

**DPC PEOPLE MAGAZINE Q & A's**  
**Updated 10/6/95**

**ABORTION/REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Jeremy Ben-Ami, 65584/Debbie Fine, 65572

Updated 10/6/95

**Q:** The Congressional majority has passed a number of provisions relating to abortion in the various authorization and appropriations bills about to be sent to you as part of the FY96 budget. Will you be vetoing those provisions?

**A:** As I have often said, I believe that abortion should be safe, legal and rare. The Supreme Court has prescribed the conditions under which the Constitution provides individuals the right to make this difficult decision for themselves. I believe that Congress should be focussing in these appropriations bills on designing a balanced budget that provides America's working families the supports they need in terms of health care, education and tax relief -- not on contentious social issues. Instead, now some Republicans in Congress are using the complicated budget process to launch a stealth campaign to undermine the reproductive health of American women.

[If pressed on the veto question] I have already said that I would veto a number of these bills for a range of reasons -- primarily because I disagree with the budget priorities of the Congressional Republicans. I want a balanced budget that invests in education, does not devastate Medicaid and Medicare and focusses tax relief on the middle class helping them meet critical expenses like buying a home and putting their children through college.

**Q:** A bill to outlaw the D&X abortion procedure (called "partial birth" by its proponents) is ready to be considered on the House floor. If the bill is passed, will you sign it?

**A:** The Constitution permits states to ban abortion after fetal viability except when necessary to preserve the woman's life or health. As I have stated consistently, I support such post-viability restrictions. However, the House bill, as currently written, is another matter entirely. First of all, its ban on the D&X procedure applies even in cases where the procedure is needed to preserve the health of the woman. Second, the ban applies even pre-viability. And finally, I think the bill makes a real mistake in picking and choosing among different kinds of procedures. It is a physician's job -- not the government's -- to use medical discretion to determine whether a certain procedure is the safest and most medically appropriate method for his or her patient.

## CRIME/DRUGS

Domestic Policy Council: Dennis Burke, 65568

Updated 10/29/95

### The Administration's Crack Sentencing Guidelines Legislation

Q. Why did you sign legislation that would disapprove of the Sentencing Commission guideline recommendation on crack sentencing?

A. We submitted this legislation to Congress and I signed it because we are concerned that the equalization of the penalties for crack and cocaine powder trafficking does not reflect:

- \* the significant differences between the two;
- \* the impact crack has had on our communities;
- \* and the effect a drastic change in penalties would have on deterring those who traffic in this dangerous drug.

Q. What's the point of sending this back to the Sentencing Commission -- aren't you just punting a political hot potato?

A. No. I recommended this legislation to Congress and signed it for a good policy reason. Had we not enacted this legislation, the Sentencing Commission's recommendations would have gone into effect on November 1. Their guidelines would have created bad policy. The truth of the matter is this -- permitting these guidelines recommendations to become law -- without changing the underlying statutes on powder cocaine and crack -- will create even greater sentencing disparity than what some believe exists under the current guidelines.

What I did here -- by proposing this legislation and signing it -- is tell the Sentencing Commission -- "I disagree with your recommendations; I want you to go back, work with my Attorney General, and come back in May with sentences that treat crack distribution generally harsher than powder cocaine, but I also want sentences that ensure that we treat a high-level powder cocaine distributor harsher than a street-level crack distributors."

Q. Does this proposed Conference really mean anything or is the President just doing this to appease leaders in the African-American community?

A. The idea for this conference has been in the planning stages for sometime and I was actually intending to mention it in a drug speech this Thursday. All we are doing today is moving up the announcement date -- by just a few days -- of an idea that has been vetted and approved. This is a very important issue to me and I am committed to reducing drug use in this country and the violence that is linked to it.

Q. Why don't you increase the sentences for cocaine -- won't that reduce the disparity in the current sentencing system?

A. That indeed might be the result. But I want the Sentencing Commission, working with the Attorney General, to have the opportunity to reexamine their recommendations and return with sentences that still reflect our concern with crack distribution.

In the mean time, I have also asked the Attorney General to begin working immediately with United States Attorneys to make sure that high-level power cocaine distributors are prosecuted for what they know they are doing -- selling powder cocaine that is ending up as crack on our streets.

Crack is a more dangerous drug than powder cocaine; I believe that the sentencing structure should reflect this in some way. But a high-level drug distributor who knows his powder cocaine is ending up as crack vials on the street, should be punished for what he is doing -- pushing crack.

Q. Isn't crack and cocaine powder effectively the same drug?

A. Crack is more psychologically addictive than cocaine powder. Our conclusions about the harmful effects of crack as compared to cocaine powder are virtually the same as those reached by the Sentencing Commission. Indeed in its report to Congress on this issue, the Sentencing Commission concluded that:

"[T]he higher addictive qualities associated with crack combined with its inherent ease of use can support a higher ratio for crack over powder."

Furthermore, as the Sentencing Commission itself stated:

"crack dealers generally tend to have a stronger association with systemic violence and are more likely to possess weapons than powder cocaine dealers."

Q. Doesn't the current penalty structure discriminate against African-Americans?

A. As you know, I recently spoken out on my concern with the number of African-Americans who are in our criminal justice system. This is a very important issue to me and it is on that I will continue to address. But reducing crack cocaine sentences is not the solution to that problem.

Instead, reduced sentences for crack trafficking would ignore the devastation this drug has cause so many communities and victims across the country. A crack dealer could only interpret it one way -- the cost of business is going down, keep pushing.

The legislation I signed includes an amendment by Senator Kennedy that was unanimously accepted in the Senate, which instructs the Sentencing Commission to undertake a review and report back to Congress its findings and recommendations on what sentencing structure can both provide the penalties needed by law enforcement but also ensure that our drug enforcement laws and policies are fair.

#### 100,000 COPS Program

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

A: After 6 years of political bickering -- on one of the most important issues to the American public -- Congress finally passed a comprehensive crime bill last year; and I proudly signed it. Every major law enforcement organization in America strongly supports this legislation -- because it is the toughest and smartest crime bill ever enacted. Through the COPS program, the Crime Bill will put 100,000 new community police officers on the streets of America.

In one year, we have already authorized funding for over 25,000 additional police officers. These officers are already making an impact, and for the first time in a long while, the violent crime rate in this country is actually going down. Yet, now, the Republican leadership in Congress wants to eliminate this program and replace it with a program that would not require that even 1 new officer be hired.

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

### Adolscnt Drug Use

**Q: The 1994 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse was released last month and it found that marijuana use is rising among American teenagers. What is your Administration planning to do to address this problem?**

A: Over the last 3 years, my Administration has recognized and drawn attention to the increase in marijuana use among American teenagers. We have challenged parents, teachers and leaders in the public and private sectors -- including media -- to be active and aggressive in the struggle against drug abuse.

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

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

### Gun Control

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

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

In just its first 100 days, the Brady Law stopped the sale of handguns to thousands of convicted felons, fugitives from justice, and persons under restraining orders for alleged stalking, harassment or other forms of domestic threats or intimidation. Yet, at the same time, honest law-abiding citizens were able to continue to purchase handguns for their own personal safety.

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

December 6, 1995

### Terrorism

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

**A:** The tragic bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on April 19th made clear the need to enhance the Federal government's ability to investigate, prosecute, and punish terrorist activity. I was pleased that the Senate acted quickly on the 2 anti-terrorism bills that I transmitted to Congress earlier this year -- passing them as one bill in June with over 90 votes. Unfortunately, this important legislation, which passed the House Judiciary Committee sometime ago, has been languishing before the full House.

I know understand that the House Republicans have worked out a deal to bring the Anti-Terrorism Bill to the House Floor for a vote before the end of the year. I was disappointed that they are going to take out provisions that were passed in Committee and overwhelmingly supported in the Senate.

I want to take this opportunity to urge the House leadership to provide me with a strong and effective Anti-Terrorism bill -- like the one that I sent them after the Oklahoma City bombing. The bill that I submitted to Congress will increase our security from terrorist attacks and save American lives; it should not be delayed any longer.

### Juvenile Crime

**Q: The Attorney General came out with a report recently that found that juvenile crime is on the rise and will continue to rise. What is your Administration doing to address this problem?**

**A:** It is true that while overall crime rates have been dropping, the incidence of youth crime have risen. That is why my anti-crime strategy has and will focus on youth crime and violence.

The 1994 Crime Bill that I signed sends a strong message to young criminals: it bans handguns for juveniles, imposes stiff penalties for gang members who commit crimes, establishes boot camps and drug courts to discipline first-time offenders. At the same time, it invests in smart prevention programs that offer at-risk youth positive alternatives to criminal activities.

But we are going to continue to do more to help the local levels deal with this problem. Indeed recently, I announced grants to 10 cities across the country to implement programs to reduce youth firearm violence.

## **EDUCATION Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Jeremy Ben-Ami/Gaynor McCown, 65575

Updated 10/6/95

**Mr. President, you recently said that "cutting education today would be like cutting defense budgets at the height of the cold war." Can you explain what you mean by this comment.**

Let me just begin by saying that I firmly believe that the American people want to balance the budget to lift the burden of debt off of our children and to strengthen our economy. But I also believe that the American people want to strengthen families, expand our economy, and raise living standards and that nothing is more critical to that effort than education. My budget proposal proves that it is possible to deal with the deficit while investing in human capital. Education is the key to the future of America and demolishing our investment in education is not the means to balance the budget. Yet, in the last two weeks, both the House and the Senate have taken a variety of actions that are direct attacks on our nation's investment for the future.

On September 28, the House Educational and Economic Opportunities Committee approved a bill that would dramatically reduce federal support for Americans going to college and would eliminate my Direct Lending program.

I am strongly opposed to any action which would raise the cost of college for students and their families. In particular, I will oppose any plan that contains an unwise and unjustified elimination of my Direct Lending program. This program works! It is already saving taxpayers billions of dollars and students are getting their funds with less government red tape. Students are getting flexible repayment plans, schools have less administrative costs, and thousands of intermediaries and attendant complexities are eliminated. It is inexcusable for Congress to allow the banks and special interest to pass a law that would take away the choice for hundreds of schools. My Direct Lending program is "good government" at its best and I will fight to keep it.

On September 26, the Republican majority in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee voted to cut \$10.8 billion from student loans over the next seven years.

Tucked in this legislation is a series of provisions that sign over \$1.8 billion of taxpayers' money to guaranty agencies in the student loan program. In the name of balancing the budget, the Senate committee has voted to cut back funds available to students while padding the pockets of this little-known special interest.

My bottom line is that I cannot support any proposal that will raise the cost of college and deny our young people the opportunity to make the most of the opportunities of the coming century.

It's a question of values. We can balance the budget and still maintain our investment in education, in our children and in our future.

**In addition to the reconciliation bills, it seems likely that one of the biggest battles in the budget will be over the Labor/H appropriations bill which contains funding for several of your initiatives in the education area. Would you really bring the whole budget process to a halt over a few billion dollars in this bill?**

Let me be clear. This is not a question of money and dollars. It's not an abstract budget fight. We're talking about critical investments in the future of our children, our families and our country.

Education has clearly emerged as the fault line between those who are making it and those who are falling behind in the new economy. Every year of education beyond high school adds six to twelve percent to a person's income.

It has always been a shared value in this country that we should support efforts to prepare our children to learn, to improve our schools, to help those who can't afford it to pay for college.

So, yes, I will stand firm in my opposition to efforts to cut these investments to pay for a tax cut for those who don't need it.

**[Follow] The Senate Appropriations Committee did put back some of the funding eliminated by the House, particularly for Goals 2000. If the final version of the bill is closer to what the Senate is likely to approve, would you sign the bill?**

We cannot allow some of these marginal improvements to make the Senate version seem acceptable. To me, even with some of the changes, it still represents a break with our traditional support for our children and their education.

I stand behind my proposal to balance the budget AND increase our investments in these areas.

## Background

The Labor/H bill has passed the House but has not gone to the Senate floor. The House bill would, for example:

fund \$500 million less for Head Start than my request. To maintain current program quality, that would mean denying services to more than 45,000 children next year.

cut Title One funding by \$1.1 billion in 1996, denying this crucial assistance to improve basic and advanced skills to 1.1 million students nationwide.

eliminate Goals 2000 and deny funding to as many as 17,500 schools.

It would gut Safe and Drug-Free Schools, a program which 14,575 out of 14,783 school districts in the U.S. use to keep crime, violence, and drugs away from students and out of schools.

deny Pell Grants to 380,000 students in 1996 alone, possibly forcing them to drop out of college.

It would eliminate AmeriCorps and deny 50,000 young people the chance to serve in 1996 (note: this is in HUD/VA, not Labor/H)..

It would cut job training programs by \$1.4 billion and deny training opportunities to 506,100 dislocated workers and 84,000 disadvantaged adults in 1996.

It would eliminate summer jobs, denying jobs to over 600,000 youths in 1996 and almost 4 million youths over 7 years and it would severely cut my School to Work initiative.

## **EDUCATION VOUCHERS/CHOICE Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Gaynor McCown, 65575

Updated 9/13/95

**Q:** Mr. President, many people including New York Mayor Rudolph Guiliani, have said that Catholic schools have provided a model for how young people in this country should receive their education. As President, you have made education a priority and have indicated that you want to see to it that every child in this country gets the quality education they need and deserve. Yet, your policies do not allow vouchers for parents who want to send their children to Catholic schools instead of Public schools. Please explain what seems to me to be a blatant contradiction.

**A:** Well, let me just begin by saying that education is a priority of mine and I do care deeply about ensuring that every individual in this country has the opportunity to receive the quality education they need and deserve. I also believe strongly in private education and the right of parents to choose that option for their children. And, for the most part, I think all educators, whether they are from a Catholic school or a public school have a common purpose and concern which is for children and families. However, it is my belief that using public funds for private education has two fundamental problems:

(1) At a time when enrollment is at an all-time high and we need public schools the most, I don't think we should be taking funds away. A good, strong public school system is essential to our Democracy and in order to improve and maintain the quality of education in this country, we must keep available funds in the system.

(2) Equally important, part of the beauty of our system is that private schools, because they don't all general education funds from the government, do not have to be regulated as strictly. Public funds would require a great deal of oversight that in effect would destroy the very nature of private and parochial schools.

**Q:** Mr. President, you have talked a lot about the need for parents to have an opportunity to help their children choose what school they want to go to. Yet, the public school system today, rarely allows that to happen. Young people who live in a certain district are often forced to go to schools in that same district unless their parent are savvy enough to break the rules. What are you doing to prevent this trend from continuing.

**A:** Let me begin by saying that I believe strongly in public school choice. That is, if a student lives in one part of the city and wants to go to school in another part of the city simply because that schools meets his / her needs and the parents are amenable, that student should be free to go wherever he / she wants. I think a little bit of competition among public schools is not only acceptable, it is healthy. I also believe in and have supported charter schools, magnet schools and other alternative approaches to education that meet the needs of different populations.

**Q:** Mr. President, Catholic schools in this country are slowly becoming a thing of the past largely due to lack of funding. How do you feel about Catholic or any other religious education and what is your Administration doing to prevent the demise of these institutions that have served so many children for so long?

**A:** I just want to begin by saying that even if Catholic and other parochial schools got the same amount of federal funding that other elementary and secondary schools receive, it would not be enough. You have to remember that the federal role in elementary and secondary education is limited to less than 10%. As my Education Secretary Dick Riley so often and eloquently says: "Education is a national priority, a

state responsibility and a local function." We don't provide for general support of elementary and secondary education.

Now, having said that, I also want to let you in on a little known fact. Catholic and other parochial schools in very needy areas do receive federal support -- the same support that similar public schools in those areas receive. But, it still is not enough. The federal government will never be able, and I don't think it should be responsible for supporting or saving public or parochial schools. Does that mean, I want them to fail, no...but, general funding for K-12 education comes from state and local government and support from the federal government is not the answer.

**Q:** Mr. President, for years the federal government has been subsidizing loans for young people to attend private colleges. The objective here is to provide an opportunity for an individual to make choices about their own education. However, your policies do not allow parents and children to make choices about where they go to elementary and secondary schools. Why is it more important for an individual to make a choice for higher education than it is for elementary and secondary education?

**A:** Let me again emphasize that for the k-12 levels, state and local governments -- not the federal government -- provide general support. The federal government's support goes primarily toward needy populations and helps out with special needs. For this, parochial and private schools also benefit. On the other hand, at the post-secondary level, the federal government provides over half of the funding for students to attend college.

Another important point here is that college age students are no longer minors and college is not mandatory. Therefore, in choosing to go to a particular college, whether it is private or public, they can make their own decisions about religious affiliation. A key factor in elementary and secondary education is that students don't leave their religion at the school house door and they must be allowed to have their religious freedom. But, because they are minors, the state cannot dictate a particular religious belief.

## **HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT Q/As**

**Domestic Policy Council: Molly Brostrom, 65561**

Updated 9/28/95

**Q: Secretary Cisneros has made a number of statements recently about the severity of the cuts to housing assistance. Are the Republican cuts really as bad as Secretary Cisneros claims?**

**A: Absolutely. The House appropriations bill would cut housing assistance to very low-income families and the homeless in 1996 by 19 percent compared to my budget plan -- a cut of nearly \$5 billion. As I said when I introduced my 7-year budget plan, the budget can be balanced by FY 2005 while preserving essential commitments to low-income households and communities.**

The House cuts would provide no new housing vouchers, breaking a 20-year bipartisan precedent at a time when the number of families with severe housing needs has been rising. In contrast, my budget adds over 500,000 voucher subsidies over 7 years.

**Q: How do the Congressional cuts differ from your budget plan in meeting the needs of homeless families and individuals?**

**A: While taking actions that would increase the number of homeless families, the House also reduced funding for HUD's homeless programs by 40 percent (-\$444 million) from the previous year and cut another \$30 million in the Emergency Food and Shelter program operated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Secretary Cisneros has pointed out that the housing assistance cuts, along with reductions in other aid to poor families, would increase the numbers of homeless families in communities all over the country while, at the same time, denying those communities help needed to create transitional and longer-term housing options for the homeless.**

**Q: Are you concerned about the proposed Congressional budget cuts to HUD's public housing programs?**

**A: Yes. The House-passes appropriations bill would make deep cuts to public housing capital and operating funds that will likely force rent increases and worsen living conditions for families living in public housing. Specifically, the House-passed appropriations bill would cut public housing capital funding by \$2.3 billion. This reduction would severely impede demolition of the worst obsolete projects and prevent improvements needed to ensure the remaining housing stock's viability. In addition, the \$720 million reduction in public housing operating funds would force localities raise rents and curtail security, maintenance, and drug elimination efforts. In contrast, my budget plan would provide \$8.1 billion in 1996 public housing capital and operating funds, enough to reduce a backlog of capital needs, bring down or reconfigure the worst projects, and prepare for our proposed transition to portable assistance that gives public housing residents housing choices.**

**Q: Would you veto the VA/HUD appropriations bill as passed by the House?**

**A: Yes. The budget can be balanced by FY 2005 while preserving these essential commitments to low-income households and communities. My Administration is now working with the Congress to restore FY 1996 funding for critical investments, including housing and homeless assistance programs. This is one of the bills I would veto if presented to me in its current form.**

## **IMMIGRATION Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Stephen Warnath, 65576

Updated 10/30/95

**Both the House and the Senate are considering immigration legislation right now. What are your thoughts on these bills?**

I want Congress to pass immigration reform legislation quickly to provide the Administration with the enforcement tools and resources that we need to deal effectively and comprehensively with the problem of illegal immigration. And I want legal immigration reform. The Congress should not delay on this important legislation and I have challenged them to present me with immigration legislation before the end of the year.

Both houses are considering bills that are very similar to much of the legislation the Administration proposed and work we are already doing.

The House bill would strengthen our border patrol and efforts to check work authorization -- which I strongly support. However, I would like the House to put more emphasis on worksite enforcement -- for instance, funding more Labor investigators and enforcement officers. The problem of the immigrant slave labor at the El Monte garment factory underscores the need for this

**Can you expand on the Administration's views regarding the immigration legislation being considered now in the House (HR 2202)?**

Many of the provisions of the House bill -- which the Judiciary Committee just completed marking up -- advance the Administration's strategy to control illegal immigration. This strategy calls for regaining control of our borders; removing the job magnet through worksite enforcement; and aggressively pursuing the removal of criminal aliens and other illegal aliens. Much of the House bill at this point is similar the Administration's enforcement bill. We are therefore pleased that the bill follows our policies to a significant extent. This includes:

- . a significant increase in border patrol agents.
- . work authorization pilots, including SSA and INS database checks.
- . making immigration documents more fraud-resistant.
- . strong penalties for violation of the immigration laws including for illegal entry.
- . expedited exclusion to increase the Attorney General's authority to effectively address mass migration situations.

We do not agree with every detail of the proposed legislation. Reductions in legal immigration must promote underlying principles that are pro-family, pro-work and pro-naturalization. We have been working with Democrats and Republicans to attempt to arrive at bipartisan immigration reform legislation that is in the national interest.

**What is an example of an area where you disagree with the House bill?**

Employment is the biggest magnet for illegal immigration to this country. If you are serious about curbing illegal immigration you have to be serious about effective worksite enforcement. Border enforcement alone

is not enough. Thus, we are disappointed by some Republican efforts to water down enforcement at the workplace. For example, the bill currently does not provide for all of the worksite investigators and enforcement officers that we need and have asked for. Some provisions seek to limit enforcement discretion. We also want to ensure that while worksite enforcement is strengthened, adequate safeguards against discrimination are included in the legislation.

### **What are you doing to stop illegal immigration?**

**At the Border:** We are engaged in an unprecedented buildup of Border Patrol Agents as part of Operations Gatekeeper in California, Hold-the-Line in Texas, and Safeguard in Arizona -- and we are deploying more technology (like sensors and night scopes). Our new computerized fingerprinting illegal crosser identification system and dedication of increased resources has led to a 240% increase in prosecutions on felony charges for reentry after deportation since 1992 in California.

**At the Worksite:** Employment is the largest magnet for illegal immigration. We are intensifying worksite enforcement by the INS and the Department of Labor. We support work authorization verification and are presently recruiting and training employers in California to participate in an expanded telephone verification system. We have taken steps to make INS immigration cards more fraud-resistant. We have asked Congress for more investigators and enforcement personnel to bolster the deterrence effect of effective worksite enforcement.

**Deportations:** We are increasing deportations, especially of criminal aliens. The number of criminal aliens removed from the U.S. increased by 17.6% in 1994 over 1992 levels. This has resulted from stepped up vigilance in identification, detention, and deportation of criminal aliens rather than just letting them back into our communities at the end of their sentences, which is what happened in the past. For example, we conducted a pilot at L.A. County Jail to identify and deport criminal aliens. Under this program, INS officers staff the release lines at the jail 24 hours a day, seven days a week to ensure that deportable aliens are taken into Federal custody to be deported rather than released out into the streets. We are looking to expand this effort in L.A. and elsewhere.

### **Some people have expressed concern about a national work registry. Please expand on your view on this.**

We need to find an effective, non-discriminatory way to verify employment authorization of all new employees. I support the recommendation of the Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, to test different ways to do this, including use of the Social Security and INS databases.

In fact, we're not waiting for Congress to act in this area, we are right now recruiting and training employers in the Los Angeles area to participate in a telephone verification system with the INS.

Let me add, however, that we are absolutely committed to protecting privacy and civil rights. The Administration will develop pilots carefully, building in safeguards against the invasion of privacy and discrimination. All employers will be instructed as to the laws against discrimination as well as the verification requirements. We will also monitor these pilots closely for evidence of discriminatory action.

### **What is the Administration doing about the terrible El Monte, CA sweatshop slavery situation?**

First, we are prosecuting those involved and seeking millions in unpaid wages due the workers.

More generally, the Administration is intensifying our enforcement efforts against sweatshops which hold workers in involuntary servitude or generally exploit immigrant workers. Already the INS and Department of Labor have followed-up with additional raids of sweatshops in the Los Angeles area. We are committed to stepped-up worksite enforcement targeted especially at low-wage industries, and will continue such initiatives in the future.

The INS, with other agencies, has significantly increased anti-smuggling efforts to reduce the ability of these criminals to bring smuggled workers into the country. More than any previous Administration, we have clamped down on alien smuggling by land and sea into California. For example, prosecution of antismuggling cases rose 24 percent in July 1995 over July 1994. Along with increased interdiction and prosecution of smugglers, we have asked Congress to increase penalties to punish these criminals.

Secretary Reich has been working with the garment industry to make that industry and their retailers more accountable for preventing this type of abuse. Secretary Reich convened a Summit of some of the country's largest clothing retailers immediately after the El Monte raid to enlist the cooperation of retailers to end subcontracting with illegal sweatshops and to improve labor law compliance within the garment industry. Under Secretary Reich's leadership, the Department of Labor has also been working hard over the last few years to get the assistance of garment manufacturers to promote labor law compliance by their production contractors. We will continue our efforts to gain industry assistance in this area.

We are now seeking more worksite enforcement resources and tools from Congress for both the Department of Labor and the Immigration and Naturalization Service needed to protect workers and fight against any recurrence of this type of subjugation. Unfortunately, present Republican legislation would provide less resources for this purpose than my Administration has requested.

The El Monte sweatshop was uncovered as a result of cooperation by federal, state and local officials. Attorney General Reno has asked the U.S. Attorney in Los Angeles and Immigration and Naturalization Service Commissioner Doris Meissner to thoroughly review the actions of federal law enforcement in this case since 1992. We hope to find ways to improve this cooperative work. On the federal level, we are taking steps to enhance interagency enforcement coordination.

**You opposed prop. 187. Do you favor benefits for illegal aliens?**

No, except public health and safety and a child's constitutional right to an education.

**What is the Administration's position on the restrictions on eligibility of legal immigrants for benefits in the House and Senate Welfare bills?**

The Administration supports holding sponsors who bring immigrants into this country legally responsible for their financial support, but these changes should be made in an equitable manner.

Both bills go too far in cutting benefits to legal immigrants who find themselves temporarily in need of help. In addition, I think that it is likely to result in a very significant shift in costs from the federal government to states with substantial numbers of immigrants (e.g. California, Texas, Florida, N.Y., New Jersey, and Illinois).

In particular, the Administration opposes the Senate provision that would discriminate against U.S. citizens by denying benefits to legal immigrants even after they become naturalized citizens. We cannot have two categories of citizens, and a provision that treats naturalized citizens less favorably than the native born raises serious Constitutional issues.

I am also deeply concerned about the Senate provision that would require sponsors' income to exceed 200 percent of poverty. Working families who are U.S. citizens should not have to pass a wealth test in order to be reunited with a family member. This would reverse a fundamental element of our country's immigration heritage.

The Administration will also seek other changes in conference including adopting the House provision to exempt those over age 7 from benefit cut-offs, letting those who become disabled after entering the country remain eligible for benefits, and making sure that benefit restrictions do not apply to discretionary programs and certain mandatory programs such as student loans.

**Applications for citizenship have increased dramatically ( 78% during first 10 months of '95 compared to the same period of '94) and waiting periods for processing those applications are very long. What are you doing about it?**

We want to encourage and help immigrants who qualify and who want to become citizens to do so as quickly as possible. In so doing, we will maintain the requirements (e.g. English language proficiency) that demonstrate an individual's readiness to accept the responsibilities of citizenship and full participation in our National community. Streamlining and promoting citizenship are priorities of the INS and it is dedicating more personnel and resources to addressing this problem.

INS has just announced a new initiative, Citizenship USA, to ensure that by the summer of 1996, eligible persons applying for citizenship can be accepted within six months.

Los Angeles will be the first site for this nationwide initiative. We'll be increasing staff levels, expanding facilities, using new technology, streamlining procedures, and forging new and better partnerships with community organizations.

Perhaps too often we allow ourselves to take for granted what U.S. citizenship means. One need only attend a naturalization ceremony and observe the depth of the pride and hope of our newest citizens to be reminded of how fortunate we are to be Americans.

**What do you think about the apparent undercurrent of anti-immigrant feelings in the country?**

Some are trying to use immigration, like affirmative action, to drive a wedge in this country. This is wrong and we must fight "immigrant-bashing." We need to examine our immigration policies in the same factual, nonpolitical way that we tried to do with affirmative action.

We need to crack down on illegal immigration, but we must not allow immigration to become a wedge.

**Some are proposing a new guestworker program -- What is your position on this?**

I oppose a guestworker or "bracero-type" program because it will lead to increased illegal immigration, depressed wages and work standards for citizens and legal immigrants already in this country.

**What is your view on legal immigration reform?**

I have always said that while we must crack down on illegal immigration -- because we are a nation of laws -- we are also a nation of immigrants. Nearly all of us can trace our roots beyond the shores of this

country, and we have a historic commitment to immigration. I believe that legal immigration strengthens this country.

I support the recommendations of Barbara Jordan's Commission on Immigration Reform as the framework for Congress to consider for legal immigration reform. The Commission has recommended moderate reduction in the level of legal immigration and gives high priority to reunifying Americans with their close family members. I share this view.

Reuniting closest family members should be the highest priority and basic unit of immigration. At the same time, this Administration has proposed a way to lower the level of legal immigration while retaining more family reunification opportunities than the Republicans would allow (i.e. for adult children and parents.)

We support reduction in employment-based immigration as a means of encouraging employers to hire and train domestic workers -- both citizens and legal immigrants. I favor eliminating the unskilled category of immigration to reduce job competition with those in our own country who need work.

Legal immigration reform must be based upon principles that are pro-family, pro-work, and pro-naturalization. My Administration anticipates working with Congress in a spirit of bipartisanship to craft the details of the specific legislation that will put these principles into practice. We must not let this issue become divisive in this country.

## **LINE ITEM Q/As**

**Domestic Policy Council: Paul Weinstein, 65577**

**Updated 9/28/95**

**Q:** Mr. President, why are Republicans backing away from passing the line-item veto and why aren't you more vocal about the dwindling prospects for getting the line-item veto power you have so long demanded. Isn't this just Washington as usual?

**A:** I have actively sought passage of the line-item veto. Since my January 5 letter to Congressional leaders, I have called on Congress on at least 17 different occasions to pass line-item veto authority so that I can start cutting pork out of the budget this year.

The American people have waited long enough for the line-item veto. Congress should stop the delaying tactics, stop playing politics, and pass the line-item veto now.

This is not a partisan issue, Presidents Reagan and Bush asked Congress for the line-item veto time and again. It was part of the "Republican Contract with America" and my book "Putting People First." It has strong support from Members of Congress in both parties and both houses. No matter what party the President belongs to or what party has a majority in Congress, the line-item veto would be good for America.

**WOMEN'S ISSUES (Points to emphasize)**

Domestic Policy Council: Jennifer Klein, 62599

Updated 9/28/95

President Clinton: you may want to contrast your record on women's issues with that of the Congressional majority. For example, you have:

- revoked the "Gag Rule," the import ban on RU-486, the ban on abortion services at military hospitals and the "Mexico City policy."

- signed the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the Violence Against Women Act

- appointed the highest percentage of senior women officials of any Administration in history

- dramatically increased the Earned Income Tax Credit

- dramatically increased small business loans to women entrepreneurs

- promoted the study of science and math by women and girls

By contrast, the Congressional majority is attempting to:

- undermine the reproductive health of American women

- endanger the health of older women by slashing Medicare

- cut the Earned Income Tax Credit

- cut funding for battered women's shelters, rape prevention, and other Violence Against Women Act programs

- cut or eliminate initiatives that promote equity in education and train women for high skill jobs such as Goals 2000 and School-to-Work.

## LARRY KING LIVE Q/A's

### **CRIME/DRUGS**

Domestic Policy Council:

Dennis Burke, 65568

Updated 9/18/95

**Q:** Just last week, the 1994 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse was released and it found that **marijuana use is rising** among American teenagers. What is your Administration planning to do to address this problem?

**A:** Over the last 3 years, my Administration has recognized and drawn attention to the increase in marijuana use among American teenagers. We have challenged parents, teachers and leaders in the public and private sectors -- including media -- to be active and aggressive in the struggle against drug abuse.

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

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

**Q:** You have supported and signed both the **Brady Bill and the ban on assault weapons**. Have these measures worked? Where do you stand on efforts to repeal them?

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

In just its first 100 days, the Brady Law stopped the sale of handguns to thousands of convicted felons, fugitives from justice, and persons under restraining orders for alleged stalking, harassment or other forms of domestic threats or intimidation. Yet, at the same time, honest law-abiding citizens were able to continue to purchase handguns for their own personal safety.

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

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

A: The tragic bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on April 19th made clear the need to enhance the Federal government's ability to investigate, prosecute, and punish terrorist activity. I was pleased that the Senate acted quickly on the 2 anti-terrorism bills that I transmitted to Congress earlier this year -- passing them as one bill in June with over 90 votes. Unfortunately, this important legislation, which passed the House Judiciary Committee some time ago, has been languishing before the full House. I want to take this opportunity to urge the House leadership to move quickly on this legislation so that I can sign it and increase our security from terrorist attacks. This is a bill that will save American lives and it should not be delayed any longer.

Q: I heard the Attorney General came out with a report recently that found that **juvenile crime** is on the rise and will continue to rise. What is your Administration doing to address this problem?

A: It is true that while overall crime rates have been dropping, the incidence of youth crime have risen. That is why my anti-crime strategy has and will focus on youth crime and violence.

The 1994 Crime Bill that I signed sends a strong message to young criminals: it bans handguns for juveniles, imposes stiff penalties for gang members who commit crimes, establishes boot camps and drug courts to discipline first-time offenders. At the same time, it invests in smart prevention programs that offer at-risk youth positive alternatives to criminal activities.

But we are going to continue to do more to help the local levels deal with this problem. Indeed just last week, I announced grants to 10 cities across the country to implement programs to reduce youth firearm violence.

Q: Is **Mark Fuhrman** an accurate reflection of policing in this country?

A: Absolutely not. The vast majority of police officers in this country do their job well and every day they are out there risking their lives for our personal safety. These men and women do so without discriminating and by playing by the rules.

We have so many great success stories from the 25,000 new community police officers that we have funded from my crime bill. Those individuals are the ones who accurately reflect policing in this country.

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

A: After 6 years of political bickering -- on one of the most important issues to the American public -- Congress finally passed a comprehensive crime bill last year; and I proudly signed it. Every major law enforcement organization in America strongly supports this legislation -- because it is the toughest and smartest crime bill ever enacted. Through the COPS program, the Crime Bill will put 100,000 new community police officers on the streets of America.

In just its first year, the COPS program has already authorized funding for over 25,000 additional police officers. These officers are already making an impact, and for the first time in a long while, the violent crime rate in this country is actually going down. Yet, now, the Republican leadership in Congress wants to eliminate this program and replace it with a program that would not require that even 1 new officer be hired.

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

## **IMMIGRATION**

Domestic Policy Council:

Steve Warnath, 65576

Updated 9/18/95

**Q:** What are you doing to stop illegal immigration in California?

At the Border: Large buildup of Border Patrol Agents as part of Operation Gatekeeper -- and more technology (like sensors and night scopes). Our new computerized fingerprinting identification system and dedication of increased resources has led to a 240% increase in prosecutions on felony charges for reentry after deportation since 1992. As part of the first anniversary of Operation Gatekeeper, we will be announcing additional steps to strengthen control of the border very soon.

At the Worksite: Employment is the largest magnet for illegal immigration. We are intensifying worksite enforcement by INS and the Department of Labor. We support the work authorization verification that the Jordan Commission recommended. We have taken steps to make INS cards more fraud-resistant and the INS is working with the California DMV to check license applicants. We have asked Congress for more investigators and enforcement personnel to bolster the deterrence effect of effective worksite enforcement.

Deportations: We are increasing deportations, especially criminal aliens. The number of criminal aliens removed from the U.S. increased by 17.6% in 1994 over 1992 levels. For example, we conducted a pilot at L.A. County Jail to identify and deport criminal aliens. Under this program, INS officers staff the release lines at the jail 24 hours a day, seven days a week to ensure that virtually all deportable aliens are taken into Federal custody to be deported rather than released out into the streets. We are looking to expand this effort in L.A. and elsewhere.

**Q:** What are you doing about the terrible El Monte, CA sweatshop slavery situation?

First, we are prosecuting those involved. More generally we are increasing our work in this area and will be vigilant in shutting down these sweatshops. The INS, with other agencies, has significantly increased anti-smuggling efforts. For example, prosecution of antismuggling cases rose 24 percent in July 1995 over July 1994. Secretary Reich has been working with the garment industry to make that industry and the retailers more accountable for preventing this type of abuse.

**Q:** You opposed prop. 187. Do you favor benefits for illegal aliens?

**A:** No, except to protect public health and safety and a child's constitutional right to an education.

## EDUCATION

Domestic Policy Council:

Gaynor McCown, 65575

Updated 9/18/95

Q: You have made a big issue of Republican cuts in education spending, but why shouldn't we leave education to the state and local level where it has traditionally been funded?

A: Education is truly the fault line dividing those who are getting ahead and those falling behind in the new economy. The income gap between those with a college education and those who have only graduated high school is now 74 percent. Every additional year of graduate education and training adds six to twelve percent to a family's income. We have to address the budget deficit, it's true, but equally important we have to address the education deficit facing the country. My balanced budget plan would address both these deficits.

Background on the types of cuts being considered that could be used in answering education questions.

The House would cut Title One funding by \$1.1 billion, and the Senate by \$679 million in 1996, denying this crucial assistance to improve basic and advanced skills to as many as 1,150,000 students nationwide.

The House would eliminate and the Senate would reduce funding for Goals 2000 by 17% from the 1995 level and 60% less than the \$750 million I requested for 1996.

The House would eliminate and the Senate would reduce by 60% the Safe and Drug-Free Schools, a program which provides safer, ore drug-free learning environments for 39 million children in 14,575 out of 15,000 school districts in the U.S.

It would eliminate AmeriCorps and deny 50,000 young people the chance to serve in 1996.

It would cut job training programs by \$1.4 billion and deny training opportunities to 506,100 dislocated workers and 84,000 disadvantaged adults in 1996.

It would eliminate summer jobs, denying jobs to over 550,000 youths in 1996 and 3.9 million youths over 7 years. It would also stall progress on my school to work efforts after just 27 states have received support to start implementing systems for young people to leave school with a marketable skill.

At risk for higher education are millions of Pell Grants, the in-school interest

subsidy and the Direct Lending Program which makes borrowing simpler and faster for students and schools.

**DPC HEARST Q & A's**  
**10/6/95**

**ABORTION/REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Jeremy Ben-Ami, 65584/Debbie Fine, 65572

Updated 10/6/95

**Q:** The Congressional majority has passed a number of provisions relating to abortion in the various authorization and appropriations bills about to be sent to you as part of the FY96 budget. Will you be vetoing those provisions?

**A:** As I have often said, I believe that abortion should be safe, legal and rare. The Supreme Court has prescribed the conditions under which the Constitution provides individuals the right to make this difficult decision for themselves. I believe that Congress should be focussing in these appropriations bills on designing a balanced budget that provides America's working families the supports they need in terms of health care, education and tax relief -- not on contentious social issues. Instead, now some Republicans in Congress are using the complicated budget process to launch a stealth campaign to undermine the reproductive health of American women.

[If pressed on the veto question] I have already said that I would veto a number of these bills for a range of reasons -- primarily because I disagree with the budget priorities of the Congressional Republicans. I want a balanced budget that invests in education, does not devastate Medicaid and Medicare and focusses tax relief on the middle class helping them meet critical expenses like buying a home and putting their children through college.

**Q:** A bill to outlaw the D&X abortion procedure (called "partial birth" by its proponents) is ready to be considered on the House floor. If the bill is passed, will you sign it?

**A:** The Constitution permits states to ban abortion after fetal viability except when necessary to preserve the woman's life or health. As I have stated consistently, I support such post-viability restrictions. However, the House bill, as currently written, is another matter entirely. First of all, its ban on the D&X procedure applies even in cases where the procedure is needed to preserve the health of the woman. Second, the ban applies even pre-viability. And finally, I think the bill makes a real mistake in picking and choosing among different kinds of procedures. It is a physician's job -- not the government's -- to use medical discretion to determine whether a certain procedure is the safest and most medically appropriate method for his or her patient.

## **CRIME/DRUGS**

Domestic Policy Council: Dennis Burke, 65568

Updated 10/6/95

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

**A: After 6 years of political bickering -- on one of the most important issues to the American public -- Congress finally passed a comprehensive crime bill last year; and I proudly signed it. Every major law enforcement organization in America strongly supports this legislation -- because it is the toughest and smartest crime bill ever enacted. Through the COPS program, the Crime Bill will put 100,000 new community police officers on the streets of America.**

In one year, we have already authorized funding for over 25,000 additional police officers. These officers are already making an impact, and for the first time in a long while, the violent crime rate in this country is actually going down. Yet, now, the Republican leadership in Congress wants to eliminate this program and replace it with a program that would not require that even 1 new officer be hired.

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

**Q: The 1994 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse was released last month and it found that marijuana use is rising among American teenagers. What is your Administration planning to do to address this problem?**

**A: Over the last 3 years, my Administration has recognized and drawn attention to the increase in marijuana use among American teenagers. We have challenged parents, teachers and leaders in the public and private sectors -- including media -- to be active and aggressive in the struggle against drug abuse.**

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

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

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

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

In just its first 100 days, the Brady Law stopped the sale of handguns to thousands of convicted felons, fugitives from justice, and persons under restraining orders for alleged stalking, harassment or other forms of domestic threats or intimidation. Yet, at the same time, honest law-abiding citizens were able to continue to purchase handguns for their own personal safety.

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

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

**A:** The tragic bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on April 19th made clear the need to enhance the Federal government's ability to investigate, prosecute, and punish terrorist activity. I was pleased that the Senate acted quickly on the 2 anti-terrorism bills that I transmitted to Congress earlier this year -- passing them as one bill in June with over 90 votes. Unfortunately, this important legislation, which passed the House Judiciary Committee sometime ago, has been languishing before the full House. I want to take this opportunity to urge the House leadership to move quickly on this legislation so that I can sign it and increase our security from terrorist attacks. This is a bill that will save American lives and it should not be delayed any longer.

**Q: The Attorney General came out with a report recently that found that juvenile crime is on the rise and will continue to rise. What is your Administration doing to address this problem?**

**A:** It is true that while overall crime rates have been dropping, the incidence of youth crime have risen. That is why my anti-crime strategy has and will focus on youth crime and violence.

The 1994 Crime Bill that I signed sends a strong message to young criminals: it bans handguns for juveniles, imposes stiff penalties for gang members who commit crimes, establishes boot camps and drug courts to discipline first-time offenders. At the same time, it invests in smart prevention programs that offer at-risk youth positive alternatives to criminal activities.

But we are going to continue to do more to help the local levels deal with this problem. Indeed recently, I announced grants to 10 cities across the country to implement programs to reduce youth firearm violence.

**Q: Do you approve of the use of cameras in the courtroom?**

**A:** I don't think we know enough yet to decide whether cameras in the courtroom are a good idea. The idea of opening up our judicial system to public scrutiny is very appealing. In general, it is true that the more information the public has about the way the government works, the stronger our democratic indications that the presence of cameras in the courtroom changes the way witnesses, lawyers, and jurors behave. For example, I think some of the circus atmosphere of the O.J. Simpson trial came from the presence of cameras.

I think this should be a time of experimentation and study with respect to cameras in the courtroom. The federal courts do not allow cameras in the courtroom in either civil or criminal cases. Some state judicial systems allow cameras in all cases, some in only certain kinds of cases, some in no cases at all. Perhaps the best thing to do right now is to leave the choice up to each judicial system and try to learn something from the variety of rules they adopt -- try to see what consequences follow from different rules on using cameras. I certainly wouldn't favor throwing open the federal courts to cameras tomorrow; that would be, at the least, very premature.

## **EDUCATION Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Jeremy Ben-Ami/Gaynor McCown, 65575

Updated 10/6/95

**Mr. President, you recently said that "cutting education today would be like cutting defense budgets at the height of the cold war." Can you explain what you mean by this comment.**

Let me just begin by saying that I firmly believe that the American people want to balance the budget to lift the burden of debt off of our children and to strengthen our economy. But I also believe that the American people want to strengthen families, expand our economy, and raise living standards and that nothing is more critical to that effort than education. My budget proposal proves that it is possible to deal with the deficit while investing in human capital. Education is the key to the future of America and demolishing our investment in education is not the means to balance the budget. Yet, in the last two weeks, both the House and the Senate have taken a variety of actions that are direct attacks on our nation's investment for the future.

On September 28, the House Educational and Economic Opportunities Committee approved a bill that would dramatically reduce federal support for Americans going to college and would eliminate my Direct Lending program.

I am strongly opposed to any action which would raise the cost of college for students and their families. In particular, I will oppose any plan that contains an unwise and unjustified elimination of my Direct Lending program. This program works! It is already saving taxpayers billions of dollars and students are getting their funds with less government red tape. Students are getting flexible repayment plans, schools have less administrative costs, and thousands of intermediaries and attendant complexities are eliminated. It is inexcusable for Congress to allow the banks and special interest to pass a law that would take away the choice for hundreds of schools. My Direct Lending program is "good government" at its best and I will fight to keep it.

On September 26, the Republican majority in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee voted to cut \$10.8 billion from student loans over the next seven years.

Tucked in this legislation is a series of provisions that sign over \$1.8 billion of taxpayers' money to guaranty agencies in the student loan program. In the name of balancing the budget, the Senate committee has voted to cut back funds available to students while padding the pockets of this little-known special interest.

My bottom line is that I cannot support any proposal that will raise the cost of college and deny our young people the opportunity to make the most of the opportunities of the coming century.

It's a question of values. We can balance the budget and still maintain our investment in education, in our children and in our future.

**In addition to the reconciliation bills, it seems likely that one of the biggest battles in the budget will be over the Labor/H appropriations bill which contains funding for several of your initiatives in the education area. Would you really bring the whole budget process to a halt over a few billion dollars in this bill?**

Let me be clear. This is not a question of money and dollars. It's not an abstract budget fight. We're talking about critical investments in the future of our children, our families and our country.

Education has clearly emerged as the fault line between those who are making it and those who are falling behind in the new economy. Every year of education beyond high school adds six to twelve percent to a person's income.

It has always been a shared value in this country that we should support efforts to prepare our children to learn, to improve our schools, to help those who can't afford it to pay for college.

So, yes, I will stand firm in my opposition to efforts to cut these investments to pay for a tax cut for those who don't need it.

**[Follow] The Senate Appropriations Committee did put back some of the funding eliminated by the House, particularly for Goals 2000. If the final version of the bill is closer to what the Senate is likely to approve, would you sign the bill?**

We cannot allow some of these marginal improvements to make the Senate version seem acceptable. To me, even with some of the changes, it still represents a break with our traditional support for our children and their education.

I stand behind my proposal to balance the budget AND increase our investments in these areas.

## Background

The Labor/H bill has passed the House but has not gone to the Senate floor. The House bill would, for example:

fund \$500 million less for Head Start than my request. To maintain current program quality, that would mean denying services to more than 45,000 children next year.

cut Title One funding by \$1.1 billion in 1996, denying this crucial assistance to improve basic and advanced skills to 1.1 million students nationwide.

eliminate Goals 2000 and deny funding to as many as 17,500 schools.

It would gut Safe and Drug-Free Schools, a program which 14,575 out of 14,783 school districts in the U.S. use to keep crime, violence, and drugs away from students and out of schools.

deny Pell Grants to 380,000 students in 1996 alone, possibly forcing them to drop out of college.

It would eliminate AmeriCorps and deny 50,000 young people the chance to serve in 1996 (note: this is in HUD/VA, not Labor/H)..

It would cut job training programs by \$1.4 billion and deny training opportunities to 506,100 dislocated workers and 84,000 disadvantaged adults in 1996.

It would eliminate summer jobs, denying jobs to over 600,000 youths in 1996 and almost 4 million youths over 7 years and it would severely cut my School to Work initiative.

## **IMMIGRATION Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Stephen Warnath, 65576

Updated 10/5/95

**Both the House and the Senate are considering immigration legislation right now. What are your thoughts on these bills?**

I want Congress to pass a strong bill -- quickly to deal effectively and comprehensively with the problem of illegal immigration. And I want legal immigration reform. The Congress should not delay on this important legislation and I have challenged them to present me with immigration legislation before the end of the year.

Both houses are considering bills that are very similar to legislation the Administration proposed and work we are already doing.

The House bill would strengthen our border patrol and efforts to check work authorization -- which I strongly support. However, I would like the House to put more emphasis on worksite enforcement -- funding, for instance, more Labor investigators and enforcement officers. The problem of the immigrant slave labor at the El Monte garment factory underscores the need for this

**Can you expand on the Administration's views regarding the immigration legislation being considered now in the House (HR 2202)?**

Many of the provisions of the House bill -- now being marked-up in full committee -- advance the Administration's strategy to control illegal immigration. This strategy calls for regaining control of our borders; removing the job magnet through worksite enforcement; and aggressively pursuing the removal of criminal aliens and other illegal aliens. Much of the House bill at this point is similar the Administration's enforcement bill. We are therefore pleased that the bill follows our policies to a significant extent. This includes:

- . a significant increase in border patrol agents.
- . work authorization pilots, including SSA and INS database checks.
- . making immigration documents more fraud-resistant.
- . strong penalties for violation of the immigration laws including for illegal entry.
- . expedited exclusion to increase the Attorney General's authority to effectively address mass migration situations.
- . reductions in the total level of legal immigration.

We do not agree with every detail of the proposed legislation. We have been working with Democrats and Republicans to attempt to arrive at bipartisan immigration reform legislation that is in the national interest. The President has requested that Congress get immigration legislation to him before the end of the year to ensure that the Administration is provided with the needed tools and resources to effectively address the immigration problems that the country faces.

## **What is an example of an area where you disagree with the House bill?**

Employment is the biggest magnet for illegal immigration to this country. If you are serious about curbing illegal immigration you have to be serious about effective worksite enforcement. Border enforcement alone is not enough. Thus, we are disappointed by some Republican efforts to water down enforcement at the workplace. For example, the bill currently does not provide for all of the worksite investigators and enforcement officers that we need and have asked for. Some provisions seek to limit enforcement discretion. We also want to ensure that while worksite enforcement is strengthened, adequate safeguards against discrimination are included in the legislation.

## **What are you doing to stop illegal immigration?**

**At the Border:** We are engaged in an unprecedented buildup of Border Patrol Agents as part of Operations Gatekeeper in California, Hold-the-Line in Texas, and Safeguard in Arizona -- and we are deploying more technology (like sensors and night scopes). Our new computerized fingerprinting identification system and dedication of increased resources has led to a 240% increase in prosecutions on felony charges for reentry after deportation since 1992 in California.

**At the Worksite:** Employment is the largest magnet for illegal immigration. We are intensifying worksite enforcement by the INS and the Department of Labor. We support work authorization verification and are presently recruiting and training employers in California to participate in an expanded telephone verification system. We have taken steps to make INS immigration cards more fraud-resistant. We have asked Congress for more investigators and enforcement personnel to bolster the deterrence effect of effective worksite enforcement.

**Deportations:** We are increasing deportations, especially of criminal aliens. The number of criminal aliens removed from the U.S. increased by 17.6% in 1994 over 1992 levels. This has resulted from stepped up vigilance in identification, detention, and deportation of criminal aliens rather than just letting them back into our communities at the end of their sentences, which is what happened in the past. For example, we conducted a pilot at L.A. County Jail to identify and deport criminal aliens. Under this program, INS officers staff the release lines at the jail 24 hours a day, seven days a week to ensure that deportable aliens are taken into Federal custody to be deported rather than released out into the streets. We are looking to expand this effort in L.A. and elsewhere.

## **Some people have expressed concern about a national work registry. Please expand on your view on this.**

We need to find an effective, non-discriminatory way to verify employment authorization of all new employees. I fully support the recommendation of the Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, to test different ways to do this, including use of the Social Security and INS databases.

In fact, we're not waiting for Congress to act in this area, we are right now recruiting and training employers in the Los Angeles area to participate in a telephone verification system with the INS.

Let me add, however, that we are absolutely committed to protecting privacy and civil rights. The Administration will develop pilots carefully, building in safeguards against the invasion of privacy and discrimination. All employers will be instructed as to the laws against discrimination as well as the verification requirements. We will also monitor these pilots closely for evidence of discriminatory action.

**What is the Administration doing about the terrible El Monte, CA sweatshop slavery situation?**

First, we are prosecuting those involved and seeking millions in unpaid wages due the workers.

More generally, the Administration is intensifying our enforcement efforts against sweatshops which hold workers in involuntary servitude or generally exploit immigrant workers. Already the INS and Department of Labor have followed-up with additional raids of sweatshops in the Los Angeles area. We are committed to stepped-up worksite enforcement targeted especially at low-wage industries, and will continue such initiatives in the future.

The INS, with other agencies, has significantly increased anti-smuggling efforts to reduce the ability of these criminals to bring smuggled workers into the country. More than any previous Administration, we have clamped down on alien smuggling by land and sea into California. For example, prosecution of antismuggling cases rose 24 percent in July 1995 over July 1994. Along with increased interdiction and prosecution of smugglers, we have asked Congress to increase penalties to punish these criminals.

Secretary Reich has been working with the garment industry to make that industry and their retailers more accountable for preventing this type of abuse. Secretary Reich convened a Summit of some of the country's largest clothing retailers immediately after the El Monte raid to enlist the cooperation of retailers to end subcontracting with illegal sweatshops and to improve labor law compliance within the garment industry. Under Secretary Reich's leadership, the Department of Labor has also been working hard over the last few years to gain the attention and constructive action of garment manufacturers to promote labor law compliance by their production contractors. We will continue our efforts to gain industry assistance in this area.

We are now seeking more worksite enforcement resources and tools from Congress for both the Department of Labor and the Immigration and Naturalization Service needed to protect workers and fight against any recurrence of this type of subjugation. Unfortunately, present Republican legislation would provide less resources for this purpose than my Administration has requested.

The El Monte sweatshop was uncovered as a result of cooperation by federal, state and local officials. Attorney General Reno has asked the U.S. Attorney in Los Angeles and Immigration and Naturalization Service Commissioner Doris Meissner to thoroughly review the actions of federal law enforcement in this case since 1992. We hope to find ways to improve this cooperative work. On the federal level, we are taking steps to enhance interagency enforcement coordination.

I would be interested in additional ideas you may have to increase my Administration's ability to work with your community and others to achieve our shared objective to end illegal sweatshops.

**You opposed prop. 187. Do you favor benefits for illegal aliens?**

No, except public health and safety and a child's constitutional right to an education.

**Some are proposing a new guestworker program -- What is your position on this?**

I oppose a guestworker or "bracero-type" program because it will lead to increased illegal immigration, depressed wages and work standards for citizens and legal immigrants already in this country.

**Applications for citizenship have increased dramatically ( 78% during first 10 months of '95 compared to the same period of '94) and waiting periods for processing those applications are very long. What are you doing about it?**

We want to encourage and help immigrants who qualify and who want to become citizens to do so as quickly as possible. Streamlining and promoting citizenship are priorities of the INS and it is dedicating more personnel and resources to addressing this problem.

INS has just announced a new initiative, Citizenship USA, to ensure that by the summer of 1996, eligible persons applying for citizenship can be accepted within six months.

Just last month, Commissioner Doris Meissner announced that Los Angeles will be the first site for this nationwide initiative. We'll be doing this by increasing staff levels, expanding facilities, using new technology, streamlining procedures, and forging new and better partnerships with community organizations.

Perhaps too often we allow ourselves to take for granted what U.S. citizenship means. One need only attend a naturalization ceremony and observe the depth of the pride and hope of our newest citizens to be reminded of how fortunate we are to be Americans.

**What do you think about the apparent undercurrent of anti-immigrant feelings in the country?**

Some are trying to use immigration, like affirmative action, to drive a wedge in this country. This is wrong and we must fight "immigrant-bashing." We need to examine our immigration policies in the same factual, nonpolitical way that we tried to do with affirmative action.

We need to crack down on illegal immigration, but we must not allow immigration to become a wedge.

**What is your view on legal immigration reform?**

I have always said that while we must crack down on illegal immigration -- because we are a nation of laws -- we are also a nation of immigrants. Nearly all of us can trace our roots beyond the shores of this country, and we have a historic commitment to immigration.

I support the recommendations of Barbara Jordan's Commission on Immigration Reform as the framework for Congress to consider for legal immigration reform. The Commission has recommended moderate reduction in the level of legal immigration and gives high priority to reunifying Americans with their close family members. I share this view.

Legal immigration reform must be based upon principles that are pro-family, pro-work, and pro-naturalization. My Administration anticipates working with Congress in a spirit of bipartisanship to craft the details of the specific legislation that will put these principles into practice. We must not let this issue become divisive in this country.

**DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL**  
**African American Press Roundtable**

**EDUCATION Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Jeremy Ben-Ami/Gaynor McCown, 65575

Updated 10/30/95

**Mr. President, you recently said that "cutting education today would be like cutting defense budgets at the height of the cold war." Can you explain what you mean by this comment.**

Let me just begin by saying that I firmly believe that the American people want to balance the budget to lift the burden of debt off of our children and to strengthen our economy. But I also believe that the American people want to strengthen families, expand our economy, and raise living standards and that nothing is more critical to that effort than education. My budget proposal proves that it is possible to deal with the deficit while investing in human capital. Education is the key to the future of America and demolishing our investment in education is not the means to balance the budget. Yet, in the last two weeks, both the House and the Senate have taken a variety of actions that are direct attacks on our nation's investment for the future.

On October 26, the House approved a bill that would dramatically reduce federal support for Americans going to college and would eliminate my Direct Lending program.

I am strongly opposed to any action which would raise the cost of college for students and their families. In particular, I will oppose any plan that contains an unwise and unjustified elimination of my Direct Lending program. This program works! It is already saving taxpayers billions of dollars and students are getting their funds with less government red tape. Students are getting flexible repayment plans, schools have less administrative costs, and thousands of intermediaries and attendant complexities are eliminated. It is inexcusable for Congress to allow the banks and special interest to pass a law that would take away the choice for hundreds of schools. My Direct Lending program is "good government" at its best and I will fight to keep it.

On October 27, the Republican majority in the Senate voted to cut \$5 billion from student loans over the next seven years.

While the Senate bill is clearly "better," it is still not good enough. The senate bill still places an arbitrary cap on the Direct Loan program. The result of this cap will be an end to competition in the loan industry, and a return to years past. My bottom line is that I cannot support any proposal that will raise the cost of college and deny our young people the opportunity to make the most of the opportunities of the coming century.

It's a question of values. We can balance the budget and still maintain our investment in education, in our children and in our future.

**In addition to the reconciliation bills, it seems likely that one of the biggest battles in the budget will be over the Labor/H appropriations bill which contains funding for several of your initiatives in the education area. Would you really bring the whole budget process to a halt over a few billion dollars in this bill?**

Let me be clear. This is not a question of money and dollars. It's not an abstract budget fight. We're talking about critical investments in the future of our children, our families and our country.

Education has clearly emerged as the fault line between those who are making it and those who are falling behind in the new economy. Every year of education beyond high school adds six to twelve percent to a person's income.

It has always been a shared value in this country that we should support efforts to prepare our children to learn, to improve our schools, to help those who can't afford it to pay for college.

So, yes, I will stand firm in my opposition to efforts to cut these investments to pay for a tax cut for those who don't need it.

**[Follow] The Senate Appropriations Committee did put back some of the funding eliminated by the House, particularly for Goals 2000. If the final version of the bill is closer to what the Senate is likely to approve, would you sign the bill?**

We cannot allow some of these marginal improvements to make the Senate version seem acceptable. To me, even with some of the changes, it still represents a break with our traditional support for our children and their education.

I stand behind my proposal to balance the budget AND increase our investments in these areas.

## Background

The Labor/H bill has passed the House but has not gone to the Senate floor. The House bill would, for example:

fund \$500 million less for Head Start than my request. To maintain current program quality, that would mean denying services to more than 45,000 children next year.

cut Title One funding by \$1.1 billion in 1996, denying this crucial assistance to improve basic and advanced skills to 1.1 million students nationwide.

eliminate Goals 2000 and deny funding to as many as 17,500 schools.

It would gut Safe and Drug-Free Schools, a program which 14,575 out of 14,783 school districts in the U.S. use to keep crime, violence, and drugs away from students and out of schools.

deny Pell Grants to 380,000 students in 1996 alone, possibly forcing them to drop out of college.

It would eliminate AmeriCorps and deny 50,000 young people the chance to serve in 1996 (note: this is in HUD/VA, not Labor/H)..

It would cut job training programs by \$1.4 billion and deny training opportunities to 506,100 dislocated workers and 84,000 disadvantaged adults in 1996.

It would eliminate summer jobs, denying jobs to over 600,000 youths in 1996 and almost 4 million youths over 7 years and it would severely cut my School to Work initiative.

## **EDUCATION VOUCHERS/CHOICE Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Gaynor McCown, 65575

Updated 10/30/95

**Q:** Mr. President, many people including New York Mayor Rudolph Guiliani, have said that Catholic schools have provided a model for how young people in this country should receive their education. As President, you have made education a priority and have indicated that you want to see to it that every child in this country gets the quality education they need and deserve. Yet, your policies do not allow vouchers for parents who want to send their children to Catholic schools instead of Public schools. Please explain what seems to me to be a blatant contradiction.

**A:** Well, let me just begin by saying that education is a priority of mine and I do care deeply about ensuring that every individual in this country has the opportunity to receive the quality education they need and deserve. I also believe strongly in private education and the right of parents to choose that option for their children. And, for the most part, I think all educators, whether they are from a Catholic school or a public school have a common purpose and concern which is for children and families. However, it is my belief that using public funds for private education has two fundamental problems:

(1) At a time when enrollment is at an all-time high and we need public schools the most, I don't think we should be taking funds away. A good, strong public school system is essential to our Democracy and in order to improve and maintain the quality of education in this country, we must keep available funds in the system.

(2) Equally important, part of the beauty of our system is that private schools, because they don't all general education funds from the government, do not have to be regulated as strictly. Public funds would require a great deal of oversight that in effect would destroy the very nature of private and parochial schools.

**Q:** Mr. President, you have talked a lot about the need for parents to have an opportunity to help their children choose what school they want to go to. Yet, the public school system today, rarely allows that to happen. Young people who live in a certain district are often forced to go to schools in that same district unless their parent are savvy enough to break the rules. What are you doing to prevent this trend from continuing.

**A:** Let me begin by saying that I believe strongly in public school choice. That is, if a student lives in one part of the city and wants to go to school in another part of the city simply because that schools meets his / her needs and the parents are amenable, that student should be free to go wherever he / she wants. I think a little bit of competition among public schools is not only acceptable, it is healthy. I also believe in and have supported charter schools, magnet schools and other alternative approaches to education that meet the needs of different populations.

**Q:** Mr. President, Catholic schools in this country are slowly becoming a thing of the past largely due to lack of funding. How do you feel about Catholic or any other religious education and what is your Administration doing to prevent the demise of these institutions that have served so many children for so long?

**A:** I just want to begin by saying that even if Catholic and other parochial schools got the same amount of federal funding that other elementary and secondary schools receive, it would not be enough. You have to remember that the federal role in elementary and secondary education is limited to less than 10%. As my Education Secretary Dick Riley so often and eloquently says: "Education is a national priority, a

state responsibility and a local function." We don't provide for general support of elementary and secondary education.

Now, having said that, I also want to let you in on a little known fact. Catholic and other parochial schools in very needy areas do receive federal support -- the same support that similar public schools in those areas receive. But, it still is not enough. The federal government will never be able, and I don't think it should be responsible for supporting or saving public or parochial schools. Does that mean, I want them to fail, no...but, general funding for K-12 education comes from state and local government and support from the federal government is not the answer.

Q: Mr. President, for years the federal government has been subsidizing loans for young people to attend private colleges. The objective here is to provide an opportunity for an individual to make choices about their own education. However, your policies do not allow parents and children to make choices about where they go to elementary and secondary schools. Why is it more important for an individual to make a choice for higher education than it is for elementary and secondary education?

A: Let me again emphasize that for the k-12 levels, state and local governments -- not the federal government -- provide general support. The federal government's support goes primarily toward needy populations and helps out with special needs. For this, parochial and private schools also benefit. On the other hand, at the post-secondary level, the federal government provides over half of the funding for students to attend college.

Another important point here is that college age students are no longer minors and college is not mandatory. Therefore, in choosing to go to a particular college, whether it is private or public, they can make their own decisions about religious affiliation. A key factor in elementary and secondary education is that students don't leave their religion at the school house door and they must be allowed to have their religious freedom. But, because they are minors, the state cannot dictate a particular religious belief.

## **CRIME/DRUGS**

Domestic Policy Council: Dennis Burke, 65568

Updated 10/30/95

### The Administration's Crack Sentencing Guidelines Legislation

Q. Why did you sign legislation that would disapprove of the Sentencing Commission guideline recommendation on crack sentencing?

A. We submitted this legislation to Congress and I signed it because we are concerned that the equalization of the penalties for crack and cocaine powder trafficking does not reflect:

- \* the significant differences between the two;
- \* the impact crack has had on our communities;
- \* and the effect a drastic change in penalties would have on deterring those who traffic in this dangerous drug.

Q. What's the point of sending this back to the Sentencing Commission -- aren't you just punting a political hot potato?

A. No. I recommended this legislation to Congress and signed it for a good policy reason. Had we not enacted this legislation, the Sentencing Commission's recommendations would have gone into effect on November 1. Their guidelines would have created bad policy. The truth of the matter is this -- permitting these guidelines recommendations to become law -- without changing the underlying statutes on powder cocaine and crack -- will create even greater sentencing disparity than what some believe exists under the current guidelines.

What I did here -- by proposing this legislation and signing it -- is tell the Sentencing Commission -- "I disagree with your recommendations; I want you to go back, work with my Attorney General, and come back in May with sentences that treat crack distribution generally harsher than powder cocaine, but I also want sentences that ensure that we treat a high-level powder cocaine distributor harsher than a street-level crack distributors."

Q. Does this proposed Conference really mean anything or is the President just doing this to appease leaders in the African-American community?

A. The idea for this conference has been in the planning stages for sometime and I was actually intending to mention it in a drug speech this Thursday. All we are doing today is moving up the announcement date -- by just a few days -- of an idea that has been vetted and approved. This is a very important issue to me and I am committed to reducing drug use in this country and the violence that is linked to it.

Q. Why don't you increase the sentences for cocaine -- won't that reduce the disparity in the current sentencing system?

A. That indeed might be the result. But I want the Sentencing Commission, working with the Attorney General, to have the opportunity to reexamine their recommendations and return with sentences that still

reflect our concern with crack distribution.

In the mean time, I have also asked the Attorney General to begin working immediately with United States Attorneys to make sure that high-level power cocaine distributors are prosecuted for what they know they are doing -- selling powder cocaine that is ending up as crack on our streets.

Crack is a more dangerous drug than powder cocaine; I believe that the sentencing structure should reflect this in some way. But a high-level drug distributor who knows his powder cocaine is ending up as crack vials on the street, should be punished for what he is doing -- pushing crack.

Q. Isn't crack and cocaine powder effectively the same drug?

A. Crack is more psychologically addictive than cocaine powder. Our conclusions about the harmful effects of crack as compared to cocaine powder are virtually the same as those reached by the Sentencing Commission. Indeed in its report to Congress on this issue, the Sentencing Commission concluded that:

"[T]he higher addictive qualities associated with crack combined with its inherent ease of use can support a higher ratio for crack over powder."

Furthermore, as the Sentencing Commission itself stated:

"crack dealers generally tend to have a stronger association with systemic violence and are more likely to possess weapons than powder cocaine dealers."

Q. Doesn't the current penalty structure discriminate against African-Americans?

A. As you know, I recently spoken out on my concern with the number of African-Americans who are in our criminal justice system. This is a very important issue to me and it is on that I will continue to address. But reducing crack cocaine sentences is not the solution to that problem.

Instead, reduced sentences for crack trafficking would ignore the devastation this drug has cause so many communities and victims across the country. A crack dealer could only interpret it one way -- the cost of business is going down, keep pushing.

The legislation I signed includes an amendment by Senator Kennedy that was unanimously accepted in the Senate, which instructs the Sentencing Commission to undertake a review and report back to Congress its findings and recommendations on what sentencing structure can both provide the penalties needed by law enforcement but also ensure that our drug enforcement laws and policies are fair.

#### 100,000 COPS Program

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

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

smartest crime bill ever enacted. Through the COPS program, the Crime Bill will put 100,000 new community police officers on the streets of America.

In one year, we have already authorized funding for over 25,000 additional police officers. These officers are already making an impact, and for the first time in a long while, the violent crime rate in this country is actually going down. Yet, now, the Republican leadership in Congress wants to eliminate this program and replace it with a program that would not require that even 1 new officer be hired.

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

### Adolescent Drug Use

**Q: The 1994 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse was released last month and it found that marijuana use is rising among American teenagers. What is your Administration planning to do to address this problem?**

**A: Over the last 3 years, my Administration has recognized and drawn attention to the increase in marijuana use among American teenagers. We have challenged parents, teachers and leaders in the public and private sectors -- including media -- to be active and aggressive in the struggle against drug abuse.**

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

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

### Gun Control

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

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

In just its first 100 days, the Brady Law stopped the sale of handguns to thousands of convicted felons, fugitives from justice, and persons under restraining orders for alleged stalking, harassment or other forms of domestic threats or intimidation. Yet, at the same time, honest law-abiding citizens were able to continue to purchase handguns for their own personal safety.

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

## Terrorism

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

**A:** The tragic bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on April 19th made clear the need to enhance the Federal government's ability to investigate, prosecute, and punish terrorist activity. I was pleased that the Senate acted quickly on the 2 anti-terrorism bills that I transmitted to Congress earlier this year -- passing them as one bill in June with over 90 votes. Unfortunately, this important legislation, which passed the House Judiciary Committee sometime ago, has been languishing before the full House. I want to take this opportunity to urge the House leadership to move quickly on this legislation so that I can sign it and increase our security from terrorist attacks. This is a bill that will save American lives and it should not be delayed any longer.

## Juvenile Crime

**Q: The Attorney General came out with a report recently that found that juvenile crime is on the rise and will continue to rise. What is your Administration doing to address this problem?**

**A:** It is true that while overall crime rates have been dropping, the incidence of youth crime have risen. That is why my anti-crime strategy has and will focus on youth crime and violence.

The 1994 Crime Bill that I signed sends a strong message to young criminals: it bans handguns for juveniles, imposes stiff penalties for gang members who commit crimes, establishes boot camps and drug courts to discipline first-time offenders. At the same time, it invests in smart prevention programs that offer at-risk youth positive alternatives to criminal activities.

But we are going to continue to do more to help the local levels deal with this problem. Indeed recently, I announced grants to 10 cities across the country to implement programs to reduce youth firearm violence.

## **IMMIGRATION Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Stephen Warnath, 65576

Updated 10/30/95

**Both the House and the Senate are considering immigration legislation right now. What are your thoughts on these bills?**

I want Congress to pass immigration reform legislation quickly to provide the Administration with the enforcement tools and resources that we need to deal effectively and comprehensively with the problem of illegal immigration. And I want legal immigration reform. The Congress should not delay on this important legislation and I have challenged them to present me with immigration legislation before the end of the year.

Both houses are considering bills that are very similar to much of the legislation the Administration proposed and work we are already doing.

The House bill would strengthen our border patrol and efforts to check work authorization -- which I strongly support. However, I would like the House to put more emphasis on worksite enforcement -- for instance, funding more Labor investigators and enforcement officers. The problem of the immigrant slave labor at the El Monte garment factory underscores the need for this

**Can you expand on the Administration's views regarding the immigration legislation being considered now in the House (HR 2202)?**

Many of the provisions of the House bill -- which the Judiciary Committee just completed marking up -- advance the Administration's strategy to control illegal immigration. This strategy calls for regaining control of our borders; removing the job magnet through worksite enforcement; and aggressively pursuing the removal of criminal aliens and other illegal aliens. Much of the House bill at this point is similar the Administration's enforcement bill. We are therefore pleased that the bill follows our policies to a significant extent. This includes:

- . a significant increase in border patrol agents.
- . work authorization pilots, including SSA and INS database checks.
- . making immigration documents more fraud-resistant.
- . strong penalties for violation of the immigration laws including for illegal entry.
- . expedited exclusion to increase the Attorney General's authority to effectively address mass migration situations.

We do not agree with every detail of the proposed legislation. Reductions in legal immigration must promote underlying principles that are pro-family, pro-work and pro-naturalization. We have been working with Democrats and Republicans to attempt to arrive at bipartisan immigration reform legislation that is in the national interest.

**What is an example of an area where you disagree with the House bill?**

Employment is the biggest magnet for illegal immigration to this country. If you are serious about curbing illegal immigration you have to be serious about effective worksite enforcement. Border enforcement alone

is not enough. Thus, we are disappointed by some Republican efforts to water down enforcement at the workplace. For example, the bill currently does not provide for all of the worksite investigators and enforcement officers that we need and have asked for. Some provisions seek to limit enforcement discretion. We also want to ensure that while worksite enforcement is strengthened, adequate safeguards against discrimination are included in the legislation.

### **What are you doing to stop illegal immigration?**

**At the Border:** We are engaged in an unprecedented buildup of Border Patrol Agents as part of Operations Gatekeeper in California, Hold-the-Line in Texas, and Safeguard in Arizona -- and we are deploying more technology (like sensors and night scopes). Our new computerized fingerprinting illegal crosser identification system and dedication of increased resources has led to a 240% increase in prosecutions on felony charges for reentry after deportation since 1992 in California.

**At the Worksite:** Employment is the largest magnet for illegal immigration. We are intensifying worksite enforcement by the INS and the Department of Labor. We support work authorization verification and are presently recruiting and training employers in California to participate in an expanded telephone verification system. We have taken steps to make INS immigration cards more fraud-resistant. We have asked Congress for more investigators and enforcement personnel to bolster the deterrence effect of effective worksite enforcement.

**Deportations:** We are increasing deportations, especially of criminal aliens. The number of criminal aliens removed from the U.S. increased by 17.6% in 1994 over 1992 levels. This has resulted from stepped up vigilance in identification, detention, and deportation of criminal aliens rather than just letting them back into our communities at the end of their sentences, which is what happened in the past. For example, we conducted a pilot at L.A. County Jail to identify and deport criminal aliens. Under this program, INS officers staff the release lines at the jail 24 hours a day, seven days a week to ensure that deportable aliens are taken into Federal custody to be deported rather than released out into the streets. We are looking to expand this effort in L.A. and elsewhere.

### **Some people have expressed concern about a national work registry. Please expand on your view on this.**

We need to find an effective, non-discriminatory way to verify employment authorization of all new employees. I support the recommendation of the Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, to test different ways to do this, including use of the Social Security and INS databases.

In fact, we're not waiting for Congress to act in this area, we are right now recruiting and training employers in the Los Angeles area to participate in a telephone verification system with the INS.

Let me add, however, that we are absolutely committed to protecting privacy and civil rights. The Administration will develop pilots carefully, building in safeguards against the invasion of privacy and discrimination. All employers will be instructed as to the laws against discrimination as well as the verification requirements. We will also monitor these pilots closely for evidence of discriminatory action.

### **What is the Administration doing about the terrible El Monte, CA sweatshop slavery situation?**

First, we are prosecuting those involved and seeking millions in unpaid wages due the workers.

More generally, the Administration is intensifying our enforcement efforts against sweatshops which hold

workers in involuntary servitude or generally exploit immigrant workers. Already the INS and Department of Labor have followed-up with additional raids of sweatshops in the Los Angeles area. We are committed to stepped-up worksite enforcement targeted especially at low-wage industries, and will continue such initiatives in the future.

The INS, with other agencies, has significantly increased anti-smuggling efforts to reduce the ability of these criminals to bring smuggled workers into the country. More than any previous Administration, we have clamped down on alien smuggling by land and sea into California. For example, prosecution of antismuggling cases rose 24 percent in July 1995 over July 1994. Along with increased interdiction and prosecution of smugglers, we have asked Congress to increase penalties to punish these criminals.

Secretary Reich has been working with the garment industry to make that industry and their retailers more accountable for preventing this type of abuse. Secretary Reich convened a Summit of some of the country's largest clothing retailers immediately after the El Monte raid to enlist the cooperation of retailers to end subcontracting with illegal sweatshops and to improve labor law compliance within the garment industry. Under Secretary Reich's leadership, the Department of Labor has also been working hard over the last few years to get the assistance of garment manufacturers to promote labor law compliance by their production contractors. We will continue our efforts to gain industry assistance in this area.

We are now seeking more worksite enforcement resources and tools from Congress for both the Department of Labor and the Immigration and Naturalization Service needed to protect workers and fight against any recurrence of this type of subjugation. Unfortunately, present Republican legislation would provide less resources for this purpose than my Administration has requested.

The El Monte sweatshop was uncovered as a result of cooperation by federal, state and local officials. Attorney General Reno has asked the U.S. Attorney in Los Angeles and Immigration and Naturalization Service Commissioner Doris Meissner to thoroughly review the actions of federal law enforcement in this case since 1992. We hope to find ways to improve this cooperative work. On the federal level, we are taking steps to enhance interagency enforcement coordination.

**You opposed prop. 187. Do you favor benefits for illegal aliens?**

No, except public health and safety and a child's constitutional right to an education.

**What is the Administration's position on the restrictions on eligibility of legal immigrants for benefits in the House and Senate Welfare bills?**

The Administration supports holding sponsors who bring immigrants into this country legally responsible for their financial support, but these changes should be made in an equitable manner.

Both bills go too far in cutting benefits to legal immigrants who find themselves temporarily in need of help. In addition, I think that it is likely to result in a very significant shift in costs from the federal government to states with substantial numbers of immigrants (e.g. California, Texas, Florida, N.Y., New Jersey, and Illinois).

In particular, the Administration opposes the Senate provision that would discriminate against U.S. citizens by denying benefits to legal immigrants even after they become naturalized citizens. We cannot have two categories of citizens, and a provision that treats naturalized citizens less favorably than the native born raises serious Constitutional issues.

I am also deeply concerned about the Senate provision that would require sponsors' income to exceed 200 percent of poverty. Working families who are U.S. citizens should not have to pass a wealth test in order to

be reunited with a family member. This would reverse a fundamental element of our country's immigration heritage.

The Administration will also seek other changes in conference including adopting the House provision to exempt those over age 7 from benefit cut-offs, letting those who become disabled after entering the country remain eligible for benefits, and making sure that benefit restrictions do not apply to discretionary programs and certain mandatory programs such as student loans.

**Applications for citizenship have increased dramatically ( 78% during first 10 months of '95 compared to the same period of '94) and waiting periods for processing those applications are very long. What are you doing about it?**

We want to encourage and help immigrants who qualify and who want to become citizens to do so as quickly as possible. In so doing, we will maintain the requirements (e.g. English language proficiency) that demonstrate an individual's readiness to accept the responsibilities of citizenship and full participation in our National community. Streamlining and promoting citizenship are priorities of the INS and it is dedicating more personnel and resources to addressing this problem.

INS has just announced a new initiative, Citizenship USA, to ensure that by the summer of 1996, eligible persons applying for citizenship can be accepted within six months.

Los Angeles will be the first site for this nationwide initiative. We'll be increasing staff levels, expanding facilities, using new technology, streamlining procedures, and forging new and better partnerships with community organizations.

Perhaps too often we allow ourselves to take for granted what U.S. citizenship means. One need only attend a naturalization ceremony and observe the depth of the pride and hope of our newest citizens to be reminded of how fortunate we are to be Americans.

**What do you think about the apparent undercurrent of anti-immigrant feelings in the country?**

Some are trying to use immigration, like affirmative action, to drive a wedge in this country. This is wrong and we must fight "immigrant-bashing." We need to examine our immigration policies in the same factual, nonpolitical way that we tried to do with affirmative action.

We need to crack down on illegal immigration, but we must not allow immigration to become a wedge.

**Some are proposing a new guestworker program -- What is your position on this?**

I oppose a guestworker or "bracero-type" program because it will lead to increased illegal immigration, depressed wages and work standards for citizens and legal immigrants already in this country.

**What is your view on legal immigration reform?**

I have always said that while we must crack down on illegal immigration -- because we are a nation of laws -- we are also a nation of immigrants. Nearly all of us can trace our roots beyond the shores of this country, and we have a historic commitment to immigration. I believe that legal immigration strengthens this country.

I support the recommendations of Barbara Jordan's Commission on Immigration Reform as the framework for Congress to consider for legal immigration reform. The Commission has recommended moderate reduction in the level of legal immigration and gives high priority to reunifying Americans with their close family members. I share this view.

Reuniting closest family members should be the highest priority and basic unit of immigration. At the same time, this Administration has proposed a way to lower the level of legal immigration while retaining more family reunification opportunities than the Republicans would allow (i.e. for adult children and parents.)

We support reduction in employment-based immigration as a means of encouraging employers to hire and train domestic workers -- both citizens and legal immigrants. I favor eliminating the unskilled category of immigration to reduce job competition with those in our own country who need work.

Legal immigration reform must be based upon principles that are pro-family, pro-work, and pro-naturalization. My Administration anticipates working with Congress in a spirit of bipartisanship to craft the details of the specific legislation that will put these principles into practice. We must not let this issue become divisive in this country.

**DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL Q & A's**  
**Updated 9/13/95**

**ABORTION/REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS Q/As**

**Domestic Policy Council: Jeremy Ben-Ami, 65584**

**Updated 9/15/95**

**Q:** The Congressional majority has passed a number of provisions relating to abortion in the various authorization and appropriations bills about to be sent to you as part of the FY96 budget. Will you be vetoing those provisions?

**A:** As I have often said, I believe that abortion should be safe, legal and rare. The Supreme Court has prescribed the conditions under which the Constitution provides individuals the right to make this difficult decision for themselves. I believe that Congress should be focussing in these appropriations bills on designing a balanced budget that provides America's working families the supports they need in terms of health care, education and tax relief -- not on contentious social issues.

[If pressed on the veto question] I have already said that I would veto a number of these bills for a range of reasons -- primarily because I disagree with the budget priorities of the Congressional Republicans. I want a balanced budget that invests in education, does not devastate Medicaid and Medicare and focusses tax relief on the middle class helping them meet critical expenses like buying a home and putting their children through college.

**Q:** A bill to outlaw the D&X abortion procedure (called "partial birth" by its proponents) is ready to be considered on the House floor. If the bill is passed, will you sign it?

**A:** The Constitution permits states to ban abortion after fetal viability except when necessary to preserve the woman's life or health. As I have stated consistently, I support such post-viability restrictions. However, the House bill, as currently written, is another matter entirely. First of all, its ban on the D&X procedure applies even in cases where the procedure is needed to preserve the health of the woman. Second, the ban applies even pre-viability. And finally, I think the bill makes a real mistake in picking and choosing among different kinds of procedures. It is a physician's job -- not the government's -- to use medical discretion to determine whether a certain procedure is the safest and most medically appropriate method for his or her patient.

## **ABORTION/REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS Q/As**

**Domestic Policy Council: Karen Guss, 65603**

**Q:** Where do you stand on the abortion-related provisions that the Congressional majority has passed as part of many of its authorization and appropriations bills?

**A:** As I have often said, I believe that abortion should be safe, legal and rare. But some Republicans in Congress are using the complicated budget process to launch a stealth campaign to undermine the reproductive health of American women.

. Last week the House passed a bill that would allow states to deny Medicaid funding for abortions for poor women who became pregnant because they were victims of rape or incest.

. The House has also voted to put servicewomen and women in military families at risk by prohibiting them from obtaining abortion services -- services paid for with their own money -- in military hospitals.

. The House and Senate have both voted to tell insurance companies who provide health insurance to federal workers that they cannot cover abortion services except in the most extreme circumstances.

. In addition, the House has voted to, in effect, undo the accreditation standards established by the medical profession for training obstetricians and gynecologists because those standards currently include a requirement that, unless a training program is morally opposed to abortion, it must offer training in abortion procedures.

. And the House came dangerously close to scrapping the Title X program, which provide family planning, pre-natal care and other health care to millions of low-income women.

None of these actions by the House are consistent with abortion being safe, legal and rare, and I oppose them.

**Q:** A bill to outlaw the D&X abortion procedure is ready to be considered on the House floor. If the bill is passed, will you sign it?

**A:** The Constitution permits states to ban abortion after fetal viability except when necessary to preserve the woman's life or health. As I have stated consistently, I support such post-viability restrictions. However, the House bill, as currently written, is another matter entirely. First of all, its ban on the D&X procedure applies even in cases where the procedure is needed to preserve the health of the woman. Second, the ban applies even pre-viability. And finally, I think the bill makes a real mistake in

picking and choosing among different kinds of procedures. It is a physician's job -- not the government's -- to use medical discretion to determine whether a certain procedure is the safest and most medically appropriate method for his or her patient.

## **TEEN PREGNANCY Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Janet Abrams, 62857

Updated 9/13/95

**Q:** What progress has the Administration made in forming the "national campaign against teen pregnancy" which President Clinton called for in January?

**A:** In this year's State of the Union Address, I urged leaders from all sectors of society to join in a national campaign to prevent teen pregnancy. The epidemic of teen pregnancy -- with more than 1 million girls under age 20 becoming pregnant each year -- is one of this nation's most serious social problems. Government has an important role to play in addressing this dilemma, but the public sector cannot solve the problem alone. The talents and energy of the private sector must be brought to bear in addressing this complex dilemma affecting America's young people.

I believe we need a national campaign that sends a clear message: It is wrong to have a child outside marriage. Nobody should get pregnant or father a child who isn't prepared to raise the child, love the child, and take responsibility for the child's future.

Since January, the Administration has worked in partnership with a group of concerned citizens to lay out a practical vision for a private-sector campaign. A framework has been developed for a national independent, bipartisan organization which will catalyze and support a sustained effort to reduce the incidence of teen pregnancy in the U.S.

In October, I will meet with selected individuals from the private sector -- from the business, religious, education, health care, media, and foundation communities -- to explore opportunities for launching the national campaign.

**Q:** What will this new private-sector organization do?

**A:** The specific agenda of the organization will be determined by its leadership. The new group will not impose any top-down solutions. Rather, it will encourage local communities to forge their own approaches to teen pregnancy prevention consistent with their values and experience. A major role of the organization will be to discover, disseminate, and celebrate what is working in teen pregnancy prevention. Right now, while many local efforts show great promise, information on what works is fragmented.

Activities of the new group are likely to include:

- . spearheading a national grassroots campaign to make teen pregnancy prevention a priority in every community;
- . launching a long-term, multi-dimensional media campaign to encourage and reinforce local efforts and instill a new ethic of responsible parenting;

- maintaining an accessible national database of teen pregnancy prevention programs and providing better opportunities for those active in the field to learn from one another;

- supporting the comprehensive evaluation of promising programs and other research as needed;

- seeking to be the most credible, independent resource available to anyone interested in preventing teen pregnancy and providing training, conferences, newsletters, briefings, and speakers.

Q: What will Dr. Henry Foster's role with the Administration and this new organization be?

A: I hope to make an announcement about Dr. Foster in the coming weeks.

Dr. Foster has worked tirelessly over his 38-year career in medicine to reduce the incidence of teen pregnancy. He has counseled young people without other role models that they should not have sex before marriage, that they should stay off drugs, and that they should stay in school and make the most of their lives.

Q: Why has it taken so long to organize the private-sector campaign?

A: Outreach has been made to dozens of prominent citizens -- experts in the field of teen pregnancy, leaders of the business, foundation, and religious communities. These consultations have been essential. We're approaching this very complicated problem in a serious, careful manner -- we don't want a band-aid solution.

Q: What else has the Administration done to address the problem of teen pregnancy?

A: The private-sector initiative is intended to complement and enhance government initiatives supported by the Administration. The range of Administration efforts related to teen pregnancy includes:

- numerous service and research programs in teen pregnancy prevention within the Department of Health and Human Services

- In 1993, President Clinton lifted the "gag rule," enabling non-directive options counselling in federally supported family planning clinics.

- The Administration has supported increases in funding for family planning services. In FY92, \$149 million was spent on family planning. Current funding is \$193 million, and the Clinton budget request for FY96 is \$199 million.

HHS provides grants to organizations across the country to support local teen pregnancy prevention efforts and to evaluate strategies for effectiveness.

programs across several agencies to promote youth development and address various risk factors associated with teen pregnancy

current and proposed welfare reform measures to provide young men and women with incentives to delay parenthood until they are married and able to support their children. President Clinton's welfare reform package includes the following provisions:

Teen mothers on welfare would be required to live at home with their parents, stay in school, identify the father, and move into employment within a limited period of time.

Tough new child support laws would be strictly enforced so that prospective teen fathers would know they had to provide child support for the next 18 years. (In 1993, the Administration collected a record \$9 billion in child support, a 12% increase over the previous year.)

States would have flexibility to try innovative ways to encourage responsible behavior, such as rewarding teen recipients who make progress in school and sanctioning those who drop out.

a comprehensive attack on background economic and social factors contributing to rising teen pregnancy rates, including poverty, unequal educational opportunity, and disinvestment in distressed urban and rural communities

Lifelong Learning Initiatives -- Pre-School and Parenting; Goals 2000; School-to-Work; National Service; Training and Reemployment

Rewarding Work for Working Families -- Earned Income Tax Credit; Minimum Wage Increase; Family and Medical Leave

Community Empowerment -- Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities; Community Development Banking

**WOMEN'S ISSUES (Points to emphasize)**

Domestic Policy Council: Karen Guss, 65603

You may want to contrast your record on women's issues with that of the Congressional majority. For example, you have:

- . revoked the "Gag Rule," the import ban on RU-486, the ban on abortion services at military hospitals and the "Mexico City policy."
- . signed the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the Violence Against Women Act
- . appointed the highest percentage of senior women officials of any Administration in history
- . dramatically increased the Earned Income Tax Credit
- . dramatically increased small business loans to women entrepreneurs
- . promoted the study of science and math by women and girls

By contrast, the Congressional majority is attempting to:

- . undermine the reproductive health of American women
- . endanger the health of older women by slashing Medicare
- . cut the Earned Income Tax Credit
- . cut funding for battered women's shelters, rape prevention, and other Violence Against Women Act programs
- . cut or eliminate initiatives that promote equity in education and train women for high skill jobs such as Goals 2000 and School-to-Work.

## **EDUCATION VOUCHERS/CHOICE Q/As**

**Domestic Policy Council: Gaynor McCown, 65575**

Updated 9/13/95

- Q:** Mr. President, many people including New York Mayor Rudolph Guiliani, have said that Catholic schools have provided a model for how young people in this country should receive their education. As President, you have made education a priority and have indicated that you want to see to it that every child in this country gets the quality education they need and deserve. Yet, your policies do not allow vouchers for parents who want to send their children to Catholic schools instead of Public schools. Please explain what seems to me to be a blatant contradiction.
- A:** Well, let me just begin by saying that education is a priority of mine and I do care deeply about ensuring that every individual in this country has the opportunity to receive the quality education they need and deserve. I also believe strongly in private education and the right of parents to choose that option for their children. And, for the most part, I think all educators, whether they are from a Catholic school or a public school have a common purpose and concern which is for children and families. However, it is my belief that using public funds for private education has two fundamental problems:
- (1) At a time when enrollment is at an all-time high and we need public schools the most, I don't think we should be taking funds away. A good, strong public school system is essential to our Democracy and in order to improve and maintain the quality of education in this country, we must keep available funds in the system.
  - (2) Equally important, part of the beauty of our system is that private schools, because they don't all general education funds from the government, do not have to be regulated as strictly. Public funds would require a great deal of oversight that in effect would destroy the very nature of private and parochial schools.
- Q:** Mr. President, you have talked a lot about the need for parents to have an opportunity to help their children choose what school they want to go to. Yet, the public school system today, rarely allows that to happen. Young people who live in a certain district are often forced to go to schools in that same district unless their parent are savvy enough to break the rules. What are you doing to prevent this trend from continuing.
- A:** Let me begin by saying that I believe strongly in public school choice. That is, if a student lives in one part of the city and wants to go to school in another part of the city simply because that schools meets his / her needs and the parents are amenable, that student should be free to go wherever he / she wants. I think a little bit of competition among public schools is not only acceptable, it is healthy. I also believe in and have supported charter schools, magnet schools and other alternative approaches to education that meet the needs of different populations.
- Q:** Mr. President, Catholic schools in this country are slowly becoming a thing of the past largely due to lack of funding. How do you feel about Catholic or any other religious education and what is your Administration doing to prevent the demise of these institutions that have served so many children for so long?
- A:** I just want to begin by saying that even if Catholic and other parochial schools got the same amount of federal funding that other elementary and secondary schools receive, it would not be enough. You have to remember that the federal role in elementary and secondary education is limited to less than

10%. As my Education Secretary Dick Riley so often and eloquently says: "Education is a national priority, a state responsibility and a local function." We don't provide for general support of elementary and secondary education.

Now, having said that, I also want to let you in on a little known fact. Catholic and other parochial schools in very needy areas do receive federal support -- the same support that similar public schools in those areas receive. But, it still is not enough. The federal government will never be able, and I don't think it should be responsible for supporting or saving public or parochial schools. Does that mean, I want them to fail, no...but, general funding for K-12 education comes from state and local government and support from the federal government is not the answer.

Q: Mr. President, for years the federal government has been subsidizing loans for young people to attend private colleges. The objective here is to provide an opportunity for an individual to make choices about their own education. However, your policies do not allow parents and children to make choices about where they go to elementary and secondary schools. Why is it more important for an individual to make a choice for higher education than it is for elementary and secondary education?

A: Let me again emphasize that for the k-12 levels, state and local governments -- not the federal government -- provide general support. The federal government's support goes primarily toward needy populations and helps out with special needs. For this, parochial and private schools also benefit. On the other hand, at the post-secondary level, the federal government provides over half of the funding for students to attend college.

Another important point here is that college age students are no longer minors and college is not mandatory. Therefore, in choosing to go to a particular college, whether it is private or public, they can make their own decisions about religious affiliation. A key factor in elementary and secondary education is that students don't leave their religion at the school house door and they must be allowed to have their religious freedom. But, because they are minors, the state cannot dictate a particular religious belief.

## EDUCATION Q/As

Domestic Policy Council: Gaynor McCown, 65575

Q: Mr. President you have indicated that you would veto the Labor / HHS appropriations bill approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Why would you veto that bill?

A: This bill slashes critical education and training initiatives. This bill if passed in its current form would severely limit effective federal support for improving academic achievement, creating safer school environments, and bringing innovative technology into the classroom. It is bad for working families, it is bad for the economy and it is bad for the country. Let me just give you a few examples:

It would cut Title One funding by \$679 million in 1996, denying this crucial assistance to improve basic and advanced skills to 650,000 students nationwide.

It would reduce funding for Goals 2000 by 17% from the 1995 level and 60% less than the \$750 million I requested for 1996. This bill would terminate funding to 1,600 of the 9,000 schools, which have already completed their planning and have begun to implement comprehensive educational reforms.

It would gut Safe and Drug-Free Schools, a program which provides safer, ore drug-free learning environments for 39 million children in 14,575 out of 15,000 school districts in the U.S.

It would eliminate AmeriCorps and deny 50,000 young people the chance to serve in 1996.

It would cut job training programs by \$1.4 billion and deny training opportunities to 506,100 dislocated workers and 84,000 disadvantaged adults in 1996.

It would eliminate summer jobs, denying jobs to over 550,000 youths in 1996 and 3.9 million youths over 7 years. It would also stall progress on my school to work efforts after just 27 states have received support to start implementing systems for young people to leave school with a marketable skill.

If this isn't enough, I have more. But let me just reiterate that these cuts are not in the best interest of the American people. Nothing is more critical to our nation's future than ensuring that all Americans have the education and skills they need to navigate in these changing times.

## **IMMIGRATION Q/As**

Domestic Policy Council: Stephen Warnath, 65576

Updated 9/29/95

**Both the House and the Senate are considering immigration legislation right now. What are your thoughts on these bills?**

I want Congress to pass a strong enforcement bill to deal effectively and comprehensively with the problem of illegal immigration. And I want legal immigration reform. The Congress should not delay on this important legislation and I have challenged them to present me with immigration legislation before the end of the year.

Both houses are considering bills that are very similar to legislation the Administration proposed and work we are already doing.

The House bill would strengthen our border patrol and efforts to check work authorization -- which I strongly support. However, I would like the House to put more emphasis on worksite enforcement -- funding, for instance, more Labor investigators and enforcement officers. The problem of the immigrant slave labor at the El Monte garment factory underscores the need for this.

**Can you expand on the Administration's views regarding the immigration legislation being considered now in the House (HR 2202)?**

Many of the provisions of the House bill -- now being marked-up in full committee -- advance the Administration's strategy to control illegal immigration. This strategy calls for regaining control of our borders; removing the job magnet through worksite enforcement; and aggressively pursuing the removal of criminal aliens and other illegal aliens. Much of the House bill at this point is similar the Administration's enforcement bill. We are therefore pleased that the bill follows our policies to a significant extent. This includes:

- . a significant increase in border patrol agents.
- . work authorization pilots, including SSA and INS database checks.
- . making immigration documents more fraud-resistant.
- . strong penalties for violation of the immigration laws including for illegal entry.
- . expedited exclusion to increase the Attorney General's authority to effectively address mass migration situations.
- . reductions in the total level of legal immigration.

We do not agree with every detail of the proposed legislation. We have been working with Democrats and Republicans to attempt to arrive at bipartisan immigration reform legislation that is in the national interest. The President has requested that Congress get immigration legislation to him before the end of the year to ensure that the Administration is provided with the needed tools and resources to effectively address the immigration problems that the country faces.

**What is an example of an area where you disagree with the House bill?**

Employment is the biggest magnet for illegal immigration to this country. If you are serious about curbing illegal immigration you have to be serious about effective worksite enforcement. Border enforcement alone is not enough. Thus, we are disappointed by some Republican efforts to water down enforcement at the workplace. For example, the bill currently does not provide for all of the worksite investigators and enforcement officers that we need and have asked for. Some provisions seek to limit enforcement discretion. We also want to ensure that while worksite enforcement is strengthened, adequate safeguards against discrimination are included in the legislation.

**What are you doing to stop illegal immigration?**

At the Border: We are engaged in an unprecedented buildup of Border Patrol Agents as part of Operations Gatekeeper in California, Hold-the-Line in Texas, and Safeguard in Arizona -- and we are deploying more technology (like sensors and night scopes). Our new computerized fingerprinting identification system and dedication of increased resources has led to a 240% increase in prosecutions on felony charges for reentry after deportation since 1992 in California.

At the Worksite: Employment is the largest magnet for illegal immigration. We are intensifying worksite enforcement by the INS and the Department of Labor. We support work authorization verification and are presently recruiting and training employers in California to participate in an expanded telephone verification system. We have taken steps to make INS immigration cards more fraud-resistant. We have asked Congress for more investigators and enforcement personnel to bolster the deterrence effect of effective worksite enforcement.

Deportations: We are increasing deportations, especially of criminal aliens. The number of criminal aliens removed from the U.S. increased by 17.6% in 1994 over 1992 levels. This has resulted from stepped up vigilance in identification, detention, and deportation of criminal aliens rather than just letting them back into our communities at the end of their sentences, which is what happened in the past. For example, we conducted a pilot at L.A. County Jail to identify and deport criminal aliens. Under this program, INS officers staff the release lines at the jail 24 hours a day, seven days a week to ensure that deportable aliens are taken into Federal custody to be deported rather than released out into the streets. We are looking to expand this effort in L.A. and elsewhere.

**Some people have expressed concern about a national work registry. Please expand on your view on this.**

We need to find an effective, non-discriminatory way to verify employment authorization of all new employees. I fully support the recommendation of the Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, to test different ways to do this, including use of the Social Security and INS databases.

In fact, we're not waiting for Congress to act in this area, we are right now recruiting and training employers in the Los Angeles area to participate in a telephone verification system with the INS.

Let me add, however, that we are absolutely committed to protecting privacy and civil rights. The Administration will develop pilots carefully, building in safeguards against the invasion of privacy and discrimination. All employers will be instructed as to the laws against discrimination as well as the verification requirements. We will also monitor these pilots closely for evidence of discriminatory action.

**What is the Administration doing about the terrible El Monte, CA sweatshop slavery situation?**

First, we are prosecuting those involved.

More generally, we are increasing our work in this area and will be vigilant in shutting down these sweatshops. The INS, with other agencies, has significantly increased anti-smuggling efforts to reduce the ability of these criminals to bring smuggled workers into the country.

For example, prosecution of antismuggling cases rose 24 percent in July 1995 over July 1994. Secretary Reich has been working with the garment industry to make that industry and their retailers more accountable for preventing this type of abuse.

**You opposed prop. 187. Do you favor benefits for illegal aliens?**

No, except public health and safety and a child's constitutional right to an education.

**Some are proposing a new guestworker program -- What is your position on this?**

I oppose a guestworker or "bracero-type" program because it will lead to increased illegal immigration, depressed wages and work standards for citizens and legal immigrants already in this country.

**Applications for citizenship have increased dramatically ( 78% during first 10 months of '95 compared to the same period of '94) and waiting periods for processing those applications are very long. What are you doing about it?**

We want to encourage and help immigrants who qualify and who want to become citizens to do so as quickly as possible. Streamlining and promoting citizenship are priorities of the INS and it is dedicating more personnel and resources to addressing this problem.

INS has just announced a new initiative, Citizenship USA, to ensure that by the summer of 1996, eligible persons applying for citizenship can be accepted within six months.

Just last month, Commissioner Doris Meissner announced that Los Angeles will be the first site for this nationwide initiative. We'll be doing this by increasing staff levels, expanding facilities, using new technology, streamlining procedures, and forging new and better partnerships with community organizations.

Perhaps too often we allow ourselves to take for granted what U.S. citizenship means. One need only attend a naturalization ceremony and observe the depth of the pride and hope of our newest citizens to be reminded of how fortunate we are to be Americans.

**What do you think about the apparent undercurrent of anti-immigrant feelings in the country?**

Some are trying to use immigration, like affirmative action, to drive a wedge in this country. This is wrong and we must fight "immigrant-bashing." We need to examine our immigration policies in the same factual, nonpolitical way that we tried to do with affirmative action.

We need to crack down as hard as possible on illegal immigration, but we must not allow immigration to become a wedge.

**What is your view on legal immigration reform?**

I have always said that while we must crack down on illegal immigration -- because we are a nation of laws -- we are also a nation of immigrants. Nearly all of us can trace our roots beyond the shores of this country, and we have a historic commitment to immigration.

I support the recommendations of Barbara Jordan's Commission on Immigration Reform as the framework for Congress to consider for legal immigration reform. The Commission has recommended moderate reduction in the level of legal immigration and gives high priority to reunifying Americans with their close family members. I share this view.

Legal immigration reform must be based upon principles that are pro-family, pro-work, and pro-naturalization. My Administration anticipates working with Congress in a spirit of bipartisanship to craft the details of the specific legislation that will put these principles into practice. We must not let this issue become divisive in this country.

## **LINE ITEM Q/As**

**Domestic Policy Council: Paul Weinstein, 65577**

**Q:** Mr. President, why are Republicans backing away from passing the line-item veto and why aren't you more vocal about the dwindling prospects for getting the line-item veto power you have so long demanded. Isn't this just Washington as usual?

**A:** . I have actively sought passage of the line-item veto. Since my January 5 letter to Congressional leaders, I have called on Congress on at least 17 different occasions to pass line-item veto authority so that I can start cutting pork out of the budget this year.

. The American people have waited long enough for the line-item veto. Congress should stop the delaying tactics, stop playing politics, and pass the line-item veto now.

. This is not a partisan issue, Presidents Reagan and Bush asked Congress for the line-item veto time and again. It was part of the "Republican Contract with America" and my book "Putting People First." It has strong support from Members of Congress in both parties and both houses. No matter what party the President belongs to or what party has a majority in Congress, the line-item veto would be good for America.

## **TEEN PREGNANCY Q/As (1)**

Domestic Policy Council: Janet Abrams, 62857

Teen Pregnancy Prevention Qs & As for *President Clinton\**

### **What progress has the Administration made in forming the "national campaign against teen pregnancy" which President Clinton called for in January?**

In this year's State of the Union Address, I urged leaders from all sectors of society to join in a national campaign to prevent teen pregnancy. The epidemic of teen pregnancy -- with more than 1 million girls under age 20 becoming pregnant each year -- is one of this nation's most serious social problems. Government has an important role to play in addressing this dilemma, but the public sector cannot solve the problem alone. The talents and energy of the private sector must be brought to bear in addressing this complex dilemma affecting America's young people.

I believe we need a national campaign that sends a clear message: It is wrong to have a child outside marriage. Nobody should get pregnant or father a child who isn't prepared to raise the child, love the child, and take responsibility for the child's future.

Since January, the Administration has worked in partnership with a group of concerned citizens to lay out a practical vision for a private-sector campaign. A framework has been developed for a national independent, bipartisan organization which will catalyze and support a sustained effort to reduce the incidence of teen pregnancy in the U.S.

In September, I will meet with selected individuals from the private sector -- from the business, religious, education, health care, media, and foundation communities -- to explore opportunities for launching the national campaign.

### **What will this new private-sector organization do?**

The specific agenda of the organization will be determined by its leadership. The new group will not impose any top-down solutions. Rather, it will encourage local communities to forge their own approaches to teen pregnancy prevention consistent with their values and experience. A major role of the organization will be to discover, disseminate, and celebrate what is working in teen pregnancy prevention. Right now, while many local efforts show great promise, information on what works is fragmented.

Activities of the new group are likely to include:

- . spearheading a national grassroots campaign to make teen pregnancy prevention a priority in every community;
- . launching a long-term, multi-dimensional media campaign to encourage and reinforce local efforts and instill a new ethic of responsible parenting;
- . maintaining an accessible national database of teen pregnancy prevention programs and providing better opportunities for those active in the field to learn from one another;
- . supporting the comprehensive evaluation of promising programs and other research as needed;
- . seeking to be the most credible, independent resource available to anyone interested in preventing teen pregnancy and providing training, conferences, newsletters, briefings, and speakers.

### **What will Dr. Henry Foster's role with the Administration and this new organization be?**

No specific role has been decided on as yet. I hope to make an announcement about Dr. Foster in the coming weeks.

Dr. Foster has worked tirelessly over his 38-year career in medicine to reduce the incidence of teen pregnancy. He has counseled young people without other role models that they should not have sex before marriage, that they should stay off drugs, and that they should stay in school and make the most of their lives.

### **Why has it taken so long to organize the private-sector campaign?**

Outreach has been made to dozens of prominent citizens -- experts in the field of teen pregnancy, leaders of the business, foundation, and religious communities. These consultations have been essential. We're approaching this very complicated problem in a serious, careful manner -- we don't want a band-aid solution.

### **What else has the Administration done to address the problem of teen pregnancy?**

The private-sector initiative is intended to complement and enhance government initiatives supported by the Administration. The range of Administration efforts related to teen pregnancy includes:

- numerous service and research programs in teen pregnancy prevention within the Department of Health and Human Services

- In 1993, President Clinton lifted the "gag rule," enabling non-directive options counselling in federally supported family planning clinics.

- The Administration has supported increases in funding for family planning services. In FY92, \$149 million was spent on family planning. Current funding is \$193 million, and the Clinton budget request for FY96 is \$199 million.

- HHS provides grants to organizations across the country to support local teen pregnancy prevention efforts and to evaluate strategies for effectiveness.

- programs across several agencies to promote youth development and address various risk factors associated with teen pregnancy

- current and proposed welfare reform measures to provide young men and women with incentives to delay parenthood until they are married and able to support their children. President Clinton's welfare reform package includes the following provisions:

- Teen mothers on welfare would be required to live at home with their parents, stay in school, identify the father, and move into employment within a limited period of time.

- Tough new child support laws would be strictly enforced so that prospective teen fathers would know they had to provide child support for the next 18 years. (In 1993, the Administration collected a record \$9 billion in child support, a 12% increase over the previous year.)

States would have flexibility to try innovative ways to encourage responsible behavior, such as rewarding teen recipients who make progress in school and sanctioning those who drop out.

a comprehensive attack on background economic and social factors contributing to rising teen pregnancy rates, including poverty, unequal educational opportunity, and disinvestment in distressed urban and rural communities

Lifelong Learning Initiatives -- Pre-School and Parenting; Goals 2000; School-to-Work; National Service; Training and Reemployment

Rewarding Work for Working Families -- Earned Income Tax Credit; Minimum Wage Increase; Family and Medical Leave

Community Empowerment -- Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities; Community Development Banking

## **TEEN PREGNANCY Q/As (2)**

**Domestic Policy Council: Janet Abrams, 62857**

**Teen Pregnancy Prevention Qs & As for *Mike McCurry*\***

### **What progress has the Administration made in forming the "national campaign against teen pregnancy" which President Clinton called for in January?**

In this year's State of the Union Address, President Clinton urged leaders from all sectors of society to join in a national campaign to prevent teen pregnancy. He called the epidemic of teen pregnancy -- with more than 1 million girls under age 20 becoming pregnant each year -- "our most serious social problem." Mr. Clinton stated that while government has an important role to play in addressing this dilemma, the public sector cannot solve the problem alone. He urged that a national campaign be organized and conducted from the private sector.

The President spoke out again in March in a speech to the National Association of County Officials. He said: "We need a national campaign ... that sends a clear message: It is wrong to have a child outside marriage. Nobody should get pregnant or father a child who isn't prepared to raise the child, love the child, and take responsibility for the child's future."

Since January, the Clinton Administration has worked in partnership with a small group of concerned citizens to lay out a practical vision for the proposed private-sector initiative. Broad consultations have been held with individuals across the country who are engaged in teen pregnancy prevention efforts and with prominent individuals in the business, religious, and foundation communities. Guided by these discussions, a framework has been developed for a national independent, bipartisan organization which will catalyze and support a sustained effort to reduce the incidence of teen pregnancy in the U.S.

In September, President Clinton will meet with selected individuals from the private sector to explore opportunities for launching the national campaign.

### **What will this new private-sector organization do?**

The specific agenda of the organization will be determined by its leadership. As envisioned by the President, the new group will not impose any top-down solutions. Rather, it will encourage local communities to forge their own approaches to teen pregnancy prevention consistent with their values and experience. A major role of the organization will be to discover, disseminate, and celebrate what is working in teen pregnancy prevention. Right now, while many local efforts show great promise, information on what works is fragmented.

Activities of the new group are likely to include:

- spearheading a national grassroots campaign to make teen pregnancy prevention a priority in every community;
- launching a long-term, multi-dimensional media campaign to encourage and reinforce local efforts and instill a new ethic of responsible parenting;
- maintaining an accessible national database of teen pregnancy prevention programs and providing better opportunities for those already active in the field to learn from one another;
- supporting the comprehensive evaluation of promising programs and other research as needed;

seeking to be the most credible, independent resource available to anyone interested in preventing teen pregnancy and providing training, conferences, newsletters, briefings, and speakers.

**What will Dr. Henry Foster's role with the Administration and this new organization be?**

No specific role has been determined. There may be an announcement in the coming weeks.

**Why has it taken so long to organize the private-sector campaign?**

Outreach has been made to dozens of prominent citizens -- experts in the field of teen pregnancy, leaders of the business, foundation, and religious communities. These consultations have been essential. We're approaching this very complicated problem in a serious, careful manner -- we don't want a band-aid solution. The President's aim is to make a significant contribution to the future of America with this effort.

**What else has the Administration done to address the problem of teen pregnancy?**

The private-sector initiative is intended to complement and enhance government initiatives supported by the Administration. The range of Administration efforts related to teen pregnancy includes:

- numerous service and research programs in teen pregnancy prevention within the Department of Health and Human Services

- In 1993, President Clinton lifted the "gag rule," enabling non-directive options counselling in federally supported family planning clinics.

- The Administration has supported increases in funding for family planning services. In FY92, \$149 million was spent on family planning. Current funding is \$193 million, and the Clinton budget request for FY96 is \$199 million.

- HHS provides grants to organizations across the country to support local teen pregnancy prevention efforts and to evaluate strategies for effectiveness.

- programs across several agencies to promote youth development and address various risk factors associated with teen pregnancy

- current and proposed welfare reform measures to provide young men and women with incentives to delay parenthood until they are married and able to support their children. President Clinton's welfare reform package includes the following provisions:

- Teen mothers on welfare would be required to live at home with their parents, stay in school, identify the father, and move into employment within a limited period of time.

- Tough new child support laws would be strictly enforced so that prospective teen fathers would know they had to provide child support for the next 18 years. (In 1993, the Administration collected a record \$9 billion in child support, a 12% increase over the previous year.)

- States would have flexibility to try innovative ways to encourage responsible behavior, such as rewarding teen recipients who make progress in school and sanctioning those who drop out.

. a comprehensive attack on background economic and social factors contributing to rising teen pregnancy rates, including poverty, unequal educational opportunity, and disinvestment in distressed urban and rural communities

. Lifelong Learning Initiatives -- Pre-School and Patenting; Goals 2000; School-to-Work; National Service; Training and Reemployment

. Rewarding Work for Working Families -- Earned Income Tax Credit; Minimum Wage Increase; Family and Medical Leave

. Community Empowerment -- Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities; Community Development Banking