

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Communications

Series/Staff Member: Mark Gearan

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 6090

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Crime Bill Etc.

Stack:

S

Row:

90

Section:

4

Shelf:

8

Position:

3

**RADIO ADDRESS FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT POLICE HEADQUARTERS
IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
February 26, 1994**

President Clinton will deliver his weekly radio address from the first district police headquarters at Fourth Street S.W. in Washington, DC. The first precinct is where Jason White worked, the police officer shot and killed earlier this year.

Attached please find background information on the Administration's record on crime, and the transcript of Ron Noble's (Assistant Secretary of Treasury for Enforcement) White House briefing which specifically addresses the implementation of the Brady Bill.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S RECORD ON CRIME

February 26, 1994

BRADY BILL

- President Clinton signed the Brady Bill on November 30, 1993 -- breaking seven years of gridlock. The Brady Law requires a five-day waiting period for the purchase of handguns.
- Monday marks the first day of implementation of the Brady bill.
- Each year nearly 7.5 million firearms are sold at retail in the United States, about half of them handguns. The Brady bill will reduce handgun violence in two ways. First, it will provide law enforcement with the opportunity to conduct background checks on handgun purchasers which will stop thousands of illegal handgun purchases. Second, it will provide a "cooling-off period" for individuals who are acting in the heat of passion or the depths of depression.

The following are initiatives the Clinton Administration has pursued during the last thirteen months::

MORE GUNS OFF THE STREET

- A ban on imports of foreign assault pistols, such as the Uzi, and called for a ban on all assault weapons. The Senate crime bill includes the toughest assault weapons ban.
- Tightened federal gun dealer licensing requirements by improving background checks on prospective dealers, requiring dealers to obtain more reliable identification from purchasers and scrutinizing multiple handgun sales reports. Proposed dramatically increasing the federal licensing fee for gun dealers to reduce the 284,000 gun dealers in the U.S. today.
- Pushed for passage of a measure in the Senate crime bill which bans the possession of handguns by minors.

100,000 NEW POLICE OFFICERS

- To make our streets safer, the President's plan puts 100,000 more police officers on the streets with heavy emphasis on community policing. This measure was adopted in the crime bill.
- President Clinton signed the Police Hiring Supplement, which awards \$150 million to communities for community policing; federal grants so far have been awarded to over 100 cities and towns.

SAFER SCHOOLS

- Requested funding for emergency legislation to help schools in high-crime areas implement the SAFE Schools Initiatives.

FIGHTING DRUGS

- Elevated the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to Cabinet rank.
- Introduced the 1994 National Drug Control Strategy which targets the problem of hardcore drug abuse and the violence that surrounds it.
- Signed an Executive Order strengthening the Office of Drug Policy's agency-wide jurisdiction over drug policy, including issues involving national security.
- Included treatment for substance abuse as part of the comprehensive health benefits package in the Health Security Act.

ADDITIONAL AGENCY INITIATIVES

ONDCP Drug Strategy: The recently released drug strategy calls for breaking the cycle of hardcore drug use that accounts for a disproportionate amount of the crime by increased treatment availability and increased use of coercive treatment. The strategy also increases resources for Safe and Drug-Free schools and ties violence prevention to existing drug education and prevention programs for in-school youth. Finally, the strategy proposes going after international drug trafficking organizations in their source countries.

Operation Safe Home: This joint effort by HUD, Justice and Treasury will bring the federal law enforcement resources, in cooperation with state and local authorities, to bear on violent crime in public and assisted housing.

Treasury-ATF Firearms Proposal: Along with reforms of the Federal Firearms Licensing laws and a ban on assault weapons, Secretary Bentsen has proposed cracking down on gun trafficking in the 10 jurisdictions that account for 23% of the crime; notifying local police of the gun dealers in their area; and expanding programs to work with local police departments.

GSA: On January 5th, the General Services Administration announced that it will no longer issue waivers allowing federal agencies to sell excess firearms to the private sector.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

February 25, 1994

PRESS BRIEFING

BY

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TREASURY FOR ENFORCEMENT RON NOBLE

The Briefing Room

2:40 P.M. EST

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: Good afternoon. Thank you for coming today to discuss the implementation of the Brady Act, which goes into effect next Monday.

After a seven-year struggle in the Congress, the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act was signed into law by President Clinton on November 30, 1993. It is the most significant gun law curtailing criminal access to handguns since the 1968 Gun Control Act.

Each year, nearly 7.5 million firearms are sold at retail in the U.S., about half of them handguns. Until now, those guns have been sold primarily on an honor system, wherein the purchasers ensure the sellers they are legally entitled to buy firearms. On February 28, 1994, retail sales of handguns will be preceded by background checks. Honest, law-abiding citizens will be able to continue to purchase firearms; criminals will not. At least not without law enforcement first having an opportunity to prevent the sale.

The Brady Act is complex, and requires close cooperation between the private sector and law enforcement. It also requires close cooperation among local, state and federal officials.

Allow me to explain the mechanics of Brady. A handgun purchaser must fill out a form stating that he or she intends to purchase a handgun and is not in one of the prohibitive categories, such as convicted felon, under indictment, or drug addict. The seller must transmit the form to the chief law enforcement officer of the purchaser's residence within 24 hours.

Each state designates which law enforcement organization will serve this role. Law enforcement is required to make a reasonable effort to determine whether the prospective purchaser is legally prohibited from purchasing a firearm. If law enforcement determines that the buyer is prohibited, they can stop the sale. If law enforcement has not informed the dealer within five business days that the sale must be stopped, the sale may be completed. They can stop the sale. If law enforcement has not informed the dealer within five business days that the sale must be stopped, the sale may be completed.

Treasury's regulations for implementing the five-day waiting period and background check for the purchaser of handguns were printed on February 14 -- two weeks before the deadline -- to ensure that all affected parties had an adequate opportunity to understand their new responsibilities. There is a 90-day comment period before regulations are finalized for us to get the feedback and find out how it's going.

MORE

Several informational mass mailings have been sent to the 284,000 current federal firearms licensees and the thousands of state and local law enforcement offices around the country. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms has conducted numerous meetings with state and local law enforcement officials to advise them of their responsibilities and to tailor the implementation process to the needs of each state.

The law allows for several state exemptions to the Brady background check: One, if there's a state system in place which requires a permit to purchase a handgun; and two, if the state already has an adequate background check system in place. Thirty-four states and territories will be required to implement Brady on Monday. In addition, certain transactions may be exempt from Brady: one, if it had been certified impracticable because of remote geographic location and a lack of telecommunications facilities; or, two, if the purchaser has received a law enforcement waiver based upon threats against the lives of the purchaser or the purchaser's family.

The five-day waiting period will sunset in five years, at which time a new automated instant check system is to be instituted. The Department of Justice's response -- for developing the automated data system to be accessed in the instant check. This system will be used for the purchase of all firearms, not just handguns, beginning in 1999.

With me today, I have Bob Creighton -- ask him to come forward -- who's a Special Agent in Charge of the Miami Division of ATF; and Brad Buckles, ATF's Counsel.

At this point we're available for questions.

Q Why only 34 states?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: Only 34 states because there are certain states which already comply with the intent of Brady. That is, they're already doing a background check before individuals purchase firearms.

Q Do you all have any estimates of how many sales that you'll stop in a given month?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: Let me ask Bob to take that question.

MR. CREIGHTON: We know from the experience of the states that had instant check systems an alternative systems up that they've excluded already thousands. So we can assume that throughout the 50 states when it's fully implemented, there will be many thousands of sales which are excluded each year.

Q There is at least one -- I believe it was a sheriff in Arizona who said he's not going to do checks; he doesn't have the money, the manpower. What are you going to do about that?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: Well, it's very important that local law enforcement officers do the check. And we're confident that with the proper coordination and cooperation with us at the federal level, we can assist them in whatever way possible. So we expect that people will do the checks.

Local law enforcement wanted this. This is not something the federal government is forcing upon state and local law enforcement. This is something state and local law enforcement officers have been seeking for some time.

Q You say the exclusions, thousands of them? What were they based on?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: They're based on people obtaining firearms -- people trying to obtain firearms with criminal records, with felony violations.

Q Are they all criminal records, is that the basic --

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: Yes.

Q When you say the regulation -- 30-day comment period --

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: Ninety.

Q I'm sorry, 90-day comment period -- in other words, the regulations that were published are proposed regulations or are they actually in place?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: They're actually effective now, but during the 90 days that follow, we will get feedback and see if we have to amend them or tailor them in some other way.

Q They are in effect now?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NOBLE: They are in effect, beginning Monday.

In other questions? Thank you very much.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

2:46 P.M. EST

**PRESIDENT CLINTON LAUNCHES EFFORT TO PASS
ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN AND RECOGNIZES
1994 VICTIM SERVICE AWARD WINNERS;
April 25, 1994**

The President today will launch an intensive effort to fight for the passage of a ban on assault weapons, which will be considered in the House of Representatives over the next two weeks. The Senate version of the Crime Bill, includes a provision to ban 19 specific types of assault weapons.

The weapons banned under the provision are large capacity firearms, designed and configured for rapid fire, combat use -- close quarter shooting at human beings. The proposal specifically safeguards the rights of hunters and sportsmen by explicitly protecting almost 700 hunting and recreational rifles.

At the Rose Garden ceremony, the President will also recognize eleven outstanding citizens who have worked selflessly on behalf of victims of violent crime and pay tribute to the efforts of hundreds of volunteer advocates who compassionately offer crime victim assistance in their communities across the country. In addition, Attorney General Reno will announce the nomination of Aileen Adams to direct the Office for Victims of Crime at the Department of Justice.

Accompanying President Clinton on stage will be Attorney General Janet Reno, Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, Steve Sposato and Lieutenant Randy Bean. Following the announcement of the appointment of Ms. Aileen Adams as the Director of the Office for Victims of Crime, the Attorney General will make remarks and introduce Steve Sposato. Mr. Sposato will then speak and introduce Secretary Bentsen. Secretary Bentsen will introduce Lt. Bean who will then speak and introduce the President.

Steve Sposato

Steve's wife, Jody, was killed in her San Francisco law office last July when a gunman entered the high-rise with two TEC-DC9 pistols and began randomly shooting at employees, apparently over a disagreement with the firm. Jody was one of eight innocent victims killed, six others were wounded. Steve has an 18-month-old daughter, Meghan.

Lt. Randy Bean

Lt. Bean is an 18-year veteran of the Dayton, OH police department. In March of 1991, he was involved in a routine traffic stop where his fellow officer, Steve Whalen, was gunned down by an AR-15 assault weapon as he approached a pickup truck. The gunman had fired off a 20-round clip in a matter of seconds. After firing at the truck, Lt. Bean received fragment wounds in both legs before the gunman was eventually caught. Officer Whalen was killed; he was in his early 30's, engaged to be married, and very well-liked in the community.

1994 Victim Service Recipients

Ms. Vickii Coffey

Executive Director, Chicago Abused Women Coalition

For five years Ms. Coffey has served the needs of domestic violence victims in Chicago.

Reverend Robert Denton, Akron, OH

Executive Director, Summit County Victim Assistance Program

A founding member of the National Organization for Victim Assistance, he has worked with abusive men, child abuse victims and survivors of vehicular fatalities.

Ms. Sharon English, Sacramento, CA

Assistant Director, Office of Prevention and Victim Services, California Youth Authority

For two decades, Ms. English has worked to develop corrections-based victim services, particularly working with juvenile offenders.

Lucy Friedman, Ph.D, New York, NY

Executive Director, Victim Assistance Agency

Dr. Friedman built VSA from a small test project to the largest victim assistance provider in the nation. She has made it her mission to incorporate victim services into institutions such as schools, hospitals and the courts.

Ms. Sandra Matheson, Hookset, NH

Director, Office of Victim and Witness Assistance

Ms. Matheson began as a law enforcement officer specially trained to handle sexual assault cases. Currently, she works with victims of child abuse, neglect and victims of sexual abuse.

Mrs. Nell Myers, Austin, TX

Founder, People Against Crime

Mrs. Myers has been providing direct services to victims on a volunteer basis since 1979, when her daughter was murdered. Mrs. Myers has also been a leader in the passage of state victim-oriented legislation.

Ms. Polly Poskin, Springfield, IL

Executive Director, Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault

For more than 15 years, Ms. Poskin has been a spokesperson, advocate, fundraiser, and counselor for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence in Illinois.

Ms. Rosemary Rocco, Duluth, MN

Executive Director, Program to Aid Victims of Sexual Assault

Ms. Rocco was a founding member of the first sexual assault program in St. Louis County, one of the largest rural counties in the nation. Over the years, she has pushed for legislation to secure victim service funding and victim rights, and reform state criminal codes.

-more-

Victim Service Awards continued, Page 3

Mrs. Roberta Roper, Upper Marlboro, MD

Director, Stephanie Roper Committee and Foundation

In the twelve years since the brutal murder of her daughter, Mrs. Roper has led the Stephanie Roper Committee and Foundation, an all-volunteer citizen's group that is one of the largest state victims' rights organizations in the country.

Mrs. Miriam Shehane, Montgomery, AL

President, Victims of Crime and Leniency (VOCAL)

This organization, under Mrs. Shehanes leadership has pushed for state legislation that secures and protects victims rights in the areas of sentencing, probation and parole, and restitution.

Mr. John Stein, Washington, DC

Deputy Director, National Organization for Victim Assistance

Mr. Stein has been a significant force in the victims' movement for twenty years. He has worked on drafting and policy direction for legislation and regularly fields calls from victims of child sexual abuse, homicide survivors, and victims of domestic violence.

PRESIDENT CLINTON SPEAKS TO POLICE OFFICERS AND CRIME VICTIMS, CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF THE CRIME BILL

August 15, 1994

The President will address police officers and crime victims in a Rose Garden ceremony to urge Congress to take swift action and pass the Crime Bill.

Americans are fed up with violent crime in this country. They are tired of violent criminals, who are caught only to be returned to the streets. They know it is time we impose stricter sentencing for violent criminals. They understand the need for more prisons to put the criminals in, and the need to steer youth, and gangs away from crime. Americans want swift passage of the crime bill and the President is fighting to see that it happens.

Expected to participate are Dewey Stokes, President of the Fraternal Order of Police; Steven Sposato; Janice Payne; and Marc Klaas. The audience includes police officers along with relatives and friends of individuals on the program.

Steven Sposato

Steve Sposato's wife, Jody, was killed in the San Francisco law office shooting last July. A gunman entered the high-rise with two TEC-DC9 pistols and began randomly shooting at employees, apparently over a disagreement with the firm. Jody was one of eight innocent victims killed, six others were wounded. Steve has an 18-month-old daughter, Meghan.

The President met with Steve on April 25 when he spoke of his wife's death at rally in the Rose Garden for the assault weapons ban. He has also testified before Congress.

Janice Payne (mother of James Darby)

James Darby, 9, was shot in the head as he walked home with his family from a Mother's Day picnic at a park in New Orleans. The bullet was fired from a shotgun pointed out the window of a car which pulled within a few feet of the crowd. James died instantly on the sidewalk about a block from his home.

Two brothers, aged 19 and 14, were arrested and booked in the killing, which police believed began as a fistfight during a football game at the park. It was New Orleans' 162nd homicide of the year, but James was the youngest victim. Nine days before the shooting, James wrote this letter to the President:

Dear Mr. Clinton,

I want you to stop the killing in the city. People is dead and I think that somebody might kill me. So would you please stop the people from deading. I'm asking you nicely to stop it. I know you can do it. Do it. I know you could.

*Your friend,
James*

Crime continued, page 2

Janice Payne is 29 years old, works as a nursing assistant and has a 7-year-old daughter named Marquita.

Marc Klaas

Marc is the father of Polly Klaas. Polly, 12, was abducted at knife point October 1, 1993, from a slumber party at her home. Richard Allen Davis, a twice-convicted kidnapper, was arrested on November 30, and confessed to her kidnapping and murder. Davis was released on parole in June, 1993 after serving half of a 16-year sentence for a 1985 kidnapping.

PROGRAM

- Dewey Stokes delivers opening remarks and introduces Steve Sposato.
- Mr. Sposato will introduce Janice Payne
- Ms. Payne will introduce Marc Klaas
- Mr. Klaas will introduce the President

-30-30-30-

The President's Anti-Crime Legislation:

Police, Punishment & Prevention -- An Overview

We don't feel safe in our own neighborhoods. Our children fear being attacked at school. The police are frequently outgunned by drug dealers. Senseless, random acts of violence seem to occur more and more frequently everyday. Career criminals are returned to the streets to violate the citizenry again and again. And we don't do what we can to lead young people and those addicted to drugs away from the path of crime and violence.

Crime and violence threaten America's future. Our economic prospects are on the upturn and we can now look to the day when all Americans will have health care coverage. Still, there can be no doubt that improvements in our economic and physical health will never be fully enjoyed if we must live every day in fear of crime and violence.

The President's crime legislation focuses on three key approaches to fighting crime and violence, which working together, amount to the needed multi-front blitz on crime which Americans rightfully expect. The legislative centerpieces are police, punishment & prevention.

Police: Making Our Streets Safer

More cops on the street; more cops walking the beat, working with citizens to prevent and solve crimes -- it's that simple. We need to add 100,000 new police officers to the streets of our cities. We need to dedicate our law enforcement resources to solving crimes, punishing crimes and preventing crimes. Police officers are the key to all three.

Central to the President's plan is maximizing "community policing" -- officers working with the community to proactively address neighborhood problems which contribute to crime and disorder. It should be easy and commonplace for responsible citizens concerned about crime to work in partnership with their local police.

And those cops deserve our maximum support. We can not expect our law enforcement officers to risk their lives on a daily basis without doing everything we can to protect them. We can increase the safety of our police by making sure that they don't get outgunned. Put simply, there is no sporting reason for anyone to own an assault weapon. Period. We are past the point at which those who would like assault weapons to be available for public sale should be permitted to jeopardize the safety of our society and its police officers. Assault weapons should be banned.

Moreover, retribution for those who kill our police officers must be swift and severe. We should adopt laws and make it known as widely as we can that if you kill a federal law enforcement officer, you will face the death penalty. Our law enforcement community needs and deserves that kind of backing.

Punishment: Sending a Signal to Criminals

All the good work done by the law enforcement community is lost if we don't punish those who devastate our neighborhoods. With strict sentences for violent criminals and prisons to put them in, all Americans will be safer.

We must make sure that offenders who commit violent act after violent act get locked up for good. Americans are exhausted and repulsed by the perpetual violence which surrounds them. Congress should pass a "3 strikes and you're out" law which says that if you are caught committing violent crimes on three separate occasions, you have permanently abandoned your right to ever be released from prison.

Other "truth in sentencing" provisions, and firm sentences (with a "safety-valves" to deal with extraordinary circumstances), will send the message that we will not let crime pay. And, there are some crimes which are so heinous that the ultimate penalty -- the death penalty -- is both necessary and appropriate.

We must provide the funds to the states necessary for them to build the prisons in which to lock up those who prey on the public. We can never allow criminals who ought to be in jail, to freely commit more violent crimes because we lack the prison space in which to put them. Prisons are expensive and it is unfortunate that we must spend our tax dollars to lock people up, but we must not hesitate to do so.

Finally, we should recognize that different kinds of prisons are appropriate for different kinds of crimes. Non-violent offenders should be put in boot camps. There, they can be punished and they can also learn skills and discipline rather than learning more about crime. Boot camps provide necessary punishment along with the opportunity to get the attention of youthful offenders on the wrong track and steer them in the right direction.

Prevention: Something To Say Yes To

Just as certainly as we must punish those who break our laws and wreak havoc in our cities, we must also take whatever steps we can to stop crime before it happens. Those who have no hope, no job, no other answer, who know no other way are often drawn to crime and violence. All Americans deserve hope and opportunity; need to know that there is a better answer than crime, and must have the opportunity to go another way.

If we are going to steer young people away from crime and gangs we must provide them with "something to say yes to": after school programs, summer youth activities, and employment, sports and recreation opportunities that can take the place of gangs. We can bring community groups, law enforcement officials, and struggling young Americans together in an effort to keep kids off the path to crime.

The Administration's Youth Employment and Skills (YES) Crime Reduction proposal is a perfect example of this kind of program. When implemented, YES would saturate high-crime, high poverty neighborhoods with employment opportunities. We believe that neighborhood youths and young adults will say "YES" to jobs and no to crime. And we must work with existing businesses in these areas to encourage them to stay, expand, and hire young people from the community.

We must all take steps to guarantee that our schools are safe and healthy places to work and learn. Gun-free, drug-free, violence-free schools are necessary to making sure that students can focus on the books, not their fear. And, we must take firm and direct steps to better protect our children from those who sexually exploit children.

Steps must also be taken to reduce the tide of violent crimes against women in this country. Protecting women from domestic violence, and expanding prevention programs that diminish the frequency of attacks against women must be priorities.

We can also prevent crime by better regulating access to guns and ammunition and tightening the procedures surrounding gun dealer licensing. Laws which will keep guns out of the hands of convicted felons, ban large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and prohibit the sale of handguns to kids will all work in tandem to reduce gun violence.

Finally, we must again recognize that we will never control crime until we control substance abuse. We must get the hard core drug users -- the 20% of cocaine users who consume over 2/3 of available cocaine -- off the streets and into treatment. Effective, innovative programs, like drug courts use the power of the criminal justice systems to force addicts to kick their drug habits. Through education, we can show our young people that substance abuse leads nowhere but to destruction. And we must provide those young people real work alternatives to drug dealing when they are trying to follow the rules in crime infested areas.

Paying for Police, Punishment & Prevention

Paying for these initiatives won't be easy. But failing to enact them will be much, much more expensive. The cost to society of a failure to act -- a cost measured not just in dollars and cents, but also in murders, rapes and assaults which need not have occurred -- is a cost we can not bear.

By reinventing government and focusing our priorities, we can make the necessary money available to achieve these goals. With the savings realized by the elimination of 250,000 federal government jobs, we can set up a multi-billion dollar Crime Control Trust Fund. And by putting those savings in the Crime Control Trust Fund, we can make the money available for the police, punishment and prevention proposed in the President's anti-crime legislation.

The Times-Picayune

July 31, 1994 Sunday, THIRD

SECTION: METRO; Pg. B1

LENGTH: 2798 words

HEADLINE: A PICNIC ENDS IN GUNFIRE;

DEATH AT AN EARLY AGE - PART I

SERIES: THE KILLING OF JAMES DARBY

BYLINE: Stories by Lisa Frazier and Bill Walsh; Staff Writers

BODY:

Janice Payne was busy preparing fried chicken and potato salad for a picnic when her 9-year-old son James took her hand, led her to the sofa and asked her to close her eyes.

Though she still had a lot to do, she complied. When she opened her eyes, she held in her hands a colorful butterfly made of construction paper and pipe cleaners. The boy, dressed in a striped shirt and freshly starched purple shorts, beamed.

"Happy Mother's Day, mom," he said, hugging her. "I love you."

It should have been the beginning of a wonderful day. It was, instead, the day James Darby died.

As Janice Payne's bus rumbles through the pre-dawn darkness, she stares out the window at the still-sleeping city. Her mind often wanders during these daily commutes to work, and all thoughts lead to James.

The smile that flashed so easily. The goofy way he danced to the radio. The promises he made to take care of her one day. The way he ran to her when she met him every day after work in the park.

The park.

A smile that has crossed her face evaporates as she thinks back to the fistfight after the touch football game. The car. The gun pointed out the window. The blast. Her son's small body spread on the sidewalk.

She wipes the tears from her eyes. For three months, she has thought of little else - and still she doesn't understand.

Few people do. And yet, James' killing - after a Sunday afternoon fight at a Central City playground - is typical of what is happening in New Orleans and around the nation. Disputes over what seem to be nothing - a schoolyard insult, a traffic squabble - are leading to gunfire and death.

More and more often, the victim and the killer are teen-agers, or younger.

What kind of person can answer a punch with a random bullet? James' killing shines a harsh light on the environment that fosters such a personality.

It is a place where boys are told to be men, and men are expected to defend their families from all slights, no matter how trivial.

It is a place where any sign of personal weakness is considered an invitation to harassment, a place where reputations are often defended with a gun.

Both James and his suspected killer lived in such a place.

Just two blocks from the Paynes' shotgun apartment, A.L. Davis Playground

had been James' favorite after-school spot since the family returned to New Orleans from rural Napoleonville two months earlier.

Every day, his mother would meet him there after work, and James would climb the fence that separates the park from La Salle Street and give her a kiss. "How ya doin,' mom?" he would say.

Janice Payne and her sister, Johnnie Mae, planned the Mother's Day picnic at the playground. The weather had come through perfectly - sunny and warm.

The Paynes spread out their food near the basketball court close to La Salle Street and tuned the boombox to WYLD.

Soon, the young girls in the family were jumping rope. The rest of the family teamed up with some of the other children in the park for a touch football game.

Janice Payne played on her son's team. So did a 14-year-old named Michael Norfleet, who lived a short distance away in the C.J. Peete public housing development.

Michael called plays in the huddle, and James and his friends ran the patterns.

It was a rout. James' team racked up touchdowns and when one of his teammates scored again, James turned to a boy on the other team and said playfully, "You haven't scored a touchdown all day."

Frustrated, the boy shoved James. Almost at once, the playfulness turned to fear. James backed away.

Friends and relatives said that as long as they could remember, James shied away from fights, even with his feisty younger sister, Marquita. Her son's timidity worried Janice Payne so much that she asked his cousins to teach him how to use his fists.

This time, as on other occasions, he didn't throw any punches. He turned to his mother.

"I told him to push that boy back," she said.

"When people hit you," she told him, "you are supposed to hit back. People are always messing with you."

James looked at the ground and started to cry. It was his mother's turn to back down, a lesson for another day. She gave him a hug.

The game resumed, but as she was walking back toward the food, she turned to see that the boy who had pushed her son was now fighting with a friend of James who apparently had taken up his cause.

Soon Michael Norfleet had joined the fray, followed by his sister Karen, 16 at the time, and at least five other teen-agers, including a friend of the Paynes named Katina Self. Few knew how the fight started, or cared.

At one point, Katina, 16, was straddling another girl, pummeling her, when the girl pleaded, "Stop, I'm pregnant."

Janice Payne, 29, broke up the fight and walked the pregnant teen-ager to the edge of the park, chiding her for taking such a chance with her baby's health.

Though the fighting had stopped, tempers were still bubbling. Michael turned to Johnnie Mae Payne and called her a bitch and a whore, the Paynes said.

The fighting started again.

Finally, Katina got hold of Karen Norfleet's braid and whacked her in the face. Karen said later it was Janice Payne who hit her. It was, in any case, the final blow.

Michael took his sister home, her eye turning purple and nearly swollen shut. Witnesses said as he left, he turned toward the Paynes and muttered a threat: "Wait here. You're going to get yours."

As she passed through the living room, on her way upstairs, Karen did her best to conceal her swollen eye from her older brother, Joseph Norfleet. She had noticed two empty 16-ounce King Cobra beer bottles. She feared what he might do.

But Joseph got up from the couch and pulled Karen's hand back from her face.

"Who did that?" he demanded.

Karen began to explain about the fight at the park. But before she could finish, she said, he threw his glass on the floor and headed out the door.

Police say he grabbed a shotgun and jumped into a white Ford Escort, along with Michael and, perhaps, a 10-year-old boy.

"He just clicked," Karen said of Joseph. "I thought they were just going to try to scare them or something."

About 7:30 p.m., as darkness fell on A.L. Davis park, Janice Payne and her family began packing up their food. Someone had come up and warned them about possible trouble, but they didn't take the warning seriously. Katina had gone home and returned after changing her shirt, which had lost a few buttons in the scuffle. The family and their friends - a group of about 15 - set out for home along the La Salle Street sidewalk.

Most of the adults were in back of the group. James was eating potato chips and chatting with his 11-year-old friend Whalen Grant.

It was Herman Payne, James' uncle, who first saw it - a white Ford Escort making a U-turn on La Salle and doubling back toward them at a crawl.

As it approached, James' cousin, Clarence, was struck by how close the car was getting to the curb. Was it going to park? he wondered.

The car was not more than 10 feet away when Clarence spotted "a black blur" hanging out the passenger side window. Suddenly, he understood. It was a gun.

"I just froze," he said.

Johnnie Mae Payne thought she heard someone yell, "Yo, bitches!" and a vague recollection flashed through her mind of the boy in the park, the one who had insulted her.

There he was in the car, she thought to herself. What was he doing here now? Who were the others in the car? Was that a shotgun?

Still munching on his chips and apparently oblivious to the car, James was thinking of what happened back at the park. "Katina really beat up that girl," he

was saying.

Then came the shot.

Janice Payne and others dove for cover behind the wall of the Rochambeau Hotel parking lot. Food and drinks spilled on the sidewalk. A football bounced into the gutter.

Herman Payne felt a sting on the side of his head. Katina was hit in the eye. Whalen, his face and clothes splattered with blood, ran around the corner to his grandmother's house. "Hold me, grandma, hold me," he cried.

From the parking lot pavement, Janice Payne looked around and could see Katina had been injured, but would be OK. She felt a pang of relief. Nearby was Marquita, also OK. Where was James?

Then, the purple shorts and striped shirt caught her eye. There on the sidewalk, by the telephone pole, she saw her son. He lay on his back, potato chips strewn about his outstretched hand.

A bullet, large enough to kill a deer, had passed through the right side of his head, exploding his skull with such force that flying bone fragments - not pellets, as first thought - had caused Katina's and Herman Payne's injuries.

Janice Payne ran wailing to her son.

"All I could do was lay on top of him and tell him how much I love him.

"I saw his hand do this and his head do this," she said, moving her hand and head, "so I figured he was waving bye."

"I went to school for nursing, but I didn't know what to do. No matter how much education you have, you just don't know what to do."

From across the street, Alfred Stevens heard the shot and looked up. He saw the car slowly drive away. Odd, he thought. He expected to hear screeching tires. The barrel of the gun was still hanging out the window.

Minutes later, as police strung yellow tape around James' body and paramedics tended to the wounded, Stevens saw the white Ford return. It pulled into a side street and its two occupants got out and craned their necks toward the gathering crowd. Then it was gone.

Dorothy Norfleet was still at her fiance's house, sometime between 8 and 9 p.m., when his son - who lived with the Norfleets - called to ask about her Medicaid card. Earlier that day, all of her children had joined her there for an early Mother's Day dinner and drinks. They had presented her with gifts: a flowing potted ivy from Michael; a card from Joseph and money he had earned cutting lawns.

Her day, like Janice Payne's, had been lovely.

Then the phone call came. Karen had been beaten badly at the park and needed to go to the hospital, her fiance's son was telling her. He agreed to pick her up on the way to the hospital.

Once there, a doctor took one look at Karen's puffy eye and turned with suspicion to her mother.

"They thought I had beat her," she said.

But she explained what happened, and the doctor backed down, apologetically.

By midnight, Karen and her mother had returned from the hospital. Karen and Michael spent the night with her at her fiance's house, Dorothy Norfleet said.

James Walker, her fiance's son, returned to the apartment, where Joseph Norfleet had already gone to bed.

Karen, her head still swirling and not quite sleepy, stayed up to watch television. A rerun of the news was on, and she noticed scenes from a gruesome murder near the same park where she had played earlier that day.

"They were asking if anybody had any information about the shooting to come forward," Karen said.

But the implications didn't hit her right away.

At the Payne home, friends were delivering food and condolences. Relatives had calmed Katina. Earlier she had thrown herself hysterically in the middle of La Salle Street. "If Junior is dead," she cried, "I want to be dead, too!"

Janice Payne had her head buried in her mother's lap, praying for her dead son.

Outside, Johnnie Mae Payne's daughter thought she saw the white car cruise by a few times. Was the shooting over? Out of fear and despair, they moved the family that night to a relative's home in Metairie.

They haven't stayed at the La Salle Street house since.

It was Monday, May 9, Dorothy Norfleet's 43rd birthday, and the television was blaring something about a 9-year-old boy who had been killed in a drive-by shooting the night before.

What a shame, she thought to herself as she saw the mother's grieving face.

Her ears perked up. She was hearing the name of a park she knew well: A.L. Davis Playground, the place where her children spent much of their time.

Once again, she thought, violence had snatched another boy from her Central City neighborhood, so close to her home, so close to her children.

But Dorothy Norfleet didn't have a clue just how close.

By day's end, she was dragged into the drama herself, trembling in disbelief, as her son, 19-year-old Joseph, confessed to her that he was the one who had fired into the crowd.

Joseph Norfleet had gone to work that day, as usual, cutting grass. But, his mother said, his conscience wore him down.

"He wanted to turn himself in," Dorothy Norfleet said. "His conscience was really getting to him. He told me, 'Mama, I didn't know I hit that little boy.'"

In Dorothy Norfleet's words, she "snapped." Fearing that police would brutalize her son, she begged him not to turn himself in. Questions shot through her mind: Would the police hurt him, kill him even?

She checked herself into the hospital, where she received a shot and pills for her nerves. Joseph stayed at her side all night.

She had yet to learn that her baby, Michael, also might be involved.

Tuesday, May 10, about 5 p.m., police pulled over James Walker, 32, the son of Dorothy Norfleet's fiancé, as he drove home from his father's house. They told him the license plate on his 1991 white Ford Escort had expired, but let him continue on his way. Perhaps they thought he would lead them to the Norfleet brothers. Perhaps they had simply failed to link the car to the crime.

In any event, pandemonium had struck the Norfleet household by the time Walker reached the C.J. Peete development, parked his car in the rear driveway and walked through to the front of the house. People were running in every direction.

"What's going on?" Walker asked.

Police had surrounded the area. When he walked outside, officers threw Walker face down on the ground and handcuffed him.

He led them to Joseph Norfleet, who was inside preparing to turn himself in.

"I can't live with myself," officers said Joseph Norfleet told them.

As officers led him away, a few neighbors applauded.

The next day, Wednesday, May 11, Michael Norfleet was fidgety in school. He bounced back and forth from his desk to his teacher's desk to ask if he could paint or play an indoor football game he and his classmates had devised for recreation time.

Finally, the teacher acquiesced, and the restless boy busied himself.

Near the end of the school day, while Michael was in his physical education class, a voice came over the loudspeaker calling him to the principal's office.

Knowing that her youngest son's arrest was imminent, Dorothy Norfleet was waiting to take him juvenile headquarters.

The National Law Journal

July 4, 1994

SECTION: Pg. A1

LENGTH: 1925 words

HEADLINE: Pettit & Martin A Year After The Massacre;
Left Eight Dead

BYLINE: BY MICHAEL CHECCHIO, SPECIAL TO THE NATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL.

DATELINE: SAN FRANCISCO

HIGHLIGHT:

Amid defections, the firm is healing as its lawyers fight for gun control.

BODY:

It was the bleakest day in the history of any San Francisco law firm. A year ago on July 1, a deranged gunman, with a long-simmering resentment against the attorneys he wrongly believed botched his case, entered the 48-story cylinder of darkened glass and granite known as the Silo at 101 California St. in the heart of this city's downtown Financial District.

The portly, well-dressed man was lugging a black canvas satchel containing two semiautomatic TEC-9 pistols, a 45-caliber handgun and hundreds of rounds of ammunition. The elevator whisked him to the 34th floor and the elegant suites of the office of Pettit & Martin, one of San Francisco's larger and more conservative law firms.

What happened next was the worst mass murder in San Francisco history. The gunman, Gian Luigi Ferri, reamed the hallways and offices, moving between the floors, shooting at anyone in his path, not distinguishing between professional and clerical staff. When it was finally over, he had killed eight persons and wounded six, and had taken his own life in a stairwell by placing the barrel of the .45 under his chin and blowing off part of his head. Three of the dead and a number of the wounded were employees of Pettit & Martin. A year has gone by, and lawyers have mourned and buried their dead. While much of life at Pettit & Martin has returned to normal, a pall of surreal memory remains. No one can forget the bullet holes and shattered glass, the bloodstained carpets and barricaded doors, the atrium lobby converted into a triage center for the dying and wounded, and the wailing of sirens and throbbing of helicopter rotors in the air above the high-rise.

Dr. Bobbi Lambert of San Raphael, Calif., who was called in to counsel Pettit & Martin's personnel after the massacre, noted that lawyers reacted to the shooting in different ways. Some buried themselves in the familiar routine of work; others found it difficult to focus on the day-to-day practice of law. But the shared trauma and pain had the effect of drawing everyone together -- "The bond was tremendous," she said.

At least for a time.

Since the massacre, Pettit & Martin has been hemorrhaging lawyers -- a massive departure of legal talent that has been described as everything from an

exodus to a "brain drain"; 10 partners have left the firm (though two have joined it, according to a firm spokeswoman).

Was the exodus an aftershock of that grisly day last July? It seems there is no simple answer to that question, just as no simple tally can calculate the effects on the firm's individual lawyers.

Many say the exodus was an inevitable product of long-standing troubles involving profits and management that had plagued the firm. Others, though, see a link, albeit oblique.

Said Dr. Lambert: "When you go through an experience like this, the only way to make some sense of it is to really look at your own life. Where do you want to be? Is this how you want to spend your life? I wouldn't say people left because of what happened, but people did a lot of introspection and were very reflective, and stepped back and looked at their lives. The shooting provided more of an opening to make changes than might have been there before."

James Lowy, Pettit's partner-in-charge, disagreed that the massacre led anyone to leave. "If anything," Mr. Lowy said, "the fact that people went through this tragedy made it more difficult to leave." And by many accounts, the shooting did become a rallying point for solidarity within the office.

Headhunter Martha Africa agreed. "By and large, people at Pettit & Martin like each other," said Ms. Africa, of San Francisco's Major, Wilson & Africa. Ms. Africa was on the phone with a Pettit employee when the shooting started and was one of the first to dial 911. "The bonds between these people helped them get through what would have been an even tougher time," she said. [NLJ, 7-13-93.] "Life Is Uncontrollable"

C. Lewis Ross, 43, a former contract attorney at Pettit who was wounded in the arm, said he would have taken his present job as a mediation lawyer with the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco in any event. But the shooting, he said, helped "accelerate my desire to live life now and not postpone things. It had a profound spiritual effect on me, and it gave me some realization of my own mortality and how life is uncontrollable in many ways."

It also made him realize lawyers should reflect more on how they affect people.

The gunman was clearly delusional, said Mr. Ross, but the fact is that he had picked up on today's popular dissatisfaction with lawyers. Found on Mr. Ferri's body was a four-page, typewritten letter filled with misspellings and grammatical errors assailing lawyers as "rapists" and "racketeers," along with a list of 30 targets of his wrath, including the names of Pettit attorneys. The firm had represented Mr. Ferri in a 1982 effort to right a soured real estate deal involving an Indiana trailer park, helping him retain local counsel in that state. His perception of the mishandling of his case apparently gnawed at him for 10 years, until his rage finally erupted without any warning in last year's shootout.

"This shooting brought home to me," Mr. Ross said, "how deeply lawyers occupy the minds and imaginations of clients and citizens. The mere fact of [Mr. Ferri's]

fascination and the nature of his ruminations on lawyers should cause lawyers to stop and think about how they treat each other and their clients."

Of the eight people Mr. Ferri murdered before taking his own life, three were from Pettit & Martin: labor specialist Allen J. Berk, 52, of Berkeley, one of Pettit's biggest rainmakers and most distinguished partners; David Sutcliffe, 30, a Pettit summer intern from the University of Colorado School of Law in Boulder; and Pettit associate John Scully, 28, who died while shielding his wife, Michelle Scully, 27, who was seriously wounded and who worked as an associate at San Francisco's Bertrand, Fox, Elliot & Cohn. Among the Pettit wounded were Brian F. Berger, 39, a litigation specialist who still has not recovered fully from his injuries and who has turned down all requests for interviews.

Also slain on the Pettit premises were Jack Berman, 35, a partner and rising star at one of San Francisco's biggest firms, Bronson, Bronson & Mckinnon; and Mr. Berman's client, Jody Jones Sposato, 30, who was at Pettit & Martin's offices for a deposition.

Also wounded was Sharon Jones O'Roke, an associate general counsel for Electronic Data Systems of Plano, Texas; and Deanna Eaves, 33, a court reporter.

Defections Were Expected

Many members of the legal community say that they are not surprised at the number of Pettit defections in the past year and that the exodus is unrelated to the massacre. The shootout came in the midst of a downturn in the firm's fortunes. Initial news reports of the slayings depicted Pettit & Martin in the light of martyrdom. But subsequent coverage, particularly by the San Francisco legal press, dwelled on the firm's ongoing financial problems and the departure of many longtime partners.

"Other firms suffered equally disappointing problems [in the recession] but were not featured as prominently or publicly," said Pettit partner Charles G. Ehrlich, a director of Legal Community Against Violence, an antigun organization formed in the wake of the high-rise tragedy.

Those who have left Pettit & Martin since the shooting include: tax partner Brett R. Dick, to San Francisco's Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe; corporate rainmaker Richard E. Climan and real estate partner Paul G. Churchill, to San Francisco's Cooley Godward Castro Huddleson & Tatum; corporate partner David Lipkin, to the Seattle insurance holding company Talegen, as in-house counsel; San Jose real estate partner James R. Janz, to the American Restaurant Group as chief in-house real estate counsel; and the core of Pettit's construction practice -- John B. Clarke, John R. Heisse II, Robert B. Thum and Stephen J. Fowler -- to San Francisco's Thelen, Marrin, Johnson & Bridges. Partner Michael Cooper returned to his former firm, Oakland's Wendel, Rosen, Black, Dean & Levitan.

Of those former partners interviewed, some of whom asked to remain anonymous, all praised Pettit & Martin's efforts to help employees cope with the tragedy and said their decisions to leave were based on the fortunes of the marketplace, not the massacre.

"If you're going to practice law, there is danger across the board," said Mr. Heisse. "I don't feel any more secure in this [new] office than I did a year ago [at Pettit]. It was a truly random act."
"Coping Very Well"

In essence, these lawyers say, a brief hiatus followed the shooting; then the outflow of lawyer talent resumed.

In three years, Pettit has dropped from 210 to 150 lawyers spread out in five offices in San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, Newport Beach and Washington, D.C. According to a January survey by the San Francisco legal newspaper the Recorder, Pettit grossed \$ 50.4 million in 1993, down 6.7 percent from the previous year, with a 6 percent drop in net profits. Reasons for the downturn cited by sources familiar with the firm's inner workings range from short-sighted management and failure to keep rainmakers and clients happy, to the slump in the commercial real estate market and the fact that Pettit never has really been a part of the Silicon Valley high-tech phenomenon, the engine that runs so much of the Bay Area's legal practice.

Pettit's partner-in-charge Mr. Lowy said the firm is recovering emotionally from the shootings and financially from the downturns of the recession.

"As an Institution, the firm is coping very well," Mr. Lowy said. "This year we are ahead of budget with respect to our profits. And we will be significantly more profitable than last year. I think we are continuing to be more attractive to people who are contemplating changing firms. We see real estate coming back -- our real estate lawyers are very busy." And he noted that the firm recently hired a construction litigator from Graham & James.

Mr. Heisse, who said his departure was simply a business decision, said that if anything, the tragedy at 101 California St. brought people together and that management "went beyond the call of duty" in helping people to cope. In addition to having trauma counselors on the scene immediately after the shooting -- and arranging to have the psychologist, Dr. Lambert, return on the anniversary -- Pettit increased office security.

The increased, security, however, couldn't protect the survivors from reliving an experience that Dr. Lambert said is likely to shape their perceptions of life permanently.

Most attorneys really feel comfortable" in the realm of the intellectual and rational, Dr. Lambert noted. "That's where they feel powerful and strong and in control. When something like this happens, it is so profoundly emotional, that the mind often cannot figure it out or make sense of it. [The attorneys] were thrown into a realm where they didn't feel in control. It opened a lot of eyes, and it broadened their reach. Such a profoundly human and very sobering experience shows us that we're all the same at some level as different as we may look or appear. There's a real commonality to us all. I think a lot of the lawyers began looking at people -- at co-workers, other lawyers, clients, themselves -- differently and with more sensitivity."

As of
8-15-94
6pm

**Protecting the American People vs. Protecting the Special Interests:
A Clear Choice**

The Clinton Administration is fighting on many fronts for the security and well-being of the American people. Yet the super-lobbies and special interests, along with some Republicans who have put politics ahead of progress, are fighting against the crime bill and fighting against health care reform. They have put their own interests ahead of the American people and are working to deny Americans safety and security in their neighborhoods and health security for their families. We will not allow Congress to take the easy way out. Balking on the security and protection of the American people simply is not an option.

Fighting to Protect the American People. The Clinton administration will continue to fight for the protection and security of American families. We are fighting so parents will know their children are safe from guns and violence, and families will know they are protected from fear of being one job loss or one illness away from losing their insurance. The legislation now before Congress will help do these things. That's why the American people overwhelmingly support both the Crime Bill and health care reform that strengthens health insurance and gives families the security of health care that will be there when they need it.

Making History for American Security. We have a chance to make history. For six long years, Americans have waited for Washington to help make their neighborhoods safe again. The Crime Bill now before Congress will do that -- putting 100,000 new cops on the beat, making "three strikes and you're out" law; and banning deadly assault weapons. And for 60 years, Americans have waited for real health care protection that would provide choice and quality, while ensuring that coverage will be there when they need it. The health care legislation before Congress will do that -- closing profitable loopholes, strengthening health insurance and providing every American choice of doctors, quality care and a rock solid guarantee that insurance coverage will be there when they need it. And if six years is too long to wait for a crime bill, 60 years is certainly long enough to wait for health care reform.

Some Want to Protect the Special Interests. But look at what's going on in Washington these days: The NRA, one of the nation's most powerful and wealthy special interest groups, has joined the Republican leadership, in an attempt to block the toughest federal attack on crime in history through petty procedural trickery. If Congress allows itself to be manipulated into protecting the special interests, they will fail to protect the safety and security of American families.

Sound Familiar? It Should. The "super-lobbies" like the Health Insurance Industry and NFIB have joined partisan Republicans in an attempt to block the best opportunity in our nation's history to guarantee every American affordable health care. If Congress allows itself to be manipulated into protecting the special interests, they will fail to protect the health security of American families. In short, they will have put their own interests ahead of the greater interests of the American people.

Keep up the Pressure on Congress. We will not allow Congress to take the easy way out. We will keep up the pressure until they make the right choice on crime and the right choice on health care. Enacted together, these measures will go a long way towards providing security for families across America. We will keep up the fight against powerful special interests in order to make sure Congress stands up for the protection and security of ordinary Americans.

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 16, 1994

Attached are recent editorials on the crime bill from the following newspapers from around the country:

The Washington Post
The Philadelphia Inquirer
The Orlando Sentinel
The Dayton Daily News
The Buffalo News
Newsday
The Boston Globe
Waco Tribune-Herald
Minneapolis Star Tribune
Quad City Times

-30-30-30-

'Social Pork' and a Kid's Death

THIRTEEN-YEAR-OLD Anthony Stokes probably wasn't on the mind of anyone on Capitol Hill when the crime bill went down in defeat last Thursday. He certainly wasn't in the thoughts of the National Rifle Association, which was busy keeping assault weapons on the nation's streets. Or House Republicans who were having a field day trashing the bill, especially the crime-prevention programs. But Anthony Stokes ought to be remembered in Congress if President Clinton is successful in getting the bill back to the House floor. Because two nights after the crime bill failed, Anthony—for whom some of the bill's anti-crime features were intended—went down in Washington too. He was fatally wounded on a Northwest street from a gunshot fired in anger by another youth about his own age.

When opponents like House Republican Whip Newt Gingrich speak derisively of crime-prevention programs as "social pork," they should think about what so many families and young people trapped in our cities are up against. President Clinton, in his Sunday church service remarks, spoke of the gulf between youths like Anthony and those members of Congress who sneer at programs aimed at helping communities produce summer and after-school activities intended to steer youths away from crime.

"There are people who represent places where all the children can go to the ballpark, where they've got a place to go swimming in the summertime . . . and they literally cannot imagine what it is like for some of our children," he said. "And so they say, oh, these programs to let these kids play basketball at midnight instead of walk the streets are pork." The president's got it exactly right.

Teenagers are being murdered in America at a brutal rate. It's hard to find a more compelling task than to keep more from becoming a part of that nightmare. In Anthony's case, his youth club football and basketball coaches had gone beyond the call of their jobs to keep him away from trouble. Trophies adorning the mantle in Anthony's house symbolized their success. His 74-year-old grandmother tried, too, by stepping in for his incarcerated mother and a father on work release. But despite their best attempts to fill the parental void, they were in competition—losing, as it turns out—with the lure and danger of the streets.

The defeated crime bill would have given the country more life prison terms, jails and death sentences. If resurrected, it should also continue to give support to institutions, groups and individuals in American communities who struggle daily to save the Anthony Stokes of this world.

WASHINGTON POST

9/9/19 (Item 1 from file: 633)
DIALOG(R)File 633:Phil.Inquirer
(c) 1994 Philadelphia Newspapers Inc. All rts. reserv.

07727105

CONGRESSIONAL COWARDS ON CRIME: A CAVE-IN TO THOSE SPECIAL INTERESTS WHO
FORGET THAT THIS IS AMERICA'S TOP CONCERN

Philadelphia Inquirer (PI) - SUNDAY August 14, 1994

Edition: FINAL Section: EDITORIAL Page: E04

Word Count: 400

TEXT:

Here's what American voters should remember about last week's attempt to prematurely kill a 1994 crime bill on the floor of Congress: The smiles on the faces of many of the 167 Republicans who think they won a great "victory" over a Democratic president.

It's true that the National Rifle Association - which seems to have more clout among members of Congress than the voters who put them there - also scared the stuffing out of many of the 58 Democrats who joined in shooting down the \$33 billion anti-crime legislation that included a ban on some assault weapons.

But what made the GOP so exposed in its victory is a letter from Republican National Committee counsel David Norcross to the 38 Republicans who had originally voted for an assault-weapon ban. The letter subtly threatened them with party reprisals if they dared support a rule to allow a vote on the crime bill. Most didn't dare.

Now that is about as close to a prima facie case of collusion between the GOP and NRA interests as any prosecutor could hope for. But collusion with special interests is not a criminal offense in Congress.

It ought to be a political sin, punishable at the polls in November.

In America, one murder is committed every 22 minutes, one rape every five minutes, a robbery every 47 seconds, an assault every 28 seconds. States and municipalities are losing the war against those crimes, and they need much more federal help.

How, then, can Republicans play politics with those against gun control when a majority of Americans are for it? How can they complain when Congress finally puts a significant amount of funds (\$9 billion) into prevention programs, like drug treatment, job training, recreation and education?

Any police officer will tell them that the skyrocketing rate of crimes among juveniles who too often become career criminals can't be stopped by \$20 billion worth of prisons and cops alone. It must be prevented in families and communities first.

Speaking to the 200,000-member National Association of Police Organizations on Friday, President Clinton said that members of Congress voted with special interests like the NRA because they thought its money

"will keep them in Congress forever." He added:

"It is time for you to say that the only way for members of Congress to keep their seats is to make the rest of America safer."

Amen.

Copyright Philadelphia Newspapers Inc. 1994

DESCRIPTORS: US; CONGRESS; CRIME; LEGISLATION; EDITORIAL

LEVEL 1 - 23 OF 44 STORIES

Copyright 1994 Sentinel Communications Co.
THE ORLANDO SENTINEL

August 13, 1994 Saturday, 3 STAR

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. A16

LENGTH: 460 words

HEADLINE: CRIME PACKAGE CAN'T WAIT;
PASSING THE ANTI-CRIME LEGISLATION SHOULD NOT BE A PARTISAN MATTER. IT IS
CRITICAL TO TACKLING CRIME IN A COMPREHENSIVE WAY.

BODY:

It's unsettling to see so many members of Congress trapped in the anti-crime rhetoric of an election year to the point of inaction on the very measure that could help America's cities to fight crime more effectively.

By a 225-210 vote Thursday, the U.S. House of Representatives blocked a compromise anti-crime measure that had been worked on for months by both houses of Congress. Much of the debate, led by Central Florida's Rep. Bill McCollum, centered on Republicans' concerns that too much money in the \$34-billion anti-crime legislation would be spent on "worthless social engineering" programs.

That legislation is far from perfect. Nevertheless, most of the \$8.9 billion aimed at prevention programs in the measure is not worthless. Indeed, they are critical to tackling crime in a comprehensive manner - at both the prevention and the punishment ends.

Among other provisions, the legislation would put an additional 100,000 police officers on the streets of a nation that has become obsessed with crime.

A big sticking point in the House is the proposed ban on the future sale of certain assault-style weapons. Both chambers of Congress approved the ban, supported in the polls by two-thirds of Americans.

Yet public support for the ban didn't stop the National Rifle Association from scaring some conservative Democrats representing Southern or Western states into voting against the overall anti-crime bill.

Republicans, meanwhile, purportedly were told that they would lose campaign contributions from the national party if they voted for a measure that might make the president look good.

President Clinton was on target when, in a speech to police officers Friday in Minneapolis, he blamed the measure's defeat on "organized, intense and highly political pressure."

Passing the anti-crime legislation should not be a partisan matter. It's not a matter of making one side or another look "good." There are enough programs in the measure that should satisfy all sides.

The legislation includes \$10.7 billion to help states imprison criminals and build juvenile boot camps, and another \$8.8 billion would be spent to help

Orlando Sentinel Tribune, August 13, 1994

cities hire 100,000 more police officers.

Not all of those programs are supportable on their merits. Some, such as life terms for three-time felons, seem to be expensive, knee-jerk political posturing.

Nevertheless, the anti-crime measure emerged as a compromise designed to be comprehensive - both by being tough on criminals and by having programs to prevent crime, especially among youth.

Only eight members of the House would have to change their minds to pass that worthwhile legislation. It shouldn't take another year to get that done. It may take only until Election Day.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE-MDC: August 13, 1994

ACCESS # DDNW42230133
HEADLINE PENDING FEDERAL CRIME BILL IMPORTANT TO DAYTON . . .
LENGTH ESTIMATED INFORMATION UNITS: 2.3 Words: 293
DATE 08/11/94
SOURCE DAYTON DAILY NEWS (DDNW)

Edition: CITY

* Section: EDITORIAL

Page: 14A

(Copyright 1994)

* The pending federal crime bill has enough in it to please and offend just about anybody who has any opinions about government policy.

* It has more money for police, as well as \$8 billion designed to confront the root causes of crime. It has tougher rules on repeat offenders, as well as tougher gun laws.

There's a package deal here, and you either accept it or you don't.

For urban Ohioans, the bill has more good than bad.

Dayton's police have high hopes that the bill will pass, for two reasons at least: the ban on assault weapons could make life a little easier (and safer) for police. And the package has money for hiring new police. Mayor Mike Turner has taken steps to assure that the city has money set aside with which to apply for the matching-fund grant.

Republican detractors in Washington say the bill will not provide nearly as many police as the 100,000 that President Clinton is talking about. But the 60,000 the lawmakers are talking about would still be roughly a 10-percent increase in the national total.

The money can help Dayton increase the number of community-based police officers without taking police from other duties. Chief James Newby says doing the latter would be difficult, now that he has already put community-based officers in about 20 neighborhoods.

The community-based police idea is central to any enhanced effort Dayton might make to combat crime. It is a natural fit with Dayton's traditions of neighborhood activism and neighborhood identity. The general idea is receiving good reviews in the neighborhoods where it has been tried. It connects people to the police and helps everybody. It can work.

But the city is financially strapped and needs all the help it can get.

DIALOG(R)File 733:The Buffalo News
(c) 1994 Buffalo News. All rts. reserv.

07725146

DON'T GIVE UP ON CRIME BILL WORK OUT KINKS, KEEP ASSAULT-WEAPONS BAN

Buffalo News (BN) - SATURDAY, August 13, 1994

Edition: FINAL Section: EDITORIAL PAGE Page: C2

Word Count: 375

MEMO:

TYPE: EDITORIALS

TEXT:

DEFEAT OF THE procedural motion that would have brought the big anti-crime bill to the House floor was an obvious political setback for the White House and Democratic leadership.

More important, it was a setback for the public and the fight against what much of the public considers the most troublesome domestic problem -- crime in the streets.

In their opposition, foes concentrated criticism on the proposed ban of 19 military-type assault weapons, along with ammunition clips of more than 10 rounds, and the authorized spending for what was scathingly branded as Great Society social welfare items.

Heaven knows, this \$33 billion anti-crime measure was not perfect. But these two disputed provisions were not among its principal weaknesses. On the contrary. An anti-crime measure without this ban on the sale and manufacture of military-style weapons, or something even tougher, would be unworthy of the name. These are the weapons of drive-by shootings and the urban drug wars. Their purposes are not hunting or taking target practice. Their purpose is to kill as many people as possible as fast as possible. Small wonder that America's police back the very pertinent prohibition.

As for the so-called "social welfare" spending decried by Rep. Bill Paxon, R-Amherst, and other Republican critics, it makes sense to invest some resources in programs to prevent crime before it happens rather than simply to punish it afterward.

Nor does a bill that broadens capital punishment, finances thousands of new cops, assists in paying for state and local prisons and provides money for local police departments like the adequately staffed one here in Buffalo to buy modern equipment strike us as wasteful "social welfare."

In the aftermath of this regrettable defeat, let Congress sharpen its wits and reshape a compromise that retains the essentials, including the ban on assault weapons and ammunition clips. After all, the revised measure, however imperfect, must be worth passing on its merits.

But if the Democrats, who control the White House and majorities in both houses of Congress, cannot adopt a worthwhile bill to attack more effectively the problem most worrisome to millions of Americans -- well, that re-raises the troublesome question of whether the Democrats can, in

fact, govern.

Copyright (c) 1994, The Buffalo News

9/9/23 (Item 2 from file: 638)
DIALOG(R)File 638:Newsday/New York Newsday
(c) 1994 Newsday Inc. All rts. reserv.

07725062

Don't Give Up The NRA managed to block the federal crime bill, but supporters should try again.

Newsday (ND) - Saturday August 13, 1994

Edition: NASSAU AND CITY Section: VIEWPOINTS Page: A18

Word Count: 346

MEMO:

MEMO: PD:

TEXT:

Just when it seemed Congress had wiggled free of the National Rifle Association's paralyzing grip, that champion of deadly assault weapons joined with Republicans flexing partisan muscles to strangle the federal crime bill. The American people deserve better.

The \$30-billion bill was flawed - any massive legislation cobbled together by committee will be an amalgam of good and bad. But it contained much of real value in the battle against crime. After a moment to catch their breath, the bill's supporters - chief among them Rep. Charles Schumer (D-Brooklyn) - will seek ways to salvage provisions for cops, prisons, crime prevention and the assault-weapons ban. Good. Now partisan obstructionists from New York should get on board.

It seemed a done deal a just few weeks ago. Republicans who'd withheld support because of a provision allowing death-row inmates to use statistical data to challenge their sentences as discriminatory got their way. Others who said the bill wasn't tough enough succeeded in shifting money from prevention to prisons. And opponents of gun control won a Brady Law loophole for pawnbrokers that would have exempted them from the requirement for a waiting period and background checks when returning pawned firearms.

Ultimately all the concessions went for naught. Democratic dissidents and Republicans - including David Levy (R-Baldwin), Rick Lazio (R-Brightwaters) and Peter King (R-Seaford) - used a procedural dodge to keep the bill from making it to the House floor.

The obstructionist votes - particularly those of Lazio and Levy, who supported both the assault weapons ban and the House version of the crime bill before defecting - put partisanship above the interests of New York.

The crime bill would have driven more than \$1 billion to the state. New York City alone would have picked up \$886 million; money to defray the cost of imprisoning illegal aliens who are felons would have been specially welcome. And nowhere is the carnage done by military-style assault weapons more obvious than New York. Republicans claim to be tough on crime. They should put their votes where their mouths are.

DESCRIPTORS: EDITORIAL; CONGRESS; CRIME; PROPOSED; LAW

Blute's courage, 'orki dsen's cave-in on crime

THOMAS OLIPHANT

WASHINGTON

It was no accident early Friday morning that the first call from Capitol Hill to Leon Panetta, the White House chief of staff, came not from his own party's embattled congressional leadership but from the temporarily victorious House Republican leader-to-be, Newt Gingrich.

Gingrich did not call to gloat, he called to deal, seeking to entice President Clinton into negotiations on a revamped crime bill to replace the one whose consideration Gingrich had helped block the day before.

Panetta, bless his heart, wasn't buying, recognizing that Gingrich's offer was much less magnanimous bipartisanship than fear of public anger at the gridlock maneuver Gingrich had pulled in unholy alliance with the National Rifle Association.

By not taking him up on his offer, Panetta has bought time for his boss to see if he can tap into some of that anger and change a few votes in a second try next week: he lost the first round by 15, meaning he needs to change eight minds. By Friday morning he knew he had two House members who had switched against him only after the vote's outcome was already determined; for the next six, Clinton has a decent-sized pond to fish in - 61 Republicans who voted for the House version of the legislation in April.

along with 10 Black Caucus Democrats and 48 NRA-influenced Democrats from primarily rural communities. To turn his defeat around, in other words, the president is looking for six votes.

This was a defeat on an issue around which a majority of Congress had already formed to vote yes. Whatever else can be said about the crime legislation still before Congress - and, like all legislation, it has good and bad points - there is no doubt that if the issue before the House on Thursday had been merely the crime bill, two out of three members would have voted for it.

But it wasn't, instead, it was a procedural vote on a bill that would have given interest groups seeking to undo majorities. In this case, the effort to keep 19 kinds of assault weapons in murderous circulation combined with partisanship to create a majority willing to block a piece of legislation that would have been approved on the merits.

It is for gimmicks like this that people despise what goes on here. It is gimmicks like this that make people disgusted that gridlock can still keep the political institutions here from acting. Fortunately the exceptions give us hope - in this case the Republicans who stood up to gun lobby and party pressure to vote their consciences and for their constituents last week. You can agree or disagree with their position on the issue, but these 11 Republicans are by definition Independent people with true grit and

guts under intense pressure.

Exhibit A is Peter Blute and environs, who supported the crime bill in April. In addition to Gingrich, Blute was warned by his party's big shots that an Independent vote would cut him off from campaign funds and might even get him a primary of the Far Right if he survives in

Blute, however, thought it more important that his district get its share of the \$200 million that can still come into Massachusetts for additional cops, the \$70 million for new prisons and boot camps, the \$12 million to counter crimes of violence against women.

Blute's courage stands in dramatic contrast to the smarmy move of his GOP colleague, Peter Torkildsen, who also voted for the crime bill in April. Because Torkildsen succumbed to the pressure, Lawrence will have at least 10 fewer cops than it otherwise would have; there will be 12 fewer cops in Lynn, at least eight fewer in Peabody.

If Thursday's vote had been up perhaps we can all bubble about President Clinton's political problems; in the meantime the question should be whether the stand-up guys like Peter Blute or shadow-kickers like Torkildsen speak for the Republicans of Massachusetts on crime. A great deal is at stake.

Thomas Oliphant is a Gloucester columnist.

The crime on Capitol Hill

Too many members of the House acted like sneak thieves Thursday, skulking away from a \$23 billion crime-fighting bill that on balance offered real relief to local law enforcement agencies and crime-weary Americans.

Many of the 225 representatives who blocked the bill from coming to the floor for a vote did so out of poltroon-like partisanship. Republican Rep. Peter Torkildsen of Danvers, the only member of the Massachusetts House delegation to vote to postpone action, tried to have it both ways, hiding behind the process. "This was a vote on the rules, not a vote on the crime bill," he argued. But Torkildsen's Republican colleague, Rep. Peter Blute of Worcester, has not been afraid to stare down the business end of either the National Rifle Association or Republican fund-raising committees.

Although flawed by the addition of a series of federal crimes punishable by death and lacking protections from racial injustice, the crime bill addresses both the surface and deep-rooted aspects of the crime problem. Included are 100,000 new police officers, a ban on 19 types of assault weap-

ons and expanded funds for prisons and prevention programs - \$284 million for Massachusetts.

Hard-core opponents continue to vilify the prevention funds as "pork." They are either unaware of or are callously ignoring the positive effects of community policing in urban areas like Boston, where crime has decreased while nontraditional police activities, like cops reaching out to youth gangs, have increased.

Opponents who gleefully knocked President Clinton off balance on crime and jeopardized his health care reform bill need to rethink their obstructionist tactics. Supporters may yet have an ace to play by carving out the assault weapons ban - which was adopted separately by the House in an earlier vote - and shipping it to the Senate. There can be no compromise, however, on the new officers or the funding for prevention programs.

The president must take to the streets and inspire Americans to insist on a workable crime bill. And the members of the House should remain locked up in session until they see the efforts of their ways.

WACO TRIBUNE-HERALD

EDITORIALS

Held at gunpoint

Crime package was derailed by single-issue power brokers

There is ample blame to go around in the parliamentary fiasco that has shelved an omnibus crime bill President Clinton thought was headed for his desk.

The House Democratic leadership thought it had the votes to get the bill on the floor for debate. It was way off.

Additionally, bill architects were asking congressmen to make a leap of faith that \$30 billion in savings can be found from Vice President Al Gore's "Re-inventing Government" effort to trim the federal bureaucracy. Though Gore's efforts are indeed paying off with a reduced payroll, the savings have not been nearly as dramatic as hoped. At this point \$30 billion sounds like ye olde pipe dream.

So for those who opposed the crime bill on the basis of fiscal smoke and mirrors — they have a point. And yet it is clear that this bill would have passed the House were it not for two issues and two voting blocs — congressmen in the hip pocket of the National Rifle Association and those in the Congressional Black Caucus.

The NRA, cooing with loose change for vote-buying, went on a lobbying spree fully appreciated only by those who have just days to live. Its target: the ban on 19 military-style assault weapons.

When the NRA talks, congressmen listen. Did we hear critics saying Congressman Chet Edwards caved in to powerful lobbyists in voting for the assault weapons ban? Listen, folks. There may be no lobbying force in Washington more powerful than the NRA. Since he's generally opposed gun control, Edwards' stance took guts.

Even with the tremendous pull of the NRA, the crime bill still would have made it onto the floor of the House were it not for hold-outs among the Congressional Black Caucus who were protesting the deletion of the so-called Racial Justice Act. It

would have allowed condemned killers to plead that racial discrimination was at play based on statistics. What it could have meant in effect would be racial quotas in sentencing.

Congressional leaders seeking to revive the bill should not budge on either the assault weapons ban or death-row racial quotas. They could, possibly, improve the bill's chances by scaling back its figures and guaranteeing that the crime bill will not drive up the federal deficit.

There are crucial provisions included in this bill, like new federal prisons and help for urban police forces. Waco is a safer place because federal aid has helped beef up its police force. That's the bottom line: safer streets and legislation that's in the public interest, not at the beck and call of special interests.

Mr. Early Out

Met the new poster boy for white-collar crime in Texas, former chief of the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles James Granberry.

Granberry voted for the early release of the man who became the symbol of all that's wrong with our justice system, two-time convicted murderer Kenneth McDuff. But that's not all. After leaving the board, Granberry sold his services in getting others out early. When asked about this in a 1992 civil case against the parole system, Granberry lied that he had done it at one time but had stopped.

He was convicted of perjury and many expected him to spend some time behind bars himself. That won't happen. This week he was sentenced to six months at a community halfway house — which he can leave from 8 a.m. to 5 a.m. and from which he can hold a job — and five years' probation.

Maybe Granberry's sentence fits the crime of perjury for a first-timer. But this is no garden-variety perjurer. This is a big shot who abused our trust.

Compliments of
McLennan County Democratic Party
P. O. Box 239
Waco, Texas 76703
817/755210

Crime bill

Healthy howling over obstructionism

President Clinton came to town on Friday to lament a disaster. No other word quite describes the U.S. House's procedural defeat of the president's crime bill. In speaking to the nation's police officers in Minneapolis, Clinton itemized the disaster's worst casualties: safer streets for kids, tougher punishment for crooks, programs to steer kids from sin. Unless the president prevails in reviving the bill, there will be other casualties as well: bipartisan cooperation, civility, integrity, fair play — not to mention representative government.

That's not to say this crime bill was wonderful. It was anything but. It would have poured billions into new prisons and longer sentences, energizing yet another wave in America's fruitless incarceration binge. It would have expanded the death penalty, compounding its cruelty and unfairness.

It also suffered from the smorgasbord syndrome, offering something tasty to every political palate. Clinton thought that would broaden the bill's appeal, but abundance may have been its fatal flaw. When the measure hit the House floor for a procedural vote last Thursday, most lawmakers found something in it they couldn't stomach.

Or so they said. But as Clinton has noted, many lawmakers who scorned the crime bill this week had no trouble embracing it in earlier, more vigorous incarnations. This time Republican leaders went out of their way to mock the bill as being full of "pork," a euphemism for the social programs that hold

the most hope for curbing crime. Such last-minute moaning made objections to this bill seem less heartfelt than manufactured. It also made the bill's failure look suspiciously like political sabotage.

Take the complaint about the bill's modest assault-weapons provision, for instance. That measure would have banned just 19 rapid-fire guns and happened to enjoy overwhelming public support. But those facts mattered little to the National Rifle Association, which insisted the ban would cramp the style of peace-loving sportsfolk. A little NRA bullying was enough to coax even many Democrats into snubbing the crime bill. But for those flirting with independence, the Republican leadership had an offer hard to refuse: If they voted to bring the bill to the House floor, the leaders warned, they'd lose party financial backing in their campaigns. The threat reportedly helped nudge a wavering handful quickly into line.

It's mystifying that so many House members would scorn the crime bill so late in the game. Though Clinton's measure may have been hard for some bystanders to swallow, it clearly heeded the will of the masses. But this vote wasn't about democracy. It was about obstructionism. As the president told the cops on Friday, it was about a minority more dedicated to subversion than to progress. If that pattern persists on other issues, the consequences for Americans — for their safety, for their health, for their financial security and happiness — could be ominous.

OPINION

EDITORIAL

1.9 million reasons crime bill must pass

At one point this summer, the crime bill looked like a done deal.

But the legislation hit a snag this week when the National Rifle Association, which failed to strip from the bill an assault-weapons ban, persuaded some House lawmakers to block a procedural vote that would pre-empt final action on the bill.

Although the bill is flawed — notably by a “three-strikes” provision that all but eliminates judicial discretion in cases involving three-time felons — it certainly merits approval when it comes up for a vote that is expected today or Friday.

Six years in the making, the bill represents Congress’ first comprehensive, strategic

It’s not perfect, but the measure before Congress represents the best defense against violent crime

approach to fighting crime. Among other things, the bill would ban 19 specific assault weapons; put 100,000 new police officers on the streets; authorize the death penalty for dozens of additional federal crimes; allow juveniles 13 and older to be tried as adults for certain violent crimes; expand prisons and boot camps throughout the United States; and create a new drug-court program for early rehabilitation of first-time, non-violent drug offenders.

It also would provide \$475 million to Iowa and Illinois:

■ **Iowa:** The state would

gain 1,300 police officers, \$20 million in prison funding, \$19 million for programs to combat violence against women, \$7.5 million for new crime-prevention initiatives and \$26.5 million in law enforcement grants. Rep. Jim Leach, R-Davenport, has yet to announce a position on the crime bill, although he did support a key provision, the assault-weapons ban.

■ **Illinois:** The state would gain 4,100 police officers, \$175 million in prison funding, \$58 million for to fight violence against women, \$39 million for crime-prevention programs and \$94 million in grants. Rep.

Lane Evans, D-Rock Island, supports the bill.

Because of the crime bill’s comprehensive nature, most congressmen can readily point to at least one element of the crime bill they oppose. At rather than look for one or two reasons to oppose this landmark piece of legislation, House members should reflect on the 1.9 million violent crimes committed in the United States last year.

They represent 24,500 murders. And more than 104,000 forcible rapes. And 659,000 robberies. And 1.1 million aggravated assaults.

And, ultimately, they represent 1.9 million reasons to vote in favor of the omnibus crime bill.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 14, 1994

CRIME BILL FIGHT EVENT

DATE: Monday, August 15, 1994

LOCATION: Rose Garden

TIME: 1:30 - 2:15 pm

FROM: Liz Bernstein

I. PURPOSE

This event is to keep up the drumbeat of public pressure since last Thursday's vote on the Crime Bill rule. All the elements of the bill that we are fighting for will be represented by individuals on the program.

II. BACKGROUND

Steven Sposato

Steve Sposato's wife, Jody, was killed in the San Francisco law office shooting last July. A gunman entered the high-rise with two TEC-DC9 pistols and began randomly shooting at employees, apparently over a disagreement with the firm. Jody was one of eight innocent victims killed, six others were wounded. Steve has an 18-month-old daughter, Meghan.

Steve spoke very eloquently about his wife's death at the assault weapons ban rally we had in the Rose Garden on April 25. He has testified before Congress, done numerous media interviews, and personally lobbied individual Members.

You met with him and his family (daughter Meghan, Jody's parents) in the Oval Office briefly after the event.

Janice Payne (mother of James Darby)

James Darby, 9, was shot in the head as he walked home with his family from a Mother's Day picnic at a park in New Orleans. The bullet was fired from a shotgun pointed out the window of a car which pulled within a few feet of the crowd. James died instantly on the sidewalk about a block from his home.

Two brothers, aged 19 and 14, were arrested and booked in the killing, which police believed began as a fistfight during a football game at the park.

It was New Orleans' 162nd homicide of the year, but James was the youngest victim. Nine days before the shooting, James wrote this letter to you:

Dear Mr. Clinton,

I want you to stop the killing in the city. People is dead and I think that somebody might kill me. So would you please stop the people from deading. I'm asking you nicely to stop it. I know you can do it. Do it. I know you could.

Your friend,

James

Janice Payne, who witnessed her son's murder, wants to come to Washington so that James will not been forgotten. She believes that the publicity will continue to focus attention on the nation's crime problem and hopes it will help prevent the deaths of other children.

She is 29 years old, works as a nursing assistant and has a 7-year-old daughter named Marquita.

Marc Klaas

As you know, Marc is the father of Polly Klaas. You met with him in the Oval Office last December to discuss the Crime Bill, Three-Strikes legislation, and other efforts to protect children.

Polly Klaas, 12, was abducted at knife point October 1, 1993, from a slumber party at her home. Richard Allen Davis, a twice-convicted kidnapper, was arrested on November 30, and confessed to her kidnapping and murder. Davis was released on parole in June, 1993 after serving half of a 16-year sentence for a 1985 kidnapping.

III. PARTICIPANTS

On the Program

Dewey Stokes, President, Fraternal Order of Police
Steven Sposato (wife killed in San Francisco law office)
Janice Payne (mother of James Darby)
Marc Klaas
The President

Audience

Police Officers (note: the officers behind you on the podium are the same ones who were there when we first announced the Crime Bill in the Rose Garden last summer)

Relatives and friends of individuals on the program.

IV. PRESS

Open press.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- * You will be briefed in the Oval Office at 1:15.
- * In between the briefing and the event you will meet for a few minutes with the individuals on the program.
- * You and the participants will walk out to the Rose Garden together.
- * Dewey Stokes will give opening remarks. He will introduce Steve Sposato.
- * Mr. Sposato will introduce Janice Payne.
- * Ms. Payne will introduce Marc Klaas.
- * Mr. Klaas will introduce you.

VI. REMARKS

Remarks to be provided by the speechwriting department.