Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. talking points	Marriage Rates Q&A; RE: phone number [partial] (1 page)	08/25/1999	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Anna Richter
OA/Box Number: 23734

FOLDER TITLE:

Various Topics Q&A/Press Releases [binder] [1]

2011-0638-S
ms171

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
- PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
- RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Domestic Policy Council

West Wing, 2^{nd} Floor

Various Topics
Q&A/ Press Releases

Domestic Policy Council
West Wing, 2nd Floor

Various Topics
Q&A/ Press Releases

1 Campaign Finance
2 Child Support
3 Equal Pay
4 Immigration
5 Marriage and Family
6 Medical Marijuana
7 Social Security
8 Welfare Reform and Poverty Issues
9 Agriculture
10 Abortion
11 Public Health
12 Tobacco
13 Community Service/ Americorps
14 Economic Record

25 Other (Sorted by Date)

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

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

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **1**

Campaign Finance Reform
Q&A
September 16, 1999

Q: Would the President support a stripped-down version of the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform legislation that would include only a "soft money" ban?

A: The President has been a consistent and strong supporter of banning so-called "soft money." As many of you recall, the President petitioned the Federal Election Commission (FEC) to use their authority to ban soft money. In light of the House's action on Tuesday, the President also believes we have a chance to pass the first comprehensive, real, and bipartisan campaign finance reform legislation in a generation. A soft money ban is an essential component of such reform, but the President supports the other provisions of McCain-Feingold as well, including the provisions on issue advocacy and stronger FEC enforcement. We hope the Republican leadership will permit an up-or-down vote on a bill that a majority of the Senate already supports – McCain-Feingold as is.

Campaign Finance Reform Q&A
April 13, 1999

Q: It seems as though the Republican Leadership in the House and Senate have put campaign finance reform on the backburner. Many believe that after last year's vote, the McCain-Feingold/Shays-Meehan bill is all but dead. Have you given up on this legislation or if not, what actions will you take to spur the Congress to pass this bill?

A: I believe that McCain-Feingold/Shays-Meehan bill remains the nation's best hope for real campaign finance reform and I am more hopeful to that this legislation will become law. Last year, the House passed this bill and only a minority of Senators stopped the legislation from being enacted. I believe in the current Congress there is even greater support among Members for the bill.

Should the House pass this legislation sometime this Summer, something which is certainly achievable, I believe support will grow in the Senate.

To help ensure enactment this year, I plan to work with the sponsors of the bill -- as I have the last two years -- in coordinating our efforts -- and I will continue to challenge the House and Senate leadership to bring the bill up for consideration early in the legislative session.

Tobacco Q&A
October 26, 1998

Q: **You've cited tobacco legislation as work that remains to be done in the next Congress. Don't you think Tuesday's election will make it more difficult for you to enact tobacco legislation?**

A: Enacting comprehensive legislation to stop kids from smoking before they start remains one of my top priorities. This year, Republicans placed partisanship over progress and killed a bill that a majority of the Senate -- 57 Senators -- supported. I think Tuesday's election will show that the American people would rather have members of Congress that act like parents instead of politicians.

Q. **What do you think of the California tobacco initiative supported by Rob Reiner?**

A. I'm glad some people in California are trying to do what this Congress failed to do, which is take significant steps to reduce youth smoking. I hope they succeed. But if we hope to reduce youth smoking substantially in all 50 states, Congress must pass national legislation.

Q. **What do you think of the potential settlement between the states and the tobacco industry?**

A. I am watching with interest to see whether there is a settlement reached between the states and the tobacco companies. The terms of the possible settlement, as I understand them, will be only a first step -- although a significant one -- toward substantially reducing youth smoking. Congress will still have a lot of work to do in this area, and I will continue to push for comprehensive legislation that will achieve all my goals.

Q&A on Tobacco Court Decision
8/14/987

Q: Isn't the 4th Circuit tobacco decision a major set-back for the Administration?

A: The Department of Justice is examining the opinion right now. We should be able to state our intentions shortly regarding seeking further judicial review.

The President is firmly committed to the FDA's rule and its role in protecting our children. Reaffirming the FDA authority over tobacco products is necessary to help stop young people from smoking before they start by stopping advertising targeted at children and curbing minors' access to tobacco products. Currently, nearly 90 percent of people begin smoking before age 18, despite the laws that make it illegal to sell cigarettes to minors. Almost 3,000 young people become regular smokers each day, and 1,000 will die as a result.

If the leadership in Congress would act more like parents and less like politicians, it could enact bipartisan comprehensive tobacco legislation to reaffirm the FDA's authority. Instead the GOP leadership has done the bidding of Big Tobacco.

Tobacco Q&A
June 29, 1998

Q. **Do you support the complaint being filed with the Federal Election Commission by the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, alleging that tobacco companies are making illegal corporate campaign contributions by promising to run political advertisements on behalf of Republican Senators who opposed the McCain bill?**

A. We cannot comment on a specific complaint filed with the FEC. But it's clear that the tobacco companies have spent massive amounts of money in their effort to kill the McCain bill, and that these company advertisements provided cover to the minority of Senators who voted against the legislation.

Q & A's on Campaign Finance Reform
May 5, 1998

Q: What do think of the Republican leadership's recent decision to go forward with a vote on campaign finance reform legislation? Would you sign the "freshman" reform legislation?

A: I am very pleased that the House Republican leadership has relented in the face of public pressure and will allow a vote on campaign finance reform. I strongly support the bipartisan legislation offered by Reps. Christopher Shays and Marty Meehan, which is the best chance in a generation for real reform. While the "freshman" reform bill also contains several good reform measures, Shays-Meehan stands a better chance of passing both houses because it has the support of a majority of Senators (though it so far has been blocked by a minority in the Senate on procedural grounds).

Every Member of the House of Representatives has a responsibility to vote for this measure to ban large soft money contributions, improve disclosure, and restrict backdoor campaign spending. A vote for bipartisan campaign finance reform will be a vote to strengthen our democracy and give ordinary voters the loudest voice.

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

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

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: 2

Child Support Q&A
June 24, 1998

Announcement

Q: What did the President announce today?

A: Today, President Clinton announced new statistics highlighting the success of Administration child support enforcement efforts and signed into law tough new penalties for parents who repeatedly refuse to pay child support.

At an Oval Office ceremony, the President announced that a new child support collection system launched nine months ago has already located one million delinquent parents and the child support enforcement program established a record 1.3 million paternities in 1997. Overall, 68 percent more child support was collected in 1997 than in 1992.

The bill he signed into law, the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1998, is based on his 1996 proposal for tougher penalties for parents who repeatedly fail to support children living in another state or who flee across state lines to avoid supporting them.

Finally, the President reiterated his position that bankruptcy reform legislation should not make it harder to collect child support and alimony.

New Child Support Data

Q: How have you located a million delinquent parents in nine months?

A: The 1996 welfare reform law contain many proposals made by the President to help track deadbeat parents across state lines. One of those provisions is the New Hire Directory, which enables child support officials to match records of delinquent parents with wage records from throughout the nation. This information helps child support agencies not only locate deadbeat parents, but garnish their wages for the child support owed. The national directory went on line October 1, 1997 and has already helped locate over one million delinquent parents, many of whom had been on the run for years.

Q: What data is collected by the National Directory of New Hires?

A: Whenever a new employee is hired, employers will report six types of data -- employee name, address, Social Security number and employer names, address, and federal employer identification number -- to a state new hire database. Each of the fifty states will then report that data to the National Directory of New Hires, where it will be matched against records of parents who owe child support to locate and begin collection procedures against them.

Q: What happens when a match occurs?

A: When a match occurs between employment information submitted to the NDNH and child support case/order data, the information is returned to the state child support enforcement agency for processing. The agency will then initiate the next appropriate action, which could include establishing paternity, obtaining an order for support, or immediately issuing an income withholding order to have child support payments automatically withheld from the noncustodial parent's wages or other form(s) of income.

Q: Aren't there privacy concerns raised by such a database?

A: Federal law requires the Department of Health and Human Services to establish safeguards to protect privacy and ensure the data are used only by authorized persons for authorized uses. These issues were reviewed in great detail as the child support legislation was considered in the last Congress, and there was strong bipartisan support for the establishment of the new hire directory and other new child support enforcement measures.

Q: Why has there been such an increase in paternities established?

A: Improving paternity establishment has been a top priority for the Clinton administration and a major issue for the nation's children in need. For children born out of wedlock, paternity establishment is the crucial first step to obtaining the child support they need and deserve. We have been moving forward aggressively on this issue by stronger enforcement tools and easier means to establish paternity, and the new data released by the President today show a remarkable rise in paternity establishments, from 510,000 in 1992 to nearly 1.3 million today.

Q: How much child support does the federal government collect each year for families?

A: In 1997, the state and federal child support enforcement program collected a record $13.4 billion for children, an increase of 68% from 1992, when $8 billion was collected. Not only are collections up, but the number of families that are actually receiving child support has also increased. In 1997, the number of child support cases with collections rose to 4.2 million, an increase of 48% from 2.8 million in 1992. (These data were released earlier this year, but have not received much attention.)

Q: What is behind the increases in collections?

A: There are a number of reasons for the record increase in collections. With passage of the new welfare law (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of

1996), states were provided tough new tools to go after those who choose to walk away from their children. These tools included the new hire reporting, which requires that employers report all new hires to state agencies to compare against outstanding child support orders. Those records are also shared with the new National Directory of New Hires to find those parents who may have crossed state lines to avoid paying support. The new law also untangles the different state procedures for interstate collections which will make it easier to collect faster. As over 30 percent of child support cases are interstate, these two measures will ensure that a delinquent parent can no longer hide by moving to a different state. States are also using license revocation to boost child support payments and improved automation to make the program run more efficiently and effectively. Lastly, the huge increase in paternity establishments means that more fathers are now legally obligated to pay support.

Q: What else has the Administration done to increase child support collections?

A: The President has used executive authority to increase child support collections He directed the Treasury Department to collect past-due child support from federal payments, including federal income tax refunds and employee salaries. The administration has taken steps to deny federal loans to any delinquent parents and make the federal government a model employer in child support enforcement.

Q: Didn't the President direct the federal government to become a model employer in terms of child support at one time. What ever happened to this pledge?

A: The goal of President Clinton's February 1995 Executive Order was to make the federal government a model employer with respect to child support. Following the order, HHS and the Office of Personnel Management undertook an extensive orientation for federal agencies to inform and make child support a priority. The main provisions directed federal agencies to cooperate and expedite the processing of state child support orders, ensuring that federal paychecks were withheld to get support to children, and to allow HHS to match records of federal employees with outstanding state orders. Both of these requirements were implemented. In fact, the federal government was a leader in the matching of employee records as it is now part of the requirements for all employers under the new welfare law. The Order directed further study in other areas to ensure more federal efforts, some are now features of the child support measures included in the new welfare.

Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act

Q: What does the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act do?

A: This bill creates two new categories of felony offenses, subject to a two-year maximum prison term: (1) Traveling in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to evade a support obligation if the obligation has remained unpaid for a period longer than one year or is greater than $5,000. (2) Willfully failing to pay a support obligation regarding a child residing in another State if the obligation has remained unpaid for a period of longer than two years or is greater than $10,000.

Q: Where did this legislation come from?

A: This bill results from the President's directive to the Attorney General of July 21, 1996 which asked the Attorney General to take several specific steps to strengthen child support enforcement efforts including "to draft legislation to amend the Child Support Recovery Act to establish a felony offense for a person who willfully fails to pay child support for a child in another State where there has been an egregious failure to meet child support obligations." In response, the Department of Justice transmitted legislation accomplishing this goal to the 104th Congress. The Department of Justice transmitted a similar bill this Congress and worked with Congress to produce this bill now being signed into law.

Q: What does the current law provide?

A: Current law makes it a federal offense willfully to fail to pay a child support obligation with respect to a child who lives in another State if the obligation has remained unpaid for longer than a year or is greater than $5,000. A first offense is subject to a maximum of six months of imprisonment (a misdemeanor), and a second or subsequent offense to a maximum of two years (a felony).

Q: Why is this bill necessary?

A: The bill addresses the law enforcement and prosecutorial concern that the current statue does not adequately address more serious instances of nonpayment of support obligations. For such cases, a maximum term of imprisonment of just six months does not meet the sentencing goals of punishment and deterrence. Aggravated offenses, such as those involving parents who move from state to state to evade child support payments, require more severe penalties.

Q: Why is there a need for federal prosecution in child support cases?

A: The Department of Justice's prosecution effort is designed to create maximum deterrence by aggressive criminal enforcement of the most egregious cases to not only punish defendants in those cases, but also influence the conduct of many other potential defendants who have failed or might otherwise fail to pay child support. Often, the threat of prosecution is enough to force a parent to pay child support.

Q: How often has the Department of Justice prosecuted under current statute?

A: Overall, the Department of Justice has prosecuted approximately 437 child support cases. We are happy to report that the number of Child Support Recovery Act cases filed and the number of convictions obtained has increased every year since the Act's enactment.

Other Child Support Issues

Q: Rep. Hyde and some advocates believe that the child support enforcement program would work better if it was federalized with either the IRS or Social Security. Do you agree?

A: No. The federal/state partnership in child support enforcement has made substantial gains in securing support for children. Since 1992, there's been a 68 percent increase in collections, a 48 percent increase in the number of families receiving support and as announced today record numbers of delinquent parents found through the new hire reporting directory and more children than ever having paternity established. The new welfare law gave this partnership the toughest enforcement measures ever to ensure that parents meet their financial and emotional obligations to their children. We know that there are still children deprived of support and programs that can improve their services. Yet, the new measures are just now going into effect and we expect even greater accomplishments. Our goals is to achieve over $20 billion collections by the year 2000 and we're well on the way. We're in the right direction with the state and federal partnership, we need not change course.

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

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

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **3**

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

Divider Title: 4

PRESIDENT CLINTON ANNOUNCES REPORT ON WAGE GAP, UNVEILS NEW SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TRAINING INITIATIVES, AND URGES PASSAGE OF PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT
May 11, 2000

Today, on National Equal Pay Day, Clinton will announce several new measures that seek to narrow the wage gap for women, particularly in high-tech fields. The President will release a new Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) report on the wage gap in the new economy, focusing on information technology fields. The report emphasizes that one way to narrow the wage gap is to recruit and train women for high-tech, high-paying jobs. In order to help narrow the wage gap for women, the President will announce that under his budget, the National Science Foundation (NSF) will invest $20 million to remove barriers to career advancement for women scientists and engineers. The President also will announce a new Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Task Force on Equal Pay. Finally, the President will call on Congress to support his $27 million Equal Pay Initiative and to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act in order to combat unfair pay practices against women. Equal Pay Day is the day on which American women's wages, added to their previous year's earnings, equal what men make in just one calendar year.

CEA REPORT ON THE WAGE GAP IN THE NEW ECONOMY. The President today will announce a new CEA report on women's progress in the new economy, focusing on information technology (IT) fields. The report shows that employment in certain occupations in the IT industry, such as computer scientists, programmers, and operators, has grown over 80 percent since 1983. However, women are underrepresented in these higher-paying, high-tech jobs – representing 29 percent of the sector, compared to 47 percent of all employed workers. Finally, the report demonstrates that the wage gap in these IT occupations, after controlling for education, age, and occupation, is about 12 percent – a gap similar to that estimated for the labor market more generally. The wage gap narrows significantly as education level rises, leading CEA to conclude that one pivotal way to narrow the gap is to encourage employers and others to recruit and train women for these high-paying, high-tech jobs.

ENCOURAGING WOMEN TO STUDY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY. President Clinton today will also highlight a new FY2001 budget initiative under which the National Science Foundation (NSF) will provide $20 million in grants to post-secondary institutions and partner organizations to promote the full participation of women in science and technology fields. The President will also announce a Department of Energy (DOE) web page that will feature women in science, engineering, and technology at DOE, and will detail DOE's efforts to help women achieve their professional goals through recruitment and employee development programs.

EEOC EQUAL PAY TASKFORCE. The President will also announce that the EEOC will create a new Task Force to ensure that EEOC field staff have the full range of legal, technical and investigatory support they need to effectively investigate charges of pay discrimination and to take appropriate action where discrimination has occurred. This Task Force's mission will be to provide up-to-date information on: (1) the law regarding unlawful compensation discrimination; (2) statistical analysis of compensation systems; and (3) non-statistical investigatory methods.

PRESIDENT CALLS ON CONGRESS TO SUPPORT EQUAL PAY. Finally, the President today will today on Congress to support his $27 million Equal Pay Initiative, which will help the EEOC and Labor Department fight wage discrimination. The Initiative includes $10 million for the EEOC to (1) provide, for the first time, training and technical assistance to about 3,000 employers on how to comply with equal pay requirements under the law; (2) develop public service announcements to educate employees and employers on their rights and responsibilities under equal pay laws; and (3) train over 1,000 EEOC staff in identifying and responding to wage discrimination. The Initiative also provides $17 million for DOL to (1) train women in nontraditional jobs including in the high technology industry; (2) fund projects to increase women's participation in non-traditional apprenticeships; and (3) provide employers with the necessary assistance to assess and improve their pay policies; and continue to educate the public on the importance of equal pay. The President will also urge Congress to pass the "The Paycheck Fairness Act," introduced by Senator Tom Daschle and Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro, to strengthen laws prohibiting wage discrimination. The highlights of this legislation include a new data collection provision; increased penalties under the Equal Pay Act (EPA); a non-retaliation provision; and a provision for increased training, research, and pay equity award.

Questions And Answers on Equal Pay
April 7, 1999

Q: What did the President announce today?

A: The President announced a new provision to collect pay data that will be added to the Paycheck Fairness Act, sponsored by Senator Daschle and Congresswoman DeLauro, that will direct the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to determine what additional data is needed to enforce effectively and efficiently the federal wage discrimination laws, and to issue a regulation to provide for collecting this data. The President and First Lady also held a roundtable discussion with working women to highlight the need to ensure that every working American receives equal pay and equal opportunities. The President urged prompt passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would strengthen wage discrimination laws; provide for additional training and public education efforts on this important subject; and ensure that pay data is collected. Finally, the President urged Congress to provide $14 million in funds for the Equal Pay Initiative in his Fiscal Year 2000 budget.

Q: What will the new provision on data collection do?

A: This provision would require the EEOC to complete a survey of data currently available for use in enforcing federal wage discrimination laws and to identify additional data collections that would enhance enforcement of these laws. In addition, the provision would call upon the EEOC to issue a regulation, within eighteen months, to provide for the collection of pay information data from employers described by the race, sex, and national origin of employees.

Q: Why is collection of data related to wages needed?

A: Currently, the federal government does not collect wage data that can be used to monitor and enforce employer compliance with laws that prohibit wage discrimination, with the exception of higher education. This data collection provision will provide an important source of data that will help to end the gender pay gap.

Q: How large is the wage gap?

A: According to the Department of the Labor, in 1998, the average woman who worked full-time earned about 75 cents for each dollar earned by the average man. For women of color, the gap was even wider. Based on weekly wages in 1998, the median earnings of a black woman who worked full-time were only 65 cents, and the median earnings of an Hispanic woman were only 55 cents for each dollar earned by the median white man. Some wage differences exist due to differing levels of experience, education, and skill. However, a recent Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) study shows that even accounting for differences in education, experience, and occupation, there is still a significant wage differential between women and men.

Q: **What about recent reports that there is no longer a wage gap?**

A: While these studies are correct that women's wages and educational attainment have been rising in recent years, there is still a sizeable gender wage gap that cannot be explained by observable characteristics. According to the Council of Economic Advisors, in 1997, the gender pay ratio was about 75 percent, leaving a gap between men's and women's wages of approximately 25 percent. The most recent detailed longitudinal study found that in the late 1980s about one-third of the gender pay gap was explained by differences in the full-time experience that women bring to the labor market and about 28 percent was due to differences in industry, occupation, and union status among men and women. Accounting for these differences raised the female/male pay ratio in the late 1980s from about 72 percent to about 88 percent, leaving around 12 percent as an "unexplained" difference. Applied to 1998 data, that leaves a gap of about 10 percent still unexplained. The 98 percent figure cited by these other studies is based on data narrowly limited to women and men aged 27 to 33 who have never had children.

A recently released report by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.), "A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT" also refutes the notion that there is no longer gender discrimination or a wage gap. The report documents a pattern in the M.I.T. School of Science of sometimes subtle -- but substantive and demoralizing -- gender discrimination. Examination of data revealed that many tenured women faculty feel marginalized and that this marginalization is often accompanied by differences in salary, space, awards, resources, and response to outside offers between men and women faculty with women receiving less despite professional accomplishments equal to those of their male colleagues. The M.I.T. report also found that the percentage of the School of Science faculty who are women, 8 percent, remained virtually unchanged for at least 10 and probably 20 years. In another recent report, the American Association of University Professors found that although women grew from 23 percent in 1975 to 34 percent of faculty nationwide currently, the gap between salaries of male and female professors actually widened in that period. The federal government currently collects some wage data at post-secondary institutions, and the EEOC will look at this data in the course of its survey of data for use in the enforcement of federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination.

Q: **What does the Paycheck Fairness Act do?**

A: The legislation, sponsored by Senator Daschle, seeks to improve the enforcement of wage discrimination laws and to strengthen the remedy provisions in the Equal Pay Act by permitting victims of wage discrimination to seek compensatory and punitive damages. Currently, women who are the victims of wage discrimination receive only backpay and liquidated damages, which may not fully compensate them for their loss. This change will mean that the penalties for sex-based wage discrimination will be the same as those for race-based wage discrimination. In addition, the legislation contains a non-retaliation provision that prohibits employers from penalizing employees for sharing information about their salaries with co-workers. The bill also provides for training for EEOC employees on matters involving the discrimination of wages, research on discrimination in the payment of wages, and the establishment of an award to recognize and promote the achievements of employers that have made strides to eliminate pay disparities. Finally, the new data collection provision will call upon EEOC to issue a regulation to provide for collecting pay information to enhance efficiently and effectively the enforcement of the federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination.

Q: What's wrong with the current scheme for collecting damages under the Equal Pay Act?

A: Currently, the Equal Pay Act allows only for liquidated damages and backpay awards. Liquidated damages usually are awarded in an amount equal to backpay. Such awards may not fully compensate a woman for real losses, such as damages for pain and suffering. In addition, employees bringing a claim under the Equal Pay Act cannot receive punitive damages for wage discrimination, no matter how intentional and egregious the employer's conduct. The legislation the Administration is endorsing will ensure that women are fully compensated and will be able to receive punitive damages if an employer's conduct is particularly egregious.

Q: Why isn't the Administration supporting comparable worth?

A: The Daschle-DeLauro bill is a significant step forward in solving the problem of unequal pay. The Administration believes there is no excuse for not taking these obvious steps towards providing better training and fuller remedies to help ensure women receive equal pay, while building a consensus on other ways to make sure all people receive the pay they deserve. The Administration is focusing on legislation that can be passed during this congressional session.

Questions on the Federal Work Force

Q: What are some of the specific accomplishments of the Clinton Administration with respect to women appointees?

A: Here are some specific accomplishments:

•**Appointed More Women than Any Other President** --40 percent of Administration appointees are women.

•**Women Hold 29 Percent of the Top Positions** --29 percent of the positions requiring

Senate confirmation (PAS) are held by women. Additionally,

- 35 percent of Presidential appointments, including boards and commissions, are held by women.

40 percent of non-career Senior Executive Service positions are held by women.
56 percent of Schedule C positions are held by women.

•**Appointed the First Women Ever to Serve as Attorney General, Janet Reno, and Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright.** Including the Attorney General and Secretary of State, women make up 32 percent of the Clinton Cabinet: Alexis Herman, Secretary of Labor; Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services; Carol Browner, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; Janet Yellen, Chair of the Council of Economic Advisors; and Charlene Barshefsky, United States Trade Representative all serve in the President's Cabinet.

•**30 Percent of All of the President's Judicial Nominees Are Women.**

•**Nominated the Second Woman to Serve on the Supreme Court.** During his first year in office, President Clinton nominated Ruth Bader Ginsburg to the United States Supreme Court. Justice Ginsburg is only the second woman to serve on the nation's highest court.

1/99

Q: **What is the representation of women in the federal work force?**

A: Women represented 42.9 percent of the Federal permanent workforce in 1998 compared to 46.3 percent of the Civilian Labor Force, a difference of a -3.4 percentage points.

Q: **What is the average salary of female political employees versus that of male appointees? How does that average compare to comparable figures in the previous Administration?**

A: In 1992, under President Bush, women made up 40 percent of the political ranks, and the average female political appointee's salary was 75 percent of the average male appointee's salary. In 1998, in the Clinton Administration, the percentage of women appointees increased to 44 percent, and the average woman's salary increased to 86 percent of the average man's.

Number and Average Salary of Political Appointments (by Gender): 1992 (Pres. Bush) Compared to 1998 (Pres. Clinton)				
Gender	1992 (Bush) Appts	1998 (Clinton) Appts	1992 (Bush) Avg. Pay ($)	1998 (Clinton) Avg. Pay ($)
Women	1,361	1,292	$61,554	$72,329*
Men	2,055	1,629	$82,490	$84,023*

TOTAL	3,416	2,921	NOTE: Total Political Appointments exclude Ambassadors but include Noncareer SES, Schedule C and Other.
Pct. Women	39.8%	44.2%	

* Rendered in constant (FY 1992) dollars
Source: Office of Personnel Management

Questions And Answers on Equal Pay
January 29, 1999

Q: What did the President announce today?

A: In his weekly radio address, the President will announce a new $14 million Equal Pay Initiative in his Fiscal Year 2000 budget and urge prompt passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act. The Initiative includes $10 million for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to increase compliance with equal pay laws by providing training to EEOC employees to identify and respond to wage discrimination, increasing technical assistance to businesses on how to meet legal requirements, and launching an equal pay public service announcement campaign to inform employers and employees alike of their rights and responsibilities. The Initiative also includes $4 million for the Department of Labor, primarily for a program to assist contractors in recruiting and retaining qualified women in non-traditional occupations. The President also will call on Congress again to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would strengthen wage discrimination laws and provide for additional research, training, and public education efforts on this important subject.

Q: How large is the wage gap?

A: According to the Department of the Labor, in 1997 the average woman who worked full-time earned just 74 cents for each dollar that men earned based on annual earnings. For women of color, the gap was even wider. On average, black women earned only 60 cents, and Hispanic women earned only 52 cents for each dollar earned by non-Hispanic white men. Some wage differences exist due to differing levels of experience, education, and skill. However, studies show that even accounting for differences in education, experience, and occupation, there is still a significant wage differential for women.

Q: What will the EEOC and Department of Labor do with the new funding the President announced today?

A: The EEOC will (1) triple the number of EEOC enforcement staff who receive training in identifying and responding to wage discrimination; (2) provide, for the first time ever, training and technical assistance to employers (about 3,000 in total) on how to comply with equal pay requirements; and (3) develop public service announcements to educate employees and employers on their rights and responsibilities under equal pay laws. The Department of Labor will (1) help women obtain and retain employment in non-traditional jobs by identifying and disseminating model employer practices and assisting contractors to finding qualified women employees, including through the new nationwide network of One-Stop Career Centers established by last year's Workforce Investment

Act; and (2) increase outreach, education, and technical assistance to federal contractors on equal pay issues, by providing legal guidelines and industry best practices.

Q: What roles do OFCCP and EEOC play in the enforcement of wage discrimination laws?

A: OFCCP enforces the anti-discrimination and affirmative action executive order that requires employers doing business with the government to apply their compensation practices in a non-discriminatory manner. The EEOC investigates equal pay claims in the private sector and brings charges against those found to violate the Equal Pay Act.

Q: What does the Paycheck Fairness Act do?

A: The legislation, sponsored by Senator Daschle, seeks to improve the enforcement of wage discrimination laws and to strengthen the remedy provisions in the Equal Pay Act by permitting victims of wage discrimination to seek compensatory and punitive damages. Currently, women who are the victims of wage discrimination receive only backpay and liquidated damages, which may not fully compensate them for their loss. This change will mean that the penalties for sex-based wage discrimination will be the same as those for race-based wage discrimination. In addition, the legislation contains a non-retaliation provision that prohibits employers from penalizing employees for sharing information about their salaries with co-workers. Finally, the bill provides for training for EEOC employees on matters involving the discrimination of wages, research on discrimination in the payment of wages, and the establishment of an award to recognize and promote the achievements of employers that have made strides to eliminate pay disparities.

Q: What's wrong with the current scheme for collecting damages under the Equal Pay Act?

A: Currently, the Equal Pay Act allows only for liquidated damages and backpay awards. Liquidated damages usually are awarded in an amount equal to backpay. Such awards may not fully compensate a woman for real losses, such as damages for pain and suffering. In addition, employees bringing a claim under the Equal Pay Act cannot receive punitive damages for wage discrimination, no matter how intentional and egregious the employer's conduct. The legislation the Administration is endorsing will ensure that women are fully compensated when an employer discriminates against them in setting wages.

Questions on the Federal Work Force

Q: What are some of the specific accomplishments of the Clinton Administration with respect to women appointees?

A: Here are some specific accomplishments:

- **Appointed More Women than Any Other President** --40 percent of Administration appointees are women.
- **Women Hold 29 Percent of the Top Positions** --29 percent of the positions requiring Senate confirmation (PAS) are held by women. Additionally,
  - 35 percent of Presidential appointments, including boards and commissions, are held by women.
  - 40 percent of non-career Senior Executive Service positions are held by women.
  - 56 percent of Schedule C positions are held by women.
- **Appointed the First Women Ever to Serve as Attorney General, Janet Reno, and Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright.** Including the Attorney General and Secretary of State, women make up 32 percent of the Clinton Cabinet: Alexis Herman, Secretary of Labor; Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services; Carol Browner, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; Janet Yellen, Chair of the Council of Economic Advisors; and Charlene Barshefsky, United States Trade Representative all serve in the President's Cabinet.
- **30 Percent of All of the President's Judicial Nominees Are Women**.
- **Nominated the Second Woman to Serve on the Supreme Court.** During his first year in office, President Clinton nominated Ruth Bader Ginsburg to the United States Supreme Court. Justice Ginsburg is only the second woman to serve on the nation's highest court.

Q: What is the representation of women in the federal work force?

A: Women represented 42.9 percent of the Federal permanent workforce in 1998 compared to 46.3 percent of the Civilian Labor Force, a difference of a -3.4 percentage points.

Q: What is the average salary of female political employees versus that of male appointees? How does that average compare to comparable figures in the previous Administration?

A: In 1992, under President Bush, women made up 40 percent of the political ranks, and the average female political appointee's salary was 75 percent of the average male appointee's salary. In 1998, in the Clinton Administration, the percentage of women appointees increased to 44 percent, and the average woman's salary increased to 86 percent of the average man's.

Number and Average Salary of Political Appointments (by Gender): 1992 (Pres. Bush) Compared to 1998 (Pres. Clinton)				
Gender	1992 (Bush) Appts	1998 (Clinton) Appts	1992 (Bush) Avg. Pay ($)	1998 (Clinton) Avg. Pay ($)
Women	1,361	1,282	$61,554	$71,859*
Men	2,055	1,611	$82,490	$83,799*
TOTAL	3,416	2,893	NOTE: Total Political Appointments exclude Ambassadors but include Noncareer SES, Schedule C and Other.	
Pct. Women	39.8%	44.3%		

* Rendered in constant (FY 1992) dollars
Source: Office of Personnel Management

**Long-Term Detainee/
Ninth Circuit Decision
Q&A
April 11, 2000**

Q: What do you think about the 9th Circuit decision invalidating the INS position that immigrants who have completed their criminal sentence must be detained pending an agreement by their home country to take them back?

A: DOJ/INS is currently reviewing the decision. Until recently, INS policy was indeed that such immigrants were to be detained pending an agreement on repatriation. But in August 1999, INS adopted a new policy of case-by-case review to determine whether some individuals might be eligible for release. It is not clear whether the 9th Circuit's ruling tracks this new policy, and so DOJ/INS will review the decision before deciding whether to appeal.

Background: Generally, the immigration reform act of 1996 requires the deportation of illegal and legal immigrants convicted of aggravated felonies after they have completed their criminal sentences. However, immigrants from certain countries – notably Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos – cannot be deported because these countries will not accept the repatriation of these individuals. In these cases, INS's position until last year was that they must detain these individuals until a repatriation agreement is reached with an individual's home country. But under a new case-by-case policy in effect since last August, INS will now release an individual if 1) he can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he is not a threat to society, and 2) he is likely to comply with an deportation order if the home country agrees to takes him back. The Ninth Circuit's decision invalidated the old INS policy and requires the INS to release the individuals after they have served their criminal sentence. But it is not clear whether the court has adopted the standards for release from the new INS policy.

INS Naturalization Efforts
January 22, 1999

Q: What is the Administration's plan for cutting the naturalization backlog?

A: Last year, the Administration succeeded in obtaining an infusion of $176 million in new resources in addition to resources obtained through application fees -- to support naturalization activities. These resources are being used to reduce the backlog of pending citizenship applications. In addition, in the past year the INS has implemented several administrative reforms that are designed to expedite processing of citizenship applications while maintaining integrity of the naturalization process -- including focusing backlog reduction efforts in the cities that handle the overwhelming majority of the naturalization workload. The INS remains committed to reducing the waiting time for citizenship applications to 12 months by the end of FY 1999, and to 6-9 months by the end of FY 2000.

Q: What is in the President's FY 2000 budget for naturalization efforts?

A: In FY 2000, applicant fees are expected to generate $174 million. In addition, to address continuing efforts to reduce the backlog of naturalization applications, the President's FY 2000 budget includes $124 million in appropriated funds.

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

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

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: 5

Domestic Partners – Vermont Civil Unions
Q&A
April 27, 2000

Q: **What is the Administration's reaction to the new Vermont law which allows gay couples to form civil unions and receive benefits of married couples? Since this Vermont law does not create formal recognition of marriage but grants gay couples nearly all of the benefits of marriage, does the Administration take a position in support of this bill?**

A: While the Administration does not have a position on specific legislation in Vermont, the President certainly supports more equal treatment for domestic partners. This Administration has been very supportive of gays and lesbians during his Administration. The President has supported the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which prohibits workplace discrimination against gays and lesbians, and has signed an executive order prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation in the federal workplace. He has also championed new legislation to prohibit hate crimes based on sexual orientation. While the President supports more equal treatment for domestic partners, he has said that he does not support formal recognition of marriage between persons of the same sex.

Q: **The President signed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA). Is there concern that this law in Vermont may become a vehicle for a constitutional challenge to DOMA?**

A: The President opposes governmental recognition of same-sex marriages, and that's why he signed DOMA. While the Administration has not had a chance to review the Vermont legislation, it appears that the Vermont law would not affect the federal definition of a marriage.

ADOPTION EVENT
Q&A
September 24, 1999

Q: Reports indicate that because the states did so much to increase adoptions, the amount of money set aside for bonus awards is not sufficient. How does the Administration propose to make up the shortfall in adoption incentive funds?

A: We are very encouraged that the adoption incentive program has been such a powerful tool. States did so well in 1998 that they exceeded the $20 million appropriated by Congress for bonuses. The law specifies that when the incentive payments earned by the states exceed the authorized limit, the awards will be pro-rated for each state according to its performance. The pro-rated adjustment has been made and those funds will be distributed to the appropriate states. Even with this cap, however, these are very substantial bonuses.

The Administration supports the effort to provide states with full bonuses for their 1998 efforts to increase adoptions. The House has approved legislation to do so, H.R. 1802, and the Administration will work closely with Congress to achieve a bipartisan solution to the shortfall.

Q: Not all states received bonuses. Why have adoptions declined in some states?

A: We believe that some of the decline is a result of reporting systems that are still under development, particularly in states with new computer systems. The shift to the new systems may be having an impact on the accuracy of the reporting. Also, some of the decline may reflect a normal variation in the number of adoptions finalized in the states. As states continue to implement the new adoption law, we expect their number of adoptions to increase.

Q: How do you respond to the claim that the Administration is not serious about ensuring that the adoption process is free from racial discrimination?

A: That is simply not true. In 1993, the President signed the Multi-Ethnic Placement Act and strengthened it further through the inter-ethnic provisions of the Small Business Job Protection of 1996. These laws ensure that the adoption process is free of discriminatory practices and delays based on race, culture or ethnicity. To ensure compliance, HHS has issued guidance to states and has pushed states to change their laws and policies accordingly. Furthermore, any complaints on this front are taken very seriously – and are quickly and thoroughly investigated by the Civil Rights Division of HHS. Finally, by making adoption more affordable through tax relief and by breaking down a host of barriers to adoption, the Administration has helped ensure that families of all backgrounds have the opportunity to consider adoption.

Q: What was the "Adoption 2002" report?

A: In response to a 1996 executive memorandum issued by President Clinton, HHS issued the "Adoption 2002" report. The report took its name from of the President's central goal -- to at least double, by the year 2002, the number of children adopted or permanently placed each year. "Adoption 2002" outlined administrative and legislative recommendations to set and meet urgent new adoption targets. We are very pleased that Adoption and Safe Families Act signed by the President in November 1997 was largely based on the report's recommendations.

Q: What does our nation's child welfare system look like today? How many children are in it and how long do they stay in foster care on average?

A: Today, approximately 520,000 of America's children live in our nation's foster care system. More than 100,000 of those children cannot return safely to their homes and need adoptive families. Our most recent data indicates that nearly half had been in care 24 months or longer. Of the children in care, the average age is 9 years old; 35 percent are white, 45 percent are black and 14 percent are Hispanic. Also, five percent of children turn 18 and leave the foster care system without having a permanent home.

Q: What is the racial breakdown of the children who were adopted in FY 1998?

A: The racial breakdown of the 36,000 children adopted in FY 1998 was: 38 percent white, non-Hispanic; 46 percent black, non-Hispanic; 13 percent Hispanic; 1 percent Asian Pacific; and 1 percent American Indian. These numbers roughly mirror the racial breakdown of the approximately 520,000 children in foster care overall.

Q: How much funding does the federal government invest in foster care and adoption services?

A: The federal government provides over $5.5 billion to states to run their foster care, adoption and child welfare programs. The funding provides a variety of supports to states which include: preventive services, investigations of child abuse and neglect, caseworkers and administrators, foster care adoption benefits to families, training, recruitment of foster and adoptive families, demonstration grants to test innovative programs, services for teenagers who are leaving foster care to be on their own, and supports for children with special needs. States must provide matching funds in order to access a majority of these funds.

Q: Does the number you are announcing today cover all adoptions?

A: No. The adoptions reported today were those that qualified to be counted for payment of adoption incentive funds. There may be other adoptions where the state was involved but did not qualify for incentive payments -- for example, where a state provided one-time non-recurring legal costs or adoption assistance for a child with special needs. We do not have a firm count of these additional adoptions. As data collection and reporting by the states improve, we expect to capture all the children adopted from the state child welfare systems.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. talking points	Marriage Rates Q&A; RE: phone number [partial] (1 page)	08/25/1999	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Anna Richter
OA/Box Number: 23734

FOLDER TITLE:
Various Topics Q&A/Press Releases [binder] [1]

2011-0638-S
ms171

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

[001]

Will Dunham

P6/(b)(6)

Marriage Rates
Q&A
August 25, 1999

Q. **Is the Administration concerned by recent reports that the marriage rate is falling? What role can and should the Government play in addressing this trend?**

A. While the government does not have a direct role to play in personal decisions citizens make, it does have an important responsibility to create the conditions necessary for Americans to build and maintain strong families. That is why the President has advanced an ambitious agenda to help parents balance their responsibilities at work and at home.

The first bill the President signed into law in 1993 was the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), which provides workers in covered businesses up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave to care for a seriously ill family member or spend time with a newborn or newly adopted child. Other important achievements include expanding the EITC, enacting a $500 per-child tax credit, achieving significant new investments in Head Start, child care, and after-school programs, creating the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), and increasing flexibility under welfare reform to assist low-income two parent families.

The President has proposed to extend the benefits of the FMLA to over 10 million more workers by covering workers in businesses with 25 or more employees and to enable workers to take 24 hours of job-protected leave each year to attend to important parental responsibilities, such as parent-teacher conferences and doctor's visits. Also, the President's FY 2000 budget includes significant new investments in Head Start, child care, and after-school programs. It also proposes additional funds for the Welfare-to-Work initiative, with an expanded focus on strengthening the role of fathers in their children's lives.

These steps, we believe, can reduce some of the pressures that American families face and can help support marriage and family building.

① M penalty – Tax
② divorce – state issue
③ at low end, EITC [illegible] more viable [illegible]
④ Med'aid bonus
[illegible]

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

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

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Divider Title: **6**

Medical Marijuana Q&A's
October 27, 1998

Q. Medical marijuana initiatives are on the ballot in six states and D.C. What is your position on these initiatives?

A. I urge voters to reject these state ballot initiatives. I recently signed into law -- as part of the omnibus spending bill -- a sense of the Congress resolution opposing the legalization of marijuana for medicinal purposes. At a time when drug use among our young people -- particularly marijuana use -- is increasing, these ballot measures send a confusing message to our children about the dangers of illegal drugs.

Also, smoking marijuana has not been demonstrated to be effective in treating disease. By ensuring that approved medications have undergone rigorous scientific scrutiny, our drug approval process protects Americans from unproven and ineffective treatments. Without these conclusive medical facts, states should not rush to change our drug laws or to circumvent our drug approval process.

I would strongly urge voters to reject these ballot initiatives.