THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 18, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the 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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

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

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

Killingworth/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

August 8, 1997

AUG 12 AM 9:47

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

Dear Mr. President:

Knowing of your strong commitment to improving retirement security for Americans, I am writing to bring to your attention action taken by the State of Connecticut to help people better understand their savings options.

Connecticut took a leading role in retirement savings education this year when it enacted a bill to teach students courses in personal financial management. The state will develop a curriculum that will then be available to local school districts. Helping students understand financial principles will help them in the short term, but more important, it will impress upon them the need to begin saving early for retirement, and will enable them to make wise choices about their economic futures.

When studies by the Labor Department show that more than a third of employees fail to take advantage of even the pension plans that are offered, it is clear that a better understanding of retirement savings options is needed. I am proud that Connecticut has taken an important step toward teaching its students about their savings options. State legislators developed the plan in conjunction with Connecticut resident Carl Feen who also serves as Vice Chairman of the Labor Department's Advisory Council on Pension and Welfare Benefits. I hope that the ERISA Board which Carl helps lead will explore how Connecticut's financial education plan could serve as a national model.

I also want to let you know that the spirit of volunteerism you have encouraged is reflected in the commitment Connecticut businesses have shown to this financial education effort. At least one firm has indicated its willingness to help underwrite development of the curriculum and to provide financial experts as volunteer teachers for the courses.

Again, I appreciate your commitment to helping Americans realize security in their retirement years, and hope that Connecticut can serve as a model for improving teaching about retirement savings.

Sincerely,

Rosa

ROSA L. DeLAURO
Member of Congress

RLD/jj

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 18, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Sen. Lauch Faircloth (R-NC).

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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6025

AUG 12 PM 4:31

August 8, 1997

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

Dear Mr. President:

Today it was announced that District of Columbia Public Schools would open three weeks after the regularly scheduled opening date. I think that this is both a tragedy and an embarrassment that this is occurring in our Nations' Capital. Now is not the time to assign blame, but rather to act to help the situation.

This spring, during consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill, I tried to obtain new money to insure that the schools opened on time. That effort was unsuccessful.

I am writing to urge you, as soon as possible, to use whatever federal resources are available to speed up the repair of the schools so that they can open on schedule. I can assure you that I will work with the Appropriations Committee to minimize any impact to other agencies whose resources might be used in the effort.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Lauch Faircloth

Lauch Faircloth
Chairman, D.C. Appropriations
Subcommittee

LF/jeh

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 17, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Elijah E. Cummings (D-MD).

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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIV
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20515

DPC

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS
SEVENTH DISTRICT
MARYLAND

August 7, 1997

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President
Office of the President
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

AUG 13 PM 1:56

Dear Mr. President:

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce you to five remarkable young women:

Ms. Angela Taylor   Ms. Michelle Beard   Ms. Sonserray Davis
Ms. Teya Boulware   Ms. Tiffany Dorkins

These young women exemplify the spirit of community involvement and concern that will propel this nation into the next millennium. In a joint venture between the Park-Reist Corridor Coalition, a community organization, and the University of Maryland Law School in Baltimore, Maryland, they have used their time and effort to study the community they live in, and become a major factor in finding solutions to the problems that exist there.

These young ladies surveyed each block in their community. They identified the problems (vacant houses, crime, lack of certain kinds of businesses and facilities), and the resources (businesses, resource centers, hospitals, recreational and educational facilities), that exist in their community. They are taking the valuable information they gathered and the possible solutions they authored, and putting their lore into an information resource database at the Housing Authority of Baltimore City for use in urban renewal planning.

I was humbled by their commitment and willingness to go the extra mile to see that their community is organized and self sufficient. Young people with this type of concern for community and insightful input must be an integral part of planning what happens in our communities, if our cities are to flourish in the future.

I know that you are always interested in the lives of America's young leaders, and I thought that you would want to know about these remarkable young women.

With warm regards,

Elijah E. Cummings

Elijah E. Cummings
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 12, 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. Robert E. Andrews (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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

ROBERT E. ANDREWS
FIRST DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

COMMITTEE:
EDUCATION AND
THE WORKPLACE
SUBCOMMITTEES:
WORKFORCE PROTECTIONS
POST SECONDARY EDUCATION,
TRAINING AND LIFELONG
LEARNING

COMMITTEE:
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEES.
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC
WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–3001

August 8, 1997

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

AUG 12 AM 9:44

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to express my concern about the recently announced tobacco settlement between the industry and the forty states' attorney generals.

Finding a resolution to the lawsuits against tobacco companies is clearly a laudable goal. I am concerned, however, that the announced settlement, which would require congressional action, does not adequately protect multiemployer health funds. The workers covered by these funds, run by labor and management, are targeted by the tobacco industry's marketing. These funds, which cover roughly thirty million Americans, have incurred billions of dollars in health care costs for tobacco-related illnesses. Their voice should be heard before their rights are taken away.

I look forward to working with you on a comprehensive tobacco settlement that is fair to all parties involved.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. ANDREWS
Member of Congress

REA:ac

LY TO:

2439 RAYBURN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–3001
(202) 225–6501

☐ 506 A WHITE HORSE PIKE
HADDON HEIGHTS, NJ 08035
(609) 546–5100

☐ 63 N. BROAD STREET
WOODBURY, NJ 08096–4602
(609) 848–3900

e-mail at: randrews@hr.house.gov

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 11, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Sen. Charles E. Grassly (R-IA).

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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

Reply To:

☐ 135 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-1501
(202) 224-3744
TTY: (202) 224-4479
e-mail:chuck_grassley@grassley.senate.gov

721 Federal Building
210 Walnut Street
Des Moines, IA 50309-2140
(515) 284-4890

☐ 206 Federal Building
101 1st Street SE.
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401-1227
(319) 363-6832

United States Senate

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-1501

Reply To:

☐ 103 Federal Courthouse Building
320 6th Street
Sioux City, IA 51101-1244
(712) 233-1860

☐ 210 Waterloo Building
531 Commercial Street
Waterloo, IA 50701-5497
(319) 232-6657

☐ 116 Federal Building
131 E. 4th Street
Davenport, IA 52801-1513
(319) 322-4331

☐ 307 Federal Building
8 South 6th Street
Council Bluffs, IA 51501-4204
(712) 322-7103

AUG 7 PM 4:02

August 4, 1997

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

Dear Mr. President:

Thank you for calling me at my farm Saturday to discuss the Grassley/Moseley-Braun provision to extend to the year 2007 ethanol's partial exemption from the highway excise tax. Today, I also received a return to my calls to Vice President Gore. In addition to your commitments, I also have received commitments from Speaker Gingrich and Senate Republican Leader Lott to help secure this ethanol extension, and I have been working closely with Senate Democratic Leader Daschle. In view of this strong support for ethanol from Republican and Democratic leaders, we will ultimately succeed.

You and I spoke about working together to extend the ethanol program on the highway reauthorization bill, and I want to do that. You should also know that both Republican and Democratic leaders with whom I have spoken agree the highway bill is our next best opportunity for the ethanol extension. But we need to learn from the mistakes made with the reconciliation bill. We cannot afford to repeat them.

To elaborate upon the frustration I shared with you Saturday, the reason I placed calls to you on Monday and Tuesday was because White House negotiators apparently did not understand that they held the power to tip the scales for ethanol in what otherwise was a deadlock between the Senate, which endorsed the Grassley/Moseley-Braun ethanol extension through 2007 by a vote of 69-30, and the House, which had a provision that while protecting the existing ethanol program, would make it more difficult to extend it after the year 2000.

White House negotiators accepted a compromise that dropped both the House and the Senate provisions. But just a few days earlier, Senate Republican negotiators had rejected the very same compromise, because I had been assured that if the ethanol issue was left open as we proceeded to the official conference, that the White House and Democratic Congressional leaders would weigh in on the side of the ethanol extension.

The reason Governor Branstad spoke to you Monday morning in Las Vegas, and the reason I left a detailed message for you through Bruce Lindsey as well as my subsequent phone messages to you was that we felt that if you knew your negotiators had somehow misunderstood the importance of weighing in tough for the ethanol extension, that you and/or the Vice President could still tip the scales.

I am not stating this to be critical, but instead simply to underscore the importance of making certain that we all work more closely together, in a productive, bi-partisan way, to accomplish our mutual objectives of extending the very important ethanol program. Your leadership will be crucial and is appreciated. I look forward to getting together with you, as you suggested, after Labor Day, to put together our legislative strategy.

Sincerely,

Chuck Grassley

Charles E. Grassley
United States Senator

Committee Assignments:

FINANCE
JUDICIARY

AGRICULTURE
BUDGET

CHAIRMAN,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 11, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Fortney Pete Stark (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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Fortney Pete Stark
Thirteenth District, California

August 6, 1997

AUG 7 PM 4:00

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, DC 20502

Dear President Clinton:

There have been a flurry of reports recently on the unacceptable level of fraud and abuse in the Medicare program. Home health care is particularly prone to abuse. The HHS Inspector General (IG) recently reported that one quarter of home health agencies (HHAs) in the five Operation Restore Trust States are "problem providers" that have "abused or defrauded Medicare or misappropriated Medicare funds through the cost report or claims process." The IG also reported that 40% of payments to HHAs in those States should not have been made.

Much of this fraud, waste and abuse occurs because providers do not comply with Medicare rules about medical necessity and about how services and supplies should be coded and documented. The GAO recently reported that "because the requirements are minimal, HCFA [the Health Care Financing Administration] certifies nearly all HHAs seeking certification [and] most will never have to demonstrate compliance with all of the participation conditions." The GAO recommends that HCFA "strengthen the survey and certification process so that it provides greater assurance that only those HHAs that provide quality care in accordance with requirements participate in Medicare."

However, HCFA is woefully lacking in resources to conduct compliance audits and other program safeguard activities. Over the past 7 years, the number of Medicare claims processed has risen 70%, while HCFA's budget for reviewing claims grew less than 11%. Between 1988 and 1996, home health spending grew from $2.1 billion to $18 billion, and the number of HHAs nearly doubled. Yet, due to budgetary constraints, home health claims reviews dropped from 62% of claims in 1987 to just 2% in 1996.

In many industries, it is standard operating procedure to have outside auditors or inspectors ensure that businesses are complying with federal regulations. As you contemplate solutions to the health fraud problem, I hope you will consider requiring independent annual compliance audits for many provider groups, especially HHAs. The provider groups should be responsible for paying for the independent audits as a Condition of Participation in the Medicare program. Annual audits, rather than initial one-time audits, are needed because some providers may start out honestly but gradually creep into abusing the system as they gain experience and "test the waters." Annual audits would also serve an educational purpose, thus reducing waste that occurs because providers don't understand the system.

I hope you will seriously consider this idea as part of your fight against Medicare fraud and abuse.

Sincerely,

Pete Stark
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 7, 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. James A. Traficant (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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

August 1, 1997

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

AUG 6 PM 12:41

Dear President Clinton:

We are writing to respectfully request the appointment of a Federal Task Force on Silicone Implants, to investigate and study the adverse health effects of silicone breast implants on the human body, and ensure the protection of public health through public awareness and education campaigns.

On October 10, 1995, the $4.23 billion global breast implant settlement collapsed, closing the door on 440,000 women, many of whom are seriously ill and in desperate need of medical treatment. With a rupture or severe gel bleed rate for silicone implants reported to be as high as 71 percent, many of these women still have ruptured or leaking implants in their bodies yet are lacking the financial means to pay for surgical explantation. An estimated one to two million women have been implanted with silicone-gel cosmetic and reconstructive prostheses. Due to various debilitating silicone associated illnesses, many former hard-working, productive women are now disabled, uninsured, and unable to care for themselves or their families. The Blue Cross/Blue Shield Underwriting Guidelines, for example, now state that coverage is to be denied to any woman with breast implants. Silicone illness, and the unwillingness of manufacturers to accept responsibility for it, has led to the burgeoning health and welfare crisis among breast implant recipients today.

Supporting the need for a Federal Task Force on Silicone Implants is an accumulating body of scientific evidence that documents the cause-and-effect relationship between silicone and human illness, some of it produced by Dow Corning's own scientists. In 1948 and 1950, Dow Chemical, the parent-company of Dow Corning, stated that commercial silicones were inert and non-toxic in the human body. Documents subpoenaed in recent litigation, however, reveal that Dow Chemical knew otherwise. The truth is, Dow Chemical was informed by scientist H.C. Spencer in the 1940s that certain silicones were toxic, and by scientist M.C. Chenowith in 1956 that liquid silicone spreads throughout the body. By the 1960s, Dow Chemical was aware that chemicals leaking from breast implants had toxic effects. All of these documents were submitted for the record during the House Government Reform and Oversight's August 1, 1995 hearing on medical devices.

Furthermore, previously undisclosed industrial research shows that silicone, which is proven to have estrogenic properties, can cross the placental barrier and have adverse, long-term effects on second-generation children. In this early-conducted laboratory study, fetal effects included skeletal defects, shrinkage and deterioration of male reproductive organs and abnormal sperm motility. In addition to placental exposure, silicone may cause harm through the chemical contamination of breast milk. In fact, the Human Resources National Breast Milk Bank no longer accepts breast milk from women with implants. Recent studies have documented a rare intestinal defect in a majority of children breast-fed by implanted mothers. Two years later these children were still suffering from the same intestinal problems. A total of nine studies and articles demonstrate a consistent set of problems among breast-fed children of mother with implants. The findings of one 1994 study,

(next page)

The Honorable William J. Clinton
July 21, 1997
Page Two

published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA), reported that six out of eight children developed esophageal abnormalities and impairment (Levine, January 19, 1994; Levine, February 26, 1996). Other published findings include immune system activation as well as increased occurrence of illnesses.

Recent evidence on silicone-related disease was examined by a panel of researchers during the April 17, 1997 National Institutes of Health Silicone Breast Implants and Atypical Rheumatic Disease Workshop. During the workshop, researchers presented evidence of neuro-cognitive disfunction, rheumatic disease and malignant myeloma, a rare form of cancer typically found in older men -- all of which were linked to silicone breast implants.

In light of the accumulation of evidence of health risks and disorders associated with silicone breast implants, we respectfully request the appointment of a Federal Task Force on Silicone Implants, comprised of:

1. Medical experts who have conducted independently-funded, peer-reviewed, published silicone research, and are not affiliated with corporate-funded or special-interest organizations.

2. Injured, silicone breast-implant recipients who represent the established goals of silicone informational and support networks.

3. Federal agency representatives of the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration (specifically the FDA Center for Devices and Radiological Health and the Office of Consumer Affairs), the Department of Health and Human Services, the Center for Disease Control and the Social Security Administration.

4. Representatives of major health-insurance providers.

We, as a country, can no longer ignore the serious health effects of silicone on unsuspecting women and children. Every medical product available to U.S. consumers must be guaranteed for safety and clearly warn of all adverse effects and risks. We urge you to immediately appoint a Federal Task Force on Silicone Implants to address the public health risks associated with silicone implants. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

James A. Traficant, Jr.
Member of Congress

Sheila Jackson-Lee
Member of Congress

Ken Bentsen
Member of Congress

Jim Turner
Member of Congress

Tim Roemer
Member of Congress

Henry B. Gonzalez
Member of Congress

Peter A. DeFazio
Member of Congress

Juanita Millender-McDonald
Member of Congress

Eleanor Holmes Norton
Member of Congress

Gene Green
Member of Congress

Corrine Brown
Member of Congress

James P. McGovern
Member of Congress

William O. Lipinski
Member of Congress

Bob Clement
Member of Congress

Maurice D. Hinchey
Member of Congress

Max Sandlin
Member of Congress

Phil English
Member of Congress

James E. Clyburn
Member of Congress

John J. LaFalce
Member of Congress

Charles B. Rangel
Member of Congress

Lloyd Doggett
Member of Congress

Bennie G. Thompson
Member of Congress

Ronald V. Dellums
Member of Congress

Lane Evans
Member of Congress

Donna M. Christian-Green
Member of Congress

Luis V. Gutierrez
Member of Congress

Eni F.H. Faleomavaega
Member of Congress

Carrie Meek
Member of Congress

Patsy T. Mink
Member of Congress

Karen L. Thurman
Member of Congress

Julia Carson
Member of Congress

Carolyn C. Kilpatrick
Member of Congress

Nick Lampson
Member of Congress

Adam Smith
Member of Congress

Louise M. Slaughter
Member of Congress

Eliot L. Engel
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Danny K. Davis (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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

DANNY K. DAVIS
7TH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS

COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–1307

DISTRICT OFFICE:
3333 WEST ARTHINGTON STREET
SUITE 130
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60624
(773) 533-7520

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
ROOM 1218
LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-5006

July 24, 1997

Mr. John L. Hilley II
Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

JUL 25 PM 5:31

Dear Mr. Hilley:

As the discussions proceed with the Congressional leadership on Medicare, I want to bring to your attention an issue of great concern to me as well as several of my colleagues. The provision about which I am concerned was actually in both the House and Senate versions of the reconciliation legislation in different forms and was supported by Bruce Vladeck of HCFA. Unfortunately, due to the opposition of two Republican participants in a conference session at which we were not present, the provision was deleted.

The issue is the reimbursement for capital expenditures for hospitals caught in the transition from cost reimbursement to prospective payment (PPS). When the original PPS legislation was adopted, regulations provided certain hospitals with reimbursements at 85% of actual cost with minimal eligibility requirements. This was done on the theory that those institutions would not have the tie necessary under prospective payment to build up reserves to pay for needed replacement facilities and major renovations. Unfortunately, many hospitals were not eligible for this level of reimbursement simply because of delays in state approvals and the sheer size of some projects. For these hospitals, there was not enough time under the new system to even begin to adequately cover Medicare capital costs. In 1994 HCFA moved to partially ameliorate the situation by providing 70% reimbursement on a cost basis for hospitals caught in the transition. However, this lower level of reimbursement, as well as added new limitations on eligibility, does not provide adequate or equitable treatment for hospitals with projects underway.

This is a matter of serious concern to several hospitals in Illinois, including Cook County Hospital which is the Chicago area's major public hospital. I am particularly distressed that the provision that we crafted and adopted in both chambers was abruptly dropped without even an effort to compromise or work out differences. It is of great importance to me that the White House insist on preserving the provision, or at least assist by brokering a compromise acceptable to those of us supporting the change.

I want you to know this is a priority for me. I look forward to working with you on this matter.

Sincerely,

Danny K. Davis

Danny K. Davis
Member of Congress

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. James P. Moran (D-VA), 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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

July 14, 1997

JUL 21 PM 4:19

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

Dear Mr. President:

As your administration seeks to build on its record of creating new jobs and making American industry more competitive in the 21st Century, we urge you to conclude an agreement promptly with congressional leaders on a comprehensive product liability bill that can be enacted before the end of the year.

There are few issues more important to this nation's competitive position than reform of its product liability laws. The existing patchwork system of state product liability laws is no longer effective in an economy where the vast majority of all manufactured goods cross state lines before final sale. The existing system discourages investments in new product development, impedes interstate commerce, and has led to inconsistent and even arbitrary results. Research has shown that this system disproportionately burdens some of the nation's most innovative industries, including aerospace, electronics, and pharmaceuticals and medical devices.

There is strong support in Congress and among the American people for product liability reform legislation that -- among other things -- creates a more level playing field for manufacturers, establishes a fair rule for the allocation of non-economic damages, and shields sellers and lessors from liability that arises through no fault of their own. In addition, we believe that it is critical that any reform legislation incorporate the provisions of H.R. 872, the Biomaterials Access Assurance Act. The enactment of H.R. 872 will avert a looming public health crisis that threatens shortages in pacemakers, hip and knee joints, brain shunts, and other implantable medical devices.

We stand ready to work with administration officials in any way we appropriately can to advance this important goal.

Sincerely,

Jim Moran

Charlie Stenholm

The Honorable William J. Clinton
July 14, 1997
page 2

Barbara B. Kennelly

Marcy Kaptur

W.G. (Bill) Hefner

Tim Holden

Bud Cramer

[illegible] Clement

[illegible]

[illegible]

Ralph M. Hall

Tony P. Hall

Rick Boucher

Norman Sisisky

Allen Boyd Jr.

Virgil Goode

Cal Dooley

Michael R. McNulty

[illegible] Minge

Bart Gordon

[illegible]

Jim Barcia

Signatures on Product Liability Letter

Rep. John S. Tanner (D-TN)
Rep. Charlie W. Stenholm (D-TX)

Rep. Jim James P. Moran (D-VA)
Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA)

page 2

Rep. Barbara B. Kennelly (D-CT)
Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D-OH)
Rep. W.G. (Bill) Hefner (D-NC)
Rep. Tim Holden (D-PA)
Rep. Bud Cramer (D-AL) Robert E.
Rep. Bob Clement (D-TN)
Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-IN) H.
Rep. Chris John (D-LA) christopher
Rep. Ralph M. Hall (D-TX)
Rep. Tony R. Hall (D-OH)

Rep. Rick Boucher (D-VA)
Rep. Norman Sisisky (D-VA)
Rep. Allen Boyd, Jr. (D-FL)
Rep. Virgil H. Goode (D-VA)
Rep. Cal Dooley (D-CA) calvin M.
Rep. Michael McNulty (D-NY) R.
Rep. David Minge (D-MN)
Rep. Bart Gordon (D-TN)
Rep. Gary A. Condit (D-CA)
Rep. James A. Barcia (D-MI)

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 30, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

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

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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

JOHN TANNER
8TH DISTRICT
TENNESSEE

COMMITTEE
ON
WAYS AND MEANS

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515-4208

July 24, 1997

JUL 28 AM 10:02

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

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to express my concern over the proposal to provide a $5 million bonus payment to any state which privatizes social service positions, such as food stamps and Medicaid operations. I do not believe this proposal should be included in the budget reconciliation legislation.

At a time when we are being called upon to reduce the budgets for many worthwhile federal programs, to add up to $250 million in new spending to a bill intended to balance our federal budget should be unacceptable. I understand that these provisions have been added to the bill in order to get around Senate rules. I urge you to consider the budgetary impact of adding this new spending simply to get around Senate rules and to remove these provisions from the budget reconciliation bill.

Sincerely,

John Tanner, M. C.

JT/vlw

1127 LONGWORTH BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-4714

POST OFFICE BOX 629
203 WEST CHURCH STREET
UNION CITY, TN 38261
(901) 885-7070

ROOM B-7, FEDERAL BUILDING
JACKSON, TN 38301
(901) 423-4848

2836 COLEMAN ROAD
MEMPHIS, TN 38128
(901) 382-3220

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 30, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Sen. John H. Chafee (R-RI), 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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

July 24, 1997

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

Dear Mr. President:

As you know, we are deeply committed, and have worked for the past two years, to balance the federal budget. We are also aware of the importance you place on this matter and applaud your efforts.

We are deeply disheartened, however, to learn that the Conferees for the spending bill are poised to reject the Senate provisions requiring affluence-testing for the Part B premiums, gradually increasing the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67 and implementing a five-dollar home health copayment . These proposals are crucial to the fairness of the Medicare program and its long-term viability. We believe dropping these proposals is short-sighted and places the Medicare program in greater jeopardy for future beneficiaries.

While the plan negotiated by the Conferees may balance the unified budget by the year 2002, it does little to address the long-term entitlement problems facing the country at the turn of the century. Even under the best economic scenario, the Medicare program will become insolvent in ten years. We believe means-testing the Part B premium and increasing the age of eligibility have to be done. By delaying these decisions, we lose an opportunity to implement them gradually so that current beneficiaries will not be harmed and future beneficiaries have an opportunity to plan for the changes.

We urge you, in the strongest possible terms, to include these provisions in the final agreement.

John H. Chafee

John H. Chafee

John Breaux

John B. Breaux

Bob Bennett

Robert F. Bennett

Robert J. Kerrey

Dan Coats

Charles S. Robb

Connie Mack

Bob Graham

Craig Thomas

Joseph I. Lieberman

Phil Gramm

Bob Smith

Richard H. Bryan

Judd Gregg

Fred Thompson

Gordon Smith

James M. Jeffords

Herb Kohl

Kent Conrad

Chuck Hagel

Larry E. Craig

Slade Gorton

Bill Frist

Dianne Feinstein

Mike Enzi

Strom Thurmond

Identical copies sent to:

The Honorable Newt Gingrich
The Honorable Trent Lott

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Debbie Stabenow (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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

07/24/97 18:45 ☎ 001

Congress of the United States

Washington, DC 20515

July 24, 1997

JUL 25 AM 8:52

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

Dear Mr. President,

We are writing to express our serious concerns about the proposal to provide a $5 million payment to any state which privatizes social service positions. We firmly oppose this proposal, and we strongly believe that it should not be included in the budget reconciliation legislation.

We are concerned about this proposal for several reasons. Private corporations are not primarily concerned about serving the poor, disabled and elderly populations, whose access will be severely restricted to the critical services they deserve. Moreover, these companies will not be liable for poor management while states will remain ultimately responsible for the proper administration of social services.

Furthermore, the use of private consultants and independent contractors to perform public services will most likely result in conflicts of interest and widespread corruption. While many states and local governments have contracted with private firms to develop efficient systems in state social service programs, corporations seeking these contracts have a growing track record of cost overruns in this area. We are particularly concerned that privatization could add up to $250 million in new federal spending to the budget reconciliation bill in order to provide $5 million bonuses to states which turn over their Food Stamp and Medicaid operations to private companies.

As you know, there has been no consideration of the potential impact of privatization on social programs administered by the states or on its beneficiaries. In fact, the Senate Finance Committee voted against privatization in all states except one, whose authority was subsequently removed during debate of the budget reconciliation bill on the Senate floor.

We urge you to use your influence to defeat this proposal as the congressional conference committee continues its consideration of the budget reconciliation legislation. Thank you, in advance, for your courtesy and attentiveness to this request.

Sincerely,

Debbie Stabenow, M.C.

Tim Roemer, M.C.

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Ron Kind, M.C.

Adam Smith, M.C.

Karen McCarthy, M.C.

David Minge, M.C.

Max Sandlin, M.C.

Ellen Tauscher, M.C.

Norm Dicks, M.C.

Jim Barcia, M.C.

John LaFalce, M.C.

Robert Matsui, M.C.

Loretta Sanchex, M.C.

Jim Turner, M.C.

Darlene Hooley, M.C.

Jim Moran, M.C.

Robert Andrews, M.C.

Steven Rothman, M.C.

Robert Wexler, M.C.

Ken Bentsen, M.C.

Peter Deutsch, M.C.

Bob Clement, M.C.

David Price, M.C.

Tom Sawyer, M.C.

Earl Pomeroy, M.C.

Bob Etheridge, M.C.

Jim Davis, M.C.

Howard Berman, M.C.

Vic Fazio, M.C.

Chet Edwards, M.C.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. John D. Dingell (D-MI), 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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

July 23, 1997

JUL 28 AM 9:07

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

Dear Mr. President:

One of the most important principles you established in the formulation of the budget agreement was that there must be guaranteed assistance with the Medicare premium payment for low-income seniors up to 150% of poverty.

You were right to insist that an expansion of payment of the Medicare premium for low-income seniors was a critical component of the changes that were agreed to in Medicare and Medicaid. You were right to insist that the payment must be for the full amount of the premium and be a meaningful guarantee for the individual beneficiary.

The Senate proposal for a block grant payment to the States to assist in meeting the Medicare premium clearly does not meet that test. WE ARE WRITING TO YOU TO ASK THAT YOU INSIST ON THE APPROACH OF THE HOUSE BILL, AND REJECT THE SENATE ALTERNATIVE.

When we joined together in the last Congress to fight the proposal to block grant the Medicaid program, you made the case articulately and correctly that a block grant program failed to meet your core principle of an enforceable guarantee of coverage for individuals. That argument applies with equal force to the block grant approach of premium assistance established in the Senate bill.

Seniors would not be assured of help, they would have no guarantee of assistance with the full amount of the premium, and the amount of assistance an individual received would vary by the State in which he or she lived. This policy does not meet the promise that you and fellow Democrats made to our low-income senior citizens throughout last year and when this year's budget agreement was made.

We continue to believe the policy you endorsed of full coverage of the premium for persons up to 150% of poverty is the right one. But, certainly, the approach included in the House bill is closer to meeting the objectives you established and is far preferable to the Senate approach.

WE ARE UNITED IN OUR POSITION OF OPPOSITION TO THE SENATE APPROACH. WE URGE YOU TO ACCEPT NOTHING LESS THAN THE HOUSE PROVISION, AND SECURE FULL COVERAGE UP TO 150% OF POVERTY IF POSSIBLE.

John D. Dingell	Sherrod Brown
Henry A. Waxman	Frank Pallone, Jr.
Pete Stark	Richard A. Gephardt
John M Spratt Jr.	

Diana DeGette | Elizabeth Furse

Martin Olav Sabo | Ted Strickland

Eva M. Clayton | Albert R. Wynn

Ronald V. Dellums | [illegible]

Bobby Scott | Earl F. Hilliard

[illegible] | Barbara B. Kennelly

Marion Berry | [illegible]

Nita Lowey | [illegible]

[illegible] | Karen McCarthy

Dave Obey	Jerrold Nadler
John W. Olver	Norm Dicks
Peter Deutsch	Harold Ford
Ron Klink	G L Ackerman
[illegible]	Patsy T. Mink
[illegible]	Melvin L. Watt
Bob Weygand	Jim McGovern
[illegible]	Bernard Sanders
[illegible]	Alcee L. Hastings

Bart Stupak

Karen L. Thurman

Bob Wise

George Miller

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Sam Farr

Dennis J. Kucinich

David Price

[illegible]

Howard L. Berman

[illegible]

[illegible]

Barney Frank

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Maxine Waters	Bobby L Rush
Gene Green	Norm Dicks
Eddie Bernice Johnson	Ben Cardin
Lloyd Doggett	Joe Moakley
Nancy Pelosi	Lucille Roybal-Allard
Debbie Stabenow	Jim Oberstar
Patrick J Kennedy	Jim Barcia

Tom Barrett

Carolyn C Kilpatrick

Lynn C Woolsey

Eliot L. Engel

Walter Capps

CLINTON LETTER SIGNATORIES

PAGE 1

1. John Dingell
2. Henry A. Waxman
3. Pete Stark
4. John. M. Spratt, Jr.
5. Vic Fazio
6. David Bonior
7. Sherrod Brown
8. Frank Pallone, Jr.
9. Richard Gephardt
10. Robert Matsui
11. Ed Markey
12. John Lewis

PAGE 2

13. Diana Degette
14. Martin Sabo
15. Eva M. Clayton
16. Ron Dellums
17. Bobby Scott
18. Bennie Thompson
19. Marion Berry
20. Nita Lowey
21. Charles Rangel
22. Elizabeth Furse
23. Ted Strickland
24. Albert Wynn
25. William Jefferson
26. Earl F. Hilliard
27. Barbara Kennelly
28. Steny Hoyer
29. Joe Kennedy
30. Karen McCarthy

PAGE 3

31. Bart Stupak
32. Bob Wise
33. Major Owens
34. Anna G. Eshoo
35. Dennis Kucinich
36. Bob Heffner
37. Ken Bentson
38. Barney Frank
39. Ed Towns
40. Karen Thurman
41. George Miller
42. Ellen Tauscher
43. Sam Farr
44. David Price
45. Howard Berman
46. Jim McDermott
47. Zoe Lofgren
48. Jose Seranno

PAGE 4

49. David Obey
50. John Olver
51. Peter Deutsch
52. Ron Klink
53. Thomas Manton
54. Corrine Brown
55. Bob Weygand
56. Jane Harman
57. Julian Dixon
58. Jerold Nadler
59. Norm Dicks
60. Harold Ford, Jr.
61. Gary Ackerman
62. Patsy Mink
63. Melvin Watt
64. James McGovern
64. Bernand Sanders
65. Alcee Hastings

PAGE 5

66. Maxine Waters
67. Gene Green
68. Eddie Bernice Johnson
69. Lloyd Doggett
70. Nancy Pelosi
71. Debbie Stabenow
72. Patrick Kennedy
73. Bobby Rush
74. Norm Dicks (repeat)
75. Ben Cardin
76. Joe Moakley
77. Lucille Roybal-Allard
78. Jim Oberstar
79. James Barcia

PAGE 6

80. James Trafficant
81. John LaFalce
82. Sidney Yates
83. Earl Pommeroy
84. Tom Barrett
85. Carolyn Kilpatrick
86. Lynn Woolsey
87. Elliot Engel
88. Connie Morella
89. Mike McIntyre
90. Sam Gejdenson
91. Walter Capps
92. Silvestre Reyes
93. Bob Filner
94. Maurice Hinchey

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Ron Paul (R-TX).

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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

RON PAUL
14TH DISTRICT, TEXAS

BANKING AND
FINANCE COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
AND CONSUMER CREDIT

DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL
MONETARY POLICY

EDUCATION AND
WORKFORCE COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
WORKFORCE PROTECTIONS

EARLY CHILDHOOD, YOUTH
AND FAMILIES

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-4314

203 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-2831

312 SOUTH MAIN
SUITE 228
VICTORIA, TX 77901
(512) 576-1231

301 GUADALUPE
ROOM 105
SAN MARCOS, TX 78666
(512) 396-1400

200 WEST 2ND STREET
SUITE 210
FREEPORT, TX 77541
(409) 230-0000

MOBILE OFFICE
(512) 753-5553

JUL 29 PM 4:26

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

July 29, 1997

Dear Mr. President:

I'm writing today to express my pleasure with your support for the inclusion of a provision allowing parents to establish Education IRAs to help pay for their college education in the final tax and budget reconciliation package. This is a major step forward in making the dream of an affordable college education a reality for millions of Americans.

However, I must also express my disappointment in your position not to allow parents use of education IRAs to defray costs of elementary and secondary education. While I differ with you on many issues, I have always supported your efforts to allow Americans to spend more of their hard-earned funds on education. In fact, I am one of the few Republicans to publicly support your HOPE Scholarship proposal.

Given your public commitment to improving America's elementary and secondary education, I am baffled as to why you have chosen to turn your back on America's parents in not allowing parents to use funds deposited in an IRA for elementary and secondary education expenses, such as that contained in the amendment to the budget agreement offered by Senator Paul Coverdell of Georgia. As you know, the Coverdell amendment passed overwhelmingly in the Senate.

The Coverdell amendment is an important step toward our shared goal of providing parents with the ability to devote a greater percentage of their income to their children's elementary and secondary education.

Senator Coverdell's amendment allows parents to contribute up to $2,000 a year to education savings accounts without having to pay taxes on the interest earned by that account so long as the funds are used for educational expenses such as tuition, fees, books, supplies, or home computers. Additionally, parents could use the savings to pay for K-12 educational expenses at a private, parochial, public, or home school. Parents could also use the IRAs to save for college. The choice of how to use these funds is, as it should be, solely up to the child's parents.

Mr. President, limiting the use of Education IRAs limits their effectiveness and limits parental freedom to choose how best to educate their children. Some parents may wish to devote more resources to K-12 education than to higher education. Furthermore, since not all children pursue higher education, not all children would benefit from education IRAs limited to higher education. Why should the parents of a 19-year old college freshman be eligible to use an education IRA when the parents of a non-college bound 18-year old high school senior are forbidden to take advantage of an education IRA?

Education IRAs would dramatically benefit all parents and children. A parent who puts aside $2,000 a year would have over $14,000 to devote to their child's education by the time the child is ready for first grade. Imagine how much stronger America's schools would be if parents had thousands of dollars to spend on their children's elementary education.

Few proposals considered by this Congress will do as much to benefit all Americans as an education IRA for all levels of schooling. This proposal will allow parents to save and invest in their children's future and begin to provide more equitable opportunities for children to receive the best possible education.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I once again thank you for your leadership in returning more money to the American people to allow them to pursue higher education through Education IRAs and the HOPE Scholarship. I also respectfully urge you to reconsider your position and support allowing parents to use education IRAs for elementary and secondary education. Please help me and all members of Congress make quality education at all levels a reality for America's children.

Sincerely,

Ron Paul

Ron Paul

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 24, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRIS JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. John Lewis (D-GA) 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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

July 16, 1997

JUL 21 PM 4:00

President William J. Clinton
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We appreciate your efforts to make sure that changes to the Medicare program will protect and preserve the program for future generations. As the House and Senate conferees debate the Medicare issues, we are writing to urge you to stand firm against a Senate provision to impose copayments on individuals in need of home care.

In general, Medicare beneficiaries who receive home health services are sicker than the general Medicare population. Seniors receiving more than 100 visits are the most frail among this frail population. According to a recent report by the Kaiser Medicare Policy Project, Medicare home health users are more likely to have substantially higher Medicare costs than other Medicare beneficiaries.

The Senate-passed bill includes a provision that would require Medicare beneficiaries to pay $5 for each home care visit they receive, up to the amount of the hospital deductible ($760 in 1997, an estimated $960 in 2002). Beneficiaries who are hospitalized for three or more days before beginning their home care would begin paying the copayment with their 101st visit.

The Kaiser report also shows that nearly two-thirds of all Medicare patients will have to pay copayments beginning with the first visit. In addition, the report shows that copayments will hit hardest the group of beneficiaries who need home care the most and can least afford it -- older, minority women, living alone, and with the greatest home care needs.

Even though the Senate provision would raise $4.9 billion (over five years), we do not believe that a copayment is the appropriate way to reach the budget savings required by the budget resolution. The House Medicare bill met its required goal of $115 billion in savings without disproportionately impacting low-income seniors in this manner.

You have shown great leadership on issues of affordable health care for all. In order to shield some of our most vulnerable populations from further financial burdens, we encourage you to strongly oppose the Senate provision to implement home health copayments.

Sincerely,

John Lewis

Charles B. Rangel

The Honorable William J. Clinton
July 16, 1997
Page two

The Honorable William J. Clinton
July 16, 1997
Page three

Signatories to the letter to President Clinton:

John Lewis
Charles Rangel
William Jefferson
Maxine Waters
Eva Clayton
Alcee Hastings
Harold Ford, Jr.
Juanita Millender-MacDonald
Sanford Bishop
Sheila Jackson Lee
Bobby Scott
Melvin Watt
Ronald Dellums
Earl Hilliard
Donald Payne
Carrie P. Meek
James E. Clyburn
Cynthia McKinney
Albert R. Wynn
Louis Stokes
Danny K. Davis
Carolyn C. Kilpatrick
William Clay
Eddie Bernice Johnson
Major Owens
Bobby Rush
Bennie Thompson
Donna M.C. Green
Elijah E. Cummings
Corrine Brown
Jesse Jackson, Jr.
Ed Towns
John Conyers
Julia Carson
Floyd Flake
Chaka Fattah
Julian Dixon
Eleanor H. Norton

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Thomas J. Manton (D-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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

THOMAS J. MANTON
7TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
FINANCE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
RANKING MEMBER

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS,
TRADE, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-3207

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
☒ 2235 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BLDG.
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-3207
(202) 225-3965

DISTRICT OFFICES:
46-12 QUEENS BOULEVARD
SUNNYSIDE, NY 11104
(718) 706-1400

2114 WILLIAMSBRIDGE ROAD
BRONX, NY 10461
(718) 931-1400

July 24, 1997

JUL 28 AM 10:05

Mr. John L. Hilley, II
Assistant to the President
for Legislative Affairs
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Hilley:

As discussions proceed with the Congressional leadership on Medicare, I take this opportunity to bring to your attention an issue of great concern to me and several of my colleagues. The provision with which I am concerned is supported by Bruce Vladeck, Administator of the Health Care Financing Administration and was included in both the House and Senate versions of the reconciliation legislation. Unfortunately, due to the misguided opposition of two Republican participants in a conference session, the provision was deleted.

The issue at hand is reimbursement for capital expenditures for hospitals caught in the transition from cost reimbursement to prospective payment system (PPS). When the original PPS legislation was adopted, regulations provided certain hospitals with reimbursement of 85% of actual cost with minimal eligibility requirements. This was done on the theory that those institutions would not have sufficient time under prospective payment to build up reserves to pay for needed replacement facilities and major renovations. Unfortunately, many hospitals were not eligible for this level of reimbursement simply because of delays in state approvals and the sheer size of some projects. In particular, a statewide moratorium in New York on construction made it impossible for some hospitals to be eligible. Under the new system, there was little time for these hospitals to begin to adequately cover Medicare capital costs. In 1994, HCFA moved to partially ameliorate the situation by providing 70% reimbursement on a cost basis for hospitals caught in the transition. However, this lower level of reimbursement, as well as added new limitations on eligibility, does not provide adequate or equitable treatment for these hospitals.

Mr. John L. Hilley, II
Page Two
July 24, 1997

This is a matter of serious concern to several hospitals in New York as well as other areas of the country. I am particularly distressed that the provision we crafted and adopted in both chambers was abruptly dropped without an effort to compromise. It is of great importance to me that the White House insist on preserving the provision, or at least assist by brokering a compromise acceptable to those of us supporting the change.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to hearing from you on this issue in the near future.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Manton
Member of Congress

cc: The Honorable Donna Shalala
Secretary of Health and Human Services

The Honorable Franklin D. Raines
Director of Office of Management and Budget

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Edolphus Towns (D-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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS
MEMBER OF CONGRESS
10TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK

ERGY AND COMMERCE
LTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT
INANCE AND HAZARDOUS
MATERIALS
ENERGY AND POWER

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
RANKING MEMBER
HUMAN RESOURCES AND
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–3210

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
SUITE 2232
RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–3210
(202) 225-5936

BROOKLYN OFFICES:
545 BROADWAY, 2D FLOOR
BROOKLYN, NY 11206–2962
(718) 387-8696
16 COURT ST., SUITE 1506
BROOKLYN, NY 11241
(718) 855-8018

July 24, 1997

Mr. John L. Hilley II
Assistant to the President
for Legislative Affairs
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear John:

As the discussions proceed with the Congressional leadership on Medicare, I want to bring to your attention an issue of great concern to me as well as several of my colleagues. The provision about which I am concerned was actually in both the House and Senate versions of the reconciliation legislation in different forms and has been supported by HCFA Administrator, Bruce Vladeck. Unfortunately, due to the misguided opposition of two Republican participants in a conference session at which we were not present, the provision was deleted.

The issue is the reimbursement for capital expenditures for hospitals caught in the transition from cost reimbursement to prospective payment (PPS). When the original PPS legislation was adopted, regulations provided certain hospitals with reimbursement at 85% of actual cost with minimal eligibility requirements. This was done on the theory that those institutions would not have the time necessary under prospective payment to build up reserves to pay for needed replacement facilities and major renovations. Unfortunately, many hospitals were not eligible for this level of reimbursement simply because of delays in state approvals, and the sheer size of some projects. In particular, in New York, a statewide moratorium on construction made it impossible for some hospitals to be eligible. For these hospitals there was not enough time under the new system to even begin to adequately cover Medicare capital costs. In 1994, HCFA moved to partially ameliorate the situation by providing 70% reimbursement on a cost basis for hospitals caught in the transition. However, this lower level of reimbursement, as well as added new limitations on eligibility, does not provide adequate or equitable treatment for these hospitals.

This is a matter of serious concern to several hospitals in New York as well as other areas of the country. I am particularly distressed that the provision that was crafted and adopted in both chambers was abruptly dropped without even an effort to compromise or work out differences. It is of great importance to me that the White House insist on preserving the provision, or at least assist by brokering a compromise acceptable to those of us supporting the change.

I want you to know this is a priority for me. I look forward to working with you on this matter.

Sincerely,

Ed Towns
Member of Congress

cc: Bruce Vladek

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 22, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Representative John D. Dingell (D-MI) 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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

July 16, 1997

JUL 17 PM 4:02

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

Dear President Clinton:

We are writing to express our strong concern about the potential inclusion in the reconciliation bill of provisions that would, in our view, seriously undermine the Medicare program and damage the protections it offers to millions of aged and disabled Americans.

We refer to the provisions which include an unrestricted fee-for-service insurance option among the available options in the Medicare Choice program, and which allow for so-called private contracts between Medicare patients and their doctors.

Both of these provisions seem to have significant support among the Republican conferees, and both hold the potential to undermine the viability of the Medicare risk pool, and pull out of the Medicare program people who are healthier and wealthier.

These provisions would undermine the basic protections of Medicare, and erode the strength and universality of the program.

Very basic protections of Medicare are absent in these proposals. Under the fee-for-service plan, for example, there is no requirement of minimum payments to providers for covered services, no limit on the premium a plan could charge for Medicare's basic benefits, and no limit on how much providers could charge beneficiaries above whatever the plan might pay. Essentially, there is no accountability for the use of Medicare capitation payments by these plans.

And under the private contract proposal, there is, of course, no way to assure that these so-called voluntary agreements are voluntary and not the result of coercive pressure by physicians.

These proposals, in our view, cannot be fixed. They are flawed in concept, and have no place in Medicare.

<u>We ask you to insist that the final conference agreement does not contain these provisions.</u>

In the last Congress, we fought together to stop Republican efforts to enact many insidious and damaging changes in the structure of the Medicare program.

Despite the fact that large savings from Medicare are part of this budget agreement, you rightly insisted that those damaging changes to the very nature of Medicare were not acceptable.

You were correct in this position in the last Congress. It is no less urgent now that you continue to insist that these changes have no place in the Medicare program.

Sincerely,

John Dingell
Ranking Member
Committee on
Commerce

Pete Stark
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Health
Committee on Ways and
Means

Henry Waxman
Ranking Member
Committee on
Government Reform
and Oversight

Sherrod Brown
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Health
and the Environment
Committee on Commerce

John Spratt
Ranking Member
Committee on the Budget

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 24, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI) 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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

July 21, 1997

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

Dear Mr. President:

As the House and Senate conferees work to craft compromise Medicare legislation, we urge you to maintain the current Medicare age eligibility of 65.

As you may know, during Senate consideration of the Budget Reconciliation bill, we supported an amendment which sought to retain the Medicare eligibility age of 65. Increasing the Medicare eligibility age is exactly the wrong way to proceed with respect to health care. Only a few years ago, your administration fought hard for universal health care in this country. We remain affirmed that our goal should be to extend health care to more Americans — not to reduce health care coverage, especially for some of our nation's most vulnerable citizens.

As you work with House and Senate conferees to preserve Medicare, we strongly encourage you to maintain your position with respect to Medicare age eligibility. The budget reconciliation negotiations are not the appropriate forum to raise this complex issue, which would undoubtedly have significant negative consequences for millions of future Medicare beneficiaries.

We thank you for your consideration of this request, and we look forward to working with you on this issue.

Sincerely,

Jack Reed

Tom Daschle

Fritz Hollings

Paul D. Wellstone

July 21, 1997
Page 2

Chris Dodd

John F. Kerry

Ted Kennedy

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 22, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Sens. J. Robert Kerry (D-NE) and John H. Chafee (R-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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

J. ROBERT KERREY
NEBRASKA

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2704

July 15, 1997

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

Dear Mr. President:

We applaud your decision to endorse an income test for the Medicare Part B premium for the wealthiest six percent of retirees. We also understand the concerns Administration officials have expressed in recent news reports about how the income test would be administered. We write because we do not want these administrative disagreements, which can be resolved, to spiral into a dispute that would scuttle the underlying proposal.

The Senate proposal is based on the simple idea that families struggling in the work force, often without insurance, should not be taxed to subsidize premiums for the wealthiest retirees who can afford to pay more of the cost of their own care. Your endorsement of an income test provided an enormous boost to that idea, which now enjoys support across the political spectrum. It is natural for supporters of this proposal, particularly when they come from so many different points of view, to hold differing views on how it should be administered. While the Administration believes the increased premiums for the wealthiest seniors should be collected by the Internal Revenue Service, Majority Leader Lott, as you know, has said he believes they should be collected by the Department of Health and Human Services.

While the question of which agency collects the premiums is legitimate, we believe it is secondary to the underlying point: that the taxpayer subsidy for the Part B premium should be phased out for the wealthiest six percent of retirees. We do not believe the American people, whom recent polls indicate broadly support this principle, want it to be hamstrung by administrative concerns that can be resolved.

We urge the Administration to work with Congress to resolve this question in the same bipartisan spirit by which the budget agreement was reached. Further, we hope Administration officials will emphasize the breadth of bipartisan agreement on the need for an income test, rather than the more minor question of which agency or department should administer it, in their public statements. This eyes on the most important prize: making Medicare more fair and fiscally sound.

Sincerely,

Bob Kerrey

John H. Chafee

John Chafee

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 29, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter that was sent to the President by Rep. Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) 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

July 24, 1997

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

JUL 29 AM 9:51

Dear Mr. President,

We are writing to express our serious concerns about the proposal to provide a $5 million payment to any state which privatizes social service positions. We firmly oppose this proposal, and we strongly believe that it should not be included in the budget reconciliation legislation.

We are concerned about this proposal for several reasons. Private corporations are not primarily concerned about serving the poor, disabled and elderly populations, whose access will be severely restricted to the critical services they deserve. Moreover, these companies will not be liable for poor management while states will remain ultimately responsible for the proper administration of social services.

Furthermore, the use of private consultants and independent contractors to perform public services will most likely result in conflicts of interest and widespread corruption. While many states and local governments have contracted with private firms to develop efficient systems in state social service programs, corporations seeking these contracts have a growing track record of cost overruns in this area. We are particularly concerned that privatization could add up to $250 million in new federal spending to the budget reconciliation bill in order to provide $5 million bonuses to states which turn over their Food Stamp and Medicaid operations to private companies.

As you know, there has been no consideration of the potential impact of privatization on social programs administered by the states or on its beneficiaries. In fact, the Senate Finance Committee voted against privatization in all states except one, whose authority was subsequently removed during debate of the budget reconciliation bill on the Senate floor.

We urge you to use your influence to defeat this proposal as the congressional conference committee continues its consideration of the budget reconciliation legislation. Thank you, in advance, for your courtesy and attentiveness to this request.

Sincerely,

Debbie Stabenow
Debbie Stabenow, M.C.

Tim Roemer
Tim Roemer, M.C.

Ron Kind, M.C.

Adam Smith, M.C.

Karen McCarthy, M.C.

David Minge, M.C.

Max Sandlin, M.C.

Ellen Tauscher, M.C.

Norm Dicks, M.C.

Jim Barcia, M.C.

John LaFalce, M.C.

Robert Matsui, M.C.

Loretta Sanchex, M.C.

Jim Turner, M.C.

Darlene Hooley, M.C.

Jim Moran, M.C.

Robert Andrews, M.C.

Steven Rothman, M.C.

Robert Wexler, M.C.

Ken Bentsen, M.C.

Peter Deutsch, M.C.

Bob Clement, M.C.

David Price, M.C.

Tom Sawyer, M.C.

Earl Pomeroy, M.C.

Bob Etheridge, M.C.

Jim Davis, M.C.

Howard Berman, M.C.

Vic Fazio, M.C.

Chet Edwards, M.C.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
PAUL WEINSTEIN

FROM: SUSAN BROPHY SB
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Enclosed please find a copy of the letter that was sent to the President from Rep. Ken Bentsen (D-TX), 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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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

July 28, 1997

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

Dear Mr. President:

As Democratic members of the Texas Congressional Delegation, we are writing to urge that the Administration hold fast to its position in the budget negotiations that no state receive greater than a 3.5 percent reduction in its Medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) funding. We believe it is imperative that the Administration hold to this position in order to achieve a conference agreement that is fair and acceptable to Texas and the other 12 so-called high-DSH states.

As you know, we have written previously to express our strong opposition to the unreasonable treatment these states would experience under the Medicaid portion of the House and Senate reconciliation bills. These bills use unfair and punitive formulas for cutting DSH funding that would cut funding to high-DSH states by up to twice as much as other states. These bills would place high-DSH states in untenable positions, forcing them to cut back on vital health care services for Medicaid and indigent patients. These bills would be especially devastating to public and children's hospitals, forcing them to curtail necessary services or even close their doors. In addition, local authorities would have to increase property taxes and insured patients would face increased costs to offset the lost revenue.

We appreciate the commitment the Administration has shown to addressing our concerns, as reflected in the latest Administration offer, and we strongly urge that you hold to this position.

Sincerely,

Kenneth E. Bentsen, Jr., M.C.

Gene Green, M.C.

Ruben Hinojosa, M.C.

Nick Lampson, M.C.

Sylvestre Reyes, M.C.

Ciro D. Rodriguez, M.C.

Max Sandlin, M.C.

Ralph Hall, M.C.

Charles W. Stenholm , M.C.

Eddie Bernice Johnson, M.C.

Jim Turner, M.C.

Lloyd Doggett, M.C.

Chet Edwards, M. C.

Sheila Jackson-Lee, M. C.

Martin Frost, M.C.

Solomon Ortiz, M.C.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 21, 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 Sen. Pete V. Domemici (R-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

PETE V. DOMENICI
NEW MEXICO

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D. C.

July 15, 1997

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

JUL 16 PM4:18

Dear President Clinton:

The questions of genetic privacy and genetic discrimination have become increasingly urgent as more and more Americans are experiencing the burden of learning and disclosing information about their own genes. I am immensely pleased that you and your Administration support the establishment of federal legislative protections for individuals and families with respect to their health insurance programs.

At this time I respectfully suggest that legislation that addresses only the issue of genetic discrimination in health insurance is important but still insufficient to cover major issues in genetic privacy. I am equally concerned about the question of informed consent as it relates to the relationship between the genetics research community and the individuals who participate as subjects in genetics research projects. Now that we have the technology to reveal an individual's most personal and unalterable identifying information, we must acknowledge an obligation to reinforce the individual's right to consent to the generation and disclosure of this information. To this end, I introduced the "Genetic Confidentiality and Nondiscrimination Act of 1997" (S.422) on March 11.

The legislation that I have proposed not only includes language that precludes genetic discrimination in health insurance, but also includes a number of provisions that confer on the individual the right to consent to the generation of genetic information in the research setting and the right to receive - or to refuse to receive - genetic information that results from genetics research. I believe that this second issue is of critical importance to meaningful federal legislation.

I am sincerely grateful for being included among the guests at yesterday's press conference, and I regret that my duties in the Senate prevented my attending. However, I do commend your support of genetic confidentiality, and I am agreeable to work with members of your Administration to craft legislation that is fair and just for the American people.

Sincerely yours,

Pete V. Domenici
United States Senate

PS good to see you at the meeting.
Ltr. A.M. PVD

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 22, 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 Reps. Constance A. Morella (R-MD), Bart Gordon (D-TN), Stephen Horn (R-CA) and Carolyn B. Maloney (D-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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

July 16, 1997

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The President
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

JUL 17 PM 4:02

Dear Mr. President:

We are writing to request your assistance in addressing the Year 2000 computer problem. If left unaddressed, the Year 2000 problem could become the single biggest challenge facing the global information technology industry since the advent of the computer.

During the 104th and 105th Congresses, we have worked to inform Federal agencies and the private sector of the looming crisis from the Year 2000 computer problem. Through legislation, an on-going series of Congressional hearings, and letters to agencies, we have worked to raise the Nation's awareness and promoted public and private sector initiatives to encourage our Nation's businesses and Federal, State, and local governments to take immediate corrective measures.

Congress alone, however, cannot solve the Year 2000 problem. To date, many Federal agencies have not, in our estimation, taken all the necessary steps to avert the pending crisis.

Specifically, we are concerned:

- That the government-wide estimate of $2.8 billion (increased from the January 1997 estimate of $2.3 billion) to correct the Year 2000 problem is understated, will continue to rise, and that a date for a final cost-estimate has yet to be set;

- That the Federal Government agency timetables and milestones submitted in the report are optimistic and, in most cases, provides little or no margin for delay in an agency's implementation plan;

- That agencies have underestimated the time for the validation of converted systems;

- That there may not be enough accountability in the current system to monitor and successfully implement Federal Government Year 2000 efforts; and

- That additional attention government-wide should be given to other date sensitive systems, such as those which have an embedded computer chip.

We need your help.

We are asking you to use the power of your Office and suggest the following actions:

1. Spur the government and the private sector in the United States and abroad to address the Year 2000 problem using the Presidential "bully pulpit";

2. Issue an Executive Order or directive to Federal agencies to give highest priority to correcting the problem; and

3. Designate within the Executive Office of the President, a senior Administration official with the oversight for directing Federal efforts and encouraging private sector initiatives to fix the problem.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue. We look forward to working with you to ensure that January 1, 2000 will not be remembered as the day the Federal Government's computers shut down.

Respectfully yours,

Connie Morella

Constance A. Morella
Chairwoman
Subcommittee on Technology
Committee on Science

Stephen Horn

Stephen Horn
Chairman
Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology
Committee on Government Reform and Oversight

Bart Gordon

Bart Gordon
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Technology
Committee on Science

Carolyn B. Maloney

Carolyn B. Maloney
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology
Committee on Government Reform and Oversight

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 21, 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 Sen. Judd Gregg (R-NH).

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

JUDD GREGG
NEW HAMPSHIRE

CHIEF DEPUTY WHIP

COMMITTEES:
BUDGET
APPROPRIATIONS
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2904
(202) 224-3324

July 9, 1997

OFFICES:

125 N. MAIN STREET
CONCORD, NH 03301
(603) 225-7115

28 WEBSTER STREET
MANCHESTER, NH 03104
(603) 622-7979

3 GLEN AVENUE
BERLIN, NH 03570
(603) 752-2604

99 PEASE BOULEVARD
PORTSMOUTH, NH 03801
(603) 431-2171

JUL 15 PM 3:57

The President
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Please accept my congratulations on your announcement to convene an Internet Summit to look at the problems of pornography on the Internet and how to protect children from access to inappropriate material. I commend your foresight in realizing that the availability of adult and child pornography on the Internet is detrimental to our nation's children.

Early press reports on the scope of this conference, however, suggest that its focus may be too narrow. In my opinion, it is vital that the Summit not only address the availability of pornography on the Internet, but also examine the issue of protecting children from child pornographers and sexual predators, who use the Internet to trade illegal child pornography and to develop abusive or exploitative relationships with children. We already have seen cases of the Internet being used as a means to aid pedophiles' abduction of children, and such predators are becoming ever more pervasive as the WorldWideWeb grows. It is estimated that by the year 2002, there will be 20 million children who have access to the Internet. To those pedophiles who use the 'Net, this means that there will be 20 million possible victims at their disposal. These facts are very disturbing and we must be committed to making some changes that will help make it more difficult for pedophiles to find and exploit victims and to trade pornographic pictures of children.

As you may know, recently, I held a hearing in the Senate Appropriations' Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies, of which I am the Chairman, regarding the facts surrounding this issue. During this hearing, Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Louis Freeh testified about the Bureau's efforts to track and apprehend the worst Internet child pornographers. Director Freeh's testimony outlined the difficulties confronting the Bureau in trying to find and catch these offenders because of the relative anonymity of the WorldWideWeb.

As a result of the hearing, it became clear that, perhaps, the most important way this problem could be addressed is to educate parents, teachers, and children on the dangers to kids who log onto the Internet. Enclosed is a copy of a pamphlet, which I created entitled, "Child Pornography on the Internet: What Every Parent, Teacher, and Child Should Know." At this time, nearly 4,000 of these pamphlets have been distributed. Although a strong prevention effort on the part of the computer industry and law enforcement is necessary, I believe that a good place to begin prevention efforts is in education. It is my hope that these and other similar pamphlets will begin to open up discussions about how to avoid predators of any kind on the WorldWideWeb.

It is imperative that today's efforts to investigate and prevent child exploitation via the Internet are continually strengthened. I hope that, when you continue to discuss the scope of the Summit on Internet pornography, you will include these issues in your discussions. The Summit would provide an excellent opportunity to educate parents on the real dangers their children may confront. I also would welcome the opportunity to participate in the Summit and to discuss these issues further with you. I am fully committed to helping develop strategies within the computer industry to filter out access to pornographic material, as well as getting educational material to parents, teachers, and children about Internet predators.

Again, I commend you on calling for the Internet Summit, which holds great promise of success in combating pornography on the Internet. Also, I hope that it will become an important vehicle for the ongoing fight against those who use the Internet as a means to exploit children.

Sincerely,

Judd Gregg
U.S. Senator

Enclosure

Elena
Jay

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 17, 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. Tom Campbell (R-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, forwarding copies to the Office of Legislative Affairs, attention 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
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20515

TOM CAMPBELL
15TH DISTRICT CALIFORNIA

July 8, 1997

Dear Mr. President:

JUL 14 AM 10:49

There is a middle way on affirmative action.

We can strongly increase our pressure against intentional discrimination by adding a criminal sanction. And when a court strikes down the use of race in a government preference program, we can immediately replace it with a particularized system that takes into account the specific qualifications individuals bring to any job or college application.

My approach, in the enclosed bills, is by design *neutral* on whether government should contrive to take race into account. I hope, thereby, to obtain the support both of those who support and those who oppose the present system.

The courts will continue to act; my hope is that we will be ready with a substitute when they do.

I offer these suggestions in the spirit of your invitation at UC San Diego for a national conversation on this most important issue. Thank you for your attention to my proposals.

Respectfully,

The Honorable Bill Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D.C.

I

105TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2078

To amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to clarify the intent of Congress to hold individuals responsible for discriminatory acts committed by them in employment.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 26, 1997

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. BOUCHER) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce

---

A BILL

To amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to clarify the intent of Congress to hold individuals responsible for discriminatory acts committed by them in employment.

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 "Individual Liability for Discrimination Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

Congress has always intended that individuals who discriminate in employment within the meaning of title

VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 may be held individually liable for their actions, whether or not any other entity or individual is also liable. Courts have in general faithfully carried out this mandate. Recently, in sexual harassment cases in particular, some courts have failed to hold individuals liable for their discriminatory conduct that is otherwise clearly covered by title VII, on grounds that individuals cannot be held liable under it. This Act will prevent this misreading.

SEC. 3. INDIVIDUAL LIABILITY UNDER TITLE VII.

Section 706 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–5) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(l) Individuals are individually liable for acts of discrimination committed by them in employment, when the acts are otherwise covered by this title, whether or not any other party is also liable for their acts.".

SEC. 4. NO REDUCTION IN EMPLOYER LIABILITY.

Section 706 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–5), as amended by section 3, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(m) Nothing in subsection (l) shall be interpreted to reduce the responsibility of employers for discrimination in employment under this title, except that in awarding monetary relief against any party, a trier of fact may take into account the relief ordered against and actually collected from other parties.".

SEC. 5. DEFINITION OF RESPONDENT CLARIFIED.

Section 701(n) of the Civil Rights of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e) is amended to read as follows:

"(n) The term 'respondent' means an employer, employee or agent of the employer (including individual employer, employee, or agent of the employer, employment agency, labor organization, joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining program, including an on-the-job training program, or Federal entity subject to section 717.".

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

○

I

105TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2079

To require implementation of an alternative program for providing a benefit or employment preference under Federal law.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 26, 1997

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. EHLERS) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

---

A BILL

To require implementation of an alternative program for providing a benefit or employment preference under Federal law.

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 "Racial and Gender Preference Reform Act".

SEC. 2. ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM REQUIRED.

Whenever the use of race, gender, or national origin as a basis for granting a benefit or a preference under a Federal program is invalidated by a court of competent jurisdiction, the program described in section 3 shall be substituted for the invalidated program.

SEC. 3. OPERATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM.

The program referred to in section 2 is one in which the official responsible for the invalidated program described in such section shall determine in each case which individuals qualify to be in the category of "individuals of special achievement", taking into account experience and achievements of each individual separately, and not as a member of any group, in order to determine which individuals have overcome particularly high obstacles to achieve the qualifications relevant for the position or benefit being sought. The responsible official shall take into account in making such a determination the individual's personal situation, including conditions of low opportunity by reason of—

(1) low parental income,

(2) low levels of education of parents,

(3) depressed economic surroundings of upbringing,

(4) low percentage of students graduating from the individual's high school (or failure to attend high school),

(5) special work obligations imposed on an individual by reason of need to care for family members,

(6) need to master a second language, and

(7) individual instances of bias or discrimination actually practiced against the individual on the basis of race, age, gender, national origin, or religion.

○

I

105TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2080

To amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to establish criminal liability for unlawful discrimination based on disparate treatment.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 26, 1997

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. CANADY of Florida) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

---

A BILL

To amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to establish criminal liability for unlawful discrimination based on disparate treatment.

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 "Anti-Discrimination Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after section 706 the following:

"CRIMINAL LIABILITY

"SEC. 706A. A defendant who purposefully engages in an employment practice defined as unlawful in section 703 or 704 of this Act by intentionally treating a covered person worse than another because of that covered person's race, gender, religion, or national origin shall, upon a first conviction, be guilty of a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine not to exceed $10,000 if an individual or $100,000 if a corporation. A subsequent conviction of a defendant under this section regarding conduct within five years of the first conviction shall be a felony punishable by a fine not to exceed $20,000 if an individual or $200,000 if a corporation, imprisonment not to exceed six months, or both, if that subsequent conviction is determined by the court to involve conduct substantially similar to the conduct of the first offense.".

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT.—The amendment made by this Act shall apply only with respect to conduct occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. SENTENCING COMMISSION.

The United States Sentencing Commission may propose to Congress amendments to the United States Sentencing Guidelines altering the sentences imposed under section 706A of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as provided in section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code.

○