

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. fax	To: Office of Bruce Reed, From: Bob Delfay, Re: NSSF visitors to White House (1 page)	12/21/99	b(6)
----------	---	----------	------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Eric Liu
OA/Box Number: 16238

FOLDER TITLE:

Crime - Gun Negotiations

2013-0717-S

sb11

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]

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

Monday January 31 8:22 PM ET

Gun Talks Stall After White House Meeting Fails

By Randall Mikkelsen

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - The Clinton administration and the gun industry blamed each other and politics on Monday for the collapse of talks aimed at resolving local government lawsuits against gun manufacturers.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) said plans for a Jan. 21 meeting between the White House and the industry -- which would have been the first since the federal government in December threatened to join the suits -- had collapsed after a "minority" of gun makers objected.

"The meeting was called off by a couple of companies who didn't want to sit down in an election year and be seen as giving the federal government a victory," said HUD spokeswoman Veda Lamar.

She said the White House and the housing department, which is taking the lead role on potential federal involvement in the suit, had been invited to the meeting.

But the association representing gun makers said the Clinton administration had invited itself to an already scheduled meeting, one in a low-profile series between local governments and the gun industry, and was rejected out of fears of politicizing the talks.

All talks are now suspended due to the attempted administration involvement, said Robert Delfay, president of the National Shooting Sports Foundation trade group. "We just felt that the whole political element of their involvement would not be constructive," he said.

The administration was now meeting individual manufacturers in hopes of making progress toward settling the lawsuits, which seek to recover damages related to gun violence, Housing Secretary Andrew Cuomo told reporters. "We're trying to get the more reasonable manufacturers and deal with them individually," Cuomo said in a telephone

Clinton -
Gun
negotiations

conference call.

He declined to identify companies the administration was speaking with and Delfay said any such talks with individual firms would be "counterproductive."

Hoping To Keep Politics Out

"We are hoping to have a chance to work toward resolving this issue as soon as possible without having politics play a role in it," said Lamar.

But politics, always a driving issue in the debate over gun control and gun violence, is becoming more intense in this presidential and congressional election year.

President Clinton launched a new front in the battle over gun control, proposing in his State of the Union address last Thursday that gun buyers be required obtain a license. The National Rifle Association and its allies in Congress immediately denounced the plan.

The legislative effort is one of three elements of the administration's strategy to fight gun violence. The others are government programs, such as education, and the threatened suit.

Thirty U.S. cities and counties have filed 20 lawsuits against gun makers for damages to cover the costs related to gun violence. The challenges have yet to go to trial.

Clinton said in December 1999 that if no settlement could be reached in the local cases, the White House would lead a suit on behalf of some 3,200 public housing authorities.

The White House lawsuit would try to force the industry to crack down on dealers who sell a disproportionate share of guns used in crime, to change sales pitches, and to require safety devices such as child-proof locks.

Cuomo declined to identify which gun makers were opposed to the Jan. 21 meeting, which the White House had hoped would open the door to settling the suits. "The vocal minority I think ruled the day on their side," he said.

Cuomo, speaking to reporters to publicize a \$30 million

proposal for a Housing Department program to fight gun violence, said he was hopeful for a settlement.

"I still believe there is a chance for success," he said. "We have said that if we don't believe there's any point in talking, any point in negotiation, then we will file suit, but I don't think we're there yet."

Delfay said in order for talks to resume with local governments, the White House must tell the local government representatives it would not try to attend the talks and they should revive them without federal involvement.

The initiative Cuomo announced on Monday will be included in Clinton's 2001 budget request. The \$30 million would be used for mapping incidents of gun violence as a prevention tool, promoting responsible use of guns and assisting community responses to gun violence, Cuomo said.

Gun industry joins NRA in Capitol Hill fight

Trade group forms PAC to raise money, boost campaigns of sympathetic candidates

By Martin Kasindorf
USA TODAY

The beleaguered gun industry is firing back at political foes with what it hopes will be a silver bullet: its first financial contributions to candidates who oppose tougher federal regulation of firearms.

Republicans stand to be the main beneficiaries of the new largess in November's elections.

The National Shooting Sports Foundation, a trade group for makers of guns, ammunition and hunting equipment, announced sponsorship of a new political action committee this week at its annual show in Las Vegas.

Until now, the mainspring of the powerful gun lobby in Washington has been the National Rifle Association, a gun owners' organization.

The gunmakers' political action committee, named SHOT — which stands for Shooting, Hunting and Outdoor Trades — is planning to add bang to the NRA's bucks by raising its own millions of dollars.

Soon, fundraising pitches will go out to 2 million recent firearms buyers and to employees of the National Shooting Sports Foundation's member companies, foundation president Robert Delfay says.

Republicans are "most of the strongest supporters of the hunting

"As that guy in the movie *Network* said, we're mad as hell, and we're not going to take it anymore." — Robert Delfay, president of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, a trade group for gun manufacturers

and shooting traditions," but friendly Democrats also will be favored, Delfay says.

NRA Executive Vice President Wayne LaPierre hailed the development, saying gunmakers are reacting to pressure in Congress and the courts for gun control. "They were simply not very political up until now," LaPierre says. "They were businesspeople, making a lawful product. But when you get mugged once or twice, you say, 'I'm going to be punching back.'"

LaPierre says the Clinton administration is leading a drive aimed at confiscating "every rifle, shotgun and pistol in America." With more than 3 million members, the NRA will spend as much as \$30 million on TV ads this year to target gun-control advocates. "We certainly believe that this is going to be settled in the No-



By Mano Tama, Agence France-Presse

'Punching back': NRA Executive Vice President Wayne LaPierre speaks at a news conference in May. He welcomes help from the SHOT committee.

vember election," LaPierre says.

"It's fair to say our efforts will be coordinated with the NRA's," Delfay says.

One goal for the gunmakers: defeating a renewed attempt by the White House and congressional Dem-

ocrats to pass legislation requiring trigger safety locks on guns and background checks of buyers at gun shows. The Senate passed the bill last year, but the House blocked it. President Clinton will promote the measure again in his State of the Union



By Ed Bailey, AP

Cuomo: HUD secretary has warned of lawsuit against gunmakers.

speech Thursday, White House spokesman Jake Siewert says.

Siewert says it's "unfortunate" that the firearms industry has created a new political arm. "Congress is already too beholden to special-interest money on gun control," he says.

In court, the industry is defending itself against a wave of civil lawsuits brought by cities and counties, aimed at redesigning guns for greater safety and changing industry marketing practices to keep guns away from kids and criminals.

Gun manufacturers were incensed

late last year when Housing and Urban Development Secretary Andrew Cuomo said his department would organize a class-action lawsuit by local housing authorities if the industry failed to negotiate a settlement of the cities' claims. A negotiating session that had been scheduled for today in Las Vegas was canceled after gun companies refused to allow administration officials to attend.

"If there's some sort of political motivation behind this, then we're not interested in furthering the administration's political agenda," Delfay says.

The industry's hardening line indicates that it is unwilling to work with Clinton and is concentrating on helping to elect a Republican president. "As that guy in the movie *Network* said, we're mad as hell, and we're not going to take it anymore," Delfay says.

Dennis Henigan, legal director of the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, says the industry is "obviously well-funded" despite its complaints that the lawsuits threaten its solvency. "They are obviously going to be as aggressive as they can be in battling us in Congress as well as in the courts."

In organizing their PAC, "some elements of the gun industry have politicized the issue of gun violence," Cuomo says. "The administration's efforts have nothing to do with politics. They have everything to do with saving lives by reducing murders, suicides and gun accidents."

Neb.'s Kerrey retires abruptly from Senate

By Kathy Kiely
and William M. Welch
USA TODAY

One of the Democrats' national stars, Nebraska Sen. Bob Kerrey, abruptly announced plans to retire, leaving his party less than six weeks to recruit a candidate for a tough race.

A charismatic iconoclast who sought the presidency in 1992 and considered doing so again this year, Kerrey told a news conference in Omaha on Thursday that he decided not to seek re-election this year because "my spiritual side needs to be filled back up."

His decision leaves the Democrats with four open seats to defend this year and makes it even more unlikely that the party will regain a majority in the Senate, where the GOP holds a 55-45 edge.

"Obviously it's bad news," said Jim Jordan, who's the political director of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. "It's one more competitive race where we thought we had a walkover."

GOP officials believe they have an excellent chance of picking up a Senate seat in Nebraska: Besides Kerrey, all of the other statewide elected officials are Republican.

At the National Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, Kerrey's retirement has made his seat "one of the highest priority races we have," spokesman Stuart Roy said.

Several candidates are being touted on both sides, among them former University of Ne-

braska football coach Tom Osborne, a Republican.

The filing deadline for the race is March 1.

Kerrey opened a campaign office in New Hampshire in the summer of 1998, which led to speculation he was planning a presidential bid in 2000. But in December 1998, he announced he would run for re-election instead. In recent weeks, after word leaked that he was a candidate for the presidency of the New School University in New York City, the senator let it be known he was reconsidering.

Kerrey remained undecided about what he would do until the last minute. At 11 p.m. Wednesday, he said, he had two speeches written.

The New School has not yet announced its choice for a new president, and Kerrey offered no specifics on what he might do after leaving office. He said, however, that he would consider becoming the Democratic vice presidential nominee if offered the spot. Kerrey is supporting the presidential bid of his former Senate colleague, Bill Bradley.

The 56-year-old Nebraskan is only the fifth Medal of Honor winner to serve in the Senate. He won the nation's highest decoration during a firefight in Vietnam where he lost the lower half of his right leg. After returning from Vietnam, Kerrey became an outspoken opponent of the war.

He served as governor of Nebraska for one term before winning election to the Senate in 1988.

Smith & Wesson CEOs Gun Industry's Maverick

Shultz, Eager to Settle Lawsuits Against Firearms Makers, Recommends Compromise

By PAUL M. BARRETT

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

SPRINGFIELD, Mass.—Sitting in his no-frills office here, Ed Shultz, chief executive of Smith & Wesson Corp., stretches his arms wide to explain the current litigation against the gun industry.

"Over here," he says, tapping the conference table with his right hand, "I've got people who say any compromise leads to the end of all gun rights. Over here"—tapping his left hand—"I've got people who want guns to disappear."

Tapping in the middle, he adds: "We're here."

Mr. Shultz wants to settle the wave of municipal lawsuits that is distracting and draining the gun industry. In the current issue of Shooting Industry magazine, he exhorts others in the firearms business to consider a truce with their foes:

"We can circle our wagons tighter and try to convince ourselves that we are absolutely correct in our positions, or we can go out, talk to, and meet our opponents, while earnestly trying to understand what motivates them and how we can impact the issues."

Coming from the head of the nation's largest handgun manufacturer, these pronouncements are getting attention in gun circles. The com-

ments are also timely, circulating just as the gun industry meets this week in Las Vegas for its main annual trade show. Industry officials have agreed to hold another round of preliminary settlement negotiations there on Friday with representatives of some of the cities that have sued, as well as with officials from New York state and the Clinton administration, both of which have threatened to file antigun suits of their own.

In urging a conciliatory approach, Mr. Shultz has some support among gun makers. Paul Jan-nuzzo, vice president and general counsel of the U.S. unit of Glock GmbH, the Austrian handgun maker, says: "None of us in the industry think these lawsuits make sense legally, but I generally agree with Ed that we can't just draw a line in the sand and refuse to budge."

However, some other major gun makers such as Sturm, Ruger & Co., Southport, Conn., have taken a much harder line. "The entire topic of compromise clouds the fact that these suits are wrong, an abuse of judicial process," says Stephen Sanetti, vice president and general counsel of Ruger, the largest overall gun manufacturer. "We have not embarked on any settlement discussions of any kind."

The National Rifle Association has warned against any agreement that infringes on the rights of the gun owners it represents—a warning the industry takes seriously because of the NRA's ability to influence customers. Even Mr. Shultz acknowledges there are some demands he isn't prepared to meet.

Still, he says forward-thinking gun executives should shake off their resentment of the lawsuits and figure out what changes in the manufacturing and distribution of guns will cause their antagonists to go away.

Don't misunderstand, Mr. Shultz is quick to say: He has a dim view of what he calls "greedy" plaintiffs' lawyers and "extremist" antigun activists who generated the suits filed by 28 cities and counties. "But I'm a pragmatist," explains

Please Turn to Page B4, Column 3

the 58-year-old executive, who came to the gun business only eight years ago. Contrary to what the famously combative NRA might argue, he adds, "You don't have to sacrifice the Second Amendment to get this resolved." An NRA spokesman declined to comment.

This isn't the first time Mr. Shultz has exerted this sort of leadership. In 1997, as gun-control proponents in Congress tried to pass legislation requiring safety locks on all firearms, Mr. Shultz unilaterally announced that Smith & Wesson would provide locks with its guns. Most of the rest of the industry later made the same pledge at a White House ceremony, drawing harsh criticism from the NRA for dealing with the Clinton administration.

A longtime gun owner with a blunt manner, Mr. Shultz lacks the emotionalism about firearms common in the industry. He took over a stumbling Smith & Wesson in 1992, when its British parent, Tomkins PLC, hired him. His earlier career included stops in the construction, power and recreational-equipment industries.

Mr. Shultz has thoroughly revamped the gun company, modernizing its factory, cutting the work force by about 50%, to 750 people, and diversifying into such products as specialty auto parts and police computer software. Annual revenue exceeds \$110 million, Mr. Shultz says, but he won't discuss exact financial figures.

One dollars-and-cents reason to resolve Smith & Wesson's legal troubles is that Tomkins, as part of a larger restructuring, has explored selling the company, according to people familiar with the situation. Uncertainty related to the litigation would depress the price, however, and Mr. Shultz says Tomkins isn't actively shopping for a buyer.

In the meantime, meeting some gun-control demands is actually good business, Mr. Shultz says. Many homeowners want locks to make sure their children can't play with firearms, for example.

A more ambitious demand made by those suing the industry is development of a high-tech "smart gun" that can be fired only by authorized users. Smith & Wesson has been quietly working on such a product for years, although the company isn't prepared to go public yet with its version.

Separately, Smith & Wesson has been tightening supervision of its wholesalers and authorized dealers. The company, like its rival Sturm, Ruger, forbids sales of its new firearms at gun shows, which law-enforcement officials call a common source of criminal arms. When five dealers in Chicago were indicted last summer for allowing allegedly shady purchases, Smith & Wesson cut them off, Mr. Shultz points out.

Such steps are precisely what gun foes hope to get out of a settlement, although they say even Smith & Wesson hasn't gone far enough.

Mr. Shultz counters that some demands being made of the industry require government action. Gun opponents want manufacturers to weed out retailers to whom the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms repeatedly traces guns used in crime. But Mr. Shultz maintains that the ATF or other police agencies should take the lead in identifying patterns of questionable sales.

"Right now, they don't give us the information," he says. If the government did so, he adds, "we are prepared to act."

Demands such as those for limiting consumers to one gun purchase a month or otherwise restricting bulk sales should be addressed by Congress, he says.

A flash point in any future talks will be a demand by New York Attorney General Elliot Spitzer—who has threatened to make his state the first to file its own suit—for an independent monitoring authority to oversee all gun companies. The industry maintains that this function already belongs to the ATF. But neither side will get all it wants, Mr. Shultz says: "That's just how these things go."

CRIME -

GUN

NEUTRALITY

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 2000

Fax**please deliver immediately****National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc.**

11 Mile Hill Road • Newtown, CT 06470-2359

Phone: (203) 426-1320 • Fax: (203) 426-1087

Date: 1/13/2000

Please deliver the following page(s) to:

Name: Bruce ReedFrom: Bob Delfay

Company: _____

Fax number: 202-456-5542Page 1 of 2

Crim

GUN

NEGOTIATIONS

Message:

The issue became one of
shattering an industry consensus
that has been difficult
to build for mayoral/AG
discussions.

Confidentiality Notice

The information contained in this fax transmission is privileged and confidential and intended only for the use of the individual or entity above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivery to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this fax transmission in error, please notify us immediately by collect telephone call and destroy this document.



National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc.

FLINTLOCK RIDGE OFFICE CENTER • 11 MILE HILL ROAD • NEWTOWN, CT 06470-2359 • 203 426-1320 • FAX 203 426-1087
WEB SITE www.nssf.org • E-MAIL rdelfay@nssf.org

ROBERT T. DELFAY
PRESIDENT AND
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

January 13, 2000

Attorney General Eliot Spitzer
State of New York
Office of Attorney General
120 Broadway
New York, NY 10271-0332

Fax: 212/416-8942

**SUBJECT: WHITE HOUSE PARTICIPATION IN SCHEDULED
JANUARY 21 MEETING**

Dear Attorney General Spitzer:

As you may know, I tried to reach both you and Peter Pope earlier this week to discuss our scheduled meeting on January 21 in Las Vegas. In particular, I was interested in discussing your view about any White House participation in that meeting.

Over the past few days there has been extensive discussions among industry representatives regarding White House participation and we have determined that we are not prepared to meet with representatives of the administration at this time. I shall attempt to call Bruce Reed this afternoon to advise him of our decision.

We do wish to proceed with the committee discussions and meeting schedule previously agreed to between our respective groups.

I will be out of the office beginning tomorrow, but can be reached via voice mail at 203/426-1320, extension 218 or at Caesars Palace at 702/731-7110.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Delfay
President and Chief Executive Officer

RTD:dp

Gun Retailers Form Group To Push Views

By PAUL M. BARRETT

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Gun retailers, worried that their interests aren't being represented by manufacturers in industry talks to settle municipal litigation, are forming a new trade group to demand a place at the table.

The move is sure to stir controversy, because the dealers have hired an industry operative whose pragmatic approach has put him at odds with a number of major manufacturers and the National Rifle Association, which represents gun owners.

The operative, Robert Ricker, has already arranged for his new clients to meet today with staff members at the White House. Seeking to get involved in settlement negotiations, the Clinton administration last month threatened to file its own lawsuit against the industry on behalf of thousands of public-housing authorities.

Gun foes began a coordinated legal assault on the industry in late 1998. Since then, 28 municipalities have sued gun makers, distributors and retailers, seeking to recover the public costs of gun violence—a demand that industry lawyers have branded improper, saying blame lies with those who misuse guns, not those who lawfully make and sell them.

The real goal of the litigation isn't large damage awards but a settlement under which the industry would agree to more stringent regulation in an effort to keep guns out of the wrong hands. There have been several rounds of preliminary settlement talks, without a substantive accord.

Bill Carter, proprietor of Carter's Country Outdoor Stores in Houston and one of the founders of the new National Coalition of Firearm Retailers, said in an interview, "We don't feel like the dealer has been represented in any of the talks at this point." He said dealers from California to New York have indicated interest in joining the organization, which will have its first meeting at a trade show in Las Vegas later this month.

The choice of Mr. Ricker as a consultant is significant. He was effectively pushed out of a Washington-based industry-lobbying job last spring, after he angered the NRA and some gun manufacturing executives by trying to forge compromises with the White House and Congress on various legislative gun-control proposals. Mr. Ricker, who has re-established himself as a state-level gun lobbyist in Sacramento, Calif., is unusual within the industry because of his open lines of communication with certain Clinton administration officials and others in the gun-control camp.

Robert Delfay, head of the overall industry trade group, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, said his organization was vigilantly representing retailers' interests and that it was best to present a unified front against gun foes.

Mr. Ricker said in an interview that the several nationally known dealers he is scheduled to accompany to the White House today "don't plan to offer anything," but would outline some issues on which dealers may have a different perspective from others in the industry.

For example, many well-established dealers would like to see more aggressive policing of gun shows, the weekend gun-selling bazaars that law-enforcement officials single out as a leading source of weapons for criminals, Mr. Ricker said. Agreeing with the law-enforcement view, many storefront dealers also resent gun shows as lightly regulated, low-price competitors. So, dealers would probably be more willing than some manufacturers to include in a settlement a requirement that all gun-show sales include the sort of computer background checks required of gun-store sales. Dealers are also more likely to back a provision calling on the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to patrol gun shows more vigorously, Mr. Carter said.

On the other hand, dealers would probably resist more fiercely than manufacturers any attempt to use the bureau's statistics showing which retailers sold guns later used in crime as a basis for excluding those retailers from the industry. "That would be very disturbing, because you're going to catch any high-volume dealer on that sort of list," Mr. Carter said. Manufacturers have firmly opposed the idea that they should be responsible for compiling such a black list, but some gun makers have suggested that if the government identified "bad-apple" dealers, the industry would consider cutting them off.

Mr. Delfay, head of the industrywide trade group, said that any differences in perspective weren't great. He explained that industry representatives haven't discussed background checks at gun shows with the municipalities because "that's got to be something that Congress does." As for use of any black list based on the bureau's trace statistics, Mr. Delfay said, "It would be totally inappropriate for manufacturers to cut off retailers based on the number of firearms traced to them."

Mr. Delfay said that he and some members of his trade group are scheduled to meet separately with White House staff members today. Both gun groups are also expected to meet with Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and Federal Bureau of Investigation officials today, but the structure of that meeting wasn't clear last night.

The prospect of gun retailers seeking to assert their own distinct views in the settlement process was first raised on a national level by a page one article in The Wall Street Journal in June 1999.

CRIME-

GUN

NBBBWWWW

E-Commerce Firms Start to Rethink Opposition To Privacy Regulation as Abuses, Anger Rise

By GLENN R. SIMPSON
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
WASHINGTON — The electronic-commerce industry is starting to reconsider its long-held opposition to federal regulation of Internet privacy issues.

To date, the industry has pushed the concept of "self-regulation" to handle the burgeoning practice of collecting detailed data on Internet consumers. But now that stance is under pressure from Congress, the states and election-year politics. Some in the industry are mulling "whether we're not better off working at a federal level to create some standards," says Washington lawyer Ron Plessner, a past advocate of self-regulation who coordinates an industry group that includes America Online Inc. and Microsoft Corp.

The industry has argued that new legal restrictions could hinder the commercial growth of the Internet. But multiplying reports of surreptitious collection of consumer data by Internet marketers and questionable distribution of personal data by other companies are making privacy an issue of increasing public concern. In the presidential race, both Vice President Al Gore and Republican Steve Forbes have jumped on the issue. And lawmakers from both parties are calling for safeguards such as requiring companies to disclose how they collect and use personal information, and to seek consumers' permission before they resell the data.

Several recent actions have combined to prompt the industry to rethink whether some new laws are inevitable. Included are the unexpected popularity of a privacy amendment by Alabama GOP Sen. Richard Shelby at the close of last year, new moves by states to strengthen their privacy laws and a tough position taken on privacy by the European Union.

"I think we would all be foolish if we were not examining the options in light of what Shelby, the states and the EU have been doing," says Mr. Plessner, a lawyer who coordinates the Electronic Commerce and Consumer Protection Group. The industry group began discussions about a change in position about a month ago, other industry representatives say.

A few of the biggest technology companies are beginning to soften their opposition to some sort of federal standard, says Scott Cooper, a Hewlett-Packard Co. vice president and a longtime advocate of some type of basic federal rules. "Public perception keeps going south on us about self-regulation having all the answers," he says.

Mr. Cooper worries that it may actually be too late. Last fall, "these privacy amendments came out of left field, and nobody wanted to stand up to them," he says. If companies don't come to the negotiating table quickly, he fears, "people are going to find right positions."

Other industry executives won't go as far as Mr. Cooper, but have clearly opened

Protecting Privacy

Some pending Internet privacy legislation in California and New York:

CALIFORNIA

- **Prohibit** Internet service providers from disclosing personal information without permission from customers.
- **Create** an office of Privacy Ombudsman to investigate the unlawful release of personal information by a commercial or governmental entity. Allow civil lawsuits for the unlawful release of personal information without permission.

NEW YORK

- **Establish** an opt-out system for unsolicited marketing and disclose to consumers that they have the right to

restrict unsolicited advertisements.

- **Restrict** collection, disclosure and dissemination of personal information acquired by a provider of online computer services in order to ensure the privacy of subscriber information.
- **Authorize** a cause of action to enjoin unwanted solicitation.
- **Enact** a telecommunications privacy law regulating the collection, use or disclosure of information by telecommunications carriers.

Sources: The Internet Alliance, Internet State Coalition

the door. "Fundamentally, our view is that the marketplace should solve the problem," says an Intel Corp. executive. But, he adds, "we're always prepared to work with Congress if there seems to be a sentiment for doing something like that."

Nominally, self-regulation remains the mantra of the industry, but several Washington-based representatives say they are preparing to negotiate with Congress and the Federal Trade Commission if the issue continues to heat up. Christine Varney of the Online Privacy Alliance, the leading promoter of self-regulation practices, takes a neutral stance, saying her group organizes self-policing of existing rules and doesn't take a position on legislation.

The potent populist appeal of new privacy-protection measures already is changing the debate in Congress. Perhaps more than anything, e-commerce lobbyists were spooked by Sen. Shelby's ability to move a privacy-related measure barring states from selling driver records through the congressional appropriations process last November.

Currently, conservative Republicans such as Joe Barton of Texas are teaming up with Democratic liberals such as Edward Markey of Massachusetts to push for drastic new restrictions. They are expected to be joined shortly by a proposal from Democratic Sen. Bob Kerrey of Nebraska. Gary Clayton, a Dallas privacy consultant who has been meeting with members of Congress and their staffs, says there has been a marked shift in recent weeks in attitudes toward regulation.

In part what is driving them is that privacy is polling high on the charts as a voter concern. In a Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll last fall, Americans were given a list of eight concerns that might face them in the new century and were asked to rank the ones that worry them the most. Loss of personal privacy ranked at the top of the

list, cited by 29%.

The impact of such worries was foreseen last fall by Boston-based Internet analyst Forrester Research Inc. It began forecasting the failure of the self-regulation approach in November, after finding that more than two-thirds of Internet users it surveyed were extremely or very concerned about privacy issues.

State actions have also put the industry in a squeeze. California and Colorado, among others, are weighing tough new privacy laws. New York State Attorney General Eliot Spitzer says in an interview that he will be making "a number of legislative proposals in the next few weeks" to address privacy issues. Among the possibilities: tough new limits on unsolicited calls and e-mails, as well as restrictions on so-called information brokers who collect and sell personal data such as addresses and Social Security numbers.

Moves by several states to toughen rules on financial privacy, in particular, have recently prompted banking lobbyists to explore whether Congress is interested in rewriting strongly criticized financial privacy rules passed just last fall, according to Andy Vermilye, an aide to Democratic Sen. Richard Bryan of Nevada. The lobbyists say they may now be willing to agree to a tougher national standard in exchange for pre-emption of state laws.

But not everyone in e-commerce feels that way. "The states are a living laboratory to figure out what will work and won't work," argues Jeff Richards of the Internet Alliance, which is owned by the Direct Marketing Association. "At this moment in time, I believe federal legislation that would be sweeping and pre-emptive is not called for."



Journal Link: For an in depth briefing on Internet privacy, see The Wall Street Journal Interactive Edition at <http://wsj.com>

6 key things

Before

- criminal law
- going for conviction, more to find things yet done

Interview

- ① what are bounds of ATF with?
 - ② what are duties for interview?
 - ③ what conduct of a witness?
- ② ... audit + inspect?
- keep track of info, who keeps track of deals? ^{draw-thru?} ~~pass-thru?~~
 - long running
 - Epiq: power to cut off lines of funds
- ③ ... enforce a law v. review law enforcement / investigation in abstraction? they try to then go to it?
- ① ... what can ATF do then - interview can't?
- now ATF?
- runs in many ways ATF cannot, & has not want the job by statute

① Longbody

② 11th conf call

③ Conde - Mor call?

④

CRIME-

600

NEGOTIATING

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. fax	To: Office of Bruce Reed, From: Bob Delfay, Re: NSSF visitors to White House (1 page)	12/21/99	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Eric Liu
OA/Box Number: 16238

FOLDER TITLE:

Crime - Gun Negotiations

2013-0717-S

sb11

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]



National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc.

FLINTLOCK RIDGE OFFICE CENTER • 11 MILE HILL ROAD • NEWTOWN, CT 06470-2359 • 203 426-1320 • FAX 203 426-1087
WEB SITE www.nssf.org • E-MAIL rdelfay@nssf.org

ROBERT T. DELFAY
PRESIDENT AND
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

December 21, 1999

TO: Kathy
Office of Bruce Reed

FAX: 202/456-5542

FROM: Bob Delfay *TJd*

SUBJECT: DECEMBER 6 VISITORS
JW

CAW-
GUN
NEGOTIATIONS

The representatives of the National Shooting Sports Foundation that will attend the December 6, 1999 meeting at 11:00 a.m. are:

James Chambers
Executive Director
Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute
2987 Westhurst Lane, Suite 110
Oakton, VA 22124
703/242-1690

DOB: [REDACTED]
SS#: [REDACTED] (b)(6)

Robert T. Delfay, President and Chief Executive Officer
National Shooting Sports Foundation
11 Mile Hill Road
Newtown, CT 06470
203/426-1320

DOB: [REDACTED]
SS#: [REDACTED] (b)(6)

Doug Kliever
General Counsel to NSSF & SAAMI
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
202/974-1500

DOB: [REDACTED]
SS#: [REDACTED] (b)(6)

RTD:dp