile area covered by the sanctuary is adjacent to an existing Indian Ocean sanctuary; together these two sanctuaries are home to three-quarters of the world's whales. Programs such as these work -- the California Grey Whale was recently removed from the Endangered Species List because the population has returned to pre-whaling levels.

Climate Change Action Plan. The Administration is implementing a comprehensive national strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels in the year 2000 -- a commitment previous administrations were

unwilling to make. The Climate Change Action Plan saves government and industry money, spurs economic growth, and creates jobs. In one Department of Energy program, more than 800 of the nation's electric utility companies have already signed voluntary pledges to limit greenhouse gas emissions under the Action Plan.

Biodiversity Treaty. Winning praise from environmentalists as well as the agriculture, pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries, the President signed the Convention on Biological Diversity, an international agreement to stem the extinction of species and preserve irreplaceable genetic resources for medicines and other valuable products.

Ocean Dumping. The United States took the lead among the world's nuclear powers and achieved a global ban on ocean dumping of radioactive waste at the London Convention. The U.S. was the first of the nuclear powers to advocate the ban.

NAFTA. The President negotiated a strong side agreement to protect the environment and helped pass NAFTA with the support of a large portion of the environmental community. The treaty sets a new environmental standard for trade agreements. Innovative "green" provisions will help protect the environment and improve the quality of life on both sides of the border. At the same time, NAFTA will double the number of American jobs supported by environmental technology exports to Mexico.

Development Financing. The United States is leading the fight for environmental reforms in the World Bank and other multilateral financial institutions. One result is a new World Bank policy that gives affected people access to information and environmental assessments on major projects. The United States also put forward the blueprint for restructuring the Global Environmental Facility, making it more democratic and more accountable.

Summit of the Americas. The Summit of the Americas focused on three central themes: strengthening democracy, expanding hemispheric economic integration, and promoting sustainable development. Economic prosperity and social progress can only be achieved if the health of the people is protected and natural resources are used responsibly. The President forged historic agreements with all leaders in the Americas to achieve lasting opportunities for all.

Desertification. On October 14 the United States signed the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. The Convention marks an important step for the U.S., France and other developed countries in our efforts to work with Africa and other developing areas to rebuild and protect their resources as they develop a sustainable economy.

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"If you think about the long-run economic development of the country, we can only hope to continue to grow and prosper if we find a way to do it that is friendly to the environment; that enhances our natural resources; that permits that elusive goal we call sustainable development."

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

President Clinton

October 18, 1994

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

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

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-APR-1995 10:50:36.21

SUBJECT: RE: Teen Pregnancy Campaign

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

READ:11-APR-1995 11:01:00.83

TEXT:

What will people say about family planning on the 800 number? Will they discuss abortion? Will they refer people to groups that discuss abortion? Will they refer people to groups that don't discuss abortion? There is obvious appeal to having an 800 number, but it is difficult to reconcile with local control. This private entity will never get off the ground if it gets anywhere near the abortion debate.

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

CREATOR: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-MAY-1995 11:21:44.32

SUBJECT: status of teen pregnancy thing

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

READ:30-MAY-1995 11:35:29.09

TEXT:

attached is the information we got from hhs on friday evening. as you can see, they're saying they don't have to do an official reprogramming (requiring congressional approps committee approval, which got us into trouble the last time), but that they'd just check with the committees. This seems reasonable, but of course it could also lead to a brick wall if someone on one of the committee staffs wants to be cute. I am asking Chuck Kieffer, our approps guru, to take a look at this and advise me tuesday what he thinks. Generally, we have always thought it is a good idea to informally advise committee staffs about things like this, just to avoid misunderstandings and recriminations--but of course, we have been working with democrats in the past. this may be one of those "d----d if you do, d-----d if you don't" situations. at any rate, i'll get back to you.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:26-MAY-1995 20:50:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Barry T. Clendenin

ATT SUBJECT: Teen Pregnancy Responses from Betty James (ASMB)

ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)

ATT CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)

TEXT:

Betty reports:

-- funding sources would be :

- * \$50,000 from CDC Teen Pregnancy activities
- * \$40,000 from HRSA Title X (family planning)
- * \$260,000 from HRSA Healthy Start

HHS' current thinking is that the HHS appropriations justifications for each of the above items have sufficient mission justification to use the Economy Act to accomplish a common mission though a Memorandum of Understanding rather than seeking a reprogramming up front.

Next steps:

Betty advises that if HHS is asked to move ahead on the request that HHS would:

* Pull together HHS technical, procurement and PSA staff needed to organize the effort within;

* Draft a MOU to state as precisely as possible why there is a common mission; and,

* Klepner would do some checking with the L/HHS committees to see if there will be any concerns about what is planned.

Let me know if you need some additional followup.

BC

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

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

CREATOR: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-MAY-1995 12:02:43.27

SUBJECT: thanks

TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

READ:30-MAY-1995 15:39:54.17

TEXT:

thanks for the update.

I had told Kevin I would touch base with him when you all had reviewed and had some thoughts - and then maybe try to put together a conference call with Kevin and Jerry (and our Leg folks?) so we could make a decision on how to proceed.

Let me know when you have a final read on this. Thanks.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:29-MAY-1995 11:18:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Nancy-Ann E. Min

ATT SUBJECT: status of teen pregnancy thing

ATT TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J)

TEXT:

attached is the information we got from hhs on friday evening. as you can see, they're saying they don't have to do an official reprogramming (requiring congressional approps committee approval, which got us into trouble the last time), but that they'd just check with the committees. This seems reasonable, but of course it could also lead to a brick wall if someone on one of the committee staffs wants to be cute. I am asking Chuck Kieffer, our approps guru, to take a look at this and advise me tuesday what he thinks. Generally, we have always thought it is a good idea to informally advise committee staffs about things like this, just to avoid misunderstandings and recriminations--but of course, we have been working with democrats in the past. this may be one of those "d---d if you do, d-----d if you don't" situations. at any rate, i'll get back to you.

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

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:26-MAY-1995 20:50:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Barry T. Clendenin

ATT SUBJECT: Teen Pregnancy Responses from Betty James (ASMB)

ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)

ATT CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)

TEXT:

Betty reports:

-- funding sources would be :

- * \$50,000 from CDC Teen Pregnancy activities
- * \$40,000 from HRSA Title X (family planning)
- * \$260,000 from HRSA Healthy Start

HHS' current thinking is that the HHS appropriations justifications for each of the above items have sufficient mission justification to use the Economy Act to accomplish a common mission though a Memorandum of Understanding rather than seeking a reprogramming up front.

Next steps:

Betty advises that if HHS is asked to move ahead on the request that HHS would:

- * Pull together HHS technical, procurement and PSA staff needed to organize the effort within;
- * Draft a MOU to state as precisely as possible why there is a common mission; and,
- * Klepner would do some checking with the L/HHS committees to see if there will be any concerns about what is planned.

Let me know if you need some additional followup.

BC

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

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

CREATOR: Christopher J. Mustain (MUSTAIN_C) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-JUN-1995 11:14:54.82

SUBJECT: Latest version of SAP - filename: HR4S.SAP

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

READ:13-JUN-1995 11:15:05.00

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:13-JUN-1995 11:13:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Christopher J. Mustain

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

June

13, 1995

(Senate)

H.R. 4 - Family Self

-Sufficiency Act

(Packwood (R) OR and ___ cosponsors)

The Administration strongly supports enactment of real and effective welfare reform that promotes the basic values of work and responsibility. Last year, the President proposed a sweeping welfare reform package that embodied these values. The President's proposal would have: established tough work requirements while providing opportunities for education, job training, and child care to working people; imposed tough child support enforcement measures; required teen mothers to live at home, stay in school, and identify their child's father; increased State flexibility and accountability; and maintained protections for children.

In all its welfare reform efforts, the Administration has emphasized the basic values of work and responsibility. The President's economic plan expanded the earned income tax credit, which cut taxes for 15 million working families to reward work over welfare. Last February, the President issued an Executive Order to crack down on Federal employees and military personnel who owe delinquent child support. In the past two years, the Administration has granted waivers from Federal rules to 29 States to try innovative ways to promote work and responsibility.

The Administration remains committed to working with the Congress in a bipartisan way to pass bold welfare reform legislation this year. The Senate version of H.R. 4 represents a significant improvement over its House counterpart. The Senate bill includes tough child support enforcement provisions proposed by the President and omits several provisions from the House bill that would be very harmful to children. The Administration, nevertheless, opposes the Senate bill because it still falls short of the basic goals and values that most Americans want welfare reform to promote.

WORK

There is a bi

-partisan consensus that the central goal of welfare

reform must be work. Unlike the legislation proposed by the Administration last year, however, the Senate bill would not end welfare as we know it by moving people from welfare to work. The bill provides neither the resources nor the requirements for States to prepare welfare recipients to become self

-supporting.

H.R. 4 would not ensure that adequate child care, education, and training are provided to make work pay and give welfare recipients the skills to hold a job. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the bill's lack of funding for job training and child care would permit only six States to meet the bill's work requirements.

In fact, H.R. 4 would repeal three child care programs that now serve more than 640,000 children. Cutting child care for people trying to leave welfare and for working people who are trying to stay off welfare is contrary to the goal of achieving real welfare reform.

Compounding the problems created by the bill's inadequate funding is the structure of the block grant. By putting resources for cash benefits, child care, and employment assistance into one block grant, States would be forced to choose between (1) providing cash benefits to families in need of assistance and (2) meeting the bill's work requirements by providing child care and employment assistance to a smaller population of its low

-income

citizens. States should be rewarded for putting more people to work, not for cutting them off. The Administration strongly recommends that cash benefits be funded separately from child care and employment assistance.

RESPONSIBILITY

Welfare reform must send a strong message to young people that they should not get pregnant or father a child until they are ready to take responsibility for that child's future. The

President has called for a national campaign against teen pregnancy that sends a clear message about abstinence and responsible parenting. While the Senate bill wisely omits House provisions to base State funding on an "illegitimacy ratio," the Senate bill fails to include provisions to address teen pregnancy.

The Administration believes that minor mothers should receive benefits when they make a serious effort to be responsible and turn their lives around -- by living at home, staying in school, and identifying the child's father. In contrast, the Senate bill would allow States to automatically punish innocent children by denying benefits to those born to unwed parents under age 18. This approach could deny many minor mothers the opportunity to turn their lives around and provide a stable environment for their child.

The Administration will continue to work with the Congress address serious concerns about provisions of H.R. 4 that would:

- o Punish innocent children. H.R. 4 would deny cash benefits to over 7 disabled children. The bill also would cut off children whose parents have received welfare for more than five years, whether the parent is able to work or not. It is essential that children are protected in reforming the welfare system.

- o Leave States with inadequate resources. H.R. 4 would replace existing programs with capped grants to States. In contrast to the funding mechanisms now in place, funding under H.R. 4 would not adjust adequately for an economic downturn or for growth in a State's low

-income population.

Without such adjustments, States in recession would encounter reduced revenues and increased caseloads. In such times, it is the working poor who would most likely need, but not receive, temporary assistance.

- o Provide perverse incentives for States to reduce their commitment to welfare assistance. H.R. 4 would neither require nor encourage States to contribute resources to welfare reform. There is a danger that States would "race to the bottom" to save State dollars or to deter migrants from other States. Many States could be expected to withdraw their own funds, cut benefits, purge large numbers of current recipients from the rolls, and avoid the investments needed to help people become self

-sufficient.

H.R. 4 should require States to provide matching funds or to maintain their current level of funding. We owe it to our children to ensure that welfare reform provides opportunities and protects children in all the States. In addition, the Administration understands that the Senate is likely to adopt Agriculture Committee language to amend the Food Stamp and other nutrition programs. The Administration strongly

supports the committee's decision to not block grant these critical programs. The Administration, however, is concerned about the severity of the cuts to the Food Stamp program included in the Agriculture Committee's proposal. These programs have produced significant and measurable improvements in health among the many who participate in them.

The Administration supports the welfare reform proposal offered by Senators Daschle, Breaux, and Mikulski. Unlike H.R. 4, the proposal provides resources for child care and training to move people to work, protects children, requires States to maintain their commitment to low

-income families, and provides adequate adjustment mechanisms for economic downturns and population changes. These are critical elements of real welfare reform that should be addressed before a bill is presented to the President. In summary, the Administration opposes H.R. 4 in its current form because it: (1) would fail to reform welfare by moving people from welfare to work; (2) would reduce Federal and State funding in ways that place children and families at risk of serious hardship; and (3) could impair the health and nutrition of children and families.

Pay

-As

-You

-Go Scoring

H.R. 4 would reduce direct spending. However, the House and Senate Budget resolutions specify that the budget savings from H.R. 4 are to be included in a package of offsets designed to pay for upcoming tax legislation. Therefore, the budget savings in H.R. 4 would go neither toward real welfare reform nor toward deficit reduction, but primarily to finance tax cuts for the wealthy.

* * * * *

(Do Not Distribute Outside the Executive Office of the President)
This position was developed by LRD (Mustain) in consultation with HRD (), OIRA (), BASD (), GC (), HTF (), VAP (), and TCJ (). The Departments of Health and Human Services (), Agriculture (), Justice (), Labor (), State (), Defense (), Transportation (), Housing and Urban Development (), the Treasury (), Veterans Affairs (), and the Office of Personnel Management (), the Office of National Drug Control Policy (), the Interagency Council for the Homeless (), the Federal EBT task force (), the Domestic Policy Council (), and the Council of Economic Advisers () agree with this position.

On June 21, 1994, the President transmitted to Congress the "Work and Responsibility Act of 1994." Major elements of the draft bill would: (1) strengthen paternity establishment; (2) improve collection of delinquent child support; (3) provide for family planning; (4) require unwed teens with children to live with their parents; (5) provide job search and training assistance; (6) provide greater child care assistance to those in training; (7) require AFDC recipients to work after two years in the program; and (8) make the application process and eligibility standards of the AFDC and Food Stamp programs more consistent. On March 24, 1995, the House passed H.R. 4. Except for its child support enforcement provisions, the House bill differs significantly from the Administration's 1994 proposal. The bill would end the entitlement status of many welfare assistance programs (Food Stamps being the only major exception) and instead provide block grants to the States. The Administration opposed the House bill in a Statement of Administration Policy. As ordered reported by the Senate Finance Committee, the Senate version of H.R. 4 follows the House model of converting welfare entitlement programs into a block grant to the States. Unlike its House counterpart, however, the Senate bill includes fewer restrictions on States and does not block grant foster care and adoption assistance programs. In addition, the Senate Finance Committee did not include provisions affecting the Food Stamp Program, nutrition programs, and the Child Care and Development Block Grant program (CCDBG). These programs fall under the jurisdiction of other Committees. Proposals to reform the Food Stamp Program, nutrition programs, and CCDBG are expected to be adopted on the Senate floor.

Major Provisions of H.R. 4

In place of certain welfare programs, H.R. 4 would establish a block grant to States -- the Block Grant for Temporary Assistance

for Needy Families. H.R. 4 also would impose new work requirements, tighten eligibility for SSI, establish new child support enforcement mechanisms, and allow States to deny benefits to aliens. The major elements of these proposals are discussed below.

The Block Grant for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) would provide funds to States in place of the following programs: (1) Aid to Families with Dependent Children; (2) Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS); (3) IV

-A, Transitional,
and At

-risk child care; and (4) Emergency Assistance. For these grants, H.R. 4 would authorize appropriations of \$16.8 billion in each of FYs 1996

-2000. States would be prohibited from paying cash benefits to a recipient for more than five years (or earlier at State's option). States could continue to provide benefits past the five year limit for up to 10 percent of its caseload for

hardship cases. Individuals receiving Social Security benefits, Supplemental Security Income benefits, or foster care payments would not be eligible for TANF benefits.

To address emergency funding needs, H.R. 4 would authorize appropriations of \$1.7 billion in FY 1996 to establish a Supplemental Assistance for Needy Families Federal Fund. HHS would administer the fund to provide loans to States in time of need. Loans could not exceed 10 percent of the State's TANF grant.

To receive a TANF block grant, H.R. 4 would require a State to certify that it operates a JOBS program, a child support enforcement program, child welfare programs, and an income and eligibility verification program. HHS would be authorized to collect penalties from States for failure to: spend funds in accord with program requirements; submit an annual report; meet JOBS participation rates; administer an income and eligibility verification program; or repay amounts borrowed from the Supplemental Assistance for Needy Families Federal Fund. H.R. 4 would give States the option make all non

- citizens ineligible for TANF benefits.

H.R. 4 would impose new work requirements. After two years (whether consecutive or not), at least one parent in a recipient family would be required to engage in work activities. The bill also would require States to meet increased participation rates under the JOBS program -- 25 percent of their caseload in FY 1996 and rising to 50 percent in FY 2001. Participation is defined as at least 20 hours per week in JOBS activities (excluding job search). For two

- parent TANF families, one parent would have to participate in at least 30 hours of work activities. In addition, States must meet a participation rate of 90 percent for two

- parent families by FY 1999. States would be required to

guarantee child care for recipients with children under age six in order to participate in JOBS activities.

The bill would restrict eligibility for SSI benefits. Under the bill, drug and alcohol addiction would no longer be a basis for eligibility for SSI benefits. Legal or illegal aliens would no longer qualify for SSI benefits unless they have worked in the United States long enough to qualify for Social Security disability income or old age benefits. Asylees and refugees would be eligible for SSI for up to five years after moving to the United States. Noncitizens who served in the armed forces (and their spouses and children) would also be eligible.

H.R. 4 also would limit SSI payments to only the most severely disabled children by more narrowly defining what constitutes a childhood disability. For example, the bill would (1) eliminate a double count of maladaptive behavior under the current "Listing

of Impairments" (LOI) that determines eligibility for SSI benefits and (2) eliminate the "individual functional assessment" process that provides an additional and often lower standard of eligibility than the LOI. The bill also would establish a National Commission on the Future of Disability Programs to make recommendations to improve Federal disability programs.

H.R. 4 includes child support enforcement provisions similar to those proposed by the Administration. As in the Administration's bill, H.R. 4 would: (1) require States to suspend professional and other licenses to parents that owe delinquent child support; (2) require States to create central case registries to track the status of support orders; (3) establish a Federal Directory of New Hires to help track down parents delinquent in their support payments; (4) improve paternity establishment, (5) expand administrative enforcement of child support orders; (6) simplify procedures to review and adjust orders; and (7) improve enforcement of orders by means such as the Federal income tax refund offset.

Pay

-As

-You

-Go Scoring

Per HRD () and BASD (), H.R. 4 is subject to the pay

-as

-you

-go

requirements of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 because it would reduce direct spending. CBO . . .

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE DIVISION

June 13, 1995 - 10:30 a.m.

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

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUN-1995 16:09:58.08

SUBJECT: RE: Family Planning reauthorization FYI

TO: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

READ:19-JUN-1995 16:36:58.49

CC: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

READ:19-JUN-1995 16:50:03.55

CC: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C) (OPD)

READ:20-JUN-1995 13:18:08.98

TEXT:

I read it and actually think this is a complicated political question. Some would argue that it is precisely the right time to take this on. I'm not sure. Keep me posted and I'll do the same.

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

CREATOR: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUN-1995 15:43:12.77

SUBJECT: Family Planning reauthorization FYI

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)
READ:19-JUN-1995 16:46:48.64

CC: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C) (OPD)
READ:20-JUN-1995 13:17:59.49

CC: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)
READ:19-JUN-1995 16:10:04.76

TEXT:

FYI: HHS wants to send a letter from Shalala to Gingrich recommending that they reauthorized Title X the PHS Act, which is family planning services. Apparently this hasn't been reauthorized since 1985, presumably because of the contentious nature of the abortion issue; yet appropriations have continued during all this time. OMB questions whether this is the right time and the right Congress to push this issue, and it certainly seems to me like they have a point! I told OMB that I agree. Supposedly Martha Foley is now considering the issue. (Chris and Jen: you were cc'd on this, but I assume you haven't commented.)

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

CREATOR: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUN-1995 16:36:51.16

SUBJECT: family planning

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

READ:19-JUN-1995 17:03:58.08

TEXT:

Sounds like you need to weigh in and settle this -- unless Jen is acting in her First Lady capacity, which is certainly possible.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:19-JUN-1995 16:06:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein

ATT SUBJECT: RE: Family Planning reauthorization FYI

ATT TO: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D)

ATT CC: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J)

ATT CC: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C)

TEXT:

I read it and actually think this is a complicated political question. Some would argue that it is precisely the right time to take this on. I'm not sure. Keep me posted and I'll do the same.

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

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

CREATOR: Sheryll D. Cashin (CASHIN_S) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-JUL-1995 12:07:26.01

SUBJECT: FYI and apologies

TO: Remote Addressee (dgarriso@os.dhhs.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

FYI, I understand from Jim Gatz that you are sending something over. Please apologize to Gatz for me; he just called me and I was very abrupt with him in giving my fax number because I had to catch a call. Perhaps you could forward my e-mail to him. I am sorry Jim, I am quite hassled today. Thanks.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:20-JUL-1995 11:51:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Sheryll D. Cashin

ATT SUBJECT: Carnegie Corporation Initiative

ATT TO: Remote Addressee (Julian_Potter@hud.gov@INET)

TEXT:

Per our conversation, the Carnegie Corporation would like the task force's recommendation as to the top three EC and the top three EZ candidates for their starting points grant initiative. They want to give additional support to places that have already mounted initiatives that focus on very young children (preferably ages 0-3).

They will be distributing \$3 million among 8 states and communities. The money will be flexible; it can be used for extra planning and bringing together of stakeholders to support implementation of ready-to-go or ongoing initiatives.

They will send a letter on AUG. 1 to 20 states and localities that they have identified as likely candidates.

They will probably focus on ECs rather than EZs for the few local grants that they give.

Appropriate EZ/EC candidates would be those that had a strong focus on children and families in their plan and/or any or all of the following types of activities:

family support and parenting education

family planning

comprehensive health care services for parents and children

quality childcare services

and an existing task force or committee that is focusing on families and children.

For each candidate, they would like a few sentences on why they were selected. They will need an address or contact for those places as well.

Thanks. Sorry for the delay.

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

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

CREATOR: Barry White (WHITE_B) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-JUL-1995 15:14:26.41

SUBJECT: Action to date on Labor/HHS/ED at H full committee - FYI

TO: Paul R. Dimond (DIMOND_P) (OPD)
READ:20-JUL-1995 15:15:59.42

TO: Gaynor R. McCown (MCCOWN_G) (OPD)
READ:20-JUL-1995 18:32:17.26

TO: Michael T. Schmidt (SCHMIDT_MT) (OPD)
READ:20-JUL-1995 17:01:35.81

TO: Robert Gordon (GORDON_R) (OPD)
READ:20-JUL-1995 15:15:24.19

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:20-JUL-1995 14:21:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Elizabeth L. Rossman

ATT SUBJECT: L/HHS/Ed -- Full Committee Markup (Markup not yet completed)

ATT TO: Barry White (WHITE_B)

ATT TO: Larry R. Matlack (MATLACK_L)

ATT TO: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B)

ATT TO: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)

ATT TO: Mark E. Miller (MILLER_ME)

ATT TO: Lisa B. Fairhall (FAIRHALL_L)

ATT TO: Jonas E. Neihardt (NEIHARDT_J)

ATT TO: Linda K. Wiesman (WIESMAN_L)

ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)

ATT TO: Kenneth S. Apfel (APFEL_K)

ATT TO: Keith J. Fontenot (FONTENOT_K)

ATT TO: Richard E. Green (GREEN_R)
ATT CC: Richard P. Emery Jr. (EMERY_R)
ATT CC: Robert E. Barker (BARKER_R)
ATT CC: Nancy S. Ridenour (RIDENOUR_N)
ATT CC: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C)
ATT CC: James I. Blount (BLOUNT_J)
ATT CC: Barry B. Anderson (ANDERSON_B)

TEXT:

The House Full Committee met today at 8:15 am and adjourned subject to the call of the chair (they did not finish on the bill).

The following actions occurred:

- (1) A Porter amendment was adopted (voice vote/without objection) that provided \$40 M more to the crime prevention programs in the bill. It provided \$35 M for rape prevention an, \$4 M for "community programs(?)" and \$1 M more in miscellaneous crime funding. They were able to do this because the House Appropriations Committee revised their 602(b) allocations once again. \$5 M was also transferred between LAE and the SSA/OIG (the Committee said that this was done at the request of the department.)
- (2) A Porter amendment was adopted (voice vote/without objection) that made eight changes to the bill report language (encouraging NIH to focus on Parkinson's disease, Alzheimers, etc. -- we will know when we get the amendment).
- (3) An Obey amendment was defeated (29-18) that would have struck eleven different legislative provisions in the bill, including the prohibition on implementation of the Executive Order on striker replacement, OSHA regulation modifications, and the elimination of the Office of the Surgeon General.
- (4) A Livingston amendment was adopted (28-25) that would terminate funding for family planning (\$193 M) and transfer the funds to the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant (\$116 M) and to Community and Migrant Health Centers (\$77 M).
- (5) A Hoyer amendment was defeated (30-19) that would have restored \$1.1 B to various Education programs (Goals 2000, Eisenhower program, Safe and Drug Free Schools, School-to-Work, Voc Ed) and to Head Start. (Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)
- (6) A Pelosi amendment was defeated (32-19) that would have restored funding for various worker protection programs (OSHA, \$44 M; MSHA, \$14 M; ESA, \$22 M; Pension protection, \$4.5 M; NLRB, \$47.5 M; Dislocated workers, \$232 M; NIOSH, \$30 M). (Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)
- (7) A Lowey amendment was defeated (24-19) that would have restored \$140 M for student aid programs (\$100 M for Perkins loan program, and \$40 M for SSIG).(Offset -- change Federal cap on

Medicaid.)

(8) A Stokes amendment was defeated (26-19) that would have restored \$1.3 B to investments in career and youth training (School-to-Work, Dislocated Workers, partial restoration of Summer Jobs). (Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)

(9) An Obey amendment was defeated (32-17) that would have restored funding to 3/4 of reductions made to LIHEAP, Older workers programs, AOA programs, Medigap counseling, Head Start, Healthy Start and Special Education. (Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)

(10) An Obey amendment was adopted by voice vote that would remove offensive language in the bill (struck lines 1-9 on p. 17 -- Labor Depart, I'm not sure if they did the same for other agencies -- we will have to wait until we get a copy of the amendment.)

(11) It seemed as if Istook was ready to offer his abortion amendment. However, Livingston expressed concern that whatever the amendment was -- that it was controversial and asked that his amendment be withdrawn.

(12) A Porter second degree amendment to a Dickey amendment failed on a 26-26 tie. The Porter amendment would have prohibited funds in the Act from being used to support the creation of human embryos for research. Porter claimed that this was consistent with the current NIH practice. The Dickey/Wicker amendment (which was adopted 30-26) would prohibit Federal funds for being used for embryo research outside the womb.

Full Committee is expected to continue on the bill either tonight or tomorrow morning.

I'll keep you posted.

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

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

CREATOR: Robert Gordon (GORDON_R) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-JUL-1995 15:15:43.88

SUBJECT: Elena, Gene should see this.

TO: Gene B. Sperling (SPERLING_G) Autoforward to: Elena R. Mccoy (MCCOY_ER)
(PDONE)
READ:20-JUL-1995 15:27:55.59

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:20-JUL-1995 15:13:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Barry White

ATT SUBJECT: Action to date on Labor/HHS/ED at H full committee - FYI

ATT TO: Paul R. Dimond (DIMOND_P)

ATT TO: Gaynor R. McCown (MCCOWN_G)

ATT TO: Michael T. Schmidt (SCHMIDT_MT)

ATT TO: Robert Gordon (GORDON_R)

TEXT:

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

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:20-JUL-1995 14:21:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Elizabeth L. Rossman

ATT SUBJECT: L/HHS/Ed -- Full Committee Markup (Markup not yet completed)

ATT TO: Barry White (WHITE_B)

ATT TO: Larry R. Matlack (MATLACK_L)

ATT TO: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B)

ATT TO: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)

ATT TO: Mark E. Miller (MILLER_ME)

ATT TO: Lisa B. Fairhall (FAIRHALL_L)
ATT TO: Jonas E. Neihardt (NEIHARDT_J)
ATT TO: Linda K. Wiesman (WIESMAN_L)
ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)
ATT TO: Kenneth S. Apfel (APFEL_K)
ATT TO: Keith J. Fontenot (FONTENOT_K)
ATT TO: Richard E. Green (GREEN_R)
ATT CC: Richard P. Emery Jr. (EMERY_R)
ATT CC: Robert E. Barker (BARKER_R)
ATT CC: Nancy S. Ridenour (RIDENOUR_N)
ATT CC: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C)
ATT CC: James I. Blount (BLOUNT_J)
ATT CC: Barry B. Anderson (ANDERSON_B)

TEXT:

The House Full Committee met today at 8:15 am and adjourned subject to the call of the chair (they did not finish on the bill).

The following actions occurred:

- (1) A Porter amendment was adopted (voice vote/without objection) that provided \$40 M more to the crime prevention programs in the bill. It provided \$35 M for rape prevention an, \$4 M for "community programs(?)" and \$1 M more in miscellaneous crime funding. They were able to do this because the House Appropriations Committee revised their 602(b) allocations once again. \$5 M was also transferred between LAE and the SSA/OIG (the Committee said that this was done at the request of the department.)
- (2) A Porter amendment was adopted (voice vote/without objection) that made eight changes to the bill report language (encouraging NIH to focus on Parkinson's disease, Alzheimers, etc. -- we will know when we get the amendment).
- (3) An Obey amendment was defeated (29-18) that would have struck eleven different legislative provisions in the bill, including the prohibition on implementation of the Executive Order on striker replacement, OSHA regulation modifications, and the elimination of the Office of the Surgeon General.
- (4) A Livingston amendment was adopted (28-25) that would terminate funding for family planning (\$193 M) and transfer the funds to the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant (\$116 M) and to Community and Migrant Health Centers (\$77 M).

(5) A Hoyer amendment was defeated (30-19) that would have restored \$1.1 B to various Education programs (Goals 2000, Eisenhower program, Safe and Drug Free Schools, School-to-Work, Voc Ed) and to Head Start. (Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)

(6) A Pelosi amendment was defeated (32-19) that would have restored funding for various worker protection programs (OSHA, \$44 M; MSHA, \$14 M; ESA, \$22 M; Pension protection, \$4.5 M; NLRB, \$47.5 M; Dislocated workers, \$232 M; NIOSH, \$30 M). (Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)

(7) A Lowey amendment was defeated (24-19) that would have restored \$140 M for student aid programs (\$100 M for Perkins loan program, and \$40 M for SSIG).(Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)

(8) A Stokes amendment was defeated (26-19) that would have restored \$1.3 B to investments in career and youth training (School-to-Work, Dislocated Workers, partial restoration of Summer Jobs). (Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)

(9) An Obey amendment was defeated (32-17) that would have restored funding to 3/4 of reductions made to LIHEAP, Older workers programs, AOA programs, Medigap counseling, Head Start, Healthy Start and Special Education. (Offset -- change Federal cap on Medicaid.)

(10) An Obey amendment was adopted by voice vote that would remove offensive language in the bill (struck lines 1-9 on p. 17 -- Labor Depart, I'm not sure if they did the same for other agencies -- we will have to wait until we get a copy of the amendment.)

(11) It seemed as if Istook was ready to offer his abortion amendment. However, Livingston expressed concern that whatever the amendment was -- that it was controversial and asked that his amendment be withdrawn.

(12) A Porter second degree amendment to a Dickey amendment failed on a 26-26 tie. The Porter amendment would have prohibited funds in the Act from being used to support the creation of human embryos for research. Porter claimed that this was consistent with the current NIH practice. The Dickey/Wicker amendment (which was adopted 30-26) would prohibit Federal funds for being used for embryo research outside the womb.

Full Committee is expected to continue on the bill either tonight or tomorrow morning.

I'll keep you posted.

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

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

CREATOR: Sheryll D. Cashin (CASHIN_S) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-JUL-1995 12:05:36.23

SUBJECT: Carnegie Corporation Initiative

TO: Remote Addressee (Julian_Potter@hud.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Per our conversation, the Carnegie Corporation would like the task force's recommendation as to the top three EC and the top three EZ candidates for their starting points grant initiative. They want to give additional support to places that have already mounted initiatives that focus on very young children (preferably ages 0-3).

They will be distributing \$3 million among 8 states and communities. The money will be flexible; it can be used for extra planning and bringing together of stakeholders to support implementation of ready-to-go or ongoing initiatives. They will send a letter on AUG. 1 to 20 states and localities that they have identified as likely candidates.

They will probably focus on ECs rather than EZs for the few local grants that they give.

Appropriate EZ/EC candidates would be those that had a strong focus on children and families in their plan and/or any or all of the following types of activities:

- family support and parenting education
- family planning
- comprehensive health care services for parents and children
- quality childcare services
- and an existing task force or committee that is focusing on families and children.

For each candidate, they would like a few sentences on why they were selected. They will need an address or contact for those places as well.

Thanks. Sorry for the delay.

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

CREATOR: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JUL-1995 19:01:22.45

SUBJECT: RE: Shalala testifying on Family Planning

TO: Robert J. Pellicci (PELLICCI_R) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 09:04:07.73

CC: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)
READ:24-JUL-1995 19:08:51.99

CC: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)
READ:24-JUL-1995 21:09:17.72

CC: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C) (OPD)
READ:25-JUL-1995 15:59:29.11

CC: James Castello (CASTELLO_J) (WHO)
READ:24-JUL-1995 19:40:02.79

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)
READ:24-JUL-1995 19:03:17.81

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)
READ:24-JUL-1995 19:16:05.48

CC: Allison H. Eydt (EYDT_A) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 09:16:06.81

CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 09:53:10.28

CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 08:09:24.92

TEXT:
when?

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

CREATOR: Robert J. Pellicci (PELLICCI_R) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JUL-1995 16:36:42.67

SUBJECT: Shalala testifying on Family Planning

TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

READ:24-JUL-1995 19:01:25.22

TO: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

READ:24-JUL-1995 17:02:13.82

TO: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

READ:24-JUL-1995 17:51:43.86

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C) (OPD)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:03:20.85

TO: James Castello (CASTELLO_J) (WHO)

READ:24-JUL-1995 17:48:05.72

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)

READ:24-JUL-1995 17:54:54.02

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)

READ:24-JUL-1995 17:54:46.08

CC: Allison H. Eydt (EYDT_A) (OMB)

READ:24-JUL-1995 16:41:33.49

CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J) (OMB)

READ:24-JUL-1995 16:38:54.01

CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J) (OMB)

READ:24-JUL-1995 16:52:32.05

TEXT:

ALERT --

Secretary Shalala has been invited and has accepted to testify before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education on the Department's title X family planning program. According to Karen Pollitz, the Secretary's testimony will be sent to us for clearance in the morning.

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

CREATOR: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JUL-1995 17:05:51.67

SUBJECT: FYI Shalala testifying on family planning

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

READ:24-JUL-1995 18:42:53.37

TO: Karen R. Guss (GUSS_K) (WHO)

READ:24-JUL-1995 17:19:59.69

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:24-JUL-1995 16:31:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Robert J. Pellicci

ATT SUBJECT: Shalala testifying on Family Planning

ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)

ATT TO: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D)

ATT TO: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J)

ATT TO: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C)

ATT TO: James Castello (CASTELLO_J)

ATT CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B)

ATT CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)

ATT CC: Allison H. Eydt (EYDT_A)

ATT CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J)

ATT CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J)

TEXT:

ALERT --

Secretary Shalala has been invited and has accepted to testify before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education on the Department's title X family planning program. According to Karen Pollitz, the Secretary's testimony will be sent to us for clearance in the morning.

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

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUL-1995 15:12:41.31

SUBJECT: RE: Shalala testifying on Family Planning

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C) (OPD)
READ:27-JUL-1995 16:31:12.30

CC: Robert J. Pellicci (PELLICCI_R) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 15:33:59.33

CC: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 17:39:18.65

CC: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)
READ:25-JUL-1995 15:14:46.05

CC: James Castello (CASTELLO_J) (WHO)
READ:25-JUL-1995 15:27:33.23

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 15:13:08.45

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 16:17:09.30

CC: Allison H. Eydt (EYDT_A) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 15:33:28.35

CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 16:38:05.30

CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 15:15:57.39

TEXT:
Has anyone asked Jerry?

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

CREATOR: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUL-1995 15:03:17.71

SUBJECT: RE: Shalala testifying on Family Planning

TO: Robert J. Pellicci (PELLICCI_R) (OMB)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:04:07.97

CC: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

READ:25-JUL-1995 17:39:03.44

CC: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:14:30.58

CC: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:12:45.25

CC: James Castello (CASTELLO_J) (WHO)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:27:23.07

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:10:54.52

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:03:34.41

CC: Allison H. Eydt (EYDT_A) (OMB)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:05:23.14

CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J) (OMB)

READ:25-JUL-1995 16:36:28.11

CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J) (OMB)

READ:25-JUL-1995 15:06:51.51

TEXT:

Fine by me, as long as it is fine by Nancy Ann and Jen. Not my issue, but I thought Jerry Klepner's past position is that the Secretary does not testify at Subcommittee level. Will this create problems for us later on when he tries to use that excuse when we don't want to testify?

CJ

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

CREATOR: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUL-1995 17:39:01.14

SUBJECT: RE: Shalala testifying on Family Planning

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C) (OPD)
READ:27-JUL-1995 16:42:58.35

CC: Robert J. Pellicci (PELLICCI_R) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:08:16.49

CC: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:06:17.33

CC: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)
READ:25-JUL-1995 17:46:26.21

CC: James Castello (CASTELLO_J) (WHO)
READ:25-JUL-1995 19:29:09.84

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:00:51.96

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:43:19.18

CC: Allison H. Eydt (EYDT_A) (OMB)
READ:26-JUL-1995 09:19:09.14

CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J) (OMB)
READ:26-JUL-1995 09:52:59.40

CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 17:45:32.06

TEXT:
yes, chris has a good point here.

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

CREATOR: Robert J. Pellicci (PELLICCI_R) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUL-1995 18:08:10.83

SUBJECT: RE: Shalala testifying on Family Planning

TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)
READ:26-JUL-1995 08:42:11.64

CC: Christopher C. Jennings (JENNINGS_C) (OPD)
READ:27-JUL-1995 16:43:08.31

CC: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:08:21.70

CC: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:39:38.74

CC: James Castello (CASTELLO_J) (WHO)
READ:25-JUL-1995 19:29:30.08

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:26:24.79

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:44:00.41

CC: Allison H. Eydt (EYDT_A) (OMB)
READ:26-JUL-1995 09:20:18.67

CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J) (OMB)
READ:26-JUL-1995 09:53:43.05

CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J) (OMB)
READ:25-JUL-1995 18:14:59.39

TEXT:

I was just advised by HHS that the family planning hearing has been cancelled -- no new date has been scheduled. HHS, however, would like to have Secretary Shalala's statement cleared in anticipation of a future hearing. We certainly do not need to clear the statement tomorrow. I believe by the end of this week or early next will be fine. As soon as a new date/time is announced I will let you know.

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

CREATOR: Robert J. Pellicci (PELLICCI_R) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-AUG-1995 11:01:20.90

SUBJECT: Secretary Shalala's Family Planning Statement

TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 14:59:08.92

TO: James Castello (CASTELLO_J) (WHO)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:36:51.53

TO: Martha Foley (FOLEY_M) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:16:09.82

TO: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:25:25.00

TO: Janet Murguia (MURGUIA_J) (WHO)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 13:06:08.52

TO: Barbara C. Chow (CHOW_B) (WHO)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 13:08:18.84

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:11:10.30

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:06:07.99

CC: William G. White (WHITE_W) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:04:17.95

CC: Nani A. Coloretti (COLORETTI_N) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:01:39.51

CC: Elizabeth L. Rossman (ROSSMAN_E) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:01:39.64

CC: Lydia Muniz (MUNIZ_L) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:02:11.75

CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 13:19:51.99

CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 11:46:06.52

TEXT:
Earlier this morning I circulated for your review and sign-off HHS Secretary Shalala's testimony for Thursday's hearing before Sen.

Spector's Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the title X family planning program. The deadline for comments was listed as 10 a.m. tomorrow. Secretary Shalala has requested that, if at all possible, we provide our comments to the Department by this evening. I told her staff that we would try.

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

CREATOR: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-AUG-1995 14:59:04.34

SUBJECT: RE: Secretary Shalala's Family Planning Statement

TO: Robert J. Pellicci (PELLICCI_R) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 15:09:26.15

CC: James Castello (CASTELLO_J) (WHO)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 16:41:14.13

CC: Martha Foley (FOLEY_M) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 17:40:14.29

CC: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 15:00:30.89

CC: Janet Murguia (MURGUIA_J) (WHO)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 16:44:30.96

CC: Barbara C. Chow (CHOW_B) (WHO)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 21:16:14.71

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 14:59:52.75

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 14:59:40.58

CC: William G. White (WHITE_W) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 14:59:58.53

CC: Nani A. Coloretti (COLORETTI_N) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 16:08:59.50

CC: Elizabeth L. Rossman (ROSSMAN_E) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 15:29:07.84

CC: Lydia Muniz (MUNIZ_L) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 15:06:25.69

CC: Janet R. Forsgren (FORSGREN_J) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 16:53:30.31

CC: James C. Murr (MURR_J) (OMB)
READ: 8-AUG-1995 15:05:27.93

TEXT:
thanks, bob--but i haven't even seen it yet and doubt i will be
able to before 6 PM or so tonight at the earliest.

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

CREATOR: Karen R. Guss (GUSS_K) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-AUG-1995 12:19:07.75

SUBJECT: repro rts talking points

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

READ:10-AUG-1995 12:29:56.53

TEXT:

I looked at your edits -- I think everything looks good.

I want to change the last paragraph to say:

"It is clear that the Congressional majority is paying back the religious right for its support at the polls last November.

Republicans have embraced the Christian Coalition's "Contract with the American Family," which contains provisions attacking reproductive rights, including funding for family planning programs. The Contract also proposes "constitutional and statutory protection for the unborn child" -- a thinly disguised call for a total ban on abortion.

What do you think?

Also, I am running the talking points past Jake Siewert to see what he thinks. Julia says he needs to see all the talking points that do or can go out of here.

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

CREATOR: Julie E. Demeo (DEMEO_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-AUG-1995 11:13:10.36

SUBJECT: Yesterday's DPC memo

TO: Patsy Fleming (FLEMING_P) (DOJ)

READ:23-AUG-1995 11:15:18.07

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

August 22, 1995

DAILY BRIEFING MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL

SUBJECT: Daily Briefing on DPC Issues

Immigration Enforcement

The Border Patrol arrested 32 illegal aliens in Orlando who had used fraudulent documents to gain employment and social services. The individuals were employed in construction at the county courthouse and the action was taken pursuant to complaints from citizens and union officials that illegal aliens were taking jobs from American workers at the site. The arrested individuals were returned voluntarily to Mexico.

Discipline for Children with Disabilities

How to discipline students with disabilities is the most controversial issue in the reauthorization of the law governing special education, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). A group of six organizations representing school boards, principals, and teachers argue there is a double standard for students with disabilities because it is more difficult to remove them from the classroom for disciplinary reasons than students without disabilities. Disability advocates argue vociferously that the discipline issue is a false one that has been used as a smokescreen to exclude children with disabilities. Last year Congress moved in the direction of the school boards by passing the Jeffords amendment, which allows immediate suspension for up to 45 days of a child who brings a gun to school. In its IDEA reauthorization proposal, the Department of Education proposes to extend this to any type of weapon and to allow schools to go before a hearing officer rather than to court to remove a student against parents' wishes. However, the group of six organizations proposes to go further and allow local school districts to determine when to remove a child, while the Senate will consider whether to let schools remove students with disabilities who are considered disruptive.

The six organizations are the American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association, National School Boards Association, American Association of School Administrators,

National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. This group also objects to the Education Department's proposals on placement

of students with disabilities in regular classrooms, resolution of disputes between parents and schools, and new requirements imposed on schools.

Mid South Foundation Initiatives

Carol Rasco has attended two programs of the Mid South Foundation. One is a group they have formed of the Enterprise Communities located in La., Ark., Miss. in the EZ/EC program. The group will meet quarterly and had their first meeting in DC some months ago. Carol along with representatives from HUD and USDA attended the second meeting recently in Louisiana. Also present were some of the evaluators hired by USDA; included among the evaluators was Pam Moore whom you may remember worked extensively on the Delta Commission report.

A second meeting was a conference "Black Churches' Role in Community Development" convened after a year's work by a Task Force on the topic. It was held in New Orleans and attended by Carol Rasco. This large meeting of area laity and clergy was to begin to achieve grassroots "buy

-in" for a long term program to be led by the Foundation.

Norplant

The FDA announced that the contraceptive implant Norplant remains safe and effective. Norplant was first approved by the FDA in 1990. More than 200 lawsuits have been filed against Norplant's manufacturer; the plaintiffs in the lawsuits claim that they were not warned about Norplant's side effects, that Norplant is painful to remove, or that Norplant is defective in other ways.

Family Planning

The U. S. Naval Academy changed its policy towards midshipmen expecting the birth of a child. Now midshipmen will be allowed to return to school after taking a 1 year leave of absence if they have given up custody of their child or children. In the past, pregnant midshipmen would have been expelled or would have to obtain an abortion. Male midshipmen would have been expelled if they acknowledged paternity. Even under the new policy, midshipmen of both sexes cannot marry or support families.

AIDS Care

The current fiscal crisis facing Los Angeles County may threaten AIDS care. Facing a deficit of \$677 million, the county has ordered cuts in the public health system that will close 29 of 38 community health centers and all 6 comprehensive health centers. Fortunately, the AIDS clinic at County/USC Hospital (largest AIDS clinic in the U.S.), will stay open in order to retain Ryan White CARE Act funds. White House AIDS Policy Director Patsy Fleming visited County/USC Hospital (Aug 18). The County is also seeking a Medicaid waiver to allow establishment of a demonstration

program that would bring new Federal dollars into the County.

Farm Bill

The Farm Bill will get serious after Labor Day. The question now at USDA is which strategy to pursue, veto or compromise. The over

-whelming preference is compromise. The expectation is that this is possible.

Farm Credit

It is the understanding of USDA that we should pursue changes in farm credit along the lines previously discussed. This would be expanding the role of Farm Credit. The Secretary will work on more specifics with the committees.

Reinventing Government

More than four out of five community national bankers who responded to a recent survey by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency said streamlined examination procedures put in place last year have helped reduce regulatory burden.

The OCC's survey of community national banks stemmed from a June 1994 initiative that streamlined exams for "non

-complex"

community national banks -- those with less than \$1 billion in assets and which met other criteria.

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

CREATOR: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-SEP-1995 09:08:30.77

SUBJECT: Choice issue in Foreign Ops bill

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

READ:27-SEP-1995 09:37:56.46

TEXT:

The State Dept called late last night about an issue in the Foreign Ops Appropriations bill - relating to the reversal of the Mexico City executive order re funding for intl family planning orgs that provide abortion services with other money. The reversal of the Bush policy was one of the early EOs we signed. The House (Chris Smith) included a provision in the bill overturning the EO. The Senate did not. The Senate actually has statutory language that supports the EO. This difference could be the single issue remaining in the conference. State wanted guidance as to how hard to push back on this - i.e., veto line or no.

I spoke to Leg Affairs late last night and to State. I understand this came up at 7:30 and I raised it at 8:15. The instruction I derived from Leon was that State should send a very strong signal that we are committed to this policy. George told me after that he thought maybe a meeting with you, Pat, him, Nancy Ann and me might be a good idea - just 15 minutes to go over this. I personally would add people from the State Dept who know the exact language at issue!

I have asked State exactly what the timing of this is. If it will be moot by noon, then there's no need to meet. If this may drag for a day or two, I will let you know.

Thanks.

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

CREATOR: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-OCT-1995 16:33:54.79

SUBJECT: More on Medicaid/Senate Finance/ Abortion

TO: Martha Foley (FOLEY_M) (WHO)

READ: 4-OCT-1995 16:35:43.01

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

READ: 4-OCT-1995 16:40:48.38

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (OPD)

READ: 5-OCT-1995 14:51:52.65

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 4-OCT-1995 16:07:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Nani A. Coloretti

ATT SUBJECT: Senate Reconciliation Plan Set; Abortion Issue Looms

ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)

ATT TO: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B)

ATT TO: Elizabeth L. Rossman (ROSSMAN_E)

ATT TO: William G. White (WHITE_W)

TEXT:

BUDGET

Senate Reconciliation Plan Set; Abortion Issue Looms

The Senate Republican budget reconciliation plan will be completed and ready to be sent to the CBO for scoring as soon as Thursday, a Republican aide said today. So far, the aide said, Republican estimates show the package would exceed the GOP's original savings target for 2002 by "several billion dollars" -- perhaps allowing Republicans to cut less from entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid.

Meanwhile, the thorny issue of abortion -- already complicating the resolution of half a dozen FY96 appropriations bills -- now may threaten the reconciliation bill as well. The Medicaid provisions of the reconciliation proposals approved by the House Commerce Committee Sept. 22 and the Senate Finance Committee last Friday include language that would "codify" the so-called Hyde amendment language prohibiting the use of federal

funds to pay for abortion except in cases of life endangerment, rape or incest. And while the language seems certain to clear the House floor, procedural tactics could see it struck in the Senate, setting up yet another source of discord between the two chambers.

The prospect of writing into permanent law the abortion funding ban, which has until now been fought year by year in appropriations bills, raises the stakes for those on both sides. Because appropriations riders "are a disfavored form of legislation," said Douglas Johnson, legislative director of the National Right to Life Committee, "We think it's necessary that if there's going to be a major rewrite of Medicaid, that this be written into the fabric of the legislation." That is exactly what abortion rights backers fear, according to NARAL President Kate Michelman, who said, "This policy will institutionalize the discrimination inherent in the Hyde amendment."

Finance members appeared to have reached a truce during markup last week. By a 11-9 vote, members Friday refused to strike the abortion ban language from the bill. But at the insistence of Sen. John Chafee, R-R.I., who offered the amendment to remove the ban -- and who reportedly threatened to withhold his vote for the entire package over the issue -- the panel late Friday night adopted an amendment requiring states to cover "pre-pregnancy family planning services and supplies." Both the abortion language and the family planning amendment, however, could well fall victim to the "Byrd rule" -- which bars inclusion of "extraneous" matters in reconciliation bills -- when the bill reaches the Senate floor. Any senator may raise a point of order that a provision violates the rule, and if the parliamentarian agrees, the provision needs 60 votes to remain in the bill. While Chafee has not said if he would seek to strike the ban on Byrd rule grounds on the floor, a Chafee aide today said, "I'd be shocked if there was not" an attempt by someone.

The Congress Daily --- Wednesday --- October 4, 1995

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

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

CREATOR: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-DEC-1995 12:29:41.81

SUBJECT: Issues for women's meeting

TO: Betsy Myers (MYERS_B) (WHO)

READ:19-DEC-1995 12:48:19.26

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (WOOLLEY_B) (WHO)

READ:19-DEC-1995 13:52:46.59

CC: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:19-DEC-1995 13:11:51.65

TEXT:

Attached is the revised version of the issues attachment for your briefing on tomorrow's meeting.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Thanks.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:19-DEC-1995 12:27:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Jeremy D. Benami

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

ATTACHMENT

Key Issues for Meeting with Women's Leaders

I. Medicaid/Medicare/Budget

Concern: Generally, women's groups have been strong supporters of the administration's position in the budget debate. They do, however, have some concerns: (1) defense of Medicaid as an entitlement; (2) the ultimate size of the Medicare cut; and (3) the administration's communications strategy, which they believe has not articulated how strongly proposed budget cuts affect women.

Potential Responses: (1) Medicaid: You should provide a strong reaffirmation of your commitment to the Medicaid entitlement; (2) Medicare: You should restate your commitment to hold line on Medicare cuts; (3)

Communications: You can indicate that the administration will be doing more to highlight the impact of Republican proposals on women and to work more closely with women's groups to get our message out.

II. Welfare Reform

Concerns: (1) AFDC Entitlement: The groups have been vocal opponents of any effort to rescind the AFDC entitlement.

They question why we defend the Medicaid entitlement on the one hand but not AFDC on the other;

(2) Family Cap: These groups have been particular opposed to the Family Cap and will likely argue for vetoing the bill on this issue alone;

(3) Welfare Generally: The groups have been disappointed with the administration's welfare proposals since the campaign which they feel have not been sensitive to the needs of women. They will press strongly for a commitment to veto the Congressional welfare reform proposal.

Potential Responses:

? General: You are likely to oppose any Congressional proposal that undermines fundamental protections, but you have reserved judgment on a veto pending the outcome of the Conference. You have pressed for more child care money, greater protection for bad economic times through a contingency fund, and for meaningful work provisions.

? Family Cap: The administration has supported making this a state option. The current Congressional proposal is to allow states to opt out of a national

rule, and while we might prefer it to be "opt

-in," this

is unlikely to be a veto issue.

? Entitlement: It would be best to avoid any commitment on this issue. You should move the conversation to how detrimental cuts in Medicaid and EITC will be to real welfare reform.

III. Choice

Concerns: (1) Appropriations: A number of the appropriations bills (Treasury/Postal, Defense, and now DC) contained provisions that restrict abortion rights, yet for various reasons we have had to sign them. The groups will express concern about these bills and about provisions in Foreign Ops and Labor/HHS that are still to be sent to the White House.

(2) HR1833: The groups will be looking for a commitment to veto the bill which criminalizes certain abortions. [Note on language: While the bill is called the Partial Birth Abortion bill, it is best to refer to it as "the bill which would criminalize certain abortions." The language is important to the debate.]

Potential Responses:

(1) Appropriations: It would be helpful to note your concern with the provisions in the bills already signed and to restate your opposition to provisions in the pending bills that would cut off funding to international family planning organizations (Foreign Ops) and to allowing states not to fund Medicaid abortions under the Hyde rules (Labor/HHS).

(2) HR1833: Administration staff have indicated that they would recommend a veto of the bill, but there has been no

explicit Presidential statement yet on the bill. It would be helpful to indicate your personal feelings on the bill and to indicate that you will veto the bill if presented as passed by the Senate.

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

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-DEC-1995 16:52:21.88

SUBJECT: Medicaid Document

TO: Pauline M. Abernathy (ABERNATHY_P) (OPD)

READ:29-DEC-1995 16:57:56.25

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

MEDICAID KEY POINTS

1. SAVINGS/EXPENDITURES/GROWTH RATE

Key Point: The magnitude of the Republican cuts and the way they are distributed over time are unacceptable. Their cuts would force states to deny coverage for millions of people.

? Based on CBO data, their annual growth rate averages less than 2% per person over seven years, which is over 70% below the private sector growth rate. In 2001, spending per person would actually decrease by 1.7%.

? The President's Medicaid plan limits the per person growth rate to 5.5% -- already more than 20% below the private sector growth rate of about 7%.

? Republicans will claim that states could reduce their costs if given more flexibility, but they have never shown how states could achieve this level of savings without denying eligibility or reducing benefits.

Medicaid payments to providers are already low, and there is little evidence that managed care would significantly reduce spending on older and disabled Americans, who account for more than two

-thirds of Medicaid spending.

CBO already assumes that more than 33% of poor children and their families are already in managed care.

2. PROGRAM STRUCTURE: BLOCK GRANT V. PER CAPITA CAP

Key Point: Under a block grant, states would be liable for 100% of the additional costs caused by circumstances beyond their control (e.g., economic downturn, inflation, changes in population, natural disaster). A per capita cap would allow us to restrain the growth in federal Medicaid outlays, without penalizing states and reducing coverage for people with low

-incomes during these circumstances.

? Rainy Day Fund. Republicans will say that they can address this issue by creating a "rainy day fund" that will be available to states experiencing downturns or

other circumstances beyond their control. While they have not outlined the specifics, we expect that there will be less than \$20 billion in this fund.

? Insufficient Funds. No rainy day fund could fully protect states or respond quickly enough to states' needs. If several regions of the country experience a recession at the same time, costs due to enrollment increases could easily be much higher than the amount in the fund. Also, states would have to go through an administrative process that could delay funding.

? Unfunded Mandates. They will also argue that our per capita cap is an unfunded mandate.

? Protects States Financially. Our per capita cap is not an unfunded mandate because, under the President's Medicaid plan, federal funding is not fixed but instead responds to state financial needs. In addition, the President's plan offers significantly more funding per beneficiary than the Republican plan.

? Scoring of Per Capita Cap. Republicans will say that CBO will not score a per capita cap. CBO has given preliminary estimates of significant savings under a per capita cap to Congressional staff. CBO has said that it did not score the President's per capita cap because the wording was not explicit enough and wrote instructions on how to fix it. We are making changes and anticipate that CBO will score savings.

3. FEDERAL GUARANTEE

Key Point: The Republican plan ends the individual entitlement under Medicaid, eliminating the guarantee of meaningful coverage.

? Coverage Loss. According to the Urban Institute, Lewin

-VHI, and HHS, millions of people will be denied meaningful coverage under the Republican plan.

?? While Republicans claim to cover poor children under the age of 13, pregnant women, and people with disabilities, states would have nearly complete discretion to determine the level of benefits provided and to define the eligible disabilities. The only required benefits would be immunizations and limited family planning. The block grant "set asides", or required spending, cover less than half of state Medicaid spending for these groups.

?? While Republicans claim to cover Medicare premiums under Medicaid for poor Medicare beneficiaries, they eliminate the guarantee and set aside less than half of the amount required to pay premiums alone. (See #6 Benefits for more details.)

? States will be forced to cut benefits. States will not be able to save enough through increased use of managed care

because CBO already assumes expansion of managed care for poor children and their families and because there is no evidence that managed care produces significant savings for elderly and disabled populations. In addition, provider payments under Medicaid are already low. As a result, states will be forced to cut benefits in order to absorb the federal spending reductions.

4. ENFORCEMENT/PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION

Key Point: A key element of maintaining the guarantee under Medicaid is retaining the right of individuals to go to court to enforce their rights.

? The Republicans, like the Republican Governors (and to some extent the Democratic Governors), strongly support eliminating the right of individuals to sue in federal court. Because we are sympathetic to their concerns about lawsuits, the President's plan repeals the Boren Amendment (that requires that payment to providers be "reasonable"), which is one of the primary sources of suits against states in federal courts.

? We have not reached consensus within the Administration on our final position on the individual right of action. However, we have conducted meaningful discussions with the Democratic Governors to examine alternatives that would help address their concerns. We anticipate having some substantive options available for internal review by early next week. We therefore believe that discussion should be deferred until that time if at all possible.

5. ELIGIBILITY

Key Point: The Republican plan does not guarantee Medicaid eligibility to older Americans, people with disabilities deemed ineligible by their state, and many children. While we strongly support maintaining current eligibility, you can signal some flexibility.

Our Position: We maintain the current categories of eligibility, and we allow states to cover anyone up to 150% of poverty within the per capita cap. We can signal interest in: (1) simplifying eligibility rules (e.g. simplifying processes for determining eligibility, consolidating small eligibility groups into broader categories); and (2) considering options for states dealing with Medicaid coverage under a new welfare program.

Republican Position:

? Children. While Republicans claim to cover children, their bill actually repeals guaranteed coverage for children under age 6 between 100

-133% of poverty. In addition, it ends Medicaid's phased

-in coverage of children aged 13

-18.

? People with Disabilities. Under the Republican plan, states would determine which disabilities would make someone eligible, so people with disabilities would not be guaranteed coverage -- meaningful or not.

? Older Americans. Republicans eliminate the guarantee of any coverage for older Americans, including nursing home coverage.

? QMBs and SLMBs: Low

-Income Older and Disabled Medicare Beneficiaries. Republicans eliminate the guarantee of Medicaid coverage of Medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments for Medicare beneficiaries under 100% of poverty (Qualified Medicare Beneficiaries or QMBs) and of coverage of Medicare premiums for those below 120% of poverty (Specified Low

-Income Medicare Beneficiaries or SLMBs). Elimination of this coverage may deny poor elderly and disabled people access to the Medicare Part B program.

6. BENEFITS

Key Point: There must be a guarantee of meaningful benefits. While there is room for some increased flexibility, you should not get into a discussion of specifics now. Our Position: We maintain the current benefit package. We allow states to set up home and community

-based care programs without waivers (as is currently required). You can signal that we are willing to discuss additional flexibility, particularly in the category of optional benefits. Republican Position:

?? No Minimum Benefits Package. The Republican plan does not guarantee anyone meaningful benefits. The only required benefits under the Republican plan are immunizations and limited family planning. States would have nearly complete discretion to set benefits, and the deep federal spending reductions would force states to reduce benefits to save money.

?? Cost Sharing. The Republican plan removes all restrictions on how large a share of the costs of medical care states could require from eligible individuals other than children and pregnant women. These increased copayments could discourage low

-income people from seeking medical care. The President's plan continues current law that requires copayments to be nominal and exempts particularly vulnerable

populations from copayments.

?? QMBs: Medicaid Coverage of Poor Older and Disabled Americans' Medicare Premiums, Deductibles and Copayments. Republicans eliminate the guarantee of Medicaid coverage of poor Medicare beneficiaries' premiums, deductibles, and copayments. Elimination of this coverage may deny poor elderly and disabled people access to the Medicare Part B program.

?? No Set

-Aside for Deductibles and Copayments. The Republican plan eliminates the guarantee to any coverage of copayments and deductibles, and does not set aside any funding for copayments and deductibles.

?? Inadequate Set

-Aside for Premiums. While Republicans claim to cover Medicare premiums for poor Medicare beneficiaries, they set aside less than half of the amount required to pay premiums. While they set aside 90% of 1993-

1995 state spending on mandated services for mandatory eligibles, this amounts to less than half of current Medicaid spending on premiums.

? Comparability of Benefits Across Eligibility Groups. The Republican plan eliminates the current requirement that states provide comparable services to all beneficiaries and provide protections against discrimination. This could lead to a sharp reduction in benefits for certain needy but politically weak populations, such as poor children and people with AIDS, in order to protect other more powerful populations.

?? Statewideness: Comparability of Benefits in All Regions in a State. The Republican plan eliminates the current requirement that states provide comparable services across geographic areas of the state, which could lead some states to short

-change certain needy but politically weak regions and shift benefits to others.

Other Issues:

? Abortion. The Administration supports current law, but any discussion of this issue should begin at the staff level before going to the level of advisors or principals.

? Assisted Suicide. The Administration does not currently have a position on this issue. Discussion of it should begin at the staff level before going to the level of advisors or principals.

7. FAMILY FINANCIAL PROTECTION

Key Point: The Republican plan ends the guarantee of meaningful coverage, potentially shifting costs of care to families who can ill afford them. It also repeals financial protections that are important not only to the poor, but also to a larger group of middle class families that depend on Medicaid to provide long

-term care for their parents. We should insist on current law.

Our Position: The President's plan and all the other Democratic plans retain both the federal guarantee of meaningful benefits and current financial protections.

Republican Position:

? Loss of Guarantee. Under the Republican plan, people who no longer qualify for medical assistance would be faced with paying all their medical costs themselves, or seeking help from relatives or charity. In the worst cases, families would have to mortgage or sell their homes to be able to pay for care, or elderly people needing long

-term care would have no choice but to turn to their children for help.

? Spousal Impoverishment. The Republicans claim that they have retained spousal impoverishment protections -- which require states to protect minimum amounts of a couple's income and assets for the at

-home spouse when the other spouse enters a nursing home or other institution for a long

-term stay.

Despite appearances, the Republican plan fails to adequately protect spouses of persons in nursing homes from being impoverished by the high cost of long

-term care because: (1) the infirm spouse may not qualify for benefits in the first place; (2) they repeal procedural safeguards and beneficiaries' rights to judicial redress if the state has acted improperly; and (3) federal tools for enforcing state compliance are severely weakened.

? Homes, Family Farms, and Liens. Republicans repeal current federal law that protects the home, family farm, and certain other assets by prohibiting states from counting their value to determine eligibility for Medicaid.

The Republican plan would give states unlimited license to decide whether and how to: (1) use liens on people's homes and other property; (2) recover before or after a beneficiaries (or spouse's) death; (3) adjust the state's

payments for care based on home equity. States could use this flexibility to require a person to sell or mortgage a home and use the proceeds either to repay the state or to finance the cost of their care even while they, a spouse, or child is still living in the home. Under current law, states are restricted from imposing liens on real property of Medicaid beneficiaries under most circumstances.

? Adult Children of Nursing Home Patients. The Republicans would also allow states to impose financial costs on the adult children of nursing home patients if they had income above the median state income for the first time under Medicaid.

8. NURSING HOME STANDARDS

Key Point: The Republicans claim to retain the federal nursing home quality standards, but they undermine these standards by repealing federal enforcement and repeal key standards. We should insist on current law, including federal enforcement. Our Position: The President's plan and all the other Democratic plans retain the 1987 bipartisan standards and enforcement models.

? Since the 1987 reforms were implemented, nursing home quality has improved dramatically. The use of physical restraints has declined 25%; dehydration has declined 50%; hospitalization rates have declined 31% (Research Triangle Institute; HCFA).

Republican Position: The Republicans claim to maintain these standards, but they undermine them by repealing federal enforcement and some key standards.

? No Federal Enforcement. The federal government would have no way to ensure that States enforce the standards. Most recently, federal surveyors found 14% of nursing homes out of compliance with the federal standards. (Source: HCFA.)

? States Could Leave Enforcement to Private Organizations. States could turn over their survey and enforcement responsibilities to private accreditation organizations with no Federal review, thereby reducing accountability and increasing variations in quality and enforcement.

? Inadequate Resources to Enforce Standards. States would have to set and enforce quality standards with significantly less Medicaid funding than they receive under current law. While States may want to maintain nursing home quality, inadequate resources combined with repeal of Federal enforcement could lead them to fail to set and enforce adequate quality standards.

? Quality May Decline With Payments. Nursing homes may find it difficult or impossible to maintain the current quality with significantly reduced Medicaid payments. Nursing homes would have to significantly lower their costs, lower services and quality, drop out of the Medicaid program, or shift costs to residents and their families, diminishing

Medicaid beneficiaries' access to quality care.

? Elimination of Key Federal Quality Standards. The Republican proposal repeals key Federal quality

standards, allowing the States to set their own standards within broad Federal guidelines. For example, Federal law would no longer guarantee that nursing homes provide services to "attain or maintain the highest practicable physical, mental, and psychosocial well being of each resident." As a result, residents could be denied skilled nursing and rehabilitative services necessary to improve their ability to function.

9. VACCINES FOR CHILDREN

Key Point: For the purposes of this discussion, it is important only to signal that VFC is important to the Administration but that we are willing to make significant changes to the program.

? Our Position. There has been significant opposition to the VFC program. Our strategy is to work with Senators Bumpers and Breaux and Congressmen Dingell and Waxman to change the program so that states are given more flexibility to tailor the program to their needs while guaranteeing funding for vaccines for needy children.

? Republican Position. The Republicans may suggest that because states are required to cover immunizations, there is no need to continue the VFC program. However:

?? VFC provides guaranteed funding for three groups of children not covered by Medicaid: American Indians, uninsured, and underinsured (at federally qualified health centers).

?? In addition, under the Republican Medicaid plan, states decide which vaccines to cover. There is no guarantee that the range of medically recommended vaccines delivered under VFC will be provided.

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-JAN-1996 07:56:36.14

SUBJECT: Older Women Document

TO: Pauline M. Abernathy (ABERNATHY_P) (OPD)

READ: 4-JAN-1996 09:55:22.16

TEXT:

Here is the latest draft of the older women document for your review. Thanks.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 4-JAN-1996 07:55:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 18_POINT_ROMAN

DRAFT

THE HEALTH OF AMERICA'S OLDER WOMEN:
A WHITE HOUSE REPORT
ON CURRENT STATUS AND
THE IMPACT OF REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS

December 20,
1995

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
ADD EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A PROFILE OF AMERICA'S OLDER WOMEN

- DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

- FINANCIAL STATUS

- HEALTH STATUS

- MEDICAL NEEDS AND EXPENSES

- WOMEN AS CAREGIVERS

- OLDER WOMEN'S DEPENDENCE ON MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

THE IMPACT OF THE REPUBLICAN CUTS IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

- MEDICARE

 - REDUCES BENEFITS AND INCREASES MEDICARE COSTS

 - INCREASES COSTS FOR BENEFICIARIES WITHOUT EXPANDING

BENEFITS OR PREVENTION

- MEDICAID

 - ENDS GUARANTEE OF COVERAGE UNDER MEDICAID

 - LOSS OF MEDICAID COVERAGE

 - WOMEN PUSHED INTO POVERTY

 - WEAKENS NURSING HOME QUALITY STANDARDS

 - WEAKENS PROTECTION AGAINST SPOUSAL IMPOVERISHMENT

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN

A PROFILE OF AMERICA'S OLDER WOMEN

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

The aging of the American population has significant implications for women. Women represent a majority of older Americans and an even larger proportion of the very old, those aged 85 and over.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

The Population is Aging. Currently, 13% of the total population in the United States, or 33.2 million Americans, are 65 or older.

In the next 35 years, the number of Americans over the age of 65

will more than double, reaching 20% of the total population or 70 million. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the

United States, 1995.

The Number of Older Women is Growing. About 20 million, or 8% of Americans aged 65 or older, are women. In the next 35 years, that number will nearly double, to 38 million or 10% of the population. Id.

? Life expectancy for women has increased steadily. In 1960,

life expectancy at birth for females was about 73. By 1994,

life expectancy increased to 79 years. Average life

expectancy is shorter for men than for women. In 1994, when

life expectancy at birth was 79 for a female, it was 72.3 for a male. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, PHS,

Monthly Vital Statistics Report, October 23, 1995.

Women Over 85 Are One of the Fastest Growing Segments of Society.

The number of people over the age of 85 is growing quickly, and

women represent an even larger proportion (72%) of this group.

Today, 2.5 million are women over 85, a figure that will more than double to 5.7 million by 2030. Statistical Abstract

of the United States, 1995.

Older Women Are Far More Likely Than Men to Live Alone.

Forty

-two percent of women aged 65 and over lived alone in 1992, compared with just 16% of older men. The proportion of women living alone increases dramatically with age. About one

-third

(34%) of women aged 65 to 74 lived alone, compared to over half of women aged 85 and over. National Institute on Aging, Profiles of America's

Elderly, November 1993. Because women have longer life expectancies and many women

marry men who are older, the life expectancy for widowed women in

the United States is about 17 years beyond the death of their

spouses -- years in which increased frailty or disability are generally endured alone. C. Costello and A.J. Stone eds.

The American Woman

1994

-1995, Women's Research and Education Institute,

1994.

FINANCIAL STATUS

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

Older women are typically poorer than older men, and women over

85 and minority women are even more likely to be poor. The most

vulnerable group is elderly women living alone.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

Older Women Are Poorer Than Older Men. The median income for

women 65 or older is \$8,600 a year. The median income for men is about \$15,000, 76% higher than the median for

women. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports,

Series P

-60

-188, Income, Poverty and Valuation of

Noncash Benefits: 1993.

Fifteen percent of older women live in poverty, compared with 8%

of older men. Twenty

-one percent of women over age 85 have incomes below the federal poverty level. Id. Forty

-one percent of women aged 65 to 74 and 57% of women over 75 live on incomes below twice the poverty line (\$14,000). Id.

Minority Women Are Poorer Still. Minority women have

substantially lower incomes. In 1992, the median income of

elderly white women (\$8,600) was 38% higher than the median

income of black women (\$6,200), and 44% higher than the median income of Hispanic women (\$6,000). U.S. Bureau

of the Census, Current Population Reports,

Series P

-60

-184, Money Income of Households, Families and Persons in the United States: 1992.

Poverty Rates Among Women Living Alone Are Higher. Poverty rates are higher at every age for women who live alone than for men, and the disparity increases with age. In 1993, over 26% of women 65 and over living alone were in poverty (income of about \$6,900), compared to 13.9% of men. Another 15.6% of these women were near poor (income of \$8,700). And the picture was even worse for minority women; 44% of black women and 47% of Hispanic women 65 and older living alone were poor, as compared with 24% of white women. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993. Widowhood often drives women into poverty. A study by the National Bureau of Economic Research found that half of poor widows were not poor when their husbands were alive. David Wise and Michael Hurd, Elderly People Living Alone: Aging and the Prospects of Poverty: Executive Summary, report prepared for The Commonwealth Fund Commission on Elderly People Living Alone (National Bureau of Economic Research, 1987). Half of All Women on Social Security Would be Poor Without It. As of 1990, 33% of unmarried women age 65 or older who received Social Security depended on it for at least 90% of their income;

more than 18% had no other income. American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) Fact Sheet, Facts About Older Women: Income and Poverty, 1995. Half of all women beneficiaries would be poor if they did not receive a Social Security benefit. R. O'Grady

-LeShane. Economic Security for Midlife and Older Women. Background paper prepared for the Conference on Women and Aging: An Agenda for Action (sponsored by PHS Office on Women's Health and the National Policy and Resource Center of Women and Aging, Brandeis University), October 30, 1995.

HEALTH STATUS

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

Despite living, on average, seven years longer than men, women have poorer health outcomes and are more likely to have chronic diseases and disability than men.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

Women Suffer from Chronic Health Conditions. Women age 65 or older are more likely than men to suffer from serious chronic conditions. For example, 41% of women over 75 [OR 75 OR OLDER] and only 30% of men suffer from hypertension. NCHS, "Trends in the Health of Older Americans: United States, 1994," Vital and Health Statistics, Series 3, No. 30, April 1995. In addition, 64% of women 75 or older and only 36% of men have diabetes. National Health Interview Survey, 1993. Older women are also more likely to experience non

-life

-threatening chronic health conditions. Fifty

-five

percent of women 65 and over suffer from arthritis, compared with 39% of men. NCHS, "Trends in the Health of Older Americans: United

States, 1994," Vital and Health Statistics, Series 3, No. 30, April 1995. These conditions may contribute to a loss of functioning, particularly as women age.

Women 85 And Older Are Even More Vulnerable. These problems become more serious with increasing age. Women over the age of 85 are extremely vulnerable. More than half of all women over age 85 have problems managing basic daily activities like bathing and eating, as compared to only 34% of men in the same age group. Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), Medicare: A Profile, February 1995. In addition, because women generally live longer than men, they are more likely to get diseases associated with very old age, including Alzheimer's and complications arising from osteoporosis.

The following table illustrates the prevalence and risks of particular diseases faced by older women.

[JASON -- INSERT TABLE HERE]

MEDICAL NEEDS AND EXPENSES

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

While all older Americans spend a significant portion of their incomes on health care, elderly women who live alone face the greatest financial burden.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

Older Americans Spend A Significant Portion of Their Incomes On

Health Care. Older Americans currently spend 21% of their incomes on health care."Coming Up Short: Increasing Out

-of

-Pocket Health

Spending By Older Americans," prepared by AARP Public Policy Institute and the Urban Institute, updated February 1995. Does not include long

-term nursing home costs.

NO WOMEN V. MEN?

Older Women Rely More Than Men On Long

-Term Care. Twenty

-two

percent of women 65 or older either live in an institution or need help to live at home, compared with 15% of men. Guralnik and Simonsick, "Physical Disability in Older Americans, J. Of Gerontology, Vol. 48 (special issue):

3

-10, 1993.

? Home Care. Older women living alone are major users of paid home care services. HHS FILL IN: HOW MUCH HOME CARE DO THEY USE? HOW MUCH DOES IT COST?] About 62% of all women receiving paid home care live alone; another 28% live with adult children or others. Only 10% of women receiving home care are married. Diane Rowland and Karen Davis.

Caring for Women in
Older Age, An Unfinished Revolution: Women and Health
Care in America, DATE????.

? Nursing Home Care. Over 75% of nursing home residents are women. Roughly 28% of all women over 85 live in nursing homes, compared with 16% of men in this age group. Bureau of the Census and National Institute on Aging, Profiles of America's Elderly, No. 4, November 1993. The average cost of nursing home care is \$38,000 per year -- more than four times the median income for older women. On average, women remain in nursing homes a year longer than men. P. Kemper, et al. A Lifetime Perspective on Proposals for Financing Nursing Home Care, Inquiry 28(4):333

-344,
Winter 1991.

WOMEN AS CAREGIVERS
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC
Women are the primary caregivers for their spouses and parents and also provide a vast majority of the paid long

-term care in
this country.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
? Today, more than 7 million Americans are unpaid caregivers who provide about 75% of all non

-medical care to the frail elderly. Paper presented by Fernando Torres

-Gil, Assistant Secretary for Aging, at the Conference on Women and Aging: An Agenda for Action, October 30, 1995. Seven out of ten of these caregivers are women. House Select Committee on Aging, Exploding the Myths: Caregiving in America, January 1987. The typical unpaid caregiver is a woman in her middle or older years (average age of 57) providing care to a parent, spouse or other relative. Women provide the care that has helped to alleviate the need for formal supportive services and health care and to forestall costly institutional care for loved ones.

? The role of "unpaid caregiver" has important consequences for women's health. Caregiving can be a significant financial drain, and it is likely to have an even greater emotional and physical impact, particularly as the woman gets older. The stresses and strains of care giving, including the inability to have a break from responsibilities, can lead to depression, reduced immunity levels, poor general health, and lower quality of life. U.S. Public Health Service, Office on Women's Health, Fact Sheet on Older Women's Health, 1995.

? The majority of paid home care workers are also women. [OR IS THIS NURSING HOME AIDES TOO?] According to estimates based on the 1989 Current Population Survey, approximately 197,049 persons work as home care aides. The overwhelming majority (90%) are female [and they are disproportionately from minority groups]. S.J. Williams, series ed. The Continuum of Long

-Term

Care: An Integrated Systems Approach, Albany, N.Y.:
Delmar Publishers Inc., 1996.

OLDER WOMEN'S DEPENDENCE ON MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

Because they are generally poorer and use more health services than men, women depend more on Medicare and Medicaid for critical health services.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

Number of Women Covered

? Medicare. Of the 37 million Medicare beneficiaries, over 20

million, or 57% are women. There are twice as many female beneficiaries over age 85 than men.HCFA, Medicare: A Profile, February 1995.

? Medicaid. Over 4 million older Americans are covered by Medicaid. 60% of all Medicaid beneficiaries are women.HCFA, Medicaid: On Overview, September 1995.

Dependence on Medicare and Medicaid

Older Women Are More Likely to Rely on Medicare and Medicaid.

Because elderly women typically have lower socioeconomic status and more limited retirement benefits than elderly men, they are more likely than men to be either solely dependent on Medicare or to have coverage under Medicaid, which serves as supplemental insurance to Medicare for eligible low

-income elderly people.

? 5 million, or 23% of women age 65 or older, have only Medicare to cover their medical bills.

? An additional 2 million (11%) of older women rely on Medicaid in addition to Medicare.Current Population Survey, March 1995.

Medicare and Medicaid Provide Critical Services for Older Women.

? Medicare covers a range of medical services, including hospital stays, physician visits, skilled nursing care, and some home health care.

? Medicaid also covers essential services for older women, including some that are not covered by Medicare -- like prescription drugs, dental care, eyeglasses, hearing aids, and more extensive long

-term care.

? Medicaid will pay an average of over \$800 for prescription drugs for an older woman on Medicaid in 1995.Department of Health and Human Services estimates

from aged National Medical Expenditure Survey data, 1995. [HHS average = \$585?]

? Approximately 68% of the nation's one million nursing home residents rely on Medicaid to pay for some or all their care.HCFA, Medicaid: An Overview, September, 1995. Over 75% of nursing home residents are women.Profiles of America's Elderly, November 1993.

? Medicaid pays Medicare premiums for about 4 million elderly women in poverty. Most of these beneficiaries also receive Medicaid coverage for Medicare coinsurance and deductibles.Estimates based on data from: HCFA, Office of Legislation and Intergovernmental Affairs; the 1994 Greenbook, Tables B

-11 and 5

-1; and G. Chulis et al., "Health Insurance and the Elderly: Data from the MCBS," Health Care Financing Review, Spring 1993: Voume 14, Number 3, pp. 163

-181.

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN THE IMPACT OF THE REPUBLICAN CUTS IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

MEDICARE

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

REDUCED BENEFITS AND INCREASED MEDICARE COSTS

The Republican Medicare Plan Will Reduce Benefits and Increase Health Care Costs for Older Women. The Republican budget cuts Medicare by an unprecedented \$[200] billion. These cuts will reduce the benefit provided by Medicare while increasing direct and indirect costs for beneficiaries.

? Cuts Benefits. Federal Medicare spending per beneficiary will be \$[1,700] less than under current law in 2002.

? Increases Premiums. The Republican budget increases premiums from 25% of Part B program costs to 31.5%. In 1996 alone, this change will increase costs for elderly couples by \$[264] and elderly individuals by \$[132]. The President's balanced budget plan maintains current policy and permanently sets premiums at 25% of program costs.

? Over 19 million elderly women, more than a third of whom are at or near poverty, are currently enrolled in the Medicare Part B program.

? Over 20%, or \$10.4 billion, of the increase would come from elderly women with incomes below 200% of poverty (\$15,000?).Id.

? Allows Doctors to Overcharge. Under current law, Medicare limits the amount doctors can charge beneficiaries above Medicare payment rates. The Republican Medicare plan creates new, private fee

-for

-service plans that are similar
to Medicare but that allow doctors to overcharge --
so

-called "balance billing."

? Ends Financial Protection for Poor Medicare Beneficiaries.

As many as [---] poor elderly women will lose funding for
their Medicare premiums -- just when these premiums are
being increased. [NEED TO MAKE CONSISTENT WITH INFO ABOVE.]

? Medicaid currently pays all Medicare premiums,

coinsurance and deductibles for people below 100% of
poverty (known as QMBs) -- two million of whom are
elderly women -- and premiums for people with incomes
between 100% and 120% of poverty. The Republican
proposal completely eliminates coverage of coinsurance
and deductibles for these poor elderly and disabled
people. And while Republicans claim to cover premiums,
they set aside less than half of the money needed to
cover their premiums in 2002, denying premium coverage
to as many as [-----] poor elderly and disabled women.

? Could Force the Poor to Leave Fee

-For

-Service Plans.

Without assistance with premiums, copayments and
deductibles, poor Medicare beneficiaries may be forced
to leave their fee

-for

-service plan and enroll in an
managed care plan that does not require cost sharing --
if one exists in their area.

INCREASES COSTS FOR BENEFICIARIES WITHOUT EXPANDING BENEFITS OR PREVENTION

? The Republican budget increases beneficiary costs while
adding only one new benefit -- coverage of oral nonsteroidal
antiestrogen for the treatment of breast cancer.

? Currently, Medicare does not cover the array of preventive
benefits now offered by many private plans, particularly
managed care plans. These preventive benefits can both
increase beneficiary's health and reduce costs.

? President Clinton's balanced budget proposal updates the
Medicare benefit package to make it more comparable to
private sector benefit packages, including:

? Mammography. The President's proposal eliminates cost
sharing for mammography services and provides annual
screening mammograms.

? Certain Colorectal Screening. Early detection of

cancers and other serious conditions can result in less costly treatment, enhanced quality of life and, in some cases, a greater likelihood of cure. The President's proposal provides coverage for some colorectal screening.

? Preventive Injections. The President's proposal would increase payments for certain preventive injections provided in physician offices which will encourage

providers to immunize beneficiaries.

? Respite Benefit for Families of Beneficiaries with Alzheimer's Disease. The President's plan creates a Medicare respite benefit for families of beneficiaries with Alzheimer's disease or other irreversible dementia, covering up to 32 hours of care per beneficiary per year, administered through home health agencies or other entities. Services could be provided in the home or in a day care setting.

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_ROMAN MEDICAID

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
ENDS GUARANTEE OF COVERAGE UNDER MEDICAID
The Republican plan cuts [\$117] billion from Medicaid and repeals the program, replacing it with a "block grant." The plan completely eliminates Medicaid's guarantee of defined, meaningful coverage for Americans who are sick, elderly, poor or disabled.

? Because the block grant constrains spending growth per beneficiary to 1.6% per year, providing 28% less funding than under current law by 2002, states will be forced to significantly reduce Medicaid eligibility and benefits.

? Under current law, all states are required to cover a minimum set of services, including hospital, physician, and nursing home services. states have the option of covering an additional 31 services, including prescription drugs, hospice care and personal care services. Under the block grant, states could eliminate almost any benefit covered by Medicaid. The only required services would be immunizations and limited family planning.

LOSS OF MEDICAID COVERAGE

The reduction in Federal support of [\$116 billion] in Medicaid spending could force states to deny meaningful coverage for [over 8 million] Americans in 2002 alone, according to estimates by the Department of Health and Human Services.

These people include:

? [650,000] older women

? [330,000] nursing home residents -- about 75% of whom are likely to be women. Department of Health and Human Services, 1995.

WOMEN PUSHED INTO POVERTY

[CHECK -- Over 185,000] women over age 65 would be thrown into poverty, largely as a result of the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, according to the Department of Health and Services. Department of Health and Human Services, December 1995. Note: In this analysis, poverty is defined more broadly than in official poverty statistics from the Census Bureau. This broader definition includes the effects of Federal tax policies (including the Earned Income Tax Credit), near

-cash in

-kind assistance

programs such as food stamps and housing programs, and out

-of

-pocket health spending.

WEAKENS NURSING HOME QUALITY STANDARDS

The Republican budget takes away key protections and enforcement of nursing home quality standards put in place by the Reagan Administration with bipartisan support.

? Nursing Home Laws Have Resulted in Dramatic Progress. The landmark nursing home reform law of OBRA '87, approved with bipartisan support during the Reagan Administration, sought to address at times deplorable treatment in nursing homes -- including unjustified physical restraints and gross negligence in caring for nursing home residents -- by establishing federal quality standards. Prior to the OBRA '87 reforms, the Institute of Medicine reported that all states had some facilities with serious deficiencies in nursing home quality of care.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

Improving the Quality of Care in Nursing Homes, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1986.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

Since OBRA '87, nursing home quality has improved dramatically. The use of physical restraints has declined

25%; dehydration has declined 50%; hospitalization rates have declined 31%. Research Triangle Institute and HCFA, 1995.

? Federal Enforcement and Protections Would be Repealed. The Republican bill takes away federal protections and enforcement and leaves responsibility for ensuring nursing home quality with states. While states may want to maintain these guarantees, inadequate resources could lead them to fail to set and enforce quality standards that protect elderly and disabled people in nursing homes.

? States could turn over their survey and enforcement responsibilities to private accreditation organizations with no federal review, thereby reducing accountability and increasing variations in quality and enforcement.

? Nursing homes would not longer be required to provide services to "attain or maintain the highest practicable physical, mental and psychosocial well being of each

resident." Without this protection, residents could be denied skilled nursing and rehabilitative services necessary to improve their ability to function.

? Residents would no longer be guaranteed the same comprehensive assessment of their health and functional

status now required nationally.

? Uniform data collection would not be required, making monitoring more difficult.

? Federal training requirements for hands

-on caregivers

would be eliminated; each state could determine who would be trained and how.

WEAKENS PROTECTION AGAINST SPOUSAL IMPOVERISHMENT

The Republican budget undermines protections against spousal impoverishment that were signed into law by President Reagan in 1987. Since this federal law went into effect in 1989, it has protected about 450,000 spouses of nursing home residents. Most of these spouses are women. Department of Health and Human Services, 1995.

? Current federal law ensures that spouses of people needing nursing home care do not have to lose everything they have in order for their spouse to qualify for Medicaid.

? Because the Republican budget repeals the guarantee of nursing home coverage, it also effectively eliminates any protection from spousal impoverishment. If an individual were denied coverage for nursing home care altogether, their spouse could be forced bear the burden of paying for that care.

? The Republican budget also repeals the right of individuals to enforce spousal impoverishment protections in court when they believe they have been wrongfully denied, making the protections unenforceable.

How many individuals in nursing homes have a living spouse?

Percentage of men v. women?

Add family financial protections?

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

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

CREATOR: Pauline M. Abernathy (ABERNATHY_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-1996 11:21:24.95

SUBJECT: Draft medicaid 2-pager for review

TO: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

READ:10-JAN-1996 12:04:42.06

CC: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS) (OPD)

READ:10-JAN-1996 12:38:39.78

CC: Aaron J. Rappaport (RAPPAPORT_A) (OPD)

READ:10-JAN-1996 12:20:38.68

TEXT:

Attached is a 2-pager on Medicaid for your review. Aaron is working on one on Medicare. Marilyn Yager asked Gene for something to give the groups ASAP. Let me know what you think. Thanks.
Pauline

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:10-JAN-1996 11:18:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Pauline M. Abernathy

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

MEDICAID: WHAT IS AT STAKE IN THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

January 10, 1996

THE MEDICAID GUARANTEE OF MEANINGFUL HEALTH BENEFITS

? Republicans are insisting on ending the Medicaid guarantee to meaningful health benefits and replacing it with a deeply underfunded block grant that will deny meaningful health benefits to millions of disabled Americans, pregnant women, poor children, and older Americans in need of nursing home care. The only required benefits would be immunizations and restricted family planning, and the depth of the Medicaid cuts could force States to significantly reduce benefits and eligibility.

? President Clinton is standing firm on retaining the guarantee of meaningful Medicaid health benefits for disabled Americans, pregnant women, poor children, and older Americans in need of nursing home care.

DEPTH OF THE CUTS

? Republicans want to cut Federal Medicaid funding to States by up to \$117 billion. As a result, funding per person would

increase by less than the rate of inflation and about 70% below projected private health care spending growth. Because States would be allowed to cut their spending significantly as well, the total cuts in Medicaid could be more than double the Federal cuts.

? President Clinton's balanced budget achieves \$52 billion in savings by capping spending growth per beneficiary, giving States incentives to reduce costs without denying anyone health care coverage.

A BLOCK GRANT THAT LEAVES STATES VULNERABLE

? Republicans are insisting on block granting Medicaid, which will leave States vulnerable to economic downturns, inflation, and natural disasters. States would be responsible for 100% of the additional costs from these circumstances beyond their control.

? President Clinton is standing firm on maintaining the 30

-year

Federal partnership with States, protecting States from circumstances beyond their control while increasing State flexibility.

FEDERAL NURSING HOME QUALITY STANDARDS

? Republicans want to repeal Federal enforcement of the nursing home quality standards that have dramatically improved the quality of nursing home care. While States may want to maintain the quality of nursing homes, deep Federal Medicaid cuts combined with the elimination of Federal standards and monitoring may lead to their failure to set and enforce adequate quality standards.

? President Clinton's balanced budget retains the current Federal nursing home quality standards and enforcement.

FINANCIAL PROTECTIONS FOR FAMILIES, THEIR HOMES AND FARMS

? Republicans would let States force the adult children of people needing nursing home care to pay for their care, if their income is above the State median income. They would repeal laws that protect families from having to sell their home or family farm in order to qualify for Medicaid, and would repeal the laws that restrict the placing of liens on homes and family farms of Medicaid recipients.

? President Clinton's balanced budget maintains current financial protections.

POOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED AMERICANS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE

? Republicans are insisting on repealing the current guarantee that Medicaid will pay poor older and disabled American's Medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments. They do not set aside any Medicaid block grant funding for deductibles

and copayments, and set aside less than half of the funds needed to cover poor elderly and disabled people's Medicare premiums -- at the same time that they increase Medicare premiums.

? President Clinton's balanced budget retains the guarantee of access to Medicare physician services for poor older and disabled Americans.

SPOUSAL IMPOVERISHMENT PROTECTIONS

? Republicans would undermine protections for spouses of nursing home residents from impoverishment by repealing the guarantee of nursing home coverage, making it more difficult for the Federal government to ensure that States enforce

spousal impoverishment protections, and repealing the right of spouses to seek redress in Federal court if they are wrongly denied protection.

? President Clinton's balanced budget retains current spousal impoverishment protections.

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

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

CREATOR: William G. White (WHITE_W) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-1996 17:58:12.59

SUBJECT: Your Questions on Family Planning

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:11-JAN-1996 18:00:14.17

CC: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

READ:12-JAN-1996 13:27:41.66

CC: James I. Blount (BLOUNT_J) (OMB)

READ:16-JAN-1996 10:00:09.87

CC: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B) (OMB)

READ:11-JAN-1996 18:00:04.31

CC: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R) (OMB)

READ:11-JAN-1996 18:22:05.73

TEXT:

Richard Turman asked me to respond to the questions regarding Title X Family Planning grants in your attached e-mail. The table and text below should answer your questions.

Funding for Title X Family Planning

(BA -- \$ in Millions)

FY95	FY96	FY96	FY96	FY96
------	------	------	------	------

	House			
--	-------	--	--	--

Pres.	Approp.	House	Senate	
-------	---------	-------	--------	--

Enacted	Budget	Committee	Final	Committee
---------	--------	-----------	-------	-----------

Family				
--------	--	--	--	--

Planning	193	199	0	193	193
----------	-----	-----	---	-----	-----

The President's FY96 Budget included a \$6 million (3 percent) increase over FY95 for Family Planning grants. The House Appropriations Committee recommended zeroing out this activity in FY96. However, it was restored to its FY95 level of \$193 million on the House Floor. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended \$193 million for Family Planning in FY96. The Senate The Senate L/HHS bill has not yet been acted upon by the full Senate.

Please let us know if you have any additional questions.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:11-JAN-1996 17:45:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Richard J. Turman

ATT SUBJECT: Please Prepare a Response

ATT TO: William G. White (WHITE_W)

TEXT:

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

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:11-JAN-1996 10:47:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Deborah L. Fine

ATT SUBJECT: family planning

ATT TO: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)

TEXT:

Hi. I think we spoke several weeks ago about Family Planning because Nancy Ann had sent a copy of a document I put together on reproductive health to you to check a bullet on the Administration's record on proposed appropriations for the Family Planning program.

I am not sure if you are the right person to ask the following questions, so just let me know if you're not.

It is my understanding that the House Republican proposal in Labor/HHS had restored Family Planning funds some time ago -- but I am not sure by how much, etc.

So, I am trying to find out how much their proposal cuts the Family Planning Program. (As far as I know it funds it with \$193 million, but I don't know what percentage a cut that is from FY 1995 or by how much.) I also wanted to find out how much we proposed to fund it for FY96.

I would appreciate any help you can give me. (But if you are facing deadlines with respect to the budget negotiations now, just let me know. This is obviously much less important.) Thanks a lot.

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

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

CREATOR: Pauline M. Abernathy (ABERNATHY_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JAN-1996 16:54:17.52

SUBJECT: mEDICAID what is at stake

TO: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

READ:16-JAN-1996 17:54:17.23

TEXT:

attached is the medicaid 2-pager signed off by HHS. Chris is still waiting to hear from HHS about Medicare. We are also working on side-by-side tables on medicare and medicaid issues - medicare is on Jason's computer and HHS drafted the Medicaid one and chris is sending them back comments. Give me a call about the older women's income stat.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:16-JAN-1996 16:51:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Pauline M. Abernathy

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

MEDICAID: WHAT IS AT STAKE IN THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS
January 15, 1996

MEDICAID GUARANTEE. Republicans are insisting on ending the Medicaid guarantee to meaningful health benefits for millions of disabled Americans, pregnant women, poor children, and older Americans in need of nursing home care -- even though it is not necessary to balance the budget.

? Republicans want to replace the Medicaid guarantee with a deeply underfunded block grant that would deny meaningful health benefits to millions of Americans, including more than 1 million children. The only required benefits would be immunizations and limited family planning -- hardly what one would call "coverage." Moreover, the depth of the Medicaid cuts could force States to significantly reduce coverage, increasing the number of uninsured people, uncompensated care, and cost

-shifting to people with private insurance.

? President Clinton is refusing to go backwards on coverage by insisting on retaining the guarantee of meaningful Medicaid health benefits for disabled Americans, pregnant women, poor children, and older Americans in need of nursing home care.

DEPTH OF THE CUTS. Republicans want to cut Federal Medicaid funding to States by \$85 billion in order to pay for an excessive

tax cut for the well

-off.

? In order to fund an excessive tax cut, Republicans are insisting on reducing annual spending growth per person more than 50% below projected private health care spending growth. Because States would be allowed to cut their spending significantly as well, the total cuts in Medicaid would be more than double the Federal cuts.

? President Clinton's balanced budget achieves \$52 billion in savings by capping spending growth per beneficiary, giving States incentives to reduce costs without denying anyone health care coverage while providing States with unprecedented flexibility to operate their programs and pay providers.

LEAVES STATES VULNERABLE. Republicans are insisting on block granting Medicaid, which will leave States vulnerable to economic downturns, inflation, demographic changes, and natural disasters -- even though it is not necessary to balance the budget.

? Under a block grant, States would be responsible for 100% of the additional costs from circumstances beyond their control. According to analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, if inflation were just 1 percentage point higher than projected over 7 years, States would have to spend about

\$65 billion more, or cut eligibility, benefits, or establish waiting lists.

? President Clinton is standing firm on maintaining the 30

-year

Federal partnership with States, protecting States from circumstances beyond their control and increasing State flexibility.

NURSING HOME QUALITY STANDARDS. Republicans want to repeal Federal enforcement of the nursing home quality standards that have dramatically improved the quality of nursing home care -- even though it is not necessary to balance the budget.

? Excessive Medicaid cuts combined with the elimination of Federal enforcement of nursing home quality standards may lead to inadequate and inconsistent enforcement of quality.

? President Clinton's balanced budget retains Federal quality standards and enforcement. Since these Federal standards were signed into law by President Reagan, there has been a 50% reduction in dehydration among nursing home residents, a 31% reduction in hospitalization rates, and a 25% reduction in the use of physical restraints.

FINANCIAL PROTECTIONS. Republicans want to repeal financial protections for families, their homes and farms -- even though this is not necessary to balance the budget.

? Republicans would repeal the laws that prevent States from forcing adult children to have to pay for their parents'

nursing home care, if their income is above the State median income -- even though it is not necessary to balance the budget. They would repeal laws that protect families from having to sell their home or family farm in order to qualify for Medicaid, and would repeal the laws that restrict the placing of liens on homes and family farms of Medicaid recipients.

? President Clinton's balanced budget maintains current financial protections.

POOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED AMERICANS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE.

Republicans are insisting on repealing the guarantee that Medicaid pay poor older and disabled American's Medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments.

? The Medicaid guarantee of assistance with Medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments ensures that more than 5 million poor older and disabled Americans can afford Medicare physician services. Yet Republicans do not set aside any Medicaid block grant funding for Medicare deductibles and copayments, and set aside less than half of the funds needed to cover premiums. Hundreds of thousands of poor and near poor elderly and disabled people could lose funding for their Medicare premiums -- at the same time that Republicans would increase Medicare premiums.

? President Clinton's balanced budget maintains the guarantee of this critical assistance.

SPOUSAL IMPOVERISHMENT PROTECTIONS. Republicans would undermine protections for spouses of nursing home residents from impoverishment -- even though it is not necessary to balance the

budget.

? Republicans undermine these spousal impoverishment protections by repealing the guarantee of nursing home coverage, making it more difficult for the Federal government to ensure that States enforce spousal impoverishment protections, and repealing the right of spouses to seek redress in Federal court if they are wrongly denied protection.

? President Clinton's balanced budget maintains the current spousal impoverishment protections which have protected about 450,000 spouses of nursing home residents since they went into effect. Most of these spouses are women.

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

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

CREATOR: Michael T. Schmidt (SCHMIDT_MT) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JAN-1996 16:02:19.78

SUBJECT: More ed tech formulations

TO: Gaynor R. McCown (MCCOWN_G) (OPD)

READ:19-JAN-1996 18:35:26.50

TEXT:

Here is a slightly different take on the ed tech language for whatever you are putting together. Hope it helps.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:19-JAN-1996 16:01:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Michael T. Schmidt

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

Background on the Clinton Administration's Approach to Sex Education

? The Administration believes that the content and structure of education programs dealing with sex, family planning, and other controversial topics must be determined by individual communities-

-in light of their values and beliefs.

? Today young people face many serious problems such as violence, drug abuse, sexually transmitted diseases including HIV infection, unintended pregnancy, school dropout, low literacy, and disrupted family and home situations. These require innovative solutions supported by all segments of society, including our health and education systems.

? Schools are the only public institution that can reach nearly all youth; therefore schools are in a unique position to improve not only the educational status but also the health status of young people throughout the nation.

? The federal government can play an important role in supporting the development and evaluation of various types of sexuality education programs, abstinence education programs, and programs focused on the prevention of adolescent pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases.

? The federal government can support local efforts to find the right approaches for their own communities by making information on promising approaches available to them.

Examples of such support are:

Adolescent Family Life Program: Last year, HHS's Adolescent Family Life Program awarded 15 grants totaling \$4.2 million

dollars for comprehensive demonstration programs aimed at preventing early teenage sexual activity and reducing teenage pregnancies. These programs feature innovative ways to emphasize abstinence as the best way to prevent adolescent pregnancy and encourage the involvement of parents in these discussions with their children.

Family Planning: Family Planning funds clinics that provide contraceptive counseling, birth control, health services, information and education, which many tailor to adolescents' needs. We strongly supported this program and fought to preserve its funding in this year's budget.

School Health Program: Through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the federal government provides approximately \$20 million to state education agencies in every state and to school districts in 18 of the largest cities to promote healthy behavior. These agencies use the money from CDC for a range of

services, such as: to work on HIV prevention activities; to train teachers; to provide schools with guidance about curriculum development and implementation; and to monitor risk behaviors of youth. It is unclear how much of CDC's funding directly goes towards sex education, but it is estimated to be a small a portion.

In addition to funding, the School Health Program collects information and provides data and guidance to state agencies so that they can make effective programming decisions.

PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

January 19, 1996

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

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

CREATOR: Pauline M. Abernathy (ABERNATHY_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JAN-1996 17:08:24.03

SUBJECT: 1/23/96 medicaid 2-pager attached

TO: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

READ:25-JAN-1996 17:09:50.21

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:25-JAN-1996 17:07:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Pauline M. Abernathy

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

MEDICAID: WHAT IS AT STAKE IN THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

January 23, 1996

MEDICAID GUARANTEE. Republicans are insisting on ending the Medicaid guarantee to meaningful health benefits for millions of people with disabilities, pregnant women, poor children, and older Americans in need of nursing home care -- even though it is not necessary to balance the budget.

? Republicans want to replace the Medicaid guarantee with a deeply underfunded block grant that could deny health benefits to 3

-6 million Americans in 2002, including more than 1 million children. And the only required benefits would be immunizations and limited family planning -- hardly what one would call "coverage." The depth of the Medicaid cuts could force States to significantly reduce coverage, increasing the number of uninsured people, uncompensated care, and cost

-shifting to people with private insurance.

? President Clinton is refusing to go backwards on coverage, insisting on retaining the guarantee of meaningful Medicaid health benefits for people with disabilities, pregnant women, poor children, and older Americans in need of nursing home care.

DEPTH OF THE CUTS. Republicans want to cut Federal Medicaid funding to States by \$85 billion in order to pay for an excessive tax cut for the well

-off.

? Republicans are insisting on \$85 billion in Medicaid cuts -- 45% more than the President -- largely to fund an excessive tax cut. They would cut spending growth per person to rates one

-third below inflation. And the total Medicaid cuts would more than triple if States only spent the minimum required.

? President Clinton's balanced budget achieves \$59 billion in savings by capping spending growth per beneficiary, giving States incentives to reduce costs without denying anyone health care coverage while providing States with unprecedented flexibility to operate their programs and pay providers.

LEAVES STATES VULNERABLE. Republicans are insisting on block granting Medicaid, which will leave States vulnerable to economic downturns, inflation, demographic changes, and natural disasters -- even though it is not necessary to balance the budget.

? Under a block grant, States would be responsible for 100% of the additional costs from circumstances beyond their control. According to analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, if inflation were just 1 percentage point higher than projected over 7 years, States would have to spend about

\$65 billion more, or cut eligibility, benefits, or establish waiting lists.

? President Clinton is standing firm on maintaining the 30

-year

Federal partnership with States, protecting States from circumstances beyond their control and increasing State flexibility.

NURSING HOME QUALITY STANDARDS. Republicans want to repeal Federal enforcement of the nursing home quality standards that have dramatically improved the quality of nursing home care -- even though it is not necessary to balance the budget.

? Excessive Medicaid cuts combined with the elimination of Federal enforcement of nursing home quality standards may lead to inadequate and inconsistent enforcement of quality.

? President Clinton's balanced budget retains Federal quality standards and enforcement. Since these Federal standards were signed into law by President Reagan, there has been a 50% reduction in dehydration among nursing home residents, a 31% reduction in hospitalization rates, and a 25% reduction in the use of physical restraints.

FINANCIAL PROTECTIONS. Republicans want to repeal financial protections for families, their homes and farms -- even though this is not necessary to balance the budget.

? Republicans would repeal the laws that prevent States from forcing adult children to have to pay for their parents' nursing home care, if their income is above the State median

income -- even though it is not necessary to balance the budget. They would repeal laws that protect families from having to sell their home or family farm in order to qualify for Medicaid, and would repeal the laws that restrict the placing of liens on homes and family farms of Medicaid recipients.

? President Clinton's balanced budget maintains current financial protections.

POOR ELDERLY AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES' ACCESS TO MEDICARE.

Republicans are insisting on repealing the guarantee that Medicaid pay poor older Americans and people with disabilities' Medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments.

? The Medicaid guarantee of assistance with Medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments ensures that more than 5 million poor older Americans and people with disabilities can afford Medicare physician services. Yet Republicans do not set aside any Medicaid block grant funding for Medicare deductibles and copayments, and set aside less than half of the funds needed to cover premiums. Hundreds of thousands of poor and near poor older Americans and people with disabilities could lose funding for their Medicare premiums -- at the same time that Republicans would increase Medicare premiums.

? President Clinton's balanced budget maintains the guarantee of this critical assistance.

SPOUSAL IMPOVERISHMENT PROTECTIONS. Republicans would undermine protections for spouses of nursing home residents from impoverishment -- even though it is not necessary to balance the

budget.

? Republicans undermine these spousal impoverishment protections by repealing the guarantee of nursing home coverage, making it more difficult for the Federal government to ensure that States enforce spousal impoverishment protections, and repealing the right of spouses to seek redress in Federal court if they are wrongly denied protection.

? President Clinton's balanced budget maintains the current spousal impoverishment protections which have protected about 450,000 spouses of nursing home residents since they went into effect. Most of these spouses are women.

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

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-MAR-1996 10:18:22.32

SUBJECT: Post editorial

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:12-MAR-1996 10:30:46.84

TEXT:

I just wanted to make sure that you had seen the editorial in the Post about family planning. It sounds as bad as you and I thought!

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAR-1996 10:32:34.78

SUBJECT: RE: cr/abortion/family planning

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:28-MAR-1996 10:34:58.82

TEXT:

No, Debbie. I think you've asked the exact right questions.

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

CREATOR: Seth E. Masket (MASKET_S) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-APR-1996 15:08:17.08

SUBJECT: Abortion w/revisions

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ: 1-APR-1996 16:34:50.68

TEXT:

[Here's the new draft. What do you think? -Seth]

Dear _____:

Thank you for your message regarding a woman's right to choose. I appreciate knowing your views on this extremely complex issue. I have always maintained that the decision to have an abortion is personal and private, and should be made solely between a woman, her doctor, her conscience, and her faith. It simply wrong for politics to interfere with such a deeply personal decision. I also firmly believe that legal abortions -- those protected by Roe v. Wade -- should be safe and rare.

Since I took office, I have worked to protect a woman's right to choose. My Administration reversed the "gag rule," which prevented women from discussing abortion with health professionals. Additionally, we repealed the "Mexico City" policy, which banned the distribution of family planning funding overseas. I was also pleased to sign the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act to protect women seeking family planning advice from violence or intimidation.

I believe that we should work to create a society in which fewer abortions are needed. Since I became President, I have fought for improved and expanded family planning services and education programs. I have also worked to prevent teenage pregnancies by promoting efforts to teach young people about personal responsibility and help them make the right choices. It is by advancing these efforts and by encouraging adoption, rather than criminalizing women and their doctors, that we can create a better future for our children.

Though some of our efforts are being fought by Congress, I am continuing our work to protect women's reproductive health and their constitutional right to choose while working to reduce the numbers of unwanted pregnancies. I am grateful for your perspective on this issue and am glad you took the time to write.

Sincerely,
Bill Clinton

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

CREATOR: Seth E. Masket (MASKET_S) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-APR-1996 12:22:39.76

SUBJECT: Women's group

TO: Betsy Myers (MYERS_B) (WHO)

READ:12-APR-1996 13:39:53.48

TO: Lynn C. Ross (ROSS_L) (OMB)

READ:15-APR-1996 09:01:17.29

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:15-APR-1996 09:22:48.99

TEXT:

Have any of you dealt much with the Global Fund for Women in Menlo Park, CA? They've written to the President express concern over Congress' attempts to hurt the US international family planning program.

I'd like to just do a letter expressing our commitment to family planning and reproductive freedom, but I don't know how close we are with this group. What do you think? How specific should we be?

-Seth

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-APR-1996 19:34:25.57

SUBJECT: RE: family planning

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:23-APR-1996 19:36:13.46

TEXT:

Sounds fine. If he's that important maybe we should have Nancy-

Ann meet with him too.

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-APR-1996 19:47:12.05

SUBJECT: RE: family planning

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:23-APR-1996 19:47:23.92

TEXT:

Great.

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

CREATOR: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-MAY-1996 11:17:00.07

SUBJECT: south carolina medicaid waivers

TO: Remote Addressee (BVladeck@hcfa.gov@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Remote Addressee (JMonahan@os.dhhs.gov@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

CC: Remote Addressee (kking@hcfa.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

I just had a conversation with the very frustrated Medicaid director of South Carolina. (I got directed to her after Carol spent some time with her and some other folks there about a month ago.)

She says they have had 2 minor waivers, which do good things for high-risk women and family planning, pending for a year. I think the 1915/high risk one may have just been approved (I'm not sure), but with a contingency that they study its cost effectiveness, which they see as already demonstrated. She said they have been on the verge of just canning both of them out of frustration over the amount of effort they have had to put in, and that it is difficult for that state to continue pursuing these initiatives under such adverse circumstances.

These are expansions or modifications of existing waivers.

I am sure there is a whole history here (I have heard a little from Lloyd Bishop and John), but since these sound like good concepts at least, that HCFA previously endorsed through the initial waivers, that must have gotten bogged down, perhaps in the crush of trying to deal first with the big, state-wide waivers. I reinforced with her that budget neutrality is a very important feature of waivers to this administration. But her point is that the whole process adds up to being incredibly frustrating and ultimately not worth it to the state.

Anyway, I think it would be appropriate for one of you to give her a chance to tell her story to you. She says she recognizes that HCFA is at least beginning to talk in terms of customer service, which is good, but that on the ground there are still big problems.

Her name is Debbie Francis, and she is at 803-253-6119.

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-MAY-1996 17:31:06.68

SUBJECT: RE: family planning

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:30-MAY-1996 18:05:06.11

TEXT:

Can we do it at 1:15?

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

CREATOR: Jill Pizzuto (PIZZUTO_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUN-1996 12:18:59.66

SUBJECT: Nancy-Ann Min

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

READ:19-JUN-1996 13:03:06.86

TEXT:

Nancy called for you. She's asking if you have any time to talk w/ her (via phone) today re: Family Planning Amendments. She needs advice from you on WHERE the POTUS stands on some of these; they will be submitting something tonight for tomorrow's (meeting or hearing).
her number: 5-5178 -- however, she's in and out of meetings today, will have her beeper and asked if you could beep her, probably better way to get her.
let me know if I need to help you w/ this. jmp.

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

CREATOR: Lyndell Hogan (HOGAN_L) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JUN-1996 10:33:10.79

SUBJECT: Appropriations bills

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:24-JUN-1996 10:36:22.76

TEXT:

Debbie,

What sort of process did you use/who did you talk to you to track abortion/family planning riders to appropriations bills? I've always tracked or worked on authorization language, not the appropriations process.

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

CREATOR: Lyndell Hogan (HOGAN_L) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JUN-1996 10:54:56.16

SUBJECT: RE: Appropriations bills

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ:24-JUN-1996 10:55:12.21

TEXT:

So you don't talk directly with those in Appropriations or analyze approps
legislation looking for abotion/family planning riders?

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

CREATOR: Lyndell Hogan (HOGAN_L) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUN-1996 12:50:31.77

SUBJECT: Appropriations Update

TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)
READ: 1-JUL-1996 13:43:55.23

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (WHO)
READ:28-JUN-1996 17:57:01.00

TO: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)
READ: 6-JUL-1996 14:00:38.55

CC: Betsy Myers (MYERS_B) (WHO)
READ:28-JUN-1996 14:28:20.47

CC: Elizabeth E. Drye (DRYE_E) (OPD)
READ:28-JUN-1996 18:10:06.43

CC: Dorothy L. Karayannis (KARAYANNIS_D) (OPD)
READ:28-JUN-1996 14:07:38.50

TEXT:

Carrie Wofford and I would like to set up a briefing for about 15 key women's group leaders on the state of abortion and family planning riders to appropriations bills.

We are hoping to have Betsy, Jeremy, Nancy Ann, myself and Carrie there as White House representatives.

We'd like to set up an 1 1/2 meeting on July 16 preferably from 4 p.m.-5:30 at 708 Jackson Place.

Nancy--This date and time work with Betsy's and Jeremy's schedules. Does it work for you?

Let me know.

Thanks!

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

CREATOR: Lyndell Hogan (HOGAN_L) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUL-1996 16:47:21.76

SUBJECT: Approps bills affecting women

TO: Betsy Myers (MYERS_B) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 17:29:22.32

CC: George Stephanopoulos (STEPHANOPO_G) Autoforward to: Laura Capps (CAPPS_L) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 18:04:04.74

CC: Marilyn Yager (YAGER_M) (WHO)

READ: 2-JUL-1996 08:55:53.46

CC: Elizabeth E. Drye (DRYE_E) (OPD)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 17:32:53.60

CC: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (OPD)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 17:45:54.46

CC: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N) (OMB)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 18:50:58.91

CC: John P. Hart (HART_J) (WHO)

READ: 2-JUL-1996 11:18:39.79

CC: Katharine M. Button (BUTTON_K) (WHO)

READ: 8-JUL-1996 10:38:19.37

CC: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)

READ: NOT READ

CC: Elena Kagan (KAGAN_E) (WHO)

READ: 2-JUL-1996 09:00:12.19

CC: Douglas B. Sosnik (SOSNIK_D) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 16:50:11.95

CC: Karen L. Hancox (HANCOX_K) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 17:23:43.01

CC: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 18:28:12.78

CC: Peter Jacoby (JACOBY_P) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 17:17:48.49

CC: Martha Foley (FOLEY_M) (WHO)

READ: 2-JUL-1996 07:53:48.55

CC: Carol H. Rasco (RASCO_C) (WHO)
READ: 3-JUL-1996 13:39:29.50

TEXT:

FYI, please see attached list and description of recent and pending action on appropriations legislation and other current issues affecting women.

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 1-JUL-1996 16:40:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Lyndell Hogan

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_COURIER
M E M O R A N D U M

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

To: Those Interested
From: Lyn Hogan
Domestic Policy Council
Date: July 1, 1996

PRINTER FONT 14_POINT_COURIER
Status of Appropriations and Other Legislation
Affecting Women

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
FY '97 Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations

Human Embryo Research
? On June 25, 1996, during Committee mark

-up of the HHS/Labor
Appropriations bill, Reps. Dickey (R

-AZ) and Wicker (R

-MS)
offered an amendment to reinstate the ban on human embryo
research. The amendment passed 25

-20.
? Rep. Lowey (D

-NY) is expected to offer on the floor an
amendment to strike the ban and codify the NIH guidelines
which allowed research on extra embryos that were created
for in vitro fertilization, but did not allow the creation
of embryos solely for research. Rep. Lowey successfully
offered this amendment in the subcommittee mark

-up.

Abortion/Family Planning

The week of July 8 Rep. Istook (R

-OK) is expected to offer on the floor the following amendments to the Labor/HHS appropriations bill:

? An amendment allowing states to deny Medicaid coverage for abortions to low

-income women who are victims of rape or incest.

? An amendment that would prohibit Title X funds from being used to provide services to teenagers without parental consent. Those services include providing contraceptives as well as testing for sexually transmitted diseases. States would be allowed to opt out of the federal mandate but, in doing so, would be required to enact new laws allowing minors to consent to sensitive health services. Currently, 49 states have laws that allow minors to consent for screening and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases and 23 states have laws allowing minors to consent for contraceptive services.

FY '97 Treasury, Postal and General Government Operations Appropriations bill

Abortion

? The week of July 8 Rep. Hoyer (D

-MD) is expected to offer on the floor an amendment to strike the restrictive language written into law in last years' appropriations bill, that prevents federal employees from selecting a health care plan that provides abortion coverage. Rep. Hoyer offered this amendment during committee debate. However, it failed
16

-22.

FY '97 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill

Abortion/Family Planning

During subcommittee consideration of this appropriations bill, Sen. Leahy (D

-VT) offered an amendment striking the Mexico City Policy language (Mexico City language denies all funding for overseas family planning organizations that perform abortions or speak out about reproductive choice, even with private money, a policy Pres. Clinton reversed when he came into office) and striking funding cuts to population assistance programs attached by the House. The Leahy amendment also restores a separate account for population assistance within the development assistance programs and increases population assistance to \$410

million. The Leahy amendment passed 8

-5. Senate floor action is
expected after the July 4 recess.

Welfare/Medicaid Legislation

On June 26 in the Senate Finance Committee, Sen. Chafee offered an amendment to strike from the welfare/Medicaid legislation language that permits states to deny coverage for abortion services except in the cases of life, rape or incest. The Chafee amendment failed 10

-10.

FDA and the Morning After Pill

After holding a hearing on Friday June 28, the FDA decided to publish in the Federal Register a notice that says ordinary oral contraceptives can be safely and effectively used as "morning after pills." However, because of concerns over liability litigation and anti

-abortion protests, no manufacturer has filed an application to market the pills specifically as "morning after pills." Without an application, the FDA cannot formally approve the new use. Instead, the FDA will use the Federal Register announcement to inform people of this use of birth control pills,

and will continue to hope a manufacturer applies.

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

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

CREATOR: Betsy Myers (MYERS_B) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUL-1996 16:00:45.24

SUBJECT: RE: Family Planning/Abortion Riders to Approps

TO: Lyndell Hogan (HOGAN_L) (OPD)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 16:48:15.67

TEXT:

Thanks -- we think you're probably right. Carrie is going to make a few calls to choice groups to see what's best for them. (sometimes they prefer to come in for a meeting). Will let you know today.

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

CREATOR: Lyndell Hogan (HOGAN_L) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUL-1996 10:40:29.33

SUBJECT: Family Planning/Abortion Riders to Approps

TO: Betsy Myers (MYERS_B) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 11:24:17.41

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 11:47:28.60

TO: Elizabeth E. Drye (DRYE_E) (OPD)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 11:10:56.74

TEXT:

FYI,

The Istook and Livingston family planning riders will be offered on the floor to the HHS/Labor approps bill, probably next Wedn or Thurs. The amendments were not offered in committee because the votes weren't there.

There are also several other amendments that will be offered to approps bills next week and the week after.

Betsy/Carrie,

This means that the July 16 briefing we had planned will be too late. As an alternative, what about a conference call next Tuesday morning??

Please advise.

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

CREATOR: Jennifer L. Klein (KLEIN_J) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JUL-1996 14:06:52.19

SUBJECT: RE: Press Clips--Follow-Up

TO: Lyndell Hogan (HOGAN_L) (OPD)

READ: 7-JUL-1996 15:54:09.66

TEXT:

Here are a list of issues in my areas: Medicare, Medicaid,
Kassebaum-Kennedy, health care costs, managed care, health care
coverage/uninsured, women's health, abortion/family planning.
Thanks.

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

CREATOR: Alice E. Shuffield (SHUFFIELD_A) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JUL-1996 11:17:55.79

SUBJECT: Labor/HHS - 7th and FINAL message

TO: Dennis Burke (BURKE_D) (OPD)

READ:12-JUL-1996 11:28:11.24

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:12-JUL-1996 09:36:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Elizabeth L. Rossman

ATT SUBJECT: L/HHS/Ed Passed House Last Night (216-209)

ATT TO: Jacob J. Lew (LEW_J)

ATT TO: Kenneth S. Apfel (APFEL_K)

ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)

ATT TO: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C)

ATT TO: Charles S. Konigsberg (KONIGSBERG_C)

ATT TO: Lisa Kountoupes (KOUNTOUPES_L)

ATT TO: Barry B. Anderson (ANDERSON_B)

ATT TO: Richard P. Emery Jr. (EMERY_R)

ATT TO: Robert E. Barker (BARKER_R)

ATT TO: Nancy S. Ridenour (RIDENOUR_N)

ATT TO: Barry White (WHITE_B)

ATT TO: Lisa B. Fairhall (FAIRHALL_L)

ATT TO: Larry R. Matlack (MATLACK_L)

ATT TO: Carole Kittl (KITTI_C)

ATT TO: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B)

ATT TO: Michelle L. Hanson (HANSON_M)

ATT TO: Thomas M. Reilly (REILLY_T)
ATT TO: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)
ATT TO: Mark E. Miller (MILLER_ME)
ATT TO: Richard E. Green (GREEN_R)
ATT TO: Alice E. Shuffield (SHUFFIELD_A)
ATT TO: Mary I. Cassell (CASSELL_M)
ATT TO: Christine B. Ellertson (ELLERTSON_C)
ATT TO: Ann M. Burget (BURGET_A)

TEXT:

An Obey substitute to the the Istook family planning amendment was adopted, 232-193. The Obey language states that a family planning entity would have to certify that it encouraged family participation in family planning decisions made by minors as a condition of receiving Title X money. Apparently, this is similar to language in existing regulation, except that it requires "certification."

The Istook language, as amended by Obey, was approved 421-0.

I should have copies of the Congressional Record early this afternoon if you would like to see any amendments.

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

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

CREATOR: Alice E. Shuffield (SHUFFIELD_A) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JUL-1996 11:13:19.58

SUBJECT: Labor/HHS - 3rd message

TO: Dennis Burke (BURKE_D) (OPD)

READ:12-JUL-1996 11:26:17.02

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:11-JUL-1996 15:18:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Elizabeth L. Rossman

ATT SUBJECT: L/HHS/Ed House Floor Action (cont'd)

ATT TO: Jacob J. Lew (LEW_J)

ATT TO: Kenneth S. Apfel (APFEL_K)

ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)

ATT TO: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C)

ATT TO: Charles S. Konigsberg (KONIGSBERG_C)

ATT TO: Lisa Kountoupes (KOUNTOUPES_L)

ATT TO: Barry B. Anderson (ANDERSON_B)

ATT TO: Richard P. Emery Jr. (EMERY_R)

ATT TO: Robert E. Barker (BARKER_R)

ATT TO: Nancy S. Ridenour (RIDENOUR_N)

ATT TO: Barry White (WHITE_B)

ATT TO: Lisa B. Fairhall (FAIRHALL_L)

ATT TO: Larry R. Matlack (MATLACK_L)

ATT TO: Carole Kittl (KITTI_C)

ATT TO: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B)

ATT TO: Michelle L. Hanson (HANSON_M)

ATT TO: Thomas M. Reilly (REILLY_T)
ATT TO: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)
ATT TO: Mark E. Miller (MILLER_ME)
ATT TO: Richard E. Green (GREEN_R)
ATT TO: Alice E. Shuffield (SHUFFIELD_A)
ATT TO: Mary I. Cassell (CASSELL_M)
ATT TO: Christine B. Ellertson (ELLERTSON_C)

TEXT:

Amendments adopted:

- (1) Mica amend (agreed to by voice vote) that would increase funding for Education for the Disadvantaged concentration grants by \$20 M. Offset -- program admin (educ??)
- (2) Deal amend (voice vote) to increase funding for Education for the Disadvantage by \$1 M. Offset unknown.
- (3) Porter technical amend (agreed to by voice vote) -- language on Impact Aid. Porter noted COB said this amend had no scoring impact.
- (4) Fox amend (adopted by voice vote) would restore \$1.9 M for the Foster grandparent program. Offset -- DoEd S&E.
- (5) A Lowey amend (294-129) that would add \$2 M for the Women's Educational Equity Act program. Offset unknown.

Amendments Defeated:

- (1) An Obey amendment (198-227) that would have added \$1,246 M (as an advance appropriation) to education and training programs in the bill (I think that this would have been the distribution):
 - \$450 M, Title I, Education for the disadvantaged
 - \$100 M, Dislocated workers
 - \$70 M, Head Start
 - \$250 M, GOALS 2000
 - \$25 M, Safe and drug free schools
 - \$233 M Eisenhower grants
 - \$93 M, Perkins loans
 - \$25 M, Summer Youth

Amendments withdrawn:

- (1) Lee amend that would have transferred \$10 M from Impact Aid to Bilingual and immigrant education.

Action for Tonight:

At 6:50 PM, Mr. Porter rose and read 15 amendments that would be considered by the House later tonight -- these included the Lowey embryo research amend, and an Istook family planning amend.

Mr. Porter said debate would be over at 11:00 PM -- the end is in sight.....

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

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

CREATOR: Alice E. Shuffield (SHUFFIELD_A) (OMB)

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JUL-1996 11:14:54.22

SUBJECT: Labor/HHS - 5th message

TO: Dennis Burke (BURKE_D) (OPD)

READ:12-JUL-1996 11:27:12.27

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:11-JUL-1996 22:47:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Elizabeth L. Rossman

ATT SUBJECT: L/HHS/Ed House Floor Action Since 10:45 PM

ATT TO: Jacob J. Lew (LEW_J)

ATT TO: Kenneth S. Apfel (APFEL_K)

ATT TO: Nancy-Ann E. Min (MIN_N)

ATT TO: Charles E. Kieffer (KIEFFER_C)

ATT TO: Charles S. Konigsberg (KONIGSBERG_C)

ATT TO: Lisa Kountoupes (KOUNTOUPES_L)

ATT TO: Barry B. Anderson (ANDERSON_B)

ATT TO: Richard P. Emery Jr. (EMERY_R)

ATT TO: Robert E. Barker (BARKER_R)

ATT TO: Nancy S. Ridenour (RIDENOUR_N)

ATT TO: Barry White (WHITE_B)

ATT TO: Lisa B. Fairhall (FAIRHALL_L)

ATT TO: Larry R. Matlack (MATLACK_L)

ATT TO: Carole Kittl (KITTI_C)

ATT TO: Barry T. Clendenin (CLENDENIN_B)

ATT TO: Michelle L. Hanson (HANSON_M)

ATT TO: Thomas M. Reilly (REILLY_T)
ATT TO: Richard J. Turman (TURMAN_R)
ATT TO: Mark E. Miller (MILLER_ME)
ATT TO: Richard E. Green (GREEN_R)
ATT TO: Alice E. Shuffield (SHUFFIELD_A)
ATT TO: Mary I. Cassell (CASSELL_M)
ATT TO: Christine B. Ellertson (ELLERTSON_C)
ATT TO: Ann M. Burget (BURGET_A)

TEXT:

A message just flashed across my machine that said that the e-mail system was shutting down at midnight. I will send a final e-mail tomorrow morning if I am not able to send it tonight.

-- ACTION SINCE 10:45 PM --

Pending votes:

- Istook amend on family planning (parental consent)
- Obey substitute to Istook amend (encouraging parental consultation)
- final passage of bill

Amendments adopted:

- (1) Bunting amend (421-3) that would bar Medicare and Social Security trust funds from being used for union activity. Bunting cited that approximately \$8.1 M was being used to pay civil servants that work at SSA and work full-time on union activities.

Amendments defeated:

- (1) Hefley amend (205-219) that would have reduced the \$250 M appropriation for the Corp for Public Broadcasting by \$1 M. Reduction was directed at Pacifica Radio network.
- (2) Sanders amend (180-242) that would require HHS to consider the appropriateness of a reasonable pricing clause when it gives a private entity the exclusive rights to market drugs developed by NIH at taxpayer expense.
- (3) Lowey amend (167-256) that would strike the ban on Federal funding for embryo research in instances where the embryo was not specifically created for the research.
- (4) Hoyer substitute to Bunting amend (see #(1) listed above) (201-220) that would amend the Bunting amend to say that union representation of SSA employees could not be denied.

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

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

CREATOR: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JUL-1996 13:56:26.34

SUBJECT: Abortion letter and adoption; I'll forward you my response

TO: Jeremy D. Benami (BENAMI_J) (WHO)

READ:23-JUL-1996 17:28:44.15

TO: Lyndell Hogan (HOGAN_L) (OPD)

READ:23-JUL-1996 14:02:11.83

TEXT:

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:23-JUL-1996 13:30:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:B

ATT CREATOR: Seth E. Masket

ATT SUBJECT: Abortion form letter

ATT TO: Elizabeth E. Drye (DRYE_E)

ATT TO: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D)

TEXT:

I'm trying to insert a little bit of adoption language into our form letter on abortion. Currently, we have a paragraph that looks like the following:

"We have also worked to help reduce the number of abortions. Since I became President, I have fought for improved and expanded family planning services and education programs. I have also worked to prevent teenage pregnancies by promoting efforts to teach young people about personal responsibility and help them make the right choices. It is by advancing these efforts and by encouraging adoption, rather than criminalizing women and their doctors, that we can create a better future for our children."

Can I revise it to look like this?

"We have also worked to help reduce the number of abortions. Since I became President, I have fought for improved and expanded family planning services and education programs. I have also worked to prevent teenage pregnancies by promoting efforts to teach young people about personal responsibility and help them make the right choices. I am additionally committed to breaking down the barriers to adoption, which is one of the most important things we can do to strengthen America's families and give more children what every young person in America deserves -- loving parents and a healthy home. By advancing these

efforts, rather than criminalizing women and their doctors, we can
create a better future for our children."

Please let me know.

Thanks,

Seth

===== END ATTACHMENT I =====

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

CREATOR: Seth E. Masket (MASKET_S) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JUL-1996 13:42:18.23

SUBJECT: Abortion form letter

TO: Elizabeth E. Drye (DRYE_E) (OPD)

READ:23-JUL-1996 20:39:44.38

TO: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

READ:23-JUL-1996 13:52:23.48

TEXT:

I'm trying to insert a little bit of adoption language into our form letter on abortion. Currently, we have a paragraph that looks like the following:

"We have also worked to help reduce the number of abortions. Since I became President, I have fought for improved and expanded family planning services and education programs. I have also worked to prevent teenage pregnancies by promoting efforts to teach young people about personal responsibility and help them make the right choices. It is by advancing these efforts and by encouraging adoption, rather than criminalizing women and their doctors, that we can create a better future for our children."

Can I revise it to look like this?

"We have also worked to help reduce the number of abortions. Since I became President, I have fought for improved and expanded family planning services and education programs. I have also worked to prevent teenage pregnancies by promoting efforts to teach young people about personal responsibility and help them make the right choices. I am additionally committed to breaking down the barriers to adoption, which is one of the most important things we can do to strengthen America's families and give more children what every young person in America deserves -- loving parents and a healthy home. By advancing these efforts, rather than criminalizing women and their doctors, we can create a better future for our children."

Please let me know.

Thanks,

Seth