THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 19, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRIS JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JACK REED
RHODE ISLAND

COMMITTEES:
BANKING
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
AGING

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3903

PLEASE RESPOND TO:
WASHINGTON:
☐ WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3903
(202) 224-4642
RHODE ISLAND:
☐ 201 HILLSIDE ROAD
SUITE 200
GARDEN CITY
CRANSTON, RI 02920-5602
(401) 943-3100
☐ FEDERAL BUILDING
ROOM 418
PROVIDENCE RI 02903-1773
(401) 528-5200
TDD RELAY RHODE ISLAND
1-(800) 745-5555

December 9, 1997

DEC 11 P4:18

The Honorable William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, 20500-0005

Dear Mr. President:

I write regarding the new definition of disability for children under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program.

In recent months, I have heard from many of my constituents who are concerned about the apparent disparity in the application of this new definition among states. They also believe that many disabled children in Rhode Island may have been inappropriately denied benefits. I, along with Representatives Patrick Kennedy and Robert Weygand, met with and wrote to Social Security Administration Commissioner Kenneth Apfel about this matter. I have enclosed a copy of our correspondence for your information.

I have been pleased by Commissioner Apfel's commitment to review the implementation of the new definition, and I look forward to reviewing his findings. However, your personal attention to this matter would help ensure that disabled children receive the benefits to which they are entitled, as well as reassure the public.

Like you, I believe that reforming our nation's entitlement system is a worthwhile endeavor. However, we must also ensure that these efforts do not unduly diminish our commitment to disabled children.

Sincerely,

Jack Reed

Jack Reed
United States Senator

Enclosure

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

November 6, 1997

Mr. Kenneth S. Apfel
Commissioner
Social Security Administration
6401 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, Maryland 21235

Dear Commissioner Apfel:

Thank you for meeting with us on Wednesday to discuss the implementation of the new definition of disability for children under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program.

As we discussed, we are very concerned about the apparent disparity in the application of this definition among states, and, more importantly, that some Rhode Island disabled children may have been inappropriately removed from the SSI rolls. We appreciate your commitment to examine these issues and to evaluate Rhode Island's actions as you conduct your overall review of the implementation process.

It is our understanding that this review, which will be completed by the end of November, consists of in-depth studies of the characteristics of a sample of children who have been terminated from SSI and probes of issues such as the appeals process, the coding of mentally retarded children, and state by state differences in implementation. As we stressed in our meeting, we believe that this review should address the particular concerns that have been raised in Rhode Island, as well as provide needed clarity and tighter standards to assist states and eliminate state by state implementation disparities.

We look forward to reviewing your findings in the coming weeks. We also look forward to continuing this important dialogue as we work to ensure that the law is appropriately and fairly implemented.

Thank you again for meeting with us and for your continued attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Jack Reed	Patrick J. Kennedy	Bob Weygand
United States Senator	Member of Congress	Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 19, 1997

Dear Senator Reed:

Thank you for your letter to the President concerning the new definition of disability for children under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program.

The President has been advised of your concerns, and you will receive a response in the near future. In the meantime, if I can be of assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Susan Brophy

Susan Brophy
Deputy Assistant to the President
for Legislative Affairs

The Honorable Jack Reed
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 19, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun (D-IL).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN
ILLINOIS

COMMITTEES:
BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS
FINANCE
SPECIAL AGING

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-1303

December 4, 1997

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

DEC 10 PM 4:31

Dear Mr. President:

Thank you again for the ride home last night on Air Force One. I wanted to follow up on our conversation about creating a secondary market for school and municipal bonds by suggesting two ways of accomplishing that goal: first, by using the National Education Technology Funding Corporation, and second, by using Fannie Mae.

National Education Technology Funding Corporation

As you may recall, we created the National Education Technology Funding Corporation (NETFC) in 1996, and the Telecom Bill authorized it to receive federal funds. The NETFC was designed to function like a Government Sponsored Enterprise, but without the Federal guarantee or tax benefits enjoyed by Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the other GSEs. One of the functions envisioned for the NETFC was the creation of a secondary market for school technology bonds: the NETFC would buy, package, and resell those bonds, creating a more liquid market and driving down the cost of borrowing funds for schools.

The NETFC was largely the idea of Jim Murray, a former Fannie Mae president and perhaps the leading expert on secondary markets. He, former Senator Jack Danforth, and former NEA president Mary Hatwood Futrell sit on an interim board of directors.

I encourage you to consider requesting funds for the NETFC in your fiscal year 1999 budget. It would not require much: according to Jim Murray, with $100 million in the bank, it could begin leveraging many times that much bonding at the local level.

Fannie Mae

Another approach I have been working on would use Fannie Mae to create a secondary market for all municipal bonds. The idea of Charles Haar and Peter Lewis, former Johnson Administration officials, the plan calls for Fannie Mae to invest 20 percent of its portfolio in municipal debt, creating a secondary market for tax-free bonds and lowering the interest cost on all municipal bonds.

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
December 4, 1997
Page Two

The tax exemption on municipal bond interest is worth more than 30 percent to most taxpayers, but interest costs on long-term municipal debt is only 10 to 15 percent lower than comparable taxable debt. Haar and Lewis postulate that by using Fannie Mae to increase the liquidity of the bond market, municipalities could capture a much greater share of the benefit they ought to receive from the municipal bond interest tax exemption. With very little cost to the Federal Treasury, this proposal could greatly increase municipal infrastructure investment.

I would like to work with you to develop both of these proposals. Please have the appropriate person on your staff contact me or my assistant, Steve Collens, to discuss these proposals.

I appreciate your leadership and continued interest in fixing and modernizing our schools, and I look forward to continuing to work with you on infrastructure issues. Thank you for your attention.

Yours truly,

Carol Moseley-Braun
United States Senator

CMB:sbc

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 19, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Juanita Millender-McDonald (D-CA).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD
37TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE
SUBCOMMITTEES ON
AVIATION
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

COMMITTEE ON
SMALL BUSINESS
SUBCOMMITTEES ON
EMPOWERMENT
TAXATION AND FINANCE EXPORTS

DEMOCRATIC REGION ONE WHIP
CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S CAUCUS
CO-CHAIR WOMEN OWNED BUSINESS
LEGISLATIVE TEAM

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-0537

419 CANNON BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-0537
(202) 225-7924
FAX (202) 225-7926

970 WEST 190TH STREET
EAST TOWER, SUITE 900
TORRANCE, CA 90502
(310) 538-1190
FAX (310) 538-9672

E-MAIL: Millender.McDonald@mail.house.gov
www.house.gov/millender-mcdonald

November 12, 1997

Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

NOV 17 PM 8:54

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to commend you on your leadership on and efforts to improve education and enhance pupil performance and standards. I agree with your observation that for our nation to compete in the 21st Century, we must adopt national standards by which we can compare student performance state by state. Such assessments would allow federal, state and local educators and policy makers to evaluate the effectiveness of various pedagogical approaches and more rapidly implement necessary reforms and allocate resources.

I voted in favor of Congressman William Goodling's amendment to H.R. 2264, the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill. I support national testing as long as it is voluntary and contains the diagnostic mechanisms that will allow teachers the ability to review data and develop curricula that addresses the educational needs of students. Increasingly diverse student enrollments dictate that a variety of approaches must be taken. One size does not fit all situations confronting today's educators. I share my colleagues' concerns that these examinations not be used to withhold promotion of students, as well.

Voluntary testing must contribute to the process of involving parents in their children's education. The data from these national examinations should be shared with parents as well as educators and policy-makers in a manner that informs them about the relative strengths and weaknesses of the student and teacher performance. Testing should enhance mutual support and accountability.

Finally, until the issue of educational funding equity is fully resolved, I will be unable to support the use of voluntary testing to delay promotion of students unable to meet a singular national standard. To do otherwise is unfairly biased toward those communities with the resources to give their students advantages others do not have solely on the basis of wealth.

Thank you for the opportunity to share with you my views on this important issue. I look forward to working with your Administration on this important issue and stand ready to assist in making this effort successful.

Sincerely,

Juanita Millender-McDonald

JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 12, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President by Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM).

The President has requested that he see and sign every letter going to Capitol Hill. We did not want to fully answer the issues addressed in the Members' letter without advice from your office; therefore, I am requesting that your office draft a response and return it to Chris Walker.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JEFF BINGAMAN
NEW MEXICO

703 HART SENATE OFFICE BLDG.
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3102
(202) 224-5521
IN NEW MEXICO—1-800-443-8658
TDD (202) 224-1792
senator_bingaman@bingaman.senate.gov

United States Senate

December 2, 1997

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The President
The White House
Washington, DC

DEC 3 10:22

Dear Mr. President:

Thank you for the invitation to provide you with recommendations on how your Administration might take action to lower the dropout rate among our nation's young people. Having recently introduced the National Dropout Prevention Act (S.1295), I appreciate your concern and strongly believe that a targeted and substantive effort towards lowering dropout rates must be part of our national education reform efforts.

Lowering the dropout rate and eliminating gaps among rates for different groups of students have been part of our bipartisan national education goals since 1989 but seem all but forgotten in the nationwide effort to raise student achievement to world-class levels. According to the latest data, almost 3,000 students drop out each day of school, joining a group of almost 4 million young people who haven't completed high school, while the first-year dropout rate for college students has reached 28 percent.

It is my belief that lowering dropout rates and raising achievement are two goals that must be pursued together in order to ensure that all students have the necessary skills for the 21st century. Reports such as Our Nation on the Fault Line and No More Excuses show that this is especially true for some minority groups such as Hispanics that, due in no small part to the education they are provided, are experiencing disproportionately high dropout rates. While most dropouts are not minorities, Hispanics, Native Americans, and other minority groups still experience disproportionately high dropout rates even after accounting for factors such as immigration status and language proficiency. In many of these communities, dropout rates of 50 percent or more represent the most serious educational challenge faced.

And yet there is neither a coordinated national strategy nor a dedicated funding stream to address the dropout crisis. Given the seriousness of the problem and the inadequate attention it has received in recent years, it is my belief that there must be a substantive national response to the dropout crisis that includes FY1999 funding increases for key programs, legislative proposals to modify existing programs, dedicated funding for dropout prevention, and several core administrative steps. Most importantly, your dropout plan should remain distinct from other initiatives so that we might create a concerted national effort to address this widespread problem.

While there are many worthy approaches to lowering dropout rates, I believe that a comprehensive national response should include the following elements:

1) Coordination and accountability at the federal level. There is at present little or no coordination or accountability for lowering dropout rates among various agencies administering programs with related elements. The response to the dropout crisis must include new means to coordinate efforts among various programs, provide necessary data regarding student participation and achievement, and ensure that resources are provided where they are needed.

2) Investments in programs serving those most at risk of dropping out. There is a small set of programs including Title I, TRIO, bilingual and immigrant education, HEP-CAMP, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and Head Start that provides core services to students at risk of dropping out that, despite the new budget caps, should receive substantially increased funding in FY1999, as specified under separate cover.

3) Modifications to assure at-risk students receive a fair share of funding. Existing programs such as TRIO, Work-Study, and Title III of the Higher Education Act must be modified to ensure that Hispanic and other students most at risk of dropping out -- and the institutions that teach them -- receive a fair share of federal funding and services that are designed to help those in need. These concerns are addressed in the House Hispanic Caucus bill and S.1295, which also proposes a new Middle School Upward Bound program.

4) Dedicated funding to restructure schools with the highest dropout rates. There is currently no targeted source of federal funding for schools to restructure themselves to lower dropout rates and raise achievement. In fact, many middle and high schools with the highest dropout rates receive little federal support. To support these efforts, $100 million could be targeted as part of the FY1999 increase for the new Comprehensive School Reform program, which takes the same comprehensive approach as my National Dropout Prevention legislation.

5) Calling on states to ensure as many students stay in school as possible. In addition to direct federal actions, there are several ways states affect dropout rates (such as how they calculate annual school budgets based on attendance) that can be addressed through federal incentives as those proposed in S.1295, the National Dropout Prevention Act of 1997.

There are many ways to address the dropout crisis, many additional administrative actions that don't require Congressional approval, and several other approaches to helping communities raise standards and lower dropout rates that I am hoping to work with you in designing. One thing is clear: it will take substantive and concerted steps such as those described above to address the dropout crisis. As stated in the title of the upcoming report of the Hispanic Dropout Project, there can be no more excuses for any of us on this issue.

Thank you again for your interest in this issue, which as you know I have been concerned about since 1995 when I worked with Secretary Riley to convene the Hispanic Dropout Project. I look forward to continuing to work with you on your response to this crisis, as well as to the final report of the Hispanic Dropout Project, which includes state, local, and community activities that are equally necessary to address this problem.

Sincerely,

Jeff Bingaman

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 19, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. James L. Oberstar (D-MN).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JAMES L. OBERSTAR
8TH DISTRICT, MINNESOTA
2366 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-2308
(202) 225-6211
FAX: (202) 225-0699

COMMITTEE:
RANKING DEMOCRAT:
TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2308

DISTRICT OFFICES:
BRAINERD CITY HALL
501 LAUREL STREET
BRAINERD, MN 56401
(218) 828-4400

CHISHOLM CITY HALL
316 LAKE STREET
CHISHOLM, MN 55719
(218) 254-5761

231 FEDERAL BUILDING
DULUTH, MN 55802
(218) 727-7474

ELK RIVER CITY HALL
13065 ORONO PARKWAY
ELK RIVER, MN 55330
(612) 241-0188

December 5, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

DEC 10 PM 4:38

Dear Mr. President:

It was a great privilege and personal honor for me to participate in your signing of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 last week. As I mentioned to you very briefly, my late wife Jo and I are adoptive parents, (son Ted, now a parent himself and who works in parish youth ministry). I introduced the first legislation to provide financial incentives for adoption (a tax deduction for hard to place children) over 15 years ago; but only in your presidency, with your commitment and that of the First Lady, has such significant legislation been enacted into law. Thank you, for caring and for your support.

Throughout your service as President, you have strongly supported initiatives that have led to effective policies to promote adoption: the Family and Medical Leave Act, the first measure that you signed into law treated birth families and adoptive families equally for job-protected, unpaid leave. You signed into law a significant tax credit for adoptive families; clarified the Multi-Ethnic adoption law; provided an exemption of vaccination requirements for children involved in inter-country adoption; and now, with P.L. 105-89, children will hopefully no longer languish in foster care.

I want to call your attention to another modest step that the federal government can and should take to open wider the doors of adoption. We should enact legislation to ensure that **adoptive families** receive the same employee leave benefits that are granted to birth families. To be sure, many employers do go beyond the minimal requirement FMLA and provide paid leave benefits to birth family employees or allow them to use accumulated sick time; however, they do not provide those same benefits to adoptive families.

To address this discrepancy, I introduced the "Leave Equity for Adoptive Families Act of 1997 (H.R. 1573). My legislation would not mandate paid leave benefits for adoptive families. H.R. 1573, however, would make it illegal for an employer to maintain a discriminatory leave benefit policy. Employers should be required to provide the same benefits for birth and adoptive families.

The Honorable William J. Clinton
December 5, 1997
Page Two

The real beneficiary of parental leave for adoption is not the parent, but the adopted child. Parental leave provides time needed by adopted children to adjust to their new home. Adopted children come into new families with the need to bond to parents not biologically connected to them, and some of these children come to their new families with a host of previous experiences that need resolution. Adoptive parents must be present to help adopted children understand their new environment.

From time to time you have expressed support for expansion of the FMLA and a willingness to consider flexible leave time legislation. As your administration considers these initiatives,I further invite your attention to my Leave Equity Act with the hope that it can become part of your administration policy initiative for the future. I will be happy to discuss the matter further with any appropriate member of your staff.

Again, heartfelt, sincere gratitude for your support of adoption initiatives.

Warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

Jim

James L. Oberstar, M.C.

JLO/tef

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 8, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRIS JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Charlie Norwood (R-GA).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

COMMITTEES
Commerce
SUBCOMMITTEES
Energy and Power
Health and Environment

Economic and
Educational Opportunities
SUBCOMMITTEE
Workforce Protections

Charlie Norwood
10th District, Georgia

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

1707 Longworth Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-4101

DISTRICT OFFICES
1056 Claussen Road, Suite 226
Augusta, GA 30907
(706) 733-7066

3720 Atlanta Highway, Suite 1
Athens, GA 30606
(706) 208-8919

1177 Hunter St.
Covington, GA 30209
(770) 787-9907

November 19, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500-0006

NOV 20 PM4:20

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing today to applaud you and the Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality In the Health Care Industry for recognizing and acting to correct problems in today's health care environment.

As you know, Americans have strong concerns about the quality of care that they receive through HMOs and other managed care entities. The American people are concerned that they are losing their ability to choose their health care providers, that insurance company bureaucrats and accountants are making medical decisions best made by trained health care professionals, and that they cannot receive health care that they need when they need it.

To remedy these problems, I have introduced H.R.1415, the Patient Access to Responsible Care Act, or PARCA. PARCA, which currently has 210 bipartisan cosponsors in the House of Representatives, addresses many of the problems cited by the Advisory Commission while restoring some of the fundamental principles to the health care market, namely choice and accountability. Without empowering people to make their own decisions about their health care and ensuring that medical decision-makers, whether they be doctors or those of the managed care variety, are responsible for their actions, efforts to improve quality of care under managed care will ultimately fail and only result in larger, more burdensome government bureaucracies.

Again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of patients in this country. I believe that working together, we can ensure that common-sense, minimum standards to protect patients under managed care can become a reality. I look forward to working with you in any way I can.

Sincerely,

Charlie Norwood
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 4, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRIS JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the John Hilley from Rep. Charles W. Stenholm (D-TX).

Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

CHARLES W. STENHOLM
17TH DISTRICT
TEXAS

1211 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-6605
FAX (202) 225-2234
e-mail: Texas17@hr.house.gov
Home Page: http://www.house.gov/stenholm/

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE
RANKING MEMBER

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

DISTRICT OFFICES:
P.O. Box 1237
STAMFORD, TX 79553
(915) 773-3623
FAX (915) 773-2833

P.O. Box 1101
ABILENE, TX 79604
(915) 673-7221
FAX (915) 676-9547

33 E. TWOHIG AVE., #318
SAN ANGELO, TX 76903
(915) 655-7994
FAX (915) 658-2798

November 18, 1997

Mr. John Hilley
Assistant To the President
For Legislative Affairs
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear John:

I wanted to bring to your attention the enclosed copy of a letter I've sent to the President recommending that the administration propose reforms of cost allocation procedures for food stamp administrative costs and reallocate the savings into priority programs within the Department of Agriculture.

There is a growing consensus that there are substantial savings that can be realized by preventing states from "double-billing" the federal government for administrative costs. Achieving savings in administrative programs and reinvesting the savings to meet the many challenges facing U.S. agriculture would make good sense on substantive and political grounds. As you may know, I have advocated using these savings to provide mandatory funds for rural development, crop insurance, agricultural research, and nutrition programs, particularly restoring food stamp benefits to certain non-citizens.

Thank you in advance for your attention and assistance in this matter. With warmest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Charlie

Charles W. Stenholm
Member of Congress

CWS:esl
Enclosures

Background and Talking Points
Cost Allocation Provision in Senate Agricultural Research Bill

Background: Prior to the enactment of welfare reform, the federal government matched state administrative costs for AFDC, food stamps and Medicaid on an open-ended basis. In general, AFDC was designated as the "primary program", meaning that most of the shared administrative costs for the three programs were charged to the AFDC program. Welfare reform replaced AFDC with a block grant (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families or TANF) that provided states with a fixed grant based on federal AFDC payments to the state in the base year, including payments for shared administrative costs. The TANF program limits administrative expenditures to 15% of the block grant. Since states no longer receive a federal match for administrative costs charged to TANF, states have an incentive to shift administrative costs from TANF to the food stamp and Medicaid programs. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that federal spending on food stamp administrative costs will be $500 million a year higher than it would have been otherwise as a result of state shifting costs from TANF to food stamps by changing cost allocation.

General Policy The bill would reduce the amount the federal government pays a state for food stamp administrative costs by the amount of food stamp administrative expenses that were previously funded through the AFDC program. This policy recaptures the costs shifted to from the TANF block grant (which succeeded the AFDC program) to the uncapped food stamp program. By reducing federal payments for food stamp administrative spending by the amount of administrative spending shifted from the AFDC (now TANF) program to the food stamp program, the Senate bill effectively prevents states from claiming federal reimbursement from the food stamp program for administrative costs that were previously allocated to the AFDC program. States would only be allowed to charge the food stamp program for food stamp common costs above the amount of food stamp administrative costs the state allocated to the AFDC program prior to welfare reform.

Response to criticisms

The Senate bill does <u>not</u> cap food stamp administrative expenses. States would continue to be reimbursed for all food stamp administrative costs, except those shifted to food stamps from the TANF block grant, on an open-ended basis. Federal payments to states will increase automatically to share in increased state costs from increased caseload, additional caseworkers hired to improve services, modernization programs, increased anti-fraud programs, or other allowable costs that increase food stamp administrative expenses

Even with the reforms of cost allocation in the Senate bill, CBO projects that states will receive more federal funding for food stamp administrative costs than they would have received prior to the enactment of welfare reform. CBO has estimated that federal spending for food stamp administrative costs will be $500 million a year -- $2.5 billion over five years -- higher than they were projected to be prior to the enactment of welfare reform as a result of changes in cost allocation. The cost allocation proposal in the Senate bill eliminates $1.25 billion of this increase, meaning that states will still be receiving $1.25 billion more for food stamp administrative costs over the next five years than they were projected to receive prior to the enactment of welfare reform.

Reforming cost allocation does not harm food stamp beneficiaries. The savings in the Senate bill are from administrative costs only, and do not reduce food stamp benefits in any way. The Senate Agriculture Committee worked with advocates to construct a cost allocation reform proposal that eliminates the loophole that states have exploited without harming beneficiaries. The bill achieves savings by preventing states from shifting costs, not by reducing the quality or quantity of services to beneficiaries.

Reforming cost allocation is <u>not</u> an unfunded mandate. Under the Senate bill and other reforms of cost allocation, the federal government would continue to fully fund the federal share of all legitimate food stamp administrative costs, except those shifted from TANF to the food stamp program. In fact, CBO estimates that states will receive more money from the federal government for food stamp administrative costs even with reforms of cost allocation than they would have prior to the enactment of welfare reform. CBO was required to invoke the Unfunded Mandates Act because the Act applies to any legislation that restricts the amount of federal funds states are projected to receive for under the CBO baseline for mandatory programs -- whether or not the funding was justified. Since the CBO baseline assumes that states will take advantage of the loophole in cost allocation resulting from enactment of welfare reform to increase federal spending for administrative costs, legislation restricting the ability of states to use that loophole technically constitutes an unfunded mandate.

The reforms of cost allocation in the Senate bill allow states flexibility to streamline administration of means-tested programs. The Senate bill allows states to use the "benefitting program" model, which distributes common costs evenly among the three programs, and adjusts federal payments under the food stamp program to reflect the amount of food stamp administrative costs are assumed in the TANF base amount. Several states have indicated that they are moving to the benefitting program model in order to simplify accounting for administrative costs. In addition, the Senate approach does not penalize states that maintain a common application process for TANF and Medicaid, as previous proposals to reform cost allocation procedures may have done.

CHARLES W. STENHOLM
17TH DISTRICT
TEXAS

1 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-6605
FAX (202) 225-2234
e-mail: Texas17@hr.house.gov
Home Page: http://www.house.gov/stenholm/

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE
RANKING MEMBER

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

DISTRICT OFFICES:
P.O. Box 1237
STAMFORD, TX 79553
(915) 773-3623
FAX (915) 773-2833

P.O. Box 1101
ABILENE, TX 79604
(915) 673-7221
FAX (915) 676-9547

33 E. TWOHIG AVE., #318
SAN ANGELO, TX 76903
(915) 655-7994
FAX (915) 658-2798

November 17, 1997

The Honorable Bill Clinton
President
United States of America
1600 Pennsylvania Ave.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As you continue your efforts to balance priorities in your FY 1999 Budget, please consider an option that would both reduce unintended federal expenditures on welfare administration and provide significant mandatory savings that can be reinvested in priority programs: legislative reform of cost allocation procedures for administrative costs of means-tested benefit programs.

The Senate-passed agricultural research bill, which recieved bipartisan support, included a provision to reduce by $1.25 billion the $2.5 billion increase for food stamp administrative costs projected by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) as a result of changes in cost allocation procedures. This reduction would be used to provide mandatory funding for rural development and nutrition programs, as well as agricultural research. I offered a similar proposal during the Agriculture Committee consideration of budget reconciliation legislation.

The savings in food stamp administration costs would neither reduce benefits nor hinder services to needy individuals. In point of fact, the savings result from restricting the amount of increased food stamp administration reimbursements that states may receive when they shift the allocation of certain administration costs, currently provided under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant, to the food stamp program. Some individuals refer to this as "double billing" the federal government.

CBO has projected that federal spending on food stamp administrative costs will be $500 million a year higher than it would have been otherwise as a result of states shifting costs from TANF to food stamps by changing cost allocation. Part of this estimate is attributable to states seeking administrative efficiencies by allocating common costs of TANF, food stamps and Medicaid equally among the three programs, the so-called "benefiting program" model. The estimate's other basis is recognition of the unintended incentive in welfare reform for states to retain an historical share of reimbursements of the common administrative costs, provided through the TANF block grant, and report reallocated costs to the food stamp program for a 50 percent federal reimbursement. CBO estimated that an analogous cost reallocation would have the same impact on Medicaid administrative costs.

It has become increasingly clear to me that the CBO is correct in its assumption that states will change their cost allocation procedures to use the "benefiting program" model, which would shift costs to the food stamp and Medicaid programs. In fact, several states have told my staff that they have already begun to allocate administrative costs according to the "benefiting program" model. Legislation providing clear guidelines on this issue will provide HHS with the legal authority and political support that will be necessary to deny states submission for payment of shared administrative costs in the food stamp and Medicaid administrative accounts.

You would find support in Congress if you propose legislation preventing states from such reallocation of administrative costs. I would caution your Administration against one proposed alternative, which is to reduce each state's TANF allotment by the amount of common administrative costs included in the allotment. While this proposal has substantive merit as a simple and direct approach, such a proposal poses very serious political risks. The issue of state allocations of federal block grant funds under the TANF program was one of the most controversial issues in the Congressional debate on welfare reform. Furthermore, the National Governors' Association (NGA) has indicated that next year it intends to reopen the maintenance of effort and transferability issues in the TANF block grant. An Administration proposal that directly changes the TANF program would strengthen NGA proposals to reduce the maintenance of effort requirements and increase the amount that can be transferred out of the TANF block grant, which both your Administration and I strongly opposed.

The Senate agricultural research bill would address the cost shift, without reopening the TANF debate, by reducing the amount the federal government pays a state for food stamp administrative costs by the amount of food stamp administrative expenses that were previously funded through the AFDC program. This approach effectively prevents states from claiming federal reimbursement from the food stamp program for administrative costs that were previously allocated to the AFDC program and now provided through the TANF block grant. States would be allowed to charge the food stamp program only for food stamp common costs above the amount of food stamp administrative costs the state allocated to the AFDC program prior to welfare reform.

After discussions with many Democratic members and numerous outside groups, I have proposed to reinvest the savings through mandatory funding in four broad priority categories: rural development; nutrition programs, particularly restoring food stamps for some legal immigrants; crop insurance; and agricultural research. These priorities reflect the interests of Democrats across the spectrum. Providing mandatory funding in these areas will also help relieve the pressure on the Appropriations Committee to fund other discretionary programs that Democrats support.

Including a proposal to legislatively address cost allocation, both for food stamps and Medicaid, would succeed in reducing unintended additional federal expenditures on welfare administration. Reinvestment of the food stamp savings in the broad priority areas I have outlined would send a very strong message to the agricultural and nutrition communities about your commitment to address the very serious needs facing the programs in these two areas. Similar reductions in Medicaid administration costs would be available for other important priorities. In addition, a proposal that addresses these broad priorities would maximize the chances for legislative success next year.

Again, thank you for your consideration of this issue. I look forward to continuing to work with you on this and other issues.

Sincerely yours,

Charlie

Charles W. Stenholm
Member of Congress

CWS:esl
Enclosures
cc: Erskine Bowles
Frank Raines
Gene Sperling
Bruce Reed
John Hilley
Dan Glickman

Cynthia/ Diana

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 19, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
JENNIFER KLEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Tony P. Hall (D-OH) and others.

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

TONY P. HALL
THIRD DISTRICT, OHIO
COMMITTEES:
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER
SUBCOMMITTEE ON RULES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE
CHAIRMAN
CRATIC TASK FORCE ON HUNGER

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

1432 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-3503
(202) 225-6465

DISTRICT OFFICE:
501 FEDERAL BUILDING
200 WEST SECOND STREET
DAYTON, OH 45402
(937) 225-2843

October 27, 1997

The President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

OCT 28 PM 5:22

Dear President Clinton:

We the undersigned co-sponsors of H.R. 1507, the Hunger Has a Cure Act of 1997, ask that as you formulate the Fiscal Year 1999 budget, you include funding necessary to secure the nutritional well-being of children, the elderly, the disabled, and adults willing to work but unable to find a job. It is especially critical that you include adequate funding to restore food stamp benefits to vulnerable groups of legal immigrants facing undue hardship as a result of recent food stamp cut-offs. Specifically, we urge you to give priority to the following areas:

1) **Restoration of Food Stamp Benefits to Vulnerable Legal Immigrants**: As of this month, hundreds of thousands of legal immigrants living well below the poverty line have been cut off of food stamps, many of them working poor as well as children, elderly, and disabled persons. State response to their plight appears to be uneven at best. Just as restoration of SSI benefits to some legal immigrants was the right thing to do, protecting millions of families from hunger by restoring food stamp benefits should be a priority. We urge you to provide funding to restore food stamp benefits to these vulnerable populations.

2) **Providing adequate Funding for Child Nutrition Programs**: The Summer Food, School Breakfast, and Child and Adult Care Feeding Programs are vital to ensuring adequate, nutritious diets to low-income children. Often, these programs provide poor children with a significant percentage of their daily nutrition. The loss of start-up funds and cuts in reimbursement rates is weakening the ability of these programs to meet the needs of children at risk of undernutrition. We urge you to provide sufficient funding for these vital programs, specifically: to restore start-up monies for school breakfast and summer food programs; to enhance meal reimbursement rates for the summer food and child and adult care programs; and to reinstate coverage for provision of fourth meals to children who spend long hours in day care centers. We also urge you to support adequate funding for the WIC and TEFAP programs.

3) **Ensuring That No Person Who Is Willing to Work Is Cut Off Food Stamps**: We appreciate your efforts in the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1997 to address unfair cut-offs of food stamp recipients who are looking for work but unable to find a job or a work program slot. Funding for additional work slots and exemptions provides some positive relief in this area. We urge your continued leadership to maintain adequate funding for the food stamp program in the FY 1999 budget, and further ask that you revisit elimination of the cap on the food stamp shelter deduction and increases in the food stamp vehicle allowance.

New numbers released on September 15th by the Department of Agriculture indicate that 11 million people in the United States, including over 4 million children, experience moderate or severe hunger. In a nation as rich as ours, that is simply unacceptable. Our Hunger Has a Cure Act of 1997 attempts to protect children, the elderly, and other vulnerable populations from facing the harsh realities of hunger. Private charities are doing much to fight hunger, but their important efforts alone cannot take the place of an adequate and effective federal safety net. We appreciate your attention to these most important matters.

Sincerely,

Jim Walsh
James P. Walsh

Tony P. Hall
Tony P. Hall

Marge Roukema
Marge Roukema

Eva M. Clayton
Eva Clayton

Maxine Waters
Maxine Waters

Carolyn B. Maloney
Carolyn Maloney

George E. Brown, Jr.
George Brown

Lucille Roybal-Allard
Lucille Roybal-Allard

James E. Clyburn
James E. Clyburn

Maurice Hinchey
Maurice Hinchey

John W. Olver

Barney Frank

Dale E. Kildee

Bobby L. Rush

Donna M. Christian-Green

Michael R. McNulty

Bob Clement

Lynn Rivers

Tom Lantos

Neil Abercrombie

John Conyers

Sheila Jackson-Lee

Jim McDermott

William D. Delahunt

Robert T. Matsui

Carolyn C. Kilpatrick

John J. LaFalce

Martin T. Meehan

Bernard Sanders

Rick Boucher

Alcee L. Hastings

Martin Olav Sabo

Edward J. Markey

Nancy L. Johnson

Bill Pascrell, Jr.

Thomas C. Sawyer

Jerry F. Costello

Ronald V. Dellums

Jack Quinn

Wayne T. Gilchrest

Ted Strickland

Lane Evans

Elijah E. Cummings

Ron Kind

Albert Russell Wynn

Melvin L. Watt

Cynthia A. McKinney

Martin Frost

Bob Filner

Eliot L. Engel

James P. McGovern

Earl F. Hilliard

David E. Price

David E. Bonior

Matthew G. Martinez

Henry A. Waxman

Karen McCarthy

Esteban Edward Torres

Anna G. Eshoo

Patrick J. Kennedy

Walter H. Capps

Louis Stokes

Frank R. Wolf

George Miller

Richard E. Neal

Lynn C. Woolsey

Gene Green

Michael P. Forbes

Rubén Hinojosa

Barbara B. Kennelly

Connie Morella

Bruce F. Vento

Jim Oberstar

Luis V. Gutierrez

(17-OH)

James A. Traficant, Jr.

William J. Coyne

Sue Kelly

Danny K. Davis

Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.

Dennis J. Kucinich

Robert Wexler

Gary L. Ackerman

Nancy Pelosi

Sherwood L. Boehlert

Peter A. DeFazio

Karen Thurman

Ed Pastor

John Lewis

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 27, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President by Rep. Richard A. Gephardt (D-MO) and others.

The President has requested that he see and sign every letter going to Capitol Hill. We did not want to fully answer the issues addressed in the Members' letter without advice from your office; therefore, I am requesting that your office draft a response and return it to Chris Walker.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

November 20, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500-0006

NOV 20 PM 4:18

Dear Mr. President:

We are writing to commend the work of the Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry in releasing a report entitled "Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities."

In this report, the Commission endorses a set of important consumer protection standards for health care. These standards include: disclosure of information, access to appropriate specialty care, access to emergency care, confidentiality protections, non-discrimination protections, and the right to an external, independent appeals process.

Many members of Congress have authored and/or support federal legislation incorporating similar standards. We are looking forward to working with you in the coming year to enact federal legislation creating an enforceable set of consumer protection standards for health care building upon the standards endorsed by your Advisory Commission.

Again, we congratulate the Commission for coming forth with these important consumer protection standards. And, we look forward to working together on this vital health care issue in the upcoming session of Congress.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Gephardt
Richard A. Gephardt

John D. Dingell

Ben Cardin
Benjamin L. Cardin

Henry A. Waxman
Henry A. Waxman

Pete Stark
Fortney Pete Stark

Marge Roukema
Marge Roukema

George Miller

Greg Ganske

Sherrod Brown

Marion Berry

Frank Pallone

Jim McDermott

Charles B. Rangel

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 6, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
JENNIFER KLEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

WASHINGTON, DC 20510–6275

October 30, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

I understand that you may soon issue a directive to limit the importation of some firearms that may have been modified to meet the requirements of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (1994 Crime Act). I respectfully urge you to reconsider such a directive and instead to work with Congress on issues relating to the assault weapons ban in the 1994 Crime Act.

I grew up hunting and fishing in the Vermont outdoors, and I know from first-hand experience that there are many semiautomatic firearms used for legitimate purposes. This is a fact known by many Vermonters, as our State enjoys one of the highest per capita ownership of firearms in America, as well as one of the lowest crime rates. Unfortunately, many Americans live in cities and other areas in our country where they are unable to enjoy the safety of Vermont. Furthermore, I have heard testimony of law enforcement officers who increasingly found themselves outgunned by criminals.

I voted for and continue to support the assault weapons ban as a reasonable step to make our streets safer. The 19 weapons subject to the assault weapons ban, including the so-called "Street Sweeper," have no place outside a target range or battlefield, let alone in our cities' streets. The assault weapons ban also reaffirmed our right to own firearms, as it contained a list of more than 600 firearms commonly used for sporting purposes that were expressly <u>exempted</u> from the ban.

I was surprised, however, when I read in the newspapers that some in the Administration may want to expand the assault weapons ban by issuing a presidential directive. A White House official was quoted regarding the proposed directive as saying: "We are taking the law and bending it as far as we can to capture a whole new class of guns." I strongly believe that using a presidential directive to avoid the normal legislative process regarding any changes to the assault weapons ban is the wrong way to go.

The law enforcement community is just now learning about the impact of the assault weapons ban. As required by the 1994 Crime Act, the Department of Justice, through a grant to the Urban Institute, recently studied the results of the assault weapons ban. This March 1997 report found that the available post-ban crime data was too partial and preliminary to determine long-term effects and recommended "future research to update and refine our results at this early post-ban stage."

As the Ranking Member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I continue to look forward to working with you and members of your Administration in the normal legislative process to enact carefully crafted laws to prevent crime and support law enforcement officers across the country.

Sincerely,

PATRICK LEAHY
Ranking Member

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
JENNIFER KLEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Steven R. Rothman (D-NJ).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

STEVEN R. ROTHMAN
9TH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

1607 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-5061
FAX (202) 225-5851

DISTRICT OFFICES:

25 MAIN STREET
COURT PLAZA
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601-7089
(201) 646-0808
FAX (201) 646-1944

130 CENTRAL AVENUE
JERSEY CITY, NJ 07306-2118
(201) 798-1366
FAX (201) 798-1725

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

COMMITTEES:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ECONOMIC POLICY AND TRADE

E-MAIL:
steven.rothman@mail.house.gov

WEB SITE:
http://www.house.gov/rothman

October 22, 1997

Hon. William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

OCT 27 -2:22

Your White House Conference on Child Care could not have been more timely. Over the past decade, the number of American families with two working parents has expanded dramatically. In 1995, 62% of all working women had children under six years old. The question of what to do with our children while parents are at work is certainly the family question of the 90s.

Just this past Monday, I had the opportunity to meet with parents in my district who are seeking a better solution to their child care problems. The meeting was held at the Corporate Child Care Center in Little Ferry, New Jersey and included four parents: Lloyd Domke of Ridgefield, Julie Blacker of Wood-Ridge, Joanne Hazuda of Lodi and Diane MacNeill of Ridgefield Park. We were also joined by Andrea Marinelli of Hackensack and Angela Ludvegsen of Wanaque who work for the child care center and are parents themselves.

We all have seen the "hidden camera" news stories of child care services that abuse the children. Ensuring that parents have a viable child care option -- in terms of cost and safety -- is important to the health of all our families. And it is essential to the health of our children.

The reality is that a bad child care experience can be the difference between a healthy child and someone who has permanent emotional scars. And the cost of care is often prohibitive. The issues raised at this meeting centered on three topics: safety, access and cost.

SAFETY

The Bergen County parents I met with want to mandate criminal background checks for EVERY worker employed in child care facilities. Only through background checks, would they feel safer about putting their children in the hands of people they barely know. Even at the most expensive child care centers, without these background checks, their children are still at risk. And they specifically noted that it should include everyone associated with the agency -- from the director to teachers to janitors.

The other safety issue which concerned them was inspections. In response to a recent series of investigative articles in the Bergen Record, the State of New Jersey recently announced that it would increase inspections at state licensed centers. Nonetheless, the director of Corporate Child Care said that in the year she has been at the center, they have NEVER been inspected. One of the parents called the lack of inspections, "a sin." They specifically cited smaller child care centers, often times having fewer than five children, that they said are rarely, if ever, inspected.

ACCESS

In Bergen and Hudson Counties, both parents often need to work just to pay the bills. Many families do not have a relative living close by who can take care of the child all day. So they turn to child care. And often times, it is difficult to find and very expensive. In NJ, we only have 2,830 licensed child care centers. That may sound like a lot, but that is only 5 child care centers per municipality. It is not getting the job done.

This has led to the proliferation of some small, less-equipped child care centers more interested in turning a profit than caring for kids. When looking for good child care, these parents said they came across day care centers that were located in someone's basement. They were not properly maintained, were very dark and did not have educational toys for the children.

They also noted that, generally, day care centers are only open until 6 pm. In northern New Jersey, the "9 to 5" job is often a thing of the past. We need to encourage child care centers to be more flexible to today's demands on our workforce. This not only puts a strain on parents who may need to leave work early, but it could mean that young children are left unattended in their home.

COST

Figuring out how to offer families quality child care at a reasonable price is a problem unique to our generation.

Because we have so few child care centers, there has yet to be true competition that would bring the cost down. Some parents said that they knew people who chose not to work because it was better financially for them to stay home and not pay for child care. Obviously the parents had a lot of ideas when it came to how we can help with costs. They mentioned increasing government subsidies and offering tax incentives that encourage businesses to make a greater contribution to child care.

We also need programs that encourage states to make this a higher priority for themselves. **In 1994, New Jersey spent 10 times as much on corrections than it did on child care.**

Thanks to your leadership, we already have increased federal assistance to families in need of child care. Since 1993, federal funding for child care has increased by approximately 68% and provides child care services for over one million children. And in 1995, you directed the Department of Health and Human Services to establish the Child Care Bureau to streamline child care operations.

Earlier this year, I helped in your fight for additional funds for the Social Services Block Grant program that goes towards child care services. The Majority Party in Congress tried to cut $135 million from the program, but we stopped them. I also have co-sponsored the "Working Families Child Care Act of 1997" to give low income families access to child care.

CONCLUSION

I hope the White House Conference on Child Care can help us figure out how our nation can better respond to the needs of working families. This week I was provided a glimpse of the state of child care in Bergen County. It is clear that we need to make providing safe, affordable child care a national priority.

I am also concerned about the quality of services children from around the country are able to receive. Are state standards strong enough in every state so that children across America are protected? What kind of immunization requirements do different states have? I hope one of the results of the White House Conference is to determine whether we need national standards for child care safety.

I wish you the best of luck in conducting this conference. This has been a priority for America's families. You should be commended for making this a priority for your Administration. I look forward to working with you on this issue in the weeks and months ahead.

Sincerely,

Steve Rothman

STEVEN R. ROTHMAN
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 14, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRIS JENNINGS

FROM: **SUSAN BROPHY**
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: **PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Rosa L. DeLauro (D-CT).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

436 Cannon Building
Washington, DC 20515-0703
(202) 225-3661

59 Elm Street
Second Floor
New Haven, CT 06510
(203) 562-3718

Lingworth/Clinton
(203) 669-1181

Stratford
(203) 378-9005

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ROSA L. DELAURO
3D DISTRICT, CONNECTICUT

CHIEF DEPUTY WHIP

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEES:
LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

October 29, 1997

NOV 6 PM 7:19

President William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20006-9900

Dear Mr. President:

I read with dismay the article in last week's *New York Times* regarding the Mental Health Parity Act. According to the article, the Administration is considering drawing up rules to grant exemptions to the law to insurers who estimate that providing equitable coverage will increase their costs by one percent.

People suffering from neurobiological illnesses have long been discriminated against by insurance companies. For too long, individuals and families with mental illness have been subject to substantially higher copayments and lower lifetime insurance limits those for physical illness.

The Mental Health Parity Act was passed to right this wrong. Providing an "out" to insurers before they even attempt to institute a policy of equitable coverage runs counter to everything we hoped to accomplish through passage of this legislation. Rather than opening a loophole, we should encourage insurers to institute innovative policies that will control costs while accomplishing the ultimate goal of providing equitable coverage for all.

I strongly believe that providing coverage for mental illness will not increase costs, but will reduce health care costs for our nation as a whole. In fact, according to the National Institutes of Mental Health, equitable insurance coverage for severe mental disorders will yield $2.2 billion in net savings each year through decreased use of general medical services and a substantial decrease in social costs.

I urge you to stand by the spirit of this legislation and not create a loophole that will allow insurers to avoid compliance with this important law. Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROSA L. DeLAURO
Member of Congress

RLD/bjs

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 14, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRIS JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Sen. Patrick J. Kennedy (D-RI).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

PATRICK J. KENNEDY
1ST DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND

WASHINGTON OFFICE
312 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
(202) 225-4911
FAX: (202) 225-3290

MAIN OFFICE
286 MAIN STREET, SUITE 600
PAWTUCKET, RI 02860
(401) 729-5600
(800) 392-5772
FAX (401) 729-5608

NATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE
RESOURCES COMMITTEE

MEMBER
PORTUGUESE-AMERICAN CAUCUS
NEW ENGLAND CAUCUS
ITALIAN-AMERICAN CAUCUS
FRIENDS OF IRELAND
OLDER AMERICANS CAUCUS
LAW ENFORCEMENT CAUCUS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

November 5, 1997

President William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, Dc 20500

NOV 6 PM 7:19

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to express my concerns on the formulation of regulations dealing with the one percent exemption provision of the Mental Health Parity Act (MHPA).

It is to my understanding that the Administration is considering regulations for the MHPA which may undermine the intention of the law. Specifically, allowing employers to obtain exemptions based on predictions of future costs is of particular concern. Employers should not be permitted to estimate their costs using 1997 data, nor should they be allowed to stop complying should they estimate costs greater than one percent. These provisions would contradict the intent of MHPA.

The Mental Health Parity Act was enacted to ensure the expansion of mental health insurance benefits. Basing exemption on estimates would essentially give employers a giant loop-hole to this legislation. With these provisions, it is possible for employers to exempt themselves from compliance using inaccurate and unverified estimates. Given the proposed provisions, the MHPA would be completely ineffective.

When the MHPA was passed last year it appeared to be a great victory for everyone. According to experts, overall health care costs would decrease due to earlier detection of mental illnesses and less costly early treatment. Those who suffer from severe mental illnesses would finally receive the appropriate medical care. Should this loophole be enacted, however, any possible benefits would become virtually unattainable.

Thank you for your time and concern in this important matter. I know you appreciate my concern for the future of the MHPA and will continue to work for those who suffer from mental illness.

Sincerely,

Patrick J. Kennedy

Patrick J. Kennedy
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 14, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. John D. Dingell (D-MI).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JOHN D. DINGELL
16TH DISTRICT, MICHIGAN

RANKING MEMBER
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE
CO-CHAIR
HOUSE GREAT LAKES TASK FORCE
MEMBER
MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2216

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
ROOM 2328
RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-2216
(202) 225-4071

DISTRICT OFFICES:
5465 SCHAEFER ROAD
DEARBORN, MI 48126-3277
(313) 846-1276

23 EAST FRONT STREET
SUITE 103
MONROE, MI 48161-2228
(313) 243-1849

October 24, 1997

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Several news organizations have reported that you intend to issue a directive suspending the importation of several dozen models of assault weapons which are believed to have been modified for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (1994 Crime Bill) and the 1968 Gun Control Act. It is also thought that you intend to reconvene a working group to again review the "sporting purposes" test under current law.

As you may recall, I voted reluctantly in favor of the 1994 Crime Bill. This followed assurances between us that modifications could be made to alleviate some of the most objectionable concerns expressed by myself and other Democrats, including Congressman Jack Brooks, then the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Despite the improvements ultimately agreed to, I remained opposed to the assault weapons provisions because I knew then that they would have very little practical impact in reducing crime.

Our agreement was quickly threatened. Immediately after you signed the Crime Bill, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) implemented a freeze on the import of magazines which clearly were eligible to enter the country under the new law. It took almost two years of fighting with ATF before it decided to honor our agreement by lifting this freeze, which clearly could not have withstood a challenge in Federal Court.

As you consider whether to issue a new directive, I wish to remind you of the report which was ordered under Sec. 110104 of the 1994 Crime Bill. Under this provision, the Attorney General was required to study the effect of the ban and its impact on violent and drug trafficking crime. The Justice Department awarded a grant to the Urban Institute to meet this requirement. The final report, issued on March 13, 1997, found that, "At best, the assault weapons ban can have only a limited effect on total gun murders, because the banned weapons and magazines were never involved in more than a modest fraction of all gun murders." The report continued, "We were unable to detect any reduction to date in two types of gun murders that are thought to be closely associated with assault weapons."

I respectfully submit that, given the results of the Urban Institute's study, and its recommendation for future research, any additional review should be conducted before ATF is again directed to implement action outside of the law and the clear intent of Congress. I appreciate your consideration of my views, and hope that you will act in a manner that respects the rights of all law abiding citizens.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

John D. Dingell
Member of Congress

cc: Hon. Robert Rubin

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 20, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-AL).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JEFF SESSIONS
ALABAMA

COMMITTEES:
JUDICIARY
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS
JOINT ECONOMIC

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-0104

October 10, 1997

President Bill Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

OCT 14 PM5:14

Dear Mr. President:

On April 10, 1996, you vetoed the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995. Although the House garnered the necessary two-thirds vote to override your veto, the Senate fell nine votes short of an override. This failure in the Senate ensured that partial-birth abortions, portrayed as an extremely rare procedure at the time, could continue unhindered. While this vote disappointed and angered pro-life Americans, you justified your veto by assuring the American people that "I cannot support use of that procedure on an elective basis, where the abortion is being performed for non-health related reasons and there are equally safe medical procedures available." Since that time, however, new evidence, testimony, and changes of heart merit not only your careful consideration but the reversal of your position from last April.

During this debate, you have stated that one of the key justifications for your veto was your belief that this was a rare procedure. I take you at your word, but unfortunately, the abortion-rights lobby misinformed not only you but the American people as well. This became apparent in February 1997 when Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, admitted that he had "lied through [his] teeth" when he characterized the procedure as rare and used only in extreme circumstances.

Why is this admission so important? Mr. Fitzsimmons' admission confirmed the fears of many Americans, who took you at your word that the proposed ban would not have a significant impact on the lives of potentially healthy children. Rather than a rare procedure, Mr. Fitzsimmons indicated that physicians perform approximately 3,000 to 5,000 partial-birth abortions annually, the vast majority on healthy mothers with healthy fetuses. The significance of this statement, on the partial-birth abortion debate in general and on your impending decision in particular, should not be underestimated. This statement indicates that you made your decision in 1996 with inaccurate information. As a result, you supported a procedure that violates your own standard, as articulated in your April 1996 veto message, of an elective abortion procedure unacceptable to you. In addition, the large number of partial-birth abortions performed is inconsistent with your statement, also from your veto message, that "I believe that the abortions protected by [*Roe v. Wade*] should be safe and rare."

For many Americans, including myself, the number of procedures performed is not the primary justification for its elimination. Rather, the nature of the procedure itself renders it indefensible. Only a few weeks ago, the American Medical Association (AMA) came out in support of the bill, as amended. The AMA's endorsement reaffirmed the contention among the bill's supporters that the life of the mother would not be in danger as a result of this legislation. In your April 1996 veto message, you indicated that the procedure needs to be an option in "the rare and tragic circumstances in which its use may be necessary." The AMA's letter, however, thanks Senator Santorum "for the opportunity to work ... towards restricting a procedure we all agree is not good medicine." One of the primary defenses of this procedure has been the insistence that physicians, not politicians, should determine whether a partial-birth abortion is justified. The AMA's support of this bill indicates that physicians, as well as politicians, do not believe that this is "good medicine."

The aforementioned developments since your veto have been accompanied by a change of heart among many abortion-rights supporters. Several pro-choice legislators, including the Minority Leader, Tom Daschle, have recognized the need to limit late-term abortions, not just partial-birth abortions, and ultimately cast their vote to end partial-birth abortions. This movement, and the subsequent changed votes of Senators Daschle, Byrd, and Hollings, indicates that many of this nation's leaders, based upon the new information, believe that this procedure must be stopped.

On May 20, 1997, the Senate followed the House's lead and voted to ban partial-birth abortions by a 64 to 36 margin. Unfortunately, the Senate remains three votes short of overriding your threatened veto. I hope that three senators will change their mind to end this unnecessary procedure; however, this result is unlikely. Rather, the hopes of the supporters of this bill and the lives of the children, who will be saved by this legislation, rest in your hands.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that I have not mischaracterized your actions or the developments of the past year. I believe, however, that these developments warrant your reconsideration and signature on this legislation. You do not need to feel as if you must remain supportive of the abortion-rights lobby. They lied to you and the American people during last year's debate. I am confident that you will find the courage, exhibited by the distinguished Minority Leader and others, to change your mind and end this gruesome procedure.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Jeff Sessions
United States Senator

JS:jl

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 20, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: **SUSAN BROPHY**
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: **PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. James T. Walsh (R-NY).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JAMES T. WALSH
MEMBER OF CONGRESS
25TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK

ASSISTANT MAJORITY WHIP

CHAIRMAN
FRIENDS OF IRELAND

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–3225

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEES:
LEGISLATIVE
CHAIRMAN
AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
VICE CHAIRMAN
VA, HUD, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

October 9, 1997

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States of America
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

OCT 14 AM 9:17

Dear President Clinton,

I am writing to ask for your continued strong support for the extension of Section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Without this provision, many families will be needlessly separated as they will be required to return to their home country to obtain an immigrant visa.

As Chairman of Friends of Ireland, I am troubled that many new immigrants, including a large segment of the Irish immigrant community, will be adversely impacted if Section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is allowed to expire. Section 245(i) enables persons who otherwise qualify for legal immigrant status and who currently are not in lawful immigration status to obtain "green cards" in the U.S. upon payment of a penalty for their visa overstay. This provision is of critical importance to certain family and employment-based immigrants, many of whom would be forced to leave their families and their businesses if they are required to return to their home country to obtain an immigrant visa.

The permanent extension of Section 245(i) is critical to the Irish immigrant community. This common-sense provision is essential in permitting immigrant families to remain together and in ensuring that these employees keep their jobs. I appreciate your leadership on this issue and urge you to do everything in your power to ensure that Section 245(i) is extended.

Sincerely,

James T. Walsh
Member of Congress

2351 RAYBURN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-3225
(202) 225-3701 (202) 225-4042 FAX
E Mail: rep.james.walsh@mail.house.gov

1340 FEDERAL BUILDING
SYRACUSE, NY 13261
(315) 423-5657 (315) 423-5669 FAX

1 LINCOLN STREET
AUBURN, NY 13021
(315) 255-0649 (315) 255-1369 FAX

45 CHURCH STREET
CORTLAND, NY 13045
(607) 758-3918

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 29, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: **SUSAN BROPHY** SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: **CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President by Sen. Bob Graham (D-FL).

The President has requested that he see and sign every letter going to Capitol Hill. We did not want to fully answer the issues addressed in the Members' letter without advice from your office; therefore, I am requesting that your office draft a response and return it to Chris Walker.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

BOB GRAHAM
FLORIDA

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20510

October 24, 1997

OCT 27 PM3:28

Dear Mr. President:

Thank you for your continued commitment to the education of our nation's youth. Throughout your Administration, you have shown that education is a top priority.

A purpose of this letter is to urge the establishment of a partnership among the federal government, states, and local school districts to alleviate the deterioration and overcrowding of existing schools through rehabilitation and new school construction. A second purpose is to suggest a process which has been effective on other national priorities as a means of developing a consensus and action plan for such a partnership.

As you are well aware, many of our nation's public schools suffer from overcrowding and deteriorating conditions. In some states and communities, this problem has reached crisis proportions. A federal role in this area would contribute to assuring an appropriate environment for learning and student achievement, while avoiding the concerns of federal intrusion into state and local prerogatives, such as curriculum and personnel. As the Interstate Highway System is for President Eisenhower, an active federal role in the building and rehabilitation of thousands of American schools could stand as one of the most important legacies of your Administration.

President Reagan established the National Commission on Social Security Reform by Executive Order in 1981. This historic Commission's recommendations led to significant, essential changes in our nation's Social Security program. Your establishment of a bipartisan National Commission on Public School Construction and Rehabilitation could be an important first step towards solving the facilities problem in our nation's communities. Attached is a memorandum on the National Commission on Social Security Reform.

Secretary Richard Riley and I have recently spoken about this concept. He recommended that I make this proposal to you, and suggested that you may want to consider this idea as a part of the agenda for your 1998 State of the Union address.

Mr. President, we both understand the implications of overcrowded and deteriorating schools on the youth of our nation. I know that we share the same concerns and I look forward to being of assistance to you as you consider this proposal for a commission. Should you or your staff have any questions or desire more information, please contact myself or Ms. Leigh Warren, our Education Policy Analyst, who may be reached at (202)224-4881.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

Bob Graham

United States Senator

The Honorable William J. Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Enclosure

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Senator Bob Graham

Date: October 24, 1997

Subject: NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

Background

The Social Security system was in need of reform in 1981. In response to the system's imminent insolvency, the National Commission on Social Security Reform was established by President Reagan's Executive Order. According to a report published by the Congressional Research Service (CRS Report 97-741, July 24, 1997),

> "President Reagan proposed the creation of the Commission in September 1981 after a summer of heated partisan debate over the necessity of changing the system.... After bipartisan consultations with congressional leaders, the Commission was established by executive order on December 16, 1981.
>
> The 1982/83 National Commission on Social Security Reform is often cited as a model for lawmakers in achieving consensus about controversial legislative matters."

Composition

The National Commission on Social Security Reform had fifteen members appointed from three different authorities:

* Five members were selected by the president from among private citizens or officers or employees of the executive branch.

* Five members were selected by the Majority Leader of the Senate from among private citizens or members of the Senate.

* Five members were selected by the Speaker of the House from among private citizens or members of the House of Representatives.

No more than three appointees from each authority could be from the same political party.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 23, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. John M. Spratt, Jr. (D-SC).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.
...ISTRICT, SOUTH CAROLINA

...36 LONGWORTH BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-5501

COMMITTEES:
RANKING MEMBER, BUDGET
NATIONAL SECURITY

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

DISTRICT OFFICES:

FEDERAL BUILDING
BOX 350
ROCK HILL, SOUTH CAROLINA 29731
(803) 327-1114

39 E. CALHOUN STREET
SUMTER, SOUTH CAROLINA 29150
(803) 773-3362

88 PUBLIC SQUARE
BOX 25
DARLINGTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29532
(803) 393-3998

October 15, 1997

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

OCT 17 PM2:00

Dear President Clinton:

A number of Members of the House wrote you a letter to request the appointment of a federal task force to investigate the effects of silicone breast implants in the human body. I was not a party to that letter, but I respectfully request that you seriously consider the appointment of such a task force.

Since the early 1960's, well over 1 million American women have had breast implant surgery for reconstruction after a mastectomy or augmentation of healthy breast tissue. Although critics cite a body of scientific studies that have found no link between silicone breast implants and disease, I have met with constituents and witnessed first-hand the ravages of such implants on recipients. Importantly, tens of thousands of women have reported similar health problems resulting from the implants, including the hardening of the breast tissue, implant rupture, and disabling autoimmune disorders, such as lupus erythematosus, scleroderma, and rheumatoid arthritis.

Research on silicone breast implants was submitted for the record during the August 1, 1995 investigative hearing of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee on medical devices. As a member of the committee, I read many conflicting reports on the implants. However, there is a growing body of scientific evidence documenting a direct relationship between silicone breast implants and human illness.

Given the increasing evidence of health disorders associated with silicone breast implants, I respectfully request the appointment of a federal task force to address the public health risks associated with the implants.

With thanks for your consideration, I am

Respectfully,

John Spratt

John M. Spratt, Jr.
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 23, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: **SUSAN BROPHY**
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: **PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Walter Capps (D-CA).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

WALTER CAPPS
[redacted] DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA
[redacted]18 LONGWORTH BUILDING
[redacted]INGTON, DC 20515-0522
(202) 225-3601
COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

DISTRICT OFFICES:
☐ 1411 MARSH STREET, STE. 205
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93401
(805) 546-8348

☐ 1428 CHAPALA STREET
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101
(805) 730-1710

☐ 801 S. BROADWAY
SANTA MARIA, CA 93454
(805) 349-3313

October 9, 1997

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

Dear Mr. President:

I would first like to congratulate you on successfully negotiating an agreement with our nation's leading gun makers to ensure that child-safety locks are placed on firearms. Your unwavering leadership on this issue truly demonstrates that your administration places the highest priority on the safety of our citizens.

Yet today another important safety concern stills lies before us -- the pending semiautomatic weapons sale between Israel Military Industries, Ltd. and the U.S. gun maker O.F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc. Last week I sent you a copy of a letter I organized from 34 Members of the House to Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu urging him to halt this sale. Today I respectfully call upon you to use your executive authority to intervene and stop the shipment of these guns into our country. I also seek your assistance in stopping similar sales from other countries in the future.

This sale has been approved by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF) because the Uzis and Galils in question have been modified in such a way as to not violate the 1968 Gun Control Act and the 1994 Assault Weapons Ban. While the BATF may believe these modified weapons are not in technical violation of these laws, this proposed sale certainly violates the spirit of U.S. law. The Assault Weapons Ban was clearly passed to keep these powerful guns off America's streets. This proposed sale, and any others that may follow, represent an enormous threat to public safety in communities throughout our country.

Semiautomatic weapons are increasingly used by criminals to outgun our police officers and to commit heinous crimes. Since 1994, semiautomatic weapons have been used to kill 12 law enforcement officers, yet the majority of these deaths occurred before the implementation of the 1994 Assault Weapons Ban. This law has done much to prevent gun-related crime and death but we must remain vigilant. One of the best ways to stop the human destruction these guns cause is to prevent them from crossing our borders.

The Honorable William J. Clinton
Page 2

I am currently circulating a version of this letter to my House colleagues and I am confident that such action on your part would meet with widespread support in Congress. I greatly respect the leadership you played in bringing about the Assault Weapons Ban as well as today's important development on trigger locks. I look forward to working with you on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Walter Capps

WALTER CAPPS
Member of Congress

WALTER CAPPS
D DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA
1H LONGWORTH BUILDING
...GTON, DC 20515-0522
(202) 225-3601

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

DISTRICT OFFICES:

☐ 1411 MARSH STREET, STE. 205
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93401
(805) 546-8348

☐ 1428 CHAPALA STREET
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101
(805) 730-1710

☐ 801 S. BROADWAY
SANTA MARIA, CA 93454
(805) 349-9313

FAX TRANSMISSION

'97 OCT 9 PM 6:51

TO: Rahm Emanuel

FAX NUMBER: 456-2530

FROM: Congressman Walter Capps

Phone: (202) 225-3601
Fax : (202) 225-5632

DATE: October 9, 1997

NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover): 3

NOTES: **Rahm - Congratulations on today's great victory on safety locks. Your work on this issue clearly made the difference in getting the companies to come to an agreement. I would appreciate your support on this issue as well. Please keep me posted on any new developments. Thank you.**

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL — ID 9706994

REFERRAL — DATE: 20 OCT 97

MEMORANDUM FOR: LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: TO: PRESIDENT

SOURCE: CAPPS, WALTER

DATE: 09 OCT 97

SUBJ: WEAPONS SALE BTW ISRAEL MILITARY INDUSTRIES & MOSSBERG & SONS

REQUIRED ACTION: APPROPRIATE ACTION

DUEDATE:

COMMENT: DOMESTIC ISSUE - HAND GUN CONTROL

DPC

FOR JOHN W. FICKLIN

NSC RECORDS MANAGEMENT OFFICE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 10, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR GLYN DAVIES
NSC Executive Secretariat

FROM: **SUSAN BROPHY**
Legislative Affairs

SUBJECT: **Presidential Correspondence**

Attached are copies of letters sent to the President by various Members of Congress. Since these letters address national security issues, we would appreciate your assistance in drafting a response.

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris Walker at x67500.

The following is a brief description of the letters:

1) Sen. Bob Graham (D-FL), concerning Latin America,

2) Rep. Bob A. Weygand (D-RI) and others, concerning the Chinese company, SinoChem,

3) Rep. Walter Capps (D-CA), concerning child-safety locks on firearms; and,

4) Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI), concerning the current situation in Transcaucasus.

Enclosures

#231804

WALTER CAPPS
22d District, California

1118 Longworth Building
ashington, DC 20515-0522
(202) 225-3601

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

DISTRICT OFFICES:

1411 Marsh Street, Ste. 205
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
(805) 546-8348

1420 Chapala Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 730-1710

801 S. Broadway
Santa Maria, CA 93454
(805) 349-9313

September 30, 1997

President William J. Clinton
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to bring to your personal attention the enclosed letter to Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu signed by 34 Members of the House of Representatives.

This letter represents our strong opposition to the pending sale between Israel Military Industries Ltd. and the U.S. gun maker O.F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc. As you know, the sale would put tens of thousands of Uzi and Galil guns on American streets. These weapons have been modified to avoid the ban instituted in the 1994 Assault Weapons legislation. I know that you believe, as I do, that we cannot continue to expose our citizens to the deadly dangers posed by assault weapons.

I respectfully urge you to intervene in this sale and to do all that you can to heighten the Bureau of Tobacco, Alcohol, and Firearms' role and responsibility in transactions such as this. While we cannot stop the worldwide marketing of these guns, we certainly can make efforts to stop their importation.

I thank you for your attention to this matter and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Walter Capps

WALTER CAPPS
Member of Congress

WHC:cj

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

September 30, 1997

His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu
Prime Minister
Jerusalem, Israel

Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

We are writing to respectfully ask for your intervention in a pending gun sale between a state-owned company, Israel Military Industries Ltd. and the United States gun maker O.F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc. This sale has been approved by the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms because importing these weapons does not technically violate United States law. However, we firmly believe that the commercial sale of powerful assault weapons in the United States must be restricted.

We understand how critical the Uzi and Galil weapons have been to the Israel Defense Forces in the IDF's efforts to maintain the security of the nation. However, these weapons have no place on American streets. As you know, the illegal use of semiautomatic assault weapons continues to rise in our country. Military-style weapons are the guns of choice of criminals from our urban streets to our rural communities.

In the spirit of U.S. - Israel friendship, we urge you to stop this sale and to do all that you can to prevent future sales. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Walter Capps

Tom Lantos

Sam Gejdenson

Eliot L. Engel

Robert Wexler | Carolyn McCarthy
Tom Barrett | Carol B. Maloney
Eddie Bernice Johnson | Sheila Jackson Lee
Anna Eshoo | Elizabeth Furse
Zoe Lofgren | Jim McGovern
Luis V. Gutierrez | Jerrold Nadler
Lucille Roybal-Allard | Lane Evans
Jim McDermott | Barney Frank
Thomas J. Manton | Edward J. Markey

John W. Olver | Neil Abercrombie
Sam Farr | John Spratt
George E. Brown Jr. | Tom Campbell
Sander Levin | Martin O. Sabo
Connie Morella | Juanita Millender-McDonald
Darlene Hooley | Patsy T. Mink

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 27, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Loretta Sanchez (D-CA).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

LORETTA SANCHEZ
46TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

SUBCOMMITTEE:
MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–0546

REPLY TO:
☐ WASHINGTON OFFICE
1529 LONGWORTH BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-0546
(202) 225-2965

☐ DISTRICT OFFICE
12397 LEWIS STREET, SUITE 101
GARDEN GROVE, CA 92840–4695
(714) 621–0102

October 17, 1997

President Bill Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

Dear President Clinton:

I would like to enlist your support for the "Rebuild and Expand America's School Act" which I hope to introduce before the House adjourns this session. I have enclosed a copy of the bill for your consideration.

As you know, the Department of Education recently released its "Baby Boom Echo" report, which highlights overcrowding problems faced by schools across the country. K-12 enrollments will be at an all time high of 52.2 million this fall, and by 2007 the number will reach 54.3 million. California, and my district especially, are one of the most affected areas. A rapid increase in immigration and class sizes have left Southern California schools scrambling for ways to cope with large numbers of students and little space with where to put them.

The Qualified Zone Academy Bond provision in the recent tax bill is a much needed first step in making sure that all of America's school children are adequately housed. Despite the astounding overcrowding crisis facing our K-12 school system, Congress has otherwise paid little attention to passing a comprehensive bill to build new schools and classrooms.

I believe that the Academy bonds concept has more potential to not only renovate schools, but also to build new ones. Therefore, I am planning to introduce similar legislation where these types of bonds can be used for the purpose of new school and classroom construction. The "Expand and Rebuild America's Schools Act" will offer a bond program to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) similar to zone academy bonds, but the eligibility criteria for receiving such bonds has been expanded to focus on assisting schools that face rapid student population growth.

Specifically, LEAs with a growth rate above 10% over five years and with student/teacher ratios over 28 to 1 can qualify for this bond program to construct new schools and/or classrooms. The qualifying criteria will also focus on schools which have made efforts to address their overcrowding problems by implementing year round schedules, portable classrooms, or non-traditional classrooms. This program will reward schools that continue succeed amidst difficult surrounding.

Since education is one of my top priorities I have been working hard to address school construction in Orange County and here in Washington. Serving on the Education & Workforce Committee and on numerous education task forces within the Democratic and Hispanic Caucuses has convinced me that Congress can correct this problem.

I strongly believe that my bill will address the overcrowding problems of schools throughout our country. I hope I can count on your support. I look forward to hearing from you in the near future. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Loretta Sanchez

Loretta Sanchez
Member of Congress

LS:ak

(Original signature of Member)

105TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. ____

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. SANCHEZ introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on ______________

A BILL

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage new school construction through the creation of a new class of bond.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Expand and Rebuild American Schools Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Many States and school districts will need to build new schools in order to accommodate in-

creasing student enrollments; the Department of Education has predicted that the Nation will need 6,000 more schools by the year 2006.

(2) In response to reduced class mandates enforced by State governments and increased enrollment, many school districts have been forced to utilize temporary classrooms and other structures to accommodate increased school populations, along with resorting to year-round schedules for students.

(3) Research has proven a direct correlation between the condition of school facilities and student achievement. Recently, researchers found that students assigned to schools in poor condition can be expected to fall 10.9 percentage points behind those in buildings in excellent condition. Similar studies have demonstrated up to a 20 percent improvement in test scores when students were moved from a school with poor facilities to a new facility.

(4) While school construction and maintenance are primarily a State and local concern, States and communities have not, on their own, met the increasing burden of providing acceptable school facilities, and the poorest communities have had the greatest difficulty meeting this need.

(5) Many local educational agencies have difficulties securing financing for school facility construction and renovation, especially in States that require a ⅔ majority of voter approval for the passage of local bond initiatives.

(6) The Federal Government, by providing interest subsidies and similar types of support, can lower the costs of State and local school infrastructure investment, creating an incentive for businesses to support local school infrastructure improvement efforts.

(7) The United States competitive position within the world economy is vulnerable if America's future workforce continues to be educated in schools not equipped for the 21st century. America must do everything in its power to properly educate its people to compete in the global marketplace.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to encourage public-private partnerships for the financing of school construction and expansion, and

(2) to help local educational agencies bring all public school facilities up to an acceptable standard and build the additional classrooms needed to edu-

cate the growing number of students who will enroll in the next decade.

SEC. 4. CREDIT TO HOLDERS OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to business-related credits) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 45D. CREDIT TO HOLDERS OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BONDS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an eligible taxpayer who holds a school construction bond on the credit allowance date of such bond which occurs during the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year the amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—The amount of the credit determined under this subsection with respect to any school construction bond is the amount equal to the product of—

"(1) the credit rate determined by the Secretary under section 1397E(b)(2) for the month in which such bond was issued, multiplied by

"(2) the face amount of the bond held by the taxpayer on the credit allowance date.

"(c) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess of—

"(1) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55, over

"(2) the sum of the credits allowable under this part (other than under this section and subpart C thereof, relating to refundable credits) and section 1397E.

"(d) SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BOND.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'school construction bond' means any bond issued as part of an issue if—

"(A) 95 percent or more of the proceeds of such issue are to be used for a qualified purpose with respect to a new qualified school established by an eligible local education agency,

"(B) the bond is issued by a State or local government within the jurisdiction of which such school is located,

"(C) the issuer—

"(i) designates such bond for purposes of this section, "(ii) certifies that it has written assurances that the private business contribution requirement of paragraph (2) will be met with respect to such school, and

"(iii) certifies that it has the written approval of the eligible local education agency for such bond issuance, and

"(D) the term of each bond which is part of such issue does not exceed the maximum term permitted under section 1397E(d)(3).

"(2) PRIVATE BUSINESS CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the private business contribution requirement of this paragraph is met with respect to any issue if the eligible local education agency that established the qualified school has written commitments from private entities to make qualified contributions having a present value (as of the date of issuance of the issue) of not less than 10 percent of the proceeds of the issue.

"(B) QUALIFIED CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'qualified contribution' means any contribution (of a type and quality acceptable to the eligible local education agency) of—

"(i) equipment for use in the qualified school (including state-of-the-art technology and vocational equipment),

"(ii) technical assistance in developing curriculum or in training teachers in order to promote appropriate market driven technology in the classroom,

"(iii) services of employees as volunteer mentors,

"(iv) internships, field trips, or other educational opportunities outside the school for students, or

"(v) any other property or service specified by the eligible local education agency.

"(3) QUALIFIED SCHOOL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified school' means any public school which is established by and operated under the supervision of an eligible local education agency to provide education or training below the postsecondary level if—

"(i) such public school is designed in cooperation with business to enhance the academic curriculum, increase graduation and employment rates, and better prepare students for the rigors of college and the increasingly complex workforce,

"(ii) students in such public school will be subject to the same academic standards and assessments as other students educated by the local education agency,

"(iv) a well-structured program to alleviate overcrowding and to improve students' education has been constructed and implemented in the opinion of the Secretary of Education, and

"(v) at least 2 of the following requirements are met:

"(I) There is a reasonable expectation (as of the date of issuance of the bonds) that at least 35 percent of the population attending the such public school will be eligible for free or reduced-cost lunches under the school lunch program established under the National School Lunch Act.

"(II) There is a reasonable expectation (as of the date of issuance of the bonds) that the student growth rate over the next 5 years for the school district in which such public school is to be located will be at least 10 percent.

"(III) The student-teacher ratio for such district as of the date of issuance of the bonds is over 28 to 1.

"(B) ELIGIBLE LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY.—The term 'eligible local education agency' means any local educational agency as defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

"(4) QUALIFIED PURPOSE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified purpose' means, with respect to any qualified school—

"(i) constructing a new school facility, and "(ii) providing equipment for use at such facility.

"(B) SCHOOL FACILITY.—The term 'school facility' means a new public structure suitable for use as a classroom, laboratory, library, media center, or related facility whose primary purpose is the instruction of public elementary or secondary students. Such term does not include an athletic stadium, or any other structure or facility intended primarily for athletic exhibitions, contests, games, or events for which admission is charged to the general public.

"(5) ELIGIBLE TAXPAYER.—The term 'eligible taxpayer' means—

"(A) a bank (within the meaning of section 581),

"(B) an insurance company to which subchapter L applies, and

"(C) a corporation actively engaged in the business of lending money.

"(e) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF BONDS DESIGNATED.—

"(1) NATIONAL LIMITATION.—There is a national school construction bond limitation for each calendar year. Such limitation is $400,000,000 for

1998 and 1999, and, except for carryovers as provided under the rules applicable under paragraph (2), zero thereafter.

"(2) ALLOCATION OF LIMITATION.—The national school construction bond limitation for a calendar year shall be allocated by the Secretary among the States on the basis of their respective populations of individuals below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget). The limitation amount allocated to a State under the preceding sentence shall be allocated by the Secretary of Education to qualified schools within such State.

"(3) DESIGNATION SUBJECT TO LIMITATION AMOUNT.—The maximum aggregate face amount of bonds issued during any calendar year which may be designated under subsection (d)(1) with respect to any qualified school shall not exceed the limitation amount allocated to such school under paragraph (2) for such calendar year.

"(4) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED LIMITATION.—If for any calendar year—

"(A) the limitation amount for any State, exceeds

"(B) the amount of bonds issued during such year which are designated under subsection (d)(1) with respect to qualified schools within such State,

the limitation amount for such State for the following calendar year shall be increased by the amount of such excess.

"(f) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—The definitions in subsections (d)(6) and (f) of section 1397E shall apply for purposes of this section.

"(g) CREDIT INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME.—Gross income includes the amount of the credit allowed to the taxpayer under this section."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 45D. Credit to holders of school construction bonds."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to obligations issued after December 31, 1997.

THE WHITE HOUSE

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

FAX COVER SHEET

NOTE: THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND INTENDED FOR THE RECIPIENT ONLY.

DATE: ______

TO: Paul Weinstein

FAX: 6-7028

FROM: X CHRISTOPHER WALKER

___ JANELLE ERICKSON

456-7500 (TEL) 456-6221 (FAX)

RE: ______

PAGE 1 OF 3

If there are any problems with this transmission, please call (202) 456-7500.

BILL GOODLING
19TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA
TOLL FREE DISTRICT NUMBER:
800-632-1811
CHAIRMAN:
MMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND
THE WORKFORCE
COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–3819

ROOM 2263
RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
TELEPHONE: (202) 225-5836
DISTRICT OFFICES:
FEDERAL BUILDING
200 SOUTH GEORGE STREET
YORK, PA 17406-8999
CHAMBER BUILDING
212 NORTH HANOVER STREET
CARLISLE, PA 17013-2423
140 BALTIMORE STREET
ROOM 301
GETTYSBURG, PA 17325-2311
2020 YALE AVENUE
CAMP HILL, PA 17011-5050
44 FREDERICK STREET
HANOVER, PA 17331-3508

September 24, 1997

President Bill Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20500-0005

SEP 25 PM5:36

Dear Mr. President:

In your recent speech before the AFL-CIO, you said, "...there is nothing more important for the future of this country than giving our kids a decent education."

I agree with that statement 100 percent.

You went on to say, "For the first time, 4th graders scored above the global average in mathematics and science."

What you didn't say was that happened because of the efforts of the states to raise their academic standards and better prepare teaching staff with some financial assistance from the federal government.

You continued with the statement, "I know all children can learn and I know we've got people who can do the job. We've just got to support them and bear down and do more of the kinds of things that we know will work."

That is exactly what I am trying to do. With your shotgun approach -- with a little money spread everywhere -- I'm left with $200 million to do the one major initiative you proposed that truly makes sense: improvements of literacy.

For $200 million spread throughout the country, I have to design a program that will have all children reading-ready by the time they reach 1st grade. That means intensive pre-school reading readiness programs. That means an all-out effort to help parents become the child's most important teacher. That means training and retraining teachers in how to teach reading using proven research and methods. That means remedying those children who are presently in 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grades who are not reading at grade level.

That's a big order for $200 million. But it is positively necessary to accomplish this before we get into the business of giving students one more standardized test.

Your stance on testing is making my job of authorizing an "America Reads" program almost impossible. I need your help if your most important initiative -- having all Americans read -- is ever going to see the light of day.

Sincerely,

Bill

BILL GOODLING
Chairman, House Committee on
Education and the Workforce

P.S. I called you last Thursday to discuss the "America Reads initiative.

WFG/ts

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 26, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find copies of letters that were sent to the President from Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun (D-IL) and others.

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

September 16, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

SEP 18 AM 11:34

Dear Mr. President:

We urge you to support a six month moratorium on the penalties imposed on all states who fail to comply with the October 1, 1997 Child Support Enforcement System automation deadline imposed by the 1988 Family Support Act.

The 1988 Act and the 1996 welfare reform requires all states to have a child support enforcement system automation plan ready and certified by HHS by October 1, 1997, as part of the state plan requirement for receiving TANF funds.

As you may know, HHS has indicated that only 16 states have been certified as of date and 22 states might be certified by December 1997 or later. Twelve or more states will not meet the October 1, 1997 deadline or be ready by December 31st. As a result, these states could lose all their TANF funds and the state's child support program funds.

The effect of completely shutting down welfare and child support funding for 12 or more states have nationwide impact, since 30% of all child support cases are interstate collection cases. This means children in Kansas or Georgia will not be able to get child support from fathers in California or Pennsylvania.

FY98 will be the first full year of welfare reform implementation and due to the Child Support Enforcement System deadline, welfare reform implementation will be in jeopardy, affecting millions of families and children nationwide who rely on TANF and child support for survival.

-- For California, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 4 billion dollars.
-- For Hawaii, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 113 million dollars.
-- For Illinois, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 654 million dollars.
-- For Ohio, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 836 million dollars.
-- For Maryland, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 274 million dollars.
-- For Michigan, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 857 million dollars.

-- For Nevada, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 62 million dollars.
-- For Pennsylvania, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 794 million dollars.
-- For the District of Columbia, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 100 million dollars.

We believe that imposing such devastating financial penalties on states who fail to meet this deadline will not hasten the development of workable systems but will result in harming the very people for whom the 1988 Family Support Act and the 1996 Welfare Reform were designed to serve.

We urge you again for your support on imposing a moratorium on the penalties and we look forward to working with you in improving our child support program that would better serve all our families and children.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein — Carol Moseley Braun
Harry Reid — Barbara Boxer
Jeff Bingaman — Mike DeWine
Richard H. Bryan — Daniel K. Akaka
Paul S. Sarbanes — Barbara A. Mikulski

Jeff Bingaman

Carl Levin

John Glenn

[illegible]

Tom Harkin

Rick Santorum

Jim Johnson

Pete Domenici

Arlen Specter (child support)

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

September 17, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20500

SEP 22 PM 4:22

Dear Mr. President:

We urge you to support a six month moratorium on the penalties imposed on all states that fail to comply with an October 1, 1997 Child Support Enforcement System automation deadline imposed by the 1988 Family Support Act.

The 1988 Act and the 1996 welfare reform require all states to have a child support enforcement system automation plan ready and certified by HHS by October 1, 1997 as part of the state plan requirement for receiving TANF funds.

As you may know, HHS has indicated that only 16 states have currently been certified and 22 states might be certified by December 1997 or later. Twelve or more states will not meet the October 1st deadline or be ready by December 31st. As a result, these states could lose all their TANF funds and the state's child support program funds.

The effect of completely shutting down welfare and child support funding for 12 or more states have nationwide impact since 30% of all child support cases are interstate collection cases. This means children in Kansas or Georgia will not be able to get child support from fathers in California or Pennsylvania.

FY98 will be the first full year of welfare reform implementation and because many states will not meet the Child Support Enforcement System deadline, welfare reform implementation will be in jeopardy, affecting millions of families and children nationwide who rely on TANF and child support for survival.

-- For California, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 4 billion dollars.
-- For South Dakota, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 25 million dollars.
-- For New Mexico, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 129 million dollars.
-- For Hawaii, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 113 million dollars.
-- For Illinois, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 654 million dollars.
-- For Ohio, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 836 million dollars.

-- For Maryland, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 274 million dollars.
-- For Michigan, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 857 million dollars.
-- For Nevada, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 62 million dollars.
-- For Pennsylvania, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 794 million dollars.
-- For the District of Columbia, loss of TANF and child support funds amounts to 100 million dollars.

We believe that imposing huge financial penalties on states that fail to meet this deadline will not hasten the development of workable systems but will result in harming the very people for whom the 1988 Family Support Act and the 1996 Welfare Reform were designed to serve.

We urge you again for your support on imposing a moratorium on the penalties and we look forward to working with you in improving our child support program to better serve all our families and children.

Sincerely,

Richard H. Bryan

Jeff Bingaman

Carl Levin

John Glenn

[illegible]

Tom Daschle

Rick Santorum

Tim Johnson

Pete Domenici

Arlen Specter (child support)

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 26, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Gerald D. Kleczka (D-WI).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

JERRY KLECZKA
4TH DISTRICT, WISCONSIN

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE
HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE

2301 RAYBURN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–4904
(202) 225–4572
FAX: (202) 225–8135
e-mail: jerry4wi@hr.house.gov

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

5032 WEST FOREST HOME AVENUE
MILWAUKEE, WI 53219–4589
(414) 297–1140
FAX: (414) 327–6151

414 WEST MORELAND BOULEVARD
SUITE 105
WAUKESHA, WI 53188–2441
(414) 549–6360
FAX: (414) 549–6723

September 17, 1997

President William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20006-1603

SEP 19 PM2:10

Dear Mr. President:

I write regarding your recent comments before the Service Employees International Union concerning possible next steps in the expansion of health coverage for early retirees. I commend you for your attention to this important matter.

As you may know, retirees of a brewery in my district faced a devastating loss last year when their former employer unexpectedly canceled their retiree health benefits. After years of dedicated service, nearly 750 retirees in Milwaukee were left without the benefits they were promised. A good number of these retirees were early retirees in their 50s and early 60s. Now, these individuals find themselves facing years of waiting and uncertainty until they are eligible for Medicare, or years of paying exorbitant premiums if they are able to secure insurance in the individual market. This should not and does not have to happen.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill, H.R. 211, the Health Care Assurance for Retired Employees Act, which seeks to address the problem of early retirees, like those in my district, who have their employer-based retiree health coverage involuntarily terminated. It will also protect future retirees from a similar fate. My bill would, among other things, allow early retirees to sign up for COBRA coverage until they are eligible for Medicare. These individuals, not the federal government or their employer, would be responsible for paying 110% of the premium for such coverage. In addition, my bill would require employers to give retirees notice prior to reducing or eliminating health benefits and to file this notice with the Department of Labor. This straightforward legislation brings some much-needed security to retirees who all too often have become pawns in a game of corporate greed and irresponsibility.

I urge you to examine my legislation as you consider solutions to this ever-increasing problem. And, I look forward to working with you in bringing fairness and decency back to the

American worker. If we truly are going to strengthen America's families, our economy and our future, we must begin again our work of guaranteeing all Americans access to health care.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Jerry

JERRY KLECZKA
Member of Congress

GDK/kc

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 2, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Bobby L. Rush (D-IL).

I do not believe this letter requires a Presidential response at this time. Please review the attached material and respond directly to the Member(s) of Congress. Please forward a copy of the response to Chris Walker, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Chris at 456-7500.

Enclosure

BOBBY L. RUSH
1ST DISTRICT
ILLINOIS

COMMERCE COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEES:
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, TRADE, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION
ENERGY AND POWER

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

August 21, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20500-0005

AUG 26 PM 12:15

Dear President Clinton:

I am writing to voice my grave concern about the Administration's recent announcement that over 95,000 disabled children will lose their Social Security Income (SSI) benefits as a result of strict new standards from the 1996 federal welfare reform law. Of those states which have completed their first round of re-determinations, Illinois is among the top 10 for cutting disabled children off the rolls. In Illinois, alone,7,055 disabled children are losing these benefits— 71 percent of all cases reviewed. This is significantly higher than the national average of 55.9 percent. More than a third of the cases being reviewed in Illinois are for children whose families live in or nearby the First Congressional District.

These children suffer from multiple disabilities that result in behavioral, social, and learning problems. Slashing benefits for these children, without a thorough review process and alternative treatment planning, may adversely impact future educational and job opportunities. Ordering these cuts in the short-run may balance the federal budget, but in the long run our society will pay the social, economic and human costs.

On behalf of disabled children and their families across the country, I call on you to ask for an immediate moratorium on these cuts nationwide until the Administration conducts an independent review to determine why some states are cutting off more children than others. If, truly, a federal standard and review process are being implemented, why is the cutoff rate as high as 82.1 percent in Mississippi and as low as 29.3 percent in Hawaii?

Additionally, it has come to my attention that in Illinois 12 percent of the denials are due to "non-cooperation." This compares with a rate of four percent in other states. Many of the children being cut off come from families that live in very poor inner city or rural communities where mail delivery is erratic. I know, firsthand, that my constituents, especially

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
131 CANNON HOB
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515-9997
(202) 225-4372
Bobby Rush@mail.house.gov

CITY OFFICE:
655 E. 79TH STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60619-3036
(773) 224-6500

SUBURBAN OFFICE:
9730 S. WESTERN AVENUE
SUITE 237
EVERGREEN PARK, IL 60805-2814
(708) 422-4055

those living in public housing, often never receive official mail, and, therefore, are not even aware of what they must do to "cooperate."

Last year, when you signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996, you promised to "fix" the parts of the law that were not working. Based on the disparity among the states in the rates at which cases are being denied, I urge you to order a complete independent review of how the new regulations and review process are being carried out in the field. I ask you to include experts in the field of child development in this review process.

In addition, I ask the Social Security Administration to provide Members of Congress with data by Congressional District of the number of cases subject to review and the disposition of these cases. My District office is preparing to be flooded with calls from constituents about these cutoffs. As a Member of Congress, I have a responsibility to be informed on what is happening in my District, and the Administration has a duty to provide Members with accurate, up-to-date information on the impact of these cuts.

I urge you to take immediate action on this situation. August 22, 1997, marks the first anniversary of federal welfare reform. The Administration has a duty to proceed with caution and protect the most vulnerable members of our country--our youth.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bobby L. Rush

Bobby L. Rush
Member of Congress

BLR\sbr

cc: Ken Apfel, Office of Management and Budget
John Callahan, Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration
Senator Carol Moseley-Braun
Senator Richard J. Durbin