

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:07-JUN-1993 11:47:00.00

SUBJECT: Talking Points 6/7

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mary H. Anton (ANTON_M) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah J. Behr (BEHR_D) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Akey (AKEY_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (2685,Julia Payne) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:2685\C:Julia Payne\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Unice B. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_U) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Rabinowitz (RABINOWITZ_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael R. Lufrano (LUFRANO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (99275744,Al Brown) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:99275744\C:Al Brown\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha Scott (SCOTT_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Julie A. Nash (NASH_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: R. Paul Richard (RICHARD_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT_GELMAN#1=US#2=TELEMAIL#3=HOUSE#MPX#KOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly Tilley (TILLEY_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Berman (BERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne Walker (WALKER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Kusnet (KUSNET_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Richard Strauss READ: UNKNOWN	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Jonathan P. Gill READ: UNKNOWN	(GILL_J) (WHO)
TO: Patricia A. Enright READ: UNKNOWN	(ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
TO: Maria M. Tio READ: UNKNOWN	(TIO_M) (WHO)
TO: Jess Sarmiento READ: UNKNOWN	(SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
TO: Kimberly S. Hopper READ: UNKNOWN	(HOPPER_K) (WHO)
TO: David B. Anderson READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Hancox READ: UNKNOWN	(HANCOX_K) (WHO)
TO: Susan Brophy READ: UNKNOWN	(BROPHY_S) (WHO)
TO: Howard Paster READ: UNKNOWN	(PASTER_H) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine C. Miller READ: UNKNOWN	(MILLER_L) (WHO)
TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan READ: UNKNOWN	(TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
TO: Steve Ricchetti READ: UNKNOWN	(RICCHETTI_S) (WHO)
TO: Nestor M. Davidson READ: UNKNOWN	(DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ: UNKNOWN	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Melissa G. Banks READ: UNKNOWN	(BANKS_M) (WHO)
TO: Kathleen L. O'Neill READ: UNKNOWN	(ONEILL_K) (WHO)
TO: Margaret C. Sherry READ: UNKNOWN	(SHERRY_M) (WHO)
TO: Timothy J. Keating READ: UNKNOWN	(KEATING_T) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Margaret A. Williams READ: UNKNOWN	(WILLIAMS_MA) (WHO)
TO: Evelyn Lieberman READ: UNKNOWN	(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: Karen Finney READ: UNKNOWN	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Melanne Verveer READ: UNKNOWN	(VERVEER_M) (WHO)
TO: Ann Stock READ: UNKNOWN	(STOCK_A) (WHO)
TO: G. N. Lattimore READ: UNKNOWN	(LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
TO: Isabelle R. Tapia READ: UNKNOWN	(TAPIA_I) (WHO)
TO: Anne Walley READ: UNKNOWN	(WALLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Stephanie Streett READ: UNKNOWN	(STREETT_S) (WHO)
TO: Marcia Hale READ: UNKNOWN	(HALE_M) (WHO)
TO: Nancy HERNREICH READ: UNKNOWN	(HERNREICH_N) (WHO)
TO: Joshua A King READ: UNKNOWN	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: David Leavy READ: UNKNOWN	(LEAVY_D) (WHO)

ARMS Email System

TO: Kathy McKiernan READ: UNKNOWN	(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)
TO: David Seldin READ: UNKNOWN	(SELDIN_D) (WHO)
TO: Steven A. Cohen READ: UNKNOWN	(COHEN_SA) (WHO)
TO: Dee Dee Myers READ: UNKNOWN	(MYERS_D) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Marla Romash READ: UNKNOWN	(ROMASH_M) (VPO)
TO: Nancy L. Ward READ: UNKNOWN	(WARD_N) (WHO)
TO: Jeremy Gaines READ: UNKNOWN	(GAINES_J) (WHO)
TO: Chad H. Griffin READ: UNKNOWN	(GRIFFIN_C) (WHO)
TO: Debra D. Bird READ: UNKNOWN	(BIRD_D) (WHO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Heather Beckel READ: UNKNOWN	(BECKEL_H) (WHO)
TO: Amanda Crumley READ: UNKNOWN	(CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ: UNKNOWN	(VOLES_L) (WHO)
TO: Dawn A. Alexander READ: UNKNOWN	(ALEXANDER_DA) (WHO)
TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez READ: UNKNOWN	(RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
TO: Regina Montoya READ: UNKNOWN	(MONTOYA_R) (WHO)
TO: Jeff Watson READ: UNKNOWN	(WATSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ: UNKNOWN	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Joan Baggett READ: UNKNOWN	(BAGGETT_J) (WHO)
TO: Elaine Weiss READ: UNKNOWN	(WEISS_E) (WHO)
TO: Carola McGiffert READ: UNKNOWN	(MCGIFFERT_C) (WHO)
TO: David Dreyer READ: UNKNOWN	(DREYER_D) (WHO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: George Stephanopoulos READ: UNKNOWN	(STEPHANOPO_G) (WHO)
TO: Robert Boorstin READ: UNKNOWN	(BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ: UNKNOWN	(WALDMAN_M) (WHO)
TO: Jason Solomon READ: UNKNOWN	(SOLOMON_J) (WHO)
TO: Ken Chitester READ: UNKNOWN	(CHITESTER_K) (WHO)
TO: Keith Boykin READ: UNKNOWN	(BOYKIN_K) (WHO)
TO: S. Collier Andress READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDRESS_S) (WHO)
TO: Jeffrey L. Eller READ: UNKNOWN	(ELLER_J) (WHO)
TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein READ: UNKNOWN	(BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
TO: Jonathan M. Prince	(PRINCE_J) (WHO)

ARMS Email System

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas F. McLarty (MCLARTY_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark Gearan (GEARAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Watkins (WATKINS_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christine Varney (VARNEY_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Dwight Holton (HOLTON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Andre C. Oliver (OLIVER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen A. Sudbay (SUDBAY_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Charles W. Burton (BURTON_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce Lindsey (LINDSEY_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John B. Emerson (EMERSON_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jan O. Piercy (PIERCY_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta (PODESTA_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bernie Nussbaum (NUSSBAUM_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Vince Foster (FOSTER_V) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ron Klain (KLAIN_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carol Rasco (RASCO_C) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce Reed (REED_B) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: William Galston (GALSTON_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Shirley Sagawa (SAGAWA_S) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Robert E. Rubin (RUBIN_R) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Gene Sperling (SPERLING_G) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: W. Bowman Cutter (CUTTER_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ira Magaziner (MAGAZINER_I) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (MATHEWS_S) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marla Romash (ROMASH_M) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JULIA M. PAYNE@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Gill (GILL_M) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SKILA S. HARRIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eli J. Segal (SEGAL_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen D. Ewing (EWING_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Allen (ALLEN_RL) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 12 POINT_COURIER
Comments on the President's Schedule
June 7, 1994

* The President continues his effort to win passage of key elements of his plan for economic growth and deficit reduction before key Senate Committees this week.

* Principles. As the Senate considers the plan, the President will be stressing eight vital principles:

1. Achieving \$500 billion in deficit reduction is a must.
2. Retaining the progressivity of the tax provisions is a must; namely, the wealthy must bear the heaviest burden, and at least 75% of the tax increases must be paid by households with incomes over \$100,000.
3. Preserving critical investments in working families is a must. These include: expansion of the earned income tax credit, empowerment zones, and the new immunization program.
4. Keeping an energy tax which promotes conservation and fuel efficiency is a must.
5. Maintaining the shared burden of deficit reduction and distributing that burden fairly is a must.
6. Ensuring the economic plan retains its basic thrust: job creation, lower interest rates, and human investment.
7. Maintaining the balance between tax increases and spending cuts is a must.

Within that framework, the President is very willing to work with the Senate to ensure that this plan passes and the country is put on the road to economic renewal: to more jobs, higher incomes, lower interest rates, and real growth for a better future.

(*)

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:08-JUN-1993 16:17:00.00

SUBJECT: AGAM 6.8.93

TO: Patricia A. Clark (CLARK_P) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Arthur L. Jones (JONES_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Berman (BERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Nestor M. Davidson (DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan (TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Arnold Shore (SHORE_A) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Keith Boykin (BOYKIN_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Leavy (LEAVY_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas F. McLarty (MCLARTY_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret A. Williams (WILLIAMS_MA) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce K. Sasser (SASSER_B) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marla Romash (ROMASH_M) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Akey (AKEY_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christine A. Varney (VARNEY_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATOR: NEWS (6=NEWS@2=ATTMAIL@1=US@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT CREATION DATE/TIME:08-JUN-1993 07:54:00.00

ATT BODY PART TYPE: B

ATT SUBJECT: AGAM 6/8

ATT TO: BAUER (HANK BAUER@4=NCC-KC@5=OIRM@3=GOV+USDA.OIRM.KC@2=ATTMAIL@1=US@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: PAO (6=PAO@4=W01B@3=USDA.FS.X400@2=ATTMAIL@1=US@MRX@EOPMRX)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: ALEXANDER (ALEXANDER_DA@A1@CD)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: BOYKIN (BOYKIN_E@A1@CD)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: ELLER (ELLER_J@A1@CD)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: GILL (GILL_J@A1@CD)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: INADOMI (INADOMI_L@A1@CD)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: PODESTA (PODESTA_J@A1@CD)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: RASCO (RASCO_C@A1@CD)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: TREVELYAN (TREVELYAN_S@A1@CD)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TEXT:
Enclosed file name.

0608.TXT

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====

ATT CREATOR: UNKNOWN (UNKNOWN)

ATT CREATION DATE/TIME:08-JUN-1993 07:54:00.00

ATT BODY PART TYPE: A

ATT SUBJECT:

ATT TEXT:
Tuesday, June 8, 1993

* * * * * COPYRIGHT NOTIFICATION * * * * *
AG a.m. is intended for use by USDA policymakers only. Redistributing AG a.m. outside USDA by any means violates copyright on the source material.

CRITICISM OF FARM INCOME FIGURES CRITICIZED (DM Reg-5/30) - George Anthan criticizes Sec. Espy's questioning of the value of USDA's farm income figures in assessing the financial health of individual farmers. He says Espy aides may have fallen under the spell of rhetoric at the latest Farm Aid concert. Anthan says ERS and NASS reports have been praised and criticized in the past, and notes that Sen. Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.) asked GAO to review the discrepancy between figures. Anthan urges Sec. Espy to work with ERS, NASS and land-grant colleges to develop figures to measure economic welfare of farm businesses.

EFFECTS OF BUDGET PLAN ON FARMS (DM Reg-5/30) -- An analysis by the Center for Rural Affairs says the House budget cutting plan would place more-severe reductions in federal payments on moderate-sized farms than on large operations. The article presents some math on the effects of budget plans. It notes that family farm advocates have contended federal farm programs are skewed toward larger operations and penalize smaller ones.
(WSJ) -- The article says the Btu tax is dying the death of a thousand

cuts. It notes efforts to exempt some farm uses of energy, and says exemption for ethanol is almost certain to emerge from Senate negotiations.

(W.Times) -- A columnist says the worst problem with the Btu tax is that it is a hidden tax that adds to the cost of all goods, including food, and consumers will blame farmers and industry for cost-of-living increases.

(Reuter-6/7, 2 stories) -- Sen. Phil Gramm (R-Texas) said the recent election in Texas was a referendum on the president's tax proposal and he expressed hope that the momentum from the election would lead to an outright defeat of the Btu tax bill. He said the proposed exemptions to the bill, and those that would be sought, would create a bureaucracy "that is totally unworkable." A second story, largely on concerns over cuts to Medicare, notes that Sen. Kent Conrad (D-N.D.) is working with farm-state senators on exempting agriculture from the budget plan.

BOOSTING FARMING'S IMAGE (DM Reg-5/28) -- The Farm Bureau (Iowa?) established an Agricultural Leadership and Promotion Foundation to help improve agriculture's image through classroom programs to teach about farm life and practices, to conduct research on attitudes in order to develop educational programs, to focus on the positive aspects of animal care, and to develop farm leadership skills through conferences and training.

BATTLING BUGS (AP) -- USDA scientists discovered that a relative of tobacco plants produces environmentally safe natural compounds that kill whiteflies. The scientists have applied for a patent, and are working to increase the plants' production of the chemicals through classic genetic breeding.

(BusWeek-6/14) -- USDA scientists are working on a genetic system for plants that will cause them to produce an insect-repelling compound when they are being attacked.

EARLIER OPENING FOR LIVESTOCK FUTURES (KRF-6/7) -- The Chicago Mercantile Exchange is expected to approve an earlier (8:30 CT) opening for livestock futures by August 2. A National Cattlemen's Assn. position against changing the trading hours appears to be aimed against extending afternoon hours when USDA supply reports are released.

FARM-TRADE SLOWDOWN FORESEEN (Deutsche Presse-6/7) -- FAO's director general warned that the volume of farm trade by the year 2000 could be half of what it was in the 1980s because of protectionism and a slow rise in demand and productivity gains. He said real progress was needed in the GATT talks. He added that if trends continue, developing countries will become net importers, and he asked how they would pay for the goods.

GATT DEVELOPMENTS (Reuter-6/7) -- Australia's trade minister said the US and EC must stick to the Blair House farm-trade deal. Australia is adamant nothing should derail a GATT settlement by the end of the year.

(Reuter-6/7) -- The Federation of German Farmers urged the EC to reject the compromise on oilseed production. The federation's president said the EC should not give in on farm issues in order to save the GATT talks. He said the oilseed compromise is unbalanced.

(Reuter-6/7 & 8) -- France's foreign minister said the oilseed agreement was "not so bad for France." The agriculture spokesman for France's ruling party said his country will agree in principle to the draft oilseeds agreement. A government official said France wants extra compensation for land set aside by farmers, and France will seek to end the tariff free import of corn gluten.

(Reuter-6/7) -- Latin American countries decided the Uruguayan trade diplomat Julio Lacarte-Muro will be their candidate to become the GATT's next director general. They said they believe they can convince other GATT members that their candidate "is the right man for GATT at this time." Some expect Peter Sutherland, the candidate backed by the EC, US, many developed countries and some developing states, to be chosen, even though it looks as if the other developing states are determined to take their drive for Lacarte-Muro down to the line.

(BusWeek-6/14) -- The article says the GATT talks are about to get a jolt in the form of an agreement that would lower trade barriers for a broad range of manufactured products. The article notes France's softening on agricultural issues and says Japan has even hinted they might phase out protection for their rice market. There are some skeptics about the prospects for a deal, but many see an improving atmosphere.

AUSTRALIANS COME TO TALK FARM ISSUES (PRN-6/7, 2 stories; FWN-6/7) -- The president of Australia's National Farmer's Federation is in Washington to discuss agriculture issues with the administration and House Agriculture Committee members. FWN says the purpose of the visit is to complain about the EEP. Australia's trade minister, coming to talk about trade and political issues with Sec. Espy and others, plans a news conference at 2 p.m., June 10, at the Australian Embassy.

FULL-SCALE EEP SOUGHT (FWN-6/7) -- FWN reprints a letter to Sec. Espy from Sens. David Pryor (D-Ark.) and Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.) who say a full-scale Export Enhancement Program is imperative because of the impending GATT and NAFTA trade agreements, and cuts in the farm programs which will force farmers to fend for themselves in world markets.

EC GRAIN FRAUD (Reuter-6/5 & 7) -- A vast fraud involving grain silos in Italy has been uncovered. Silo operators paid to store grain and keep it off the market were found to be illegally selling the wheat. The European Commission said it will seek to recover the funds from the Italian government.

RUSSIA SITUATION (KRF-6/7) -- The two remaining pacts with Russia are expected to be signed next week, not this week as thought earlier. Russia cannot begin buying until the agreements are signed, but Exportkhleb's chairman said Russia was "not in a hurry" and would spread out its purchases over the summer.

DISCLAIMER -- AG a.m. content is derived from major wires, news magazines and mass distribution press. Inclusion of an item in Ag a.m. does not imply USDA agreement; nor does USDA attest to the accuracy or completeness of the item. News Division will not read, mail or fax source material to any user.

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:08-JUN-1993 14:23:00.00

SUBJECT: Press Briefing by Dee Dee Myers 6.8.93

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christian M. Baldia (BALDIA_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JGILL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP.OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bowyer (BOWYER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas O. Levenberg (LEVENBERG_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=EASYLINK@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030,21@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JACK BELCHER@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\WH-OUTBOX-DISTR(A)LEX-LUTHOR.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JCMA(A)REAGAN.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\HES(A)AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (ALEXIS BYRNE@1=US@2=ATTMAIL@3=GOV+USDA.SIES@5=SIESNET@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JPOLEY(A)ESUSDA.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\DLYTEL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eiler (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MARLA E. ROMASH@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 8, 1993

PRESS BRIEFING
BY DEE DEE MYERS

The Briefing Room

11:50 A.M. EDT

MS. MYERS: The only other -

-

let me just get a couple
of housekeeping details out of the way -

.

the only other event on the
schedule tonight is the Congressional Picnic. There will be a pool
spray at the beginning of that at 7:30 p.m. under the tent.

The rest of the week is still somewhat unclear. The
President will be speaking to the Business Roundtable tomorrow at
3:00 p.m. That's at the Marriott Hotel. Thursday and Friday and the
weekend are unclear, although Saturday will probably be light and
Sunday will probably be down.

Q The President specifically was given a chance to
say that there would be a Btu tax, as has been said in the past, and
did not. Was he signaling that this energy tax, as some Republicans
who came out of the meeting suggested, was not going to be based on
heat content?

MS. MYERS: I think what the President has said is that
he's committed to a broad-

based energy tax, one that will be fair to
different parts of the country and one that will encourage
conservation. We'll work with members of the Senate, or actually
Secretary Bentsen will work with the Senate Finance Committee and
others to work out the exact details of that.

ARMS Email System

Q Could it be based on other elements

the value or
the price of energy?

MS. MYERS: That's something for the Senate Finance Committee to work out at this point. Again, the President's committed to a broad-

based energy tax, one that's fair and one that will encourage conservation.

Q So that's not one of his basic principles?

MS. MYERS: A broad-

based energy tax is one of his principles.

Q He's not demanding at all anymore that that be based on the heat content of the fuel?

MS. MYERS: Well, again, it's something that the Senate Finance Committee is going to have to take up this week, but he is committed to a broad-

based energy tax.

Q Is he committed to a Btu tax?

MS. MYERS: He's committed to a broad-

based energy tax.

Q Would he prefer a Btu tax?

MS. MYERS: Well, he proposed a Btu tax. Obviously, he thought that that was a proposal that was fair to different regions of the country, one that would encourage conservation, one that met his revenue goals. But, again, he's committed to a broad-

based energy tax, one that's fair and will meet his revenue goals as well.

Q A week or two ago, you said specifically it would be a Btu tax when we were talking about the size of the package, that that was under negotiation, but it would be a Btu tax. You're no longer saying that, so, therefore, the issue is open. A new kind of tax could be brought forward.

MS. MYERS: I think what the President is trying to do here is to outline the principles that will define this package both through the Senate process and through the conference process. Included in that is a broad-

based energy tax, again, one that will treat regions of the country fairly, that will encourage conservation. It is now up to the members of the Senate Finance Committee, to the full Senate to work out the details of that to pass something, and then it goes back to conference.

Q Why has he backed off?

MS. MYERS: He hasn't backed off, but I think what he's

Q Well, when you say, it will be a Btu tax, and now you say it's up to the Senate Finance Committee to figure out what kind of tax, that is changing your mind.

MS. MYERS: Well, I think, the President had outlined the principles that he wants to define this process. That includes a package that will get the economy going and create jobs -

-
we've already created close to 800,000 jobs in the first four months of this administration -

-
a process that will be fair, that will ask people who saw their incomes go up in the '80s and their taxes go down. It will ask them to contribute first, and 75 percent of new revenue under the President's plan come from people making over \$100,000 a year.

Q If he hasn't, as you said, given up -

-
what did you say -

-
I'm sorry -- if he hasn't backed off, has he opened up when it

ARMS Email System

comes to the energy tax?

MS. MYERS: I think that he's committed to, again, a broad-

based energy tax. I think what the President is trying to do here is to define the principles that are going to guide the development of this package as it goes through the Senate Finance Committee, through the Senate, and to the conference committee. The details right now are going to be left to people in the Senate Finance Committee, to Senator Moynihan, and to Secretary Bentsen, and we'll let them work out the specifics.

Q Dee Dee, Cochran mentioned an ad valorem tax as a possible replacement for Btu tax on energy. Is that acceptable to the White House?

MS. MYERS: We'll see -

-

what the President wants to see is a -

-

Q (In unison) -

-

broad based energy tax.

Q Dee Dee, how did the President find out about what this general -

-

this Air Force general said about him in the Netherlands, and what did he think about it when he found out?

MS. MYERS: He hasn't said anything about it. Obviously, the Air Force is reviewing that and we'll leave it to them.

Q Well, what does the President think about that? Have you discussed that with him today?

MS. MYERS: The Air Force is reviewing it and we'll leave it in their hands.

Q How can you leave words like that hanging without some sort of a response to it?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think that there -

-

the Air Force is reviewing it to see if there have been violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. It's up to them. They have a process for handling that. The President will continue to work with members of the military -

-

with all the different various branches. He has a good working relationship with them, with General Powell, and others, with all the service chiefs and other members of the leadership, and will continue to work with the military.

Q Would the White House like to see this guy court

martialed?

MS. MYERS: I think the Air Force is going to have to handle that as they see fit.

Q There's a story -

-

Q Has General Powell or the Air Force Secretary call the President to apologize or explain it to him?

MS. MYERS: Not that I know of. No, I think at this point the Air Force is looking into it to try to determine if there were violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Q Was he told about it before it was in The Post?

MS. MYERS: Yes.

Q And who told him? Did Secretary Aspin tell him?

ARMS Email System

MS. MYERS: I don't know the exact

we were informed
by the Pentagon. I'm not sure exactly who told who. I don't believe
that Secretary Aspin talked directly to the President, but the
Pentagon did inform us that this was being reviewed.

Q Can you take the question as to how he learned
about it and what his reaction is?

MS. MYERS: Sure.

Q Leaving aside this -

MS. MYERS: He's not going to have any comment.

Q Leaving aside the specific case and whether the
general did or didn't say it, does the President, as Commander in
Chief, believe that it's appropriate for people to make those kinds
of comments about him, or does he believe that they should be
disciplined if it's found that they do?

MS. MYERS: Well, that's something that's clearly
outlined in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. It is clearly
defined within their code, and I will leave it to them to define
exactly how that works. But there are certain standard of behavior
that must be followed. What the President believes is that there is
a long tradition of civilian leadership in this country. That is
something that is strongly endorsed and supported by the military
leadership in this country. It is a long tradition. The President
obviously supports it. He has a good working relationship with the
military at this point and he expects that to continue.

Q To follow up on that, you said that the code is
clearly defined. The code says that any commissioned officer who
uses contemptuous words against the President shall be punished as a
court martial may direct. Do you consider the terms, "draft-

dodging,
pot-

smoking, womanizing commander in chief" to be contemptuous?

MS. MYERS: Again, the Air Force is investigating at
this point. I think it is up to them to conduct a review and to
determine what the facts in this case are. And they will proceed
with disciplinary action as they see fit, as is outlined within the
Uniform Code of Military Justice and within military tradition. I
will leave it to them.

Q Aren't you concerned at what you see as -

what we
see as a lingering hostility in the military towards this man as
commander in chief?

MS. MYERS: I think that you have to look at all the -

I
mean, the negative always gets accentuated here and the positive
always gets ignored. If you look at the President's relationship
with General Powell, if you look at the words of people like General
McCaffrey at the Vietnam Memorial, if you look at reaction of people
like General Sullivan when the President went to West Point, they
have words of high praise for the President's leadership, for his
relationship with the military, for the progress we feel we've made
in forging that relationship and making it even stronger. I think
the President feels very good about where he is in his working
relationship with the military and I think we expect to continue to
build on that.

Q If I could follow up on that. Those are all people
that you just mentioned that the President has actually met and
talked to. Is there a feeling here that he needs more of an outreach
program so that the other people in the chain of command, the other
members of the officer corps get to know him better and he can win
them over?

MS. MYERS: I think that's always a good idea and I
think it's something that the President is trying to do. I think
it's important for him to get out as he has, visiting the USS Teddy
Roosevelt, going to West Point. There will be continuing, I think,
opportunities for the President to meet both with the leadership and
with the rank and file members of the military. I think that's
always a good idea for a new President. President Clinton will
continue to do that.

Q How did his meeting with Mayor Flynn go and was
there any -

MS. MYERS: I think it's going on right now with the Acting Secretary of State, with Peter Tarnoff. I think Mayor Flynn is here to discuss some of the specifics of his role as Ambassador to the Holy See.

Q Is that here or at State?

MS. MYERS: It's at State. He's not here.

Q Do you expect him to accept this appointment?

MS. MYERS: Yes.

Q He's not pulling out?

MS. MYERS: I don't believe so.

Q Has the President talked to him at all?

MS. MYERS: No, the President has not spoken directly to him. But the President continues to believe that he's the best choice, he's a fine politician, one of the great mayors in this country, and we expect that that nomination will proceed.

Q Does he think the complaints from Flynn are valid?

MS. MYERS: He's concerned about it. He wants to make sure -

-
he believes that -

-
he appointed Flynn because he does think he's one of the finest politicians in the country, he has a lot to offer, would be a very good Ambassador to the Holy See. The President continues to support him and wants to work with him to outline the specific outlines of that role.

Q What criteria does -

Q Is he coming here?

MS. MYERS: No, I don't expect him to come here.

Q What criteria does the President use when deciding whether to make a political appointment for an ambassador or use the career foreign service?

MS. MYERS: I think that it just depends on who the various candidates are and what their qualifications are. I think he's looking for the most qualified people. In some cases, those are career foreign service officers; in some cases, they are not. But he's looking for people who are experienced, who have something to offer at the post, who can help him there and in our relations with the various countries or entities.

Q To follow up on the ambassador. What's the situation of the ambassadors to Japan? There was some talk about two people being named. Or did you already answer that?

MS. MYERS: Two people?

Q That came up at the State Department yesterday.

MS. MYERS: No, I think we should have actually a number of ambassadorial appointments to announce sometime in the next week or so.

Q There was also talk about a hold-up to the ambassador to New Zealand. Is that about -

Q Including Tokyo?

MS. MYERS: I think that's likely.

Q Tokyo is likely?

MS. MYERS: I think that's likely.

Q What about New Zealand?

Q What's likely?

ARMS Email System

MS. MYERS: An announcement of an ambassador to Tokyo is coming soon.

Q Anything new?

Q Prior to the summit?

MS. MYERS: That would be helpful.

Q Anything new on the Supreme Court nomination? Or stay tuned, like the President said?

MS. MYERS: Yes, stay tuned. He's continuing to work on it. Nothing to announce yet.

Q Any decisions -

-

MS. MYERS: He has not made a decision yet. Pardon me?

Q This week?

Q Anything new on the search for a new Interior Secretary? (Laughter.)

MS. MYERS: No, nothing to announce.

Q How about on the newspaper story that talks about some of the potential irregularities of the current Interior Secretary. Is the White House looking into the old FBI investigation of gambling debts?

MR. STEPHANOPOULOS: Those charges are old and unfounded.

Q Old and unfounded? Are you looking into them again, since it is a current --

MS. MYERS: You know, just let me say in Secretary Babbitt's behalf without any linkage here -

-

Secretary Babbitt ran for president in 1988. He was just confirmed by the Senate swiftly. His background, I think, has been fully looked at and there was absolutely no grounds to validate any of those charges.

Q Dee Dee, are concerned that no matter who you all nominate there will be an attempt to Bork them, per say, to find something in their background that could be used to knock down a nominee as sort of an eye for an eye thing after what happened to Bork?

MS. MYERS: Well, we certainly hope not. Obviously, the President is going to look for somebody that he thinks has a keen intellect, good judgment, experienced both with the law and with the lives of everyday people, as he said, and a big heart. The President believes -

-

he's committed to finding somebody who's supremely qualified for this job. And he hopes that it's somebody that the Senate will give a fair and equal look at.

Q But is there some concern in the White House that this, in fact, could be the case, and is that one of the reasons why it's taken so long to come up with a nominee?

MS. MYERS: No, I think it's taken a while because the President -

-

this is the first time a Democrat has had an opportunity to appoint a Supreme Court justice in fully a generation. I think the President wants to take his time and make the best possible appointment. And we can only hope that the Senate confirmation process will be based on merit and not politics, and we're hopeful that that will be the case.

Q Dee Dee, if I can take you back to the Btu tax for a minute, and at the risk of eliciting a familiar phrase, Senator Cochran said that Senate Mitchell said that the Democrats had decided to reduce it by a fourth to a third and call it something else. Was he wrong when he said that?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think as Secretary Bentsen said over the weekend, that reducing it by a fourth to a third is something that we'd be willing to consider. Exactly how it's structured -

-

I think we've also said that we'd be willing to look at some changes in

ARMS Email System

the way it's structured. Exactly how it's structured and what it's called in the final Senate version is something that will be worked out in the Senate. We're open to a number of options at this point. I think, again, what you're going to hear from the President over the course of the next several weeks as this process goes forward is a reaffirmation of the principles he wants to see embodied in this package. And as for an energy tax, it's a broad-

based energy tax, and you'll continue to hear us say that over the course of the next couple of weeks.

Q Dee Dee, does Senator Boren share this new commitment to a broad-

based energy tax?

MS. MYERS: You'll have to check with Senator Boren. I think he's amenable to an energy tax of some fashion.

Q Has the President talked or had any contact with Senator Boren in the last 24 hours?

MS. MYERS: Not that I know of. No, I don't thing so.

Q Anything planned that you know of?

MS. MYERS: I wouldn't rule it out. I think he may talk to -

-

I think he's in the process of talking to some members of the Senate Finance Committee. I think that that will be ongoing.

Q Dee Dee, Senator Cochran said after the meeting, "It seems that they're now beginning to shift from a tax on the heat content to a tax on the value of the energy. The value paid somewhere along the distribution line, an ad valorem type of tax on energy." Is that accurate?

MS. MYERS: Again, I think that the -

-

Secretary Bentsen is going to be left to working out specific details with the Senate Finance Committee. The President is going to continue to reaffirm broad principles. I think that we've made it clear that the President would welcome less taxes, deeper spending cuts, some adjustments in the Btu tax. And exactly how that is worked out will be determined over the course of the next couple of weeks.

Again, you're just going to hear for the couple of weeks the President continue to emphasize the principles that he wants to see included in this package, the same principles that I think shaped the House version of the package and will shape the conference version of the package.

Q So let me just follow up. So you're no longer calling this a Btu tax?

MS. MYERS: We're calling it a broad-

based energy tax.
(Laughter.)

Q There have been a lot of statements from administration officials explaining why a Btu tax is preferable, outlining all the advantages of it over some kind of other energy tax. Is that no longer the administration's position? Are those statements not operative?

Q What was the question please?

MS. MYERS: The question was, there have been a lot of statements from administration officials outlining the benefits of the Btu tax. Are those statements no longer operative. I think the benefits that were most often underscored were that the Btu tax was broad-

based, that it met the President's revenue goals -

-

(laughter)

-

that it promoted conservation -

-

I'm serious. If you go back and see what it was we said -

-

and I think it was very important to the

ARMS Email System

President that it not hit one particular area of the country at the expense of another area of the country. Those are the things that he's looking for in a broad-

based energy tax.

Q A gasoline tax would not meet that test because a gasoline tax would be unfair to the west.

MS. MYERS: A gasoline tax does not meet that test.

Q You're saying a broad-based energy tax with no "s" on the end. Is that just a term, or do you rule out a mixture of taxes?

MS. MYERS: I don't think that we've ruled anything in or out, except perhaps the gas tax. We'll have to see what the Senate comes back with.

Q Would some amount of gasoline tax be part of a mixture of taxes?

MS. MYERS: We'll have to see what the Senate Finance Committee comes back with.

Q So now you're not ruling out the gas tax?

MS. MYERS: I don't want to get into ruling things and ruling things out, other than to reaffirm the principles. And by the end of this, I think we'll be able to do this all in unison.

Q The President is not speaking tonight at the picnic? He's not making any remarks?

MS. MYERS: No formal remarks, no. It's an informal picnic.

Q Dee Dee, a completely different topic. Is the President as hung up on nuclear issues as past administrations were? Specifically Prime Minister Bolger of New Zealand yesterday has spoken to the American Chamber of Commerce said it's time now to thaw relations, put the nuclear issue aside.

Q What's she talking about?

Q Nuclear issues. Nuclear.

MS. MYERS: Nuclear issues in New Zealand.

Q No, the U.S. (Laughter.) I want to know if the Clinton administration is as hung up over the nuclear matter as past administrations. Is that still going to be a deterrent to good relations?

MS. MYERS: I'm not sure how to define "as hung up as previous administrations." Obviously, the President is very concerned about nuclear issues, and I think nuclear issues are changing in the post-

Cold War world. It's something that will continue to be central in our relationship with the former Soviet Union, with Russia and the other republics, and with other countries -

-
North Korea, obviously, the nuclear issue is on the front burner there; South Africa it's come up. I think nuclear issues have changed somewhat, but it's going to continue to be a concern of this administration.

Q Sounds like a broad-based nuclear policy. (Laughter.)

Q Could you please look into whether they will continue to be an impediment to good relations with allies?

MS. MYERS: Sure.

Q Dee Dee, could I ask a couple of specific questions on this modified economic plan? Senator Mitchell says that if you make the higher income tax rates applicable July 1st as opposed to retroactively to January 1st, that will cost \$9 billion. Where do you hope to make up that \$9 billion?

MS. MYERS: Well, again, that's something that -

-
the details of this are being worked out in the Senate Finance Committee. That is the process that's beginning today. It's something that the President talked about yesterday with Senators Mitchell and Moynihan. It came up briefly today in the bipartisan leadership meeting. The President, I think, has said he would welcome further spending cuts. He would welcome less revenue from taxes. Exactly how that's going to be worked out is up to the Senate Finance Committee. What the

President is committed to is \$500 billion in deficit reduction, a disciplined deficit reduction program that will help keep interest rates low and help us continue to create jobs, as we've done. He also wants to make sure that the package is fair and that there's a good balance between new revenue and spending cuts.

Q Do you have any idea where that \$9 billion should come -

-

specific?

MS. MYERS: No, that is up to the Senate Finance Committee at this point. If they're going to make changes in the package, if they want to see deeper spending cuts, they need to say where they're going to come from.

Q Let me ask you a follow-up -

-

unrelated, also part of the economic plan. (Laughter.)

Q An unrelated part -

-

(laughter.)

Q If the energy tax, the broad-based energy tax, is scaled back by a quarter to a third, does that mean the administration is now ready to scale back the earned income tax credit by a quarter to a third, since, presumably, the energy tax won't hit the poorer people as hard as it would if it were a bigger tax?

MS. MYERS: I mean, the President, obviously, I think is committed to the earned income tax credit. The exact numbers have to be worked out in Senate Finance Committee. I think one of the things that the President has talked about throughout his campaign and throughout his administration is creating incentives to move people from welfare to work. The earned income tax credit is a very successful way to do that. And the exact structure of that, exactly how broad that tax cut will be -

-

tax credit will be -

-

in this package is something that has to be worked out in the Senate Finance Committee. And the President has asked Secretary Bentsen to be his ambassador to that process, and we'll see what they come up with.

Q So the answer is yes? Is the answer yes?

MS. MYERS: The answer is that the President is very committed to an earned income tax credit. He believes it's a very successful program. And the exact numbers are something that need to be worked out by the Senate Finance Committee.

Q There's another phase of this budget bill, the cutbacks in Medicare. And Congress already today, Pete Stark, a very important man on health on the Hill, says he won't put up with this further cut on Medicare, that the older citizens of this nation will be very horrified when they find out how this cutback in Medicare is going to affect them -

-

one that the President has apparently agreed to.

MS. MYERS: Well, I don't think the details have been worked out yet.

Q Didn't they work out the details yesterday afternoon in conference?

MS. MYERS: No, no. The Senate Finance Committee has to sit down now, roll up its sleeves and get down to the work of actually outlining where the specific cuts are going to come from.

Q Moynihan had to agree to something, and Mitchell had to agree to something and -

-

MS. MYERS: I think, again, what the President has said repeatedly is that he wants to make sure that this package is fair.

ARMS Email System

that it asks people who saw their incomes go up in the 1980s to contribute first, that 75 percent of it at this point comes from people making over \$100,000 a year. The President wants to make sure that these cuts do not come at the expense of the most vulnerable people in our society, and he's going to work very hard to make sure that those people are protected.

Q What's this Japanese briefing about?

MS. MYERS: It's about the new framework for a trade relationship between the U.S. and Japan which was given to the Japanese yesterday.

Q If Congress in its wisdom should kill either the supercollider or the space station, would that be acceptable to the White House, given the flexibility of allowing the Senate Finance Committee to -

-

Q And the election of Kay Hutchinson.

MS. MYERS: I don't understand the relationship, Mark.

The President -

those are both in the President's budget at this point. He supports both of them. We'll see what gets worked out.

Q Would he accept the wisdom of the Senate -

-

MS. MYERS: I think we'll have to wait and see on that.

Q -

-

if it decided that were a good spending cut to make?

Q Well, how do those fit in with his principles?

Q Right.

MS. MYERS: Well, neither of them is specifically mentioned in his principles.

Q They're negotiable?

MS. MYERS: He supports them. Now, I just -

-

we'll have to wait and see what they come back with. But the President continues to support both the supercollider and the space station.

Q That would not necessarily trigger a veto? If the Congress were to kill both of them -

Q Or either one of them.

MS. MYERS: I just can't get into saying "if this was in would he veto it, if that was out would he accept it" at this point. We'll have to wait and see what -

-

how it gets worked out in the Senate Finance Committee. And then there is a conference process that follows.

Q Can you explain the President's sudden hands-off attitude toward his economic program?

MS. MYERS: I think

-

Q Question?

MS. MYERS: Ruth asked, can you explain the President's sudden hands-

off approach to his own economic package. I think that he put forward a very specific economic package, but it was geared toward some very large and immutable principles which we've continued to enunciate particularly over the last few days.

Q Speaking of the principles.

MS. MYERS: Do you want to hear the principles?

Q Noooo.

Q We stipulate.

Q We want you to do them by charades. (Laughter.)

MS. MYERS: I just go, "one," and Andrea can give the first one.

Q You've been talking details on the economic plan, the Stu tax -

-

you've been talking details for months. Now, today, you're talking principles. You're kind of leaving the details to everybody else to work out. Why the shift in strategy?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think that what the -

-

because the President does not sit on the Senate Finance Committee, he's not a member of the Senate, he can't either work out the details of this package or vote on it. That has to be done in the Senate Finance Committee. What's most important to him are that the broad principles that he's outlined in his

.

talked about throughout his administration be kept intact. I think we feel very good about the House process. There were some changes in the House bill, but those principles were preserved and he got, I don't know, 90 percent of what we started with. I think we're committed to the same kind of a process in the Senate where there will clearly be some changes.

Q Are you still sticking with principles as a more effective way would be your goal than talking details?

MS. MYERS: I think that Senator Bentsen can work on the details and the President is committed to the principles. I think it's important that the American people know what it is that the President is committed to and that, as long as the principles are maintained, that some tinkering around the margins will not affect the overall thrust of the package.

Q Dee Dee, could I ask a question about Mayor Flynn please? Did he seek a meeting with the President or anyone at the White House?

MS. MYERS: No, not to my knowledge. I believe he spoke to Communications Director Mark Gearan, who was -

-

as Deputy Chief of Staff, was coordinating his confirmation process or working with Mayor Flynn as he went through the details of this process. I know that Mark spoke to him last night.

Q And did Mark or anyone else give instructions to Peter Tarnoff about what he should be assured in his meetings at State?

MS. MYERS: I don't know that Mark spoke directly to Peter. I think the President made clear his appointment of Mayor Flynn, and through his comments at that time, what he expected the Mayor's role to be as Ambassador to the Holy See.

Q

-

about what the Mayor expects his role to be?

Q -

-

concerned that he came down here today.

MS. MYERS: The President expects -

-

Q Does he agree with the Mayor's interpretation of

what his role should be as sort of this international troubleshooter?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think the President sees it as, you know, he'll be the Ambassador to the Holy See and if there are other tasks that the President wants him to undertake during his tenure in Rome, that will have to be something that's worked out on a case

by-

case basis with the State Department and with the various embassies in other countries.

Q Other tasks in Rome?

MS. MYERS: During his tenure in Rome.

Q Well, you concede that there's a problem here. That's the reason he's come down and he's trying to straighten that out?

MS. MYERS: Well, yes. I don't know if there's a problem, but I think there's been some -

-

I think there's some things that need to be clarified. But I think that what is clear is that the President is committed to this appointment.

Q Clarified on whose part?

MS. MYERS: On whose part? I think that between -

-

perhaps between Mayor Flynn and the State Department, I think there just needs to be a little clear definition of where we are in this process. But I think that the nomination is moving forward. I think Senator Kerry said yesterday he expected it to be done by the 4th of July. The President fully expects that Mayor Flynn will be confirmed as his Ambassador to the Holy See.

Q Dee Dee, another question about the Court. You've been saying week after week that an announcement would be forthcoming. Aren't you concerned that the President looks -

-

there's another perception again that the President can't make a decision, he's slow to make -

-

to settle on candidates whether it be the Court or the Cabinet, or whatever position, there's a perception out there, and this is only going to exacerbate it?

MS. MYERS: No, I think that when Justice White announced his intention to retire, he did so early specifically to give the President plenty of time to make this decision. I think the President has taken his time. He's considered a number of candidates; he's looked for somebody that would meet the criteria that he outlined.

This is an important decision. It's the President's first appointment to the Supreme Court. You never know how many bites at that apple you'll get during a presidency. It's also the first time a Democrat has had a chance to appoint anyone to the Supreme Court in 25 years. I think the President wants to take his time, to reflect on this, to really have a chance to think it through, given the magnitude of the appointment. And I think that there will be an nominee to the Supreme Court in plenty of time.

Q Why has it taken longer than you all thought?

MS. MYERS: I don't think that we ever had a time line. I'm not sure that it has taken longer than we all thought. I think we were -

-

one of the reasons that Justice White made his announcement when he did was to give the President some flexibility in timing. And we always said the process would begin immediately, but we didn't have a hard time line.

Q Has the President in his own mind settled on a candidate?

MS. MYERS: I don't think so. I mean, I think he's

-

Q He really does not know who he wants yet?

ARMS Email System

MS. MYERS: He might have been in his heart, but I think that he's -

-

but I don't think so. I think he's still reviewing a number of options.

Q What does that include? Why do you think he hasn't settled?

MS. MYERS: My conversations.

Q I thought you were all going to do -

-

Q Wait a minute, Sarah. Hold it. Hold it.

MS. MYERS: Let's finish up Supreme Court, and then I'll come back to you.

Q Your conversations lead you to this conclusion.

MS. MYERS: Yes. But I think he's made good progress. I think he's narrowing the list. I won't say how many people might be on it. And I think he'll have an announcement soon.

Q What is it that led you to the belief that he hasn't settled?

MS. MYERS: I'm not going to get into any detail about it.

Q Has the work to find a Supreme Court nominee pushed back to work to find other nominees for other offices?

MS. MYERS: No, I think they're proceeding on parallel tracks.

Q Different people working on -

-

MS. MYERS: Yes. As you know, Mack and Bernie Nussbaum and Bruce Lindsey are sort of sharing the Supreme Court piece, and then other people are working on other appointments.

Q But those other appointments eventually go through McLarty.

MS. MYERS: Yes. But this is something that's moving forward. I mean, we can do more than one thing at once.

Q What do you consider plenty of time? When you say a nominee will be confirmed in plenty of time, is your timetable the first Monday in October? Would you like, as Biden would prefer, to get it done this summer?

MS. MYERS: The first Monday in October is when you would hope to have a new justice seated. But we'll get it moving as quickly as we can, once the President has announced his decision.

Q -

-

on Biden's timetable?

MS. MYERS: We'll see.

Q One other follow on that. We know that he's talked to Babbitt about the job. The Interior people have confirmed that. But has he talked to any -

-

MS. MYERS: Are you sure?

Q Well, he's talked to Babbitt. Are you saying he has not?

MS. MYERS: He has not met with Babbitt.

Q No, talked.

Q He talked to him on the phone.

Q Has he talked to Bruce Babbitt on the telephone?

Q Or radio phone?

Q Any phone. (Laughter.)

ARMS Email System

MS. MYERS: I would just be careful about -

-
you know,
people at the Interior Department don't speak for the President, and
we'll see -

-
Q Now we're asking you to -

MS. MYERS: What's that?

Q They speak with the Interior Secretary and he's on
the other end of the conversation, right?

MS. MYERS: He's not making the decision, though.

Q But he would know if they've spoken.

MS. MYERS: Yes. There were some other things that were
said yesterday that I'm not sure about.

Q Has the Secretary of the Interior harmed his
chances by having his department put the word out here?

MS. MYERS: The President's going to make a decision
based on who he thinks is best qualified, based on criteria that he
outlined. Those were really the only factors that will be
considered.

Q Has he spoken to any other candidates?

Q If the White House nominee for the Court is
attacked the way Judge Bork was and your recent nominee for the Civil
Rights Commission was attacked, what is the White House plan to try
to shore up some public support?

MS. MYERS: We'll choose a nominee and then we'll come
up with contingency plans in the case that they're attacked.
(Laughter.)

Q Is there going to be a plan that will involve
getting public support?

MS. MYERS: I think we'll have a strategy to guarantee
the success of whoever the President chooses as his nominee.

Q Has he called Judge Breyer since Breyer's been in
the hospital?

MS. MYERS: I didn't know Judge Breyer was in the
hospital.

Q Well, if you called him once in a while.
(Laughter.)

MS. MYERS: Not to my knowledge, but I'll have to take
that.

Q The President said he wanted a quick replacement
for Lani Guinier. How is that search going? Who is handling it?
What's the division of labor between Justice and the Counsel's
Office?

MS. MYERS: As far as I know at this point, it's
proceeding normally, which is that the Justice Department would
submit some names, the White House would submit some names, they
would come up with a mutually

agreed-

upon list of people. The
process is moving forward, I don't have a specific timetable, but I
wouldn't expect it in the next couple of days.

Q Aren't you concerned that the nomination of -

-
Q Dee Dee, the back of the room, please.

MS. MYERS: I'll get you next, Sarah.

Q -

the nomination of a Supreme Court Justice.

Q I'll take it now, please. I was next. What are

ARMS Email System

you going to -

-

(laughter) -

-

people spending government money,
officials using airplanes when they shouldn't and things like that?
Are you going to let Les Aspin get by with what he did in Geneva?

Q Venice.

Q Well, what are you going to do? (Laughter.)

Q I don't know what you're laughing about up in the
front, because we can't hear.

MS. MYERS: Somebody just pointed out that Secretary
Aspin was in Venice and not in Geneva.

Q Well, all right, in Venice, then. Fine.

MS. MYERS: There are no plans at this point to take any
action.

Q You say you have made the decision not to take
action or you just haven't gotten it before you, or what?

MS. MYERS: There are just no plans to do so.

Q You going to let this guy get by with spending
government money and wasting the time and salaries of other people
who were with him on this trip and bringing along a girlfriend?
You're going to let him get by on it?

MS. MYERS: She paid her own way.

Q How does that make a difference if she paid her own
way when he was taking up the time of other officials of the
government.

Q The President thinks his action was appropriate.
for the government to pay for 22 members of his staff for R & R?

MS. MYERS: I don't know what all the details are -

-

if
that was -

-

I believe that was in the middle of a trip, that
Secretary Aspin took a few days off in the midst of that trip.

Q Well, the Pentagon has been studying the cost for
days and they can give it to you.

MS. MYERS: Yes, and I'll have to get back to you on
exactly what the costs was. As far as I know -

-

I don't have all the
details in front of me, but as far as I know, that was part of a
trip, it was in the middle of a trip, that Secretary Aspin's friend
paid her own way. And we have nothing to add at this point.

Q So the President is not appalled?

Q -

-

question or follow-

up?

MS. MYERS: I have nothing to add at this point.

Q First, is there concern that if you're going to
nominate a Supreme Court justice this week, that's going to grind the
Judiciary Committee to a halt in terms of seeking any replacements
for Guinier? Is there any concern that that post is going to be
vacant now for quite a while? And second, what is the President's
expectations going into meeting with the Black Caucus on Thursday?
What is his principal -

-

MS. MYERS: Well, I think he'd like to talk about -

-

his

ARMS Email System

principles are that he'd like to discuss the principles of reconciliation as well as a replacement for the civil rights division. I would be happy -

-

if anybody has any questions about the principles of the President's reconciliation I'd be happy to answer that.

Q Are you concerned about this post now that Guinier was up for is going to be -

-

it's not going to be replaced realistically, if you talk to members of the Judiciary Committee, if they're busy with a Supreme Court nominee. I mean, is there concern on the White House part that that post, very important post, is going to be vacant now for quite a while?

MS. MYERS: We would like to see that post filled as quickly as possible. However, I think the President's going to move forward with a Supreme Court Justice nominee. We'll move forward as quickly as we can with a civil rights division head, and hopefully, we'll get both of those confirmed as quickly as possible. I can't speak for the specific Judiciary Committee schedule other than to say that we'd like to see them both done as quickly as possible.

Q Is the Supreme Court a higher priority for you now?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think the Supreme Court will be -

-

I mean, you'll have to check with the Judiciary Committee. I expect the Supreme Court's a higher priority for them. The President -

-

those two appointments are moving along on independent tracks. I think the President's going to announce a Supreme Court nominee when he's ready. He'll announce a new civil rights division chief when he's ready. And we'll let the Judiciary Committee take it up as they see fit.

Q You said he would seek the recommendations of the Black Caucus on that appointment?

MS. MYERS: Yes, he'd like their input on a replacement.

Q On Thursday?

MS. MYERS: Sure.

Q Dee Dee, can I clarify something you said earlier? You said the ambassador to Japan would be named within this week?

MS. MYERS: No, no, within -

-

soon. Possibly later this week, but I don't have a hard timetable on it.

Q And how much lead time do you need before the Tokyo summit for an ambassador to get his feet on the ground and understand what's going on?

Q He won't be confirmed.

MS. MYERS: Yes, he won't be -

-

I don't think it will be through the confirmation process.

Q So Armacost will still be there at the time of the summit?

MS. MYERS: I would expect so, yes.

Q Dee Dee, on Guatemala, the new civilian President is trying to assert his authority over the military. He has sacked the old defense minister, put a new one. Is the White House satisfied with the way events are now unfolding in Guatemala?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think the White House is generally satisfied with the way events there generally unfolded. There was a peaceful transition, that there was an election after a ruling of the constitutional court there. As you know, we've lifted the sanctions against them and continue to support them. The new President has a good -- sterling human rights record and we stand behind him.

Q Dee Dee, under the heading of unfinished business, what's the status of the review of the Travel Office investigation?

ARMS Email System

MS. MYERS: Ongoing, and I don't have a date as to when it might be completed. Soon.

Q I mean, we expected it last week. Have the changes in your area delayed this? Mark was in charge of that.

MS. MYERS: Yes, probably a little bit. He's now taken on new responsibilities. I don't think that means -

-
and I don't know exactly if he's going to continue and see that process through, whether he's going to shift it and Roy Neel take over. I just don't know.

Q What is the investigation about -

-
whether you present a case against these people for the Justice Department?

MS. MYERS: No. I think -

-
it wasn't to review -

-
it was to review the way the White House handled it, to see if there were ways that we might handle similar situations, if there ever are any, better in the future. But I don't think it was with an eye toward seeking any kind of further action.

Q But is there a second track where charges are being considered?

MS. MYERS: No, I mean, the only separate track will be there's an FBI investigation ongoing, or if there is. You have to check with them. I can't comment.

Q Dee Dee, there was one lingering question on the general's comments about the President. In the normal course of events the President would be reviewing authority on any court martial activity against the person in the military. Would he excuse himself in this case since the offense was against him?

MS. MYERS: I don't know that the President would have to review a court martial. I'll have to get back to you. I'll have to take that question because I don't know what the process is.

Q He would normally approve all the way up the line, and it would fall to him to -

-
MS. MYERS: The President would review and approve any court martial activity?

Q That's right.

Q He's in the line of command, and the line of command gets it passed up in any case. You know, command influence is out, so I was wondering in this case whether he would just remove himself from that process.

MS. MYERS: I'll have to take that question.

Q The House a couple of weeks ago voted \$1.2 billion for the Pentagon, which the Pentagon didn't ask for. And about \$750 million of that went to the Somalia relief effort that the Pentagon said it could get through other projects and didn't really need the money. Why is the administration supporting that effort for those funds, given the size of the deficit?

MS. MYERS: Are you talking about the supplemental?

Q It's a separate -

-
MS. MYERS: There were two supplementals passed in the House. I believe Senator Byrd has combined them into one in the Senate, and it includes some foreign aid, which I believe part of it goes for peacekeeping, which we understood that we needed. So I'd have to -

-
maybe we could talk about this afterwards to find out the details.

Q This is separate from that, but it's \$1.2 billion -

-

MS. MYERS: Are you sure you're talking about -

-

there

were was two supplementals that were passed in the House that are now pending in the Senate.

Q It was a whole separate from the supplemental. I don't know where, but I know the Pentagon did not ask for the money.

MS. MYERS: It was \$1.2 billion?

Q Yes.

Q Dee Dee, at 8:00 p.m. tonight time, the Japanese royal wedding will occur. Did the President send any message of congratulations or do you have a statement?

MS. MYERS: I don't, and I'll have to double-check to see if he sent a message of congratulations. I know the world is watching. (Laughter.)

Q Or a gift.

MS. MYERS: No, I will check that because it's -

-

Q Well, he sent them a framework for trade. (Laughter.)

MS. MYERS: It was a sterling silver framework.

Q Can you describe how important it is to the President to have reconciliation done in time to go to Tokyo?

MS. MYERS: I think that it would certainly help. I mean, one of the things the President has talked repeatedly about is encouraging global growth and getting all the developed countries in the world to do their part to get the global economy moving again. If the United States takes a step forward and passes a disciplined deficit reduction package, I think that that gives us credibility in the world. I think it had an impact -

-

it's had an impact already in our relationships with other countries, and I think we can go there with an example of United States' resolve to getting this global economy moving.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

Q Free at last! (Laughter.)

END 12:31 P.M. EDT

#82-

06/08

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:08-JUN-1993 17:21:00.00

SUBJECT: Remarks at Photo Op with Bipartisan Memebers

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christian M. Baldia (BALDIA_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JGILL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM.KOHLER@SENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bowyer (BOWYER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas O. Levenberg (LEVENBERG_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=EASYLINK@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030,21@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JACK.BELCHER@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT.GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\WH-OUTBOX-DISTR(A)LEX-LUTHOR.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JCMA(A)REAGAN.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\HES(A)AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (ALEXIS.BYRNE@1=US@2=ATTMAIL@3=GOV+USDA.SIES@5=SIESNET@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JPOLEY(A)ESUSDA.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\DIYTEL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MARLA E. ROMASH@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 8, 1993

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN PHOTO OPPORTUNITY WITH BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

Cabinet Room
9:35 A.M. EDT

Q Mr. President, the Republicans have said they won't accept a plan with any taxes. How are you going to bridge that gap with Bob Dole?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know what the bridge will be. Let me just say this, I think it's very important that we move this promptly as possible to pass the economic plan. After the House acted, long-

term interest rates dropped again. We now have a seven-

year high in housing sales, unemployment below 7 percent

it's the first time in a year-

and-

a-

half -

755,000 new jobs since January. And that's because there's a serious attempt to reduce this deficit through a combination of cuts and tax increases, almost all of which come on wealthier individuals. So I think we just need to move forward.

There will be some changes in the Senate, and that is fine. Then we just need to hold to the principles.

-
there ought to
be \$500 billion in deficit reduction; it ought to be in a trust fund
so that neither the taxes nor the spending cuts can be diverted; and
it ought to be -

-
the tax burden ought to be progressive, falling
largely on the wealthiest Americans; and we ought to keep the
incentives for private sector growth in there. We're moving from
work -- from welfare to work for investing in the depressed areas of
the country for starting small businesses.

Those are the principles that I have. And the energy
tax ought to encourage conservation and the use of cleaner fuels.
Those are the things that I think ought to be done. We'll just see
what happens.

Q Does it have to include -

-
does it have to be a BTU
tax, or can you find another energy -

-
THE PRESIDENT: I have delegated to -

-
I don't want to
get into the name game here. I'm interested in the principles of the
program: deficit reduction, lower interest rates, job growth. We've
got job growth coming back into this economy now, and I think we have
to continue to do what produces it, which is lower interest rates.
The lower interest rates are causing people to refinance all their
debt and putting it back into the economy. And that's the thing I'm
interested in.

We'll just see -

-
Secretary Bentsen and Mr. Panetta are
representing the administration in the conversations with the Senate.
And we'll just see what comes out of it.

Q Do you think you can start over with Bob Dole -

-
after all the bad blood?

THE PRESIDENT: I like -

-
I like Senator Dole. I always
have. Besides that, he knows more jokes than I do, and I resent it
-- get him to share some with you.
END9:38 A.M. EDT

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:08-JUN-1993 15:56:00.00

SUBJECT: Press Briefing by Dee Dee Myers 6.7.93

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christian M. Baldia (BALDIA_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JGILL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bowyer (BOWYER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas O. Levenberg (LEVENBERG_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=EASYLINK@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030,21@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JACK BELCHER@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\WH-OUTBOX-DISTR(A)LEX-LUTHOR.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JCMA(A)REAGAN.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\HES(A)AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (ALEXIS BYRNE@1=US@2=ATTMAIL@3=GOV+USDA.SIES@5=SIESNET@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JPOLEY(A)ESUSDA.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\DLYTEL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gobble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MARLA E. ROMASH@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 7, 1993

PRESS BRIEFING
BY DEE DEE MYERS

The Briefing Room

1:50 P.M. EDT

Q Dee Dee, Dee Dee, Dee Dee. (Laughter.)
MS. MYERS: You guys never quit, you know.

Q Is it Babbitt? (Laughter.)

Q Tomorrow?

Q Enough of the foreplay, what about -

-

(Laughter.)

MS. MYERS: That's right. Now we'll get -- I can see
the press hasn't changed a bit. Helen and Bill here in the front.

I think that we will have an announcement on Supreme
Court fairly soon. I think it's likely but now assured that it will
happen this week. It will not happen today.

Q Babbitt?

Q Tomorrow?

MS. MYERS: Obviously, I can't say. I don't think so,
no.

Q Not tomorrow?

MS. MYERS: I think that's unlikely. So I think the
latter part of this week at the earliest.

Q -

ARMS Email System

-
President -
-

MS. MYERS: Yes, the normal process. The President hasn't made a final decision yet, but there is the on-going process.

Q Will the President meet with whoever the candidate is, especially if it's someone who is not from Washington -
-

or
someone that he does not personally know?

MS. MYERS: The process is going forward and the President has not made final decision yet and it is not clear --

Q Has he interviewed anyone personally? Has he spoken with anyone personally who is a potential nominee?

MS. MYERS: I don't believe that he's had any personal meetings with the potential candidates.

Q Dee Dee, did the way the Lani Guinier thing went where he said he had not read all of her writings -
-

is that
reflective of the vetting process for this particular nominee?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think certainly the vetting process is different for Supreme Court nominee than it is for as Assistant Attorney General position. However, I think that we've gone -
-

throughout this administration we've tried to learn from our mistakes and to do better. I think that there will be a very thorough review of all the likely candidates for Supreme Court. I don't know that the President will read all of the writings of each of the candidates, but you can be assured that somebody will, and those views will be presented clearly and thoroughly to the President.

Q Well, Dee Dee, could you tell us where the process is exactly because all along we've been led to believe that it would have to be -
-

the nomination would have to be made very soon because of the six-

week time lag and the fact that you wanted this nomination cleared by the time Congress leaves in August. Is he still searching for candidates? Is the search done? Has it been narrowed to one, two?

MS. MYERS: Without giving a specific number, I would say that the search has been narrowed, that the President is reviewing the results of the vetting process. I think there's still some pieces being collected and the President will continue to review that and make a final decision some time very soon. But he's obviously given this a lot of thought. He's spent a good deal of time on it as has the staff, and I think he's fairly close to making a decision.

Q And when you say the decision has not been made, does that mean that he's simply waiting for the results of the vetting process to put his chop on the final candidate, or are more than one candidate still in play?

MS. MYERS: He hasn't made a final decision, so that does mean that there are -
-

there is more than one candidate at play here, Without saying more about how many or who, the President will again review the final documents as they come into the vetting process and make a decision sometime soon. I think, again, it's likely this week, but not guaranteed.

Q Dee Dee, the Republicans on the committee say that in light of his last preparation on Guinier that they're going to want to take -- they're not going to rushed into a judgement and that any candidates are going to be squeaky clean. Has anybody been knocked out over ethical concerns?

MS. MYERS: Not that I know of.

Q This morning Mitchell says that he was tough

Boren would be on -

when it came time for the Finance Committee to vote. He didn't think they'd have to go around the Finance Committee. From where does that optimism come? Do you share that view?

MS. MYERS: Well, we've been hopeful all along that this could get worked out through the Senate Finance Committee. Obviously we'll leave that to Senator Moynihan and the other members. As you know, Senator Moynihan and Senator Mitchell will be here later today, at 5:30 p.m., to meet with the President. The President will meet with, I believe it's Democratic leadership tomorrow morning from both Houses to just talk about the reconciliation generally and other issues.

But I think -

we've been hopeful all along that we can reach a conclusion. I think the President would welcome changes in his package as long as the major principles are preserved. That is that his package will create jobs, that it will reduce the deficit by \$500 billion over five years, that it will be fair, that it will take --

most of the new revenue will come from people making over \$100,000, and that there will be a good balance between new taxes and spending cuts. And if the Senate comes back with deeper spending cuts and fewer taxes, I think the President is inclined to look favorably at that.

Q You didn't say in that list there that the Btu tax

MS. MYERS: The President has said, I think, time and time again that he's committed to a broad-

based energy tax, a Btu tax, and will continue to work with the Senate.

Q Boren keeps saying is that the Btu tax isn't going to happen as far as he's concerned. Have you got anything you can give him.

MS. MYERS: Again, this is something that the Finance Committee is going to have to work out; that's the next phase. I think, again, the President will meet with Senator Moynihan later today. I'm sure that Senator Moynihan will probably have something to say after that meeting. But the President is committed to the principles of his package. We feel good that the package has a good chance of making it through the Senate Finance Committee and through the full Senate and then it's to the Conference Committee.

Q With modifications?

MS. MYERS: Well, the modifications and then obviously you have to reconcile the differences between the House and Senate versions, whatever those might be. But, again, I mean the President is committed to the broad principles of his package as he has been throughout this process, and we're confident that we can get a budget that reflects his values.

Q What do you think about the Moynihan cut, \$51 billion, a lot of Medicare?

MS. MYERS: It's something that the President, I'm sure, will talk about with Senator Moynihan today. Obviously, the President has said he's willing to look at additional spending cuts and fewer taxes, but it's something that the Finance Committee is going to have to work out in terms of the specific details.

Q There's no gas tax rumblings. What's the administration's current position on the gas tax?

MS. MYERS: The President has not changed his position on the gas tax. He doesn't believe that it is as fair regionally as a Btu tax or some other broad-

based energy tax. The President has just not changed on that.

Q So what about increasing the gas tax within the framework of a Btu tax? I mean, gasoline is in there anyway. What about increasing that? Is that an option?

MS. MYERS: Again, as Secretary Bentsen said yesterday, the President and the administration is willing to look at all

ARMS Email System

options. However, that's not something that's been proposed yet. If the Senate Finance Committee comes back with it, we'll take a look at it.

Q Has the President rescheduled the meeting with the Black Caucus?

MS. MYERS: No.

Q Dee Dee, what about scaling back the Btu tax fairly dramatically? Is that an option that's being considered?

MS. MYERS: I think clearly it's an option that we'd be willing to take a look at what the Senate Finance Committee comes back with in terms of restructuring the Btu tax.

Q Have you discussed it with Boren? Is there a point at which he'd accept it if it was scaled way back?

MS. MYERS: I don't know that we've had specific conversations with him about a particular point. This is something that is going to have to be worked out within the committee and something that I'm sure that Senator Moynihan and the President and Senator Mitchell will talk about.

Q Senior aides for Babbitt said this morning that they think Babbitt is likely to get a Supreme Court appointment. Do you all dispute that?

MS. MYERS: I think they may be speaking from their hearts, which is understandable. I can't comment specifically on who may or may not be selected until the President's made a final decision.

Q Anything on the massacre in Liberia?

MS. MYERS: Obviously, we deplore that kind of violence and hope that the parties will come together to a negotiated settlement to the three-

year-

old civil war there.

Q I want to follow Susan's earlier question. If the point where the President focused on one person for the Supreme Court and he thought, well, this is pretty much our candidate now, would the President then sit down and personally read some of that person's major writings? Is he going to do that, do you know?

MS. MYERS: I don't want to say specifically what he might do. I think clearly that the team that's looking at the various Supreme Court candidates will give the President a thorough briefing on anything that that person may have written. I think it's up to the President then whether he feels he needs to read various documents. I think, again, there's a different level of scrutiny, if you will, for Supreme Court justice than there is probably for an assistant attorney general. I think it will very much depend on what might be out there with a particular nominee.

Q Dee Dee, will you clarify this. We all have been told that the President put the woman out from the nomination of the civil rights because she was for accumulative voting. And then the records come out and show that accumulative voting was not originated by her, not even advocated strongly by her, but that it has been in effect for years in New York City, places like New Mexico, Alabama and Pennsylvania, places like that -

-

they've been voting seven times, some of them. How can they possibly permit that to go on? Is he going to do something about stopping accumulative voting now that he's found out that it exists and he's not for it?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think that the President made his case fairly clearly on Thursday night about what his troubles were with Ms. Guinier's previous writings. There were a couple of things including proportional representation, accumulative voting which were troubling to him in the broad way that they were applied in some of her writings. But I think we've been over that, and I would hope that we can move on from that.

Q Well, you can't get over it because the facts show and the facts came out after he said he was not going to have her because of accumulative voting. And then it shows that these other states have already been doing it for years. And it must be against the law. So I wonder if the President's going to take some lead in trying to see that that's stopped.

MS. MYERS: No, we don't have any plans to, but perhaps we'll review it. I'll get back to you.

Q Dee Dee, any word on that topic? Has the President's got any candidates in mind and will it possibly be another black woman candidate?

MS. MYERS: Don't have a replacement yet. And when we do we'll let you know.

ARMS Email System

Q The long knives seem to be out for Bernie Nussbaum. Would you care to offer the President's thousand-

percent support for him, or does that fall under Mack's review?

MS. MYERS: No, the President stands behind Bernie Nussbaum.

Q Are there going to be any changes in the Counsel's Office?

MS. MYERS: I can't speak to that because I honestly don't know. Again, that is something that Mack will address later this week.

Q Dee Dee, do the administration's ethics rules allow a spouse of a Supreme Court justice to work in the Justice Department?

MS. MYERS: I don't know the answer to that. I will have to take that question.

Q Rob Krueger lost by a very big margin

-

(laughter.)

MS. MYERS: Squeaker. (Laughter.)

Q -

-

and they certainly don't say that's the only reason, but they cite it, use words like the misadventures at the White House and the President. What kind of message do you think the Texas voters were sending to this White House?

MS. MYERS: Well, I don't know that they were sending any message. I think it was largely about local issues. It was, to some degree, about spending cuts. But Senate Krueger didn't vote for the budget resolution; he didn't support the President's budget package. He didn't campaign on the President's budget package. So I don't think this can be judged in any way as a referendum on the President's budget package. I think it was a local race.

But if we're keeping score, I think it's important to look at the other races around the country, special elections that have occurred since the President, including one tomorrow in California where I think the Democrat is almost assured to win.

Q Dee Dee, do you think it was irresponsible of Mrs. Bailey Hutchinson to suggest that it had anything to do with taxes?

MS. MYERS: I think she's free to suggest it had to do with whatever she wants. But I think since neither candidate campaigned for the President's budget package, I don't think it can be read as a referendum on the President's budget package.

Q On entitlements, Senator Breaux yesterday thought that there should be a change in the Medicare Part B premium for upper income. Is the administration willing to consider any means testing on Medicare Part B?

MS. MYERS: I think that Senator Moynihan has made his views fairly clear on that. We'll see what the Senate Finance Committee comes up with. But I don't know that that's likely.

Q Is the administration also willing to consider bypassing Senate Finance altogether and getting it directly to the floor?

MS. MYERS: I think Secretary Bentsen said yesterday that if we have to go around -

-

and Senator Moynihan, whose job as the Chairman of the Committee said that he was going to get the package to the floor no matter what it took. Now, I think Senator Moynihan has also said that he doesn't think it will have to go around his committee. But I think that Senator Moynihan made it clear that he's willing to do whatever it takes to get the package to the floor.

I think the consequences of not going forward, of the kind of chaos that could result from this package not going forward are severe. Five hundred billion dollars in deficit reduction has meant a lowering of interest rates. It's put more than \$10 billion back into the economy already since the election. I think that there is significant deficit reduction, there's job creation in the package. It is a sound fiscally responsible package. And I think we need it.

Q Dee Dee, is the President meeting with any other senators?

Q It's not a matter of going forward. It's just a

ARMS Email System

matter of using a different procedure to get it forward and to get it on the floor.

MS. MYERS: Which is why we -

-

I mean, we're going to get it to the floor one way or another.

Q And health care is also hinging on progress on the budget, as you've said. Is there also a concern that if it does look like it's being tied up in Finance, that you would go that route in order not to delay health care reform?

MS. MYERS: I think our commitment now is to getting reconciliation done. I think that's our first priority. As we've said, we think that that will happen. We think we can get this package through Senate Finance and through the full Senate, and we'll continue to work toward that goal.

Q Dee Dee, can I ask you about Haiti? If the measures announced by the administration on Friday are not strong enough, is the White House ready to go further than that?

MS. MYERS: I think that we've said repeatedly that we're willing to consider tougher sanctions, including an international sanctions oil embargo.

Q What about the

-

let me follow

up on that. There was a story last night that said that at the OAS meeting in Managua, the U.S. had backed a total embargo of oil and other goods.

MS. MYERS: I think what was said is that we're willing to look at that. Obviously, there's no proposal in the U.N. right now to do that, but we've said we're willing to look at tougher measures.

Q On Ray Flynn, there's a story in the Boston Herald saying that he's very disenchanted. He's been treated badly by the State Department who called his appointment a two-

year junket to the Vatican. Has he formally submitted that he wants out?

MS. MYERS: No, I don't believe so. The President has asked him to serve as his Ambassador to the Holy See and that process is moving forward.

Q Have they talked? Have they talked?

MS. MYERS: I don't know. I don't think so, but I'll have to double-

check. I'll have to take that.

Q Dee Dee, according to Boston reporters, Flynn has given the White House 48 hours to clean up its act or whatever ultimatum he gave before he would withdraw from that nomination. Are there negotiations, discussions? What's going on between Flynn and the White House?

MS. MYERS: I think he's had conversations with the State Department, and I don't believe -

-

he hasn't talked to anybody in the White House that I know of. But I'll take the question. As far as

-

obviously, the President would like to see this move forward. I don't know that he's talked to Mayor Flynn, but I'll check and find out.

Q Dee Dee, on the aftermath of this ship going aground off the coast of New York City with the 300 Chinese immigrants or aliens -

-

whatever -

-

Representative Schumer says that the White House has set up a task force to take a look into the entire immigration problems underscored by this event. Is that true?

MS. MYERS: Yes, it's been ongoing for, I believe, several months. It includes INS, Treasury, Justice. It's coordinated by the National Security Council. And they're looking at

a number of measures, including working with the flagging countries. East Asian countries who are involved, toughening U.S. local and state laws, enhancing enforcement, and prosecuting American residents who might be involved. I think the INS put out a statement on this on Friday.

Q They did put out one?

MS. MYERS: Yes.

Q What's the administration's position on the status of these boat people now? What's going to happen to them in the immediate sense?

MS. MYERS: They'll go through the review process to determine whether or not they are eligible for legal status or actually register as political refugees.

Q Is their status similar to -

situation similar to the Haitian refugees? I mean, is it going to take as long as that?

MS. MYERS: I don't know where they're all being detained, and I would refer you to INS for the specific details. But there is a process being set up. Each of them will be interviewed to determine their identity and their actual status, and then decisions will be made on a case-

by-

case basis. And exactly where they're being held in the interim I don't know. I mean, it's not like Guantanamo and it's not like they're being sent back right away.

Q Dee Dee, can I have a follow-

up? I heard a report that many of them are asking asylum based on the fact that China has a sterilization policy and that President Bush approved something in 1989 that they could claim under that situation.

MS. MYERS: Again, we're reviewing the cases on an individual basis and will make a determination on an individual basis.

Q Dee Dee, Madeleine Albright said over the weekend that those responsible for the attack on the U.N. peacekeeping force in Somalia would pay a heavy price. The U.N. has adopted a resolution to seek out those responsible, put them on trial, and make them pay. Does the White House believe that it will require the introduction of additional U.S. troops to carry out that U.N. mandate?

MS. MYERS: At this point we don't have a decision on that. We're looking at it to try to determine who was involved in the incident in Somalia. We support the U.N. resolution, obviously, as Ambassador Albright said, and we'll take a look at it.

Q But at this point there had been no determination that additional U.S. forces of any kind will be required to carry that out?

MS. MYERS: No.

Q Dee Dee, under this new set-

up here, are you going to continue to brief in the morning on a formal basis? And the afternoon briefing -

late afternoon briefing sort of gone by the wayside in the past couple weeks. What are your plans for logistically along those lines?

MS. MYERS: I'm glad you asked. I think with the opening of the hallway -

the morning briefing was originally an opportunity to give people early morning access to somebody in the press office given that the hallway was closed. I think what we'll do is move the daily briefing to 11:30 a.m., a little earlier as a lot of you have requested, and eliminate the morning briefing. And the afternoon briefing I think will be a needs basis. If there's a particular meeting that there needs to be a readout on, myself or somebody else could come down and do that. But I think that daily schedule will be obviously open hallway, and an 11:30 a.m. briefing, starting tomorrow.

Q Hutchinson campaigned on reducing federal spending. Is the White House now more apt to take a second look at the supercollider and the space station?

MS. MYERS: At this point the President continues to support those programs that are in the budget.

ARMS Email System

Q When might he know?

MS. MYERS: At this point he continues to -

-

there's
been no change in our policy.

Q Would he accept, in fact, Congress taking those
out? Would that not make a bill subject to a veto if Congress took
those out?

MS. MYERS: We'd have to look at anything that the
Senate or the conference produced -

-

Q The election in Texas doesn't basically change the
administrations view on either project?

MS. MYERS: No.

Q Any travel on the schedule?

MS. MYERS: Nothing scheduled this week, and next week
is unclear, although there's nothing on yet. It could change.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:07 P.M. EDT

#81

06/07

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:09-JUN-1993 18:30:00.00

SUBJECT: President's REmarks to Business Roundtable 6.9.93

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christian M. Baldia (BALDIA_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JGILL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bowyer (BOWYER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas O. Levenberg (LEVENBERG_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=EASYLINK@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030.21@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JACK BELCHER@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\WH-OUTBOX-DISTR(A)LEX-LUTHOR.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JCMA(A)REAGAN.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\HES(A)AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\US1A01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (ALEXIS BYRNES@1=US@2=ATTMAIL@3=OVV-USDA.SIERRA5.SIERNET@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JPOLEY(A)ESUSDA.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\DLYTEL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MARLA E. ROMASH@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\CBS:NET_DIST@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 9, 1993

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

J.W. Marriott Hotel
Washington, D.C.

3:22 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (Applause.) Thank you, John, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the invitation to come here and speak with you today. I appreciate it not only because of the important things that we need to discuss, but because you, as the CEOs of our nation's top businesses, have a vital role to play in providing what our country needs most now -

economic renewal and an honest facing of our real challenges.

In recent years, members of the Business Roundtable have often been among the most enlightened leaders of our nation, in any walk of life. Many of you have supported the economic program that I have advanced, and for your help I am extremely grateful. All of you know there is a moment in the life of every enterprise when a CEO looks up and realizes that the company has been doing something that simply doesn't work anymore, that the time has come for overhaul and change and, though it will be painful, it has to be done. When that time comes, if you have the courage to do it, you just have to go before the stockholders and tell them that things aren't working, that there's some pain in the short run, but there's a lot of gain in the long run.

Many of you have had exactly that experience in the last 10 to 15 years. You've had to restructure your companies, slim them

ARMS Email System

down, eliminate unnecessary layers of management, embrace quality management, invest more in the training of your work force, and in the quality of your equipment and in the competitiveness of your operations.

And as a result of those calls, American companies now are once again the wonder of the world. Detroit turns out much better cars than it did 10 years ago. And guess what? It's gaining market share now in America -

-

something that a lot of people thought would never happen again. Motorola goes head to head in Japan and often wins, and manufacturing as a whole has come roaring back. Our workers are proving once again that they are the best in the world.

That's exactly what can happen to our nation as a whole, and what I believe has to happen. If we put our shoulder to the wheel and face the issues squarely, I think it will happen. We'll come roaring back, too.

As a new President, I feel the same as many of you did a few years ago. I look around and I see what I've inherited and I realize that, just as I said in the campaign, we have been on the wrong track for too long. Just as you've overhauled your companies, we've got to work together to overhaul this country. And I believe that we can. I promise you I'm doing everything I can to get it done.

The people of this country are just like the stockholders in your companies. You can tell them the changes we need. First, the people want to know what's wrong and what the problems are. Then they want to know what the strategy is for solving the problems. And then they want to know what's in it for them -

-

both good and bad. They deserve to have all those questions answered, and I'm doing my best to answer them. They are tough questions, but fair ones. They have to be faced.

Four months ago when I came to office, our country was suffering from a long period of economic slowdown, and the government's deficit figures had been revised upward after the election by \$165 billion over the next four years. After World War II, the income of the average American family was doubling about every 25 years -

-

an extraordinary feat that created a vast middle class in our country. Everybody thought these good times would go on forever, that the next generation would always be better off than its parents, that the quality of life and of social justice would continue to increase.

But in the early 1970s, that upward escalator came to a screeching halt, brought on by the global economy, its competitive pressures, and a lot of problems we had in our own country which slowed down the productivity growth rate. The incomes of many Americans started falling and average hourly incomes have been stagnant virtually ever since for the nation as a whole, in spite of the fact that the average family is spending more hours per week at work than it was in 1969.

Now we look forward to a doubling of our standard of living not every 25 years, but every 75 years. That is plainly an unacceptable rate. Many unhappy trends accelerated during the 1980s and into the 1990s. Even though the wealthiest Americans consistently did better, middle-

class incomes stalled and the percentage of people living in poverty exploded, especially the percentage of people working and still living in poverty. Our leaders continued to promise us something for nothing. There was always an easy answer, there was always a slogan that solved the problems. And slogans are always appealing. But as Americans, we can't live like that anymore.

You and I know that a major roadblock to our long

term recovery is the federal deficit. You and I know that it hasn't been tackled seriously in the past. And I want you to know today that I am committed to tackling this deficit, no matter how much political capital I have to spend to do it, because unless we regain control over our economic destiny, none of the other things that I would hope to do as President will be possible.

What I faced when I came to office was the prospect that unless we acted and acted decisively, deficits would soar out of sight in the 1990s. And notwithstanding the dramatic drop in short-

term interest rates, we would continue to have the highest real long-

term interest rates of any of our competitors. That would cripple

ARMS Email System

the economy. The United States would relinquish its place of leadership. And most importantly, we would leave our children a mean and surly existence of less economic and more social division.

That's why I believe so strongly that, as a nation, we have to have the courage to change. And so I spent weeks and weeks working on an economic plan for the nation, one that would dramatically reduce the deficit while also achieving an equally important aim: investing in a very disciplined way in some of the areas we had neglected in the 1980s, but that are critical to our growth and productivity -

-

especially education, training, new technologies for the 21st century, and strategies to ease the transition from a defense-

based high-

tech economy to one based on a dramatically reduced level of defense spending, but increased domestic spending.

Now, when I first presented this plan to Congress and to the American people in February, it received rave reviews. The reaction of the financial markets was immediate and very favorable -- just as the reaction to the financial markets had been favorable right after the election when we said we would come forward with a strong deficit reduction plan.

As the plan has moved its way through Congress, the outline of the budget resolution passing on time for the first time in 17 years, the House of Representatives passing the plan rigorously and quickly under enormous pressure, the financial markets have continued to respond in a very positive way. And many of you have stuck with us because you understand that this is a balanced and fair plan.

But most Americans don't know about that because ever since February, the last time I had a chance to discuss it entirely directly with the American people, we have seen a barrage of the same old sloganeering that got us in the fix we're in today. There is an easy answer: Just don't raise taxes and cut spending. It's a simple, unqualified thing. This, from the people who raised all the spending and cut the taxes in the 1980s.

I want to say again how very grateful I am for the people who have supported this program, from the CEOs of companies like Anheiser-

Busch, ARCO, Ford, Nations Bank, Sarah Lee, Tenneco, TRW, Apple, Xerox and others, to the Homebuilders Association, the Realtors Association, the American Electronics Industry Association and others. I appreciate that.

You might be interested to know that a congresswoman from California told me that after she spent a week at home, after voting for the plan, in town meetings she met with people who were angry at her and who left supporting the plan for two reasons: number one, they were astonished to find out what it actually did, since they couldn't tell from the rhetoric of the last three or four months; number two, they were astonished to know who was for it.

The other day, the Homebuilders Association brought their national officers group in to Maryland to meet with me at a homebuilding site to reaffirm their support for the program because we got mortgage rates at a 20-

year low and housing sales at a seven-

year high.

There has been a calculated effort to distort and to destroy this program by calling it "tax and spend." Never mind that, for years the leaders of this effort gave us "borrow and spend." Never mind that they were the architects of a program that took us from a \$1-

trillion to a \$4-

trillion debt in 12 years, from an annual deficit of \$74 billion a year to over \$300 billion a year.

Spending increased more than at any time during World War II in the last four years, and so did borrowing. And we're in a deep hole. But one more time, the apostles of the easy answers seek to divert the attention of the American people with their simple slogans.

I've been through a lot of political wars in my lifetime. I've, on occasion, gotten knocked down. Sometimes I've knocked myself down. But I always try to come back. And this time the administration is going to come back, because we're telling the truth to the American people, and if we don't face this problem now we're going to let it get out of hand and lose control of our destiny. That is the big issue, and we've got to have the courage to face it.

Because there have been so many distortions, I'd like to go back through this program one more time -

to tell you about the principles that have to be preserved as this plan works its way through Congress. First of all, let's take a look at where the deficit is heading. This is what I found based on the previous actions of the last 12 years. If we fail to act, look at where it's heading and look what the plan now before the Congress will do to bring it under control. That's what this first chart shows.

This is the inherited deficit, even after the 1990 plan

the red line. The deficit, with our budget, is the blue line. I want to come back to that in a minute, but you will see what I want to do with the blue line is take it from where it is in 1997 all the way down to zero. The slight increase in '98 is due to something you all know very well -

it's the same thing a lot of you find in your balance sheets -

that is health care costs.

If you want to go from where it is in '97 to zero, we have to bring health care costs in the government as well as in the private sector in line with inflation. That is the sole reason for that line going up. But as you can see, there is a huge difference. That's why there's been a drop in long-

term interest rates and mortgage rates are at a 20-

year low -

the promise of moving this line from red to blue.

These are things that I think can be done that will make a huge difference. Now, how do we get to the red line? First of all, in the 1980s, there was a big tax cut in '81 and a huge increase in national defense. And even though there were some restraints in domestic spending, there was no way in the wide world the domestic spending cuts got even close to the defense increases and the tax cuts.

Then in the mid-

'90s, when the defense budget started to go down, by that time, two other bad things had happened from the point of view of the deficit. Health care costs were exploding at two and three times the rate of inflation. And the interest payments on the debt had become a churning engine that kept going up and up and up, and were aggravated by high interest rates, so that we got no benefit from the defense cuts in terms of the deficit because the health care increase and the rise in interest payments.

Interest payments now consume about 15 cents on the tax dollar. And if we don't do anything about the size of the deficit, they will be up over 20 cents on the tax dollar within the next 10 years. These things have to be faced.

Now, let's go to the next chart. My opponents have been distorting the ratio of spending cuts to tax increases in all manner of ways. That now -

first they started off saying it was three to one; now they're saying it's six to one. Again, I will say that this is the crowd that gave you the deficits of the '80s, and all I used in trying to determine what the ratio of spending to taxes was, was the same thing my predecessors did in defining what was a reduction in federal spending.

There are some minor differences in the way these things are calculated. Actually, the House Budget Committee has given me more credit for spending cuts as opposed to tax increases than we do. But the rough balance is 50-

50. And let me give you an idea of why it's hard to be exact, because of all the word games that are played in Washington. I'll give you two examples -

one that arguably -

to
my favor; one that arguably doesn't.

One of the best things about this program is we increased the earned income tax credit. I'll say a little more about that in a minute. To reward who move from welfare to work; to say that if you work 40 hours a week and you've got kids in the house, the tax system should lift you above the poverty line. Now, that's a tax cut, right? Because the earned income tax credit involves an outlay by the government, some people count it as a spending increase, even though it's a tax cut. I think it's a tax cut. That's the way we count it.

Let me give you another example. Previous presidents had counted anything that restricted Social Security benefits as a spending reduction in entitlements. Now my adversaries say my proposal to extend income tax consideration to 85 percent of the incomes of the top 20 percent of Social Security earners is a tax increase. In a literal sense, it's a restriction on entitlements and a tax increase. You can argue it either way.

Which is better policy? We could restrain cost-
of-

living allowances to Social Security recipients, or we could apply the incomes -

-

taxation to the incomes of upper-

income recipients.
The fairer way to do it plainly is to ask the people who can afford it to pay more as opposed to holding down the cost-

of-

living
allowances to people just above the poverty line. One is called a tax increase; the other is called a spending reduction. It's six and one and half a dozen of the other.

So there are some arguments around the edges. But basically, this plan is roughly equally divided between spending cuts and tax increases. And as those of you who follow this closely know, we are moving into the Senate where we hope and believe there will be less tax and more spending cuts to further improve the ratio.

But I do want to emphasize that there are significant and very real spending cuts in this program and, as all of you know again, that 75 percent of the new taxes are paid for by people with incomes above \$100,000, two-

thirds of people with incomes above
\$200,000 -

-

me and everybody else in this room included in that.

The spending cuts I want to talk to you about. They're made in discretionary programs, entitlement programs and interest payments on the national debt. You can't make cuts of this size unless you basically disappoint every interest group in the Congress. For example, in agriculture, we have made cuts in commodity support, crop insurance and rural electric. We've asked federal employees to forego the automatic pay increases tied to inflation they have been getting for years and years and years to the tune of \$13 billion. We're trimming 150,000 people from the federal payrolls by attrition, and saving \$11 billion in overall administrative cuts.

We're replacing the existing system of guaranteed student loans in a way that will save \$4 billion -

-

and is wildly
unpopular from the people who were making money from the student loan program because it was a government guarantee with no risk. If you ask about Medicare, there's about \$60 billion in cuts from Medicare from the red line I showed you. There are cuts in Medicaid. There are cuts in military and civilian retirement, delaying payments for them to reduce our payments on retirement this year and in the years ahead. No part of the federal budget has been fully spared.

Of the cuts that are made -

-

I don't think I have a
chart on this -

but of the cuts that are made, basically we cut over twice as much and apply it to the deficit as we cut and applied to new spending. I've been criticized because I've advocated some

to new spending. I've been criticized because I've advocated some new spending programs. I plead guilty to that. But I want you to know exactly what they are.

I plead guilty to believing that it is worth it to have the government replace some of these defense cuts with investments in domestic commercial technologies and new partnerships with the private sector. That's what our competitors do. I think we have to compete.

I plead guilty to wanting to fully fund the Head Start program, because we've got all these underprivileged kids out there that need to be very privileged and empowered adults, and I think we ought to fully fund the program as part of an overall strategy to meet the national education goals. I plead guilty to that. I think it's worth the money.

There are some targeted and limited funds in there to help every state in the country work with the private sector to set up a system of apprenticeship for all the people who don't go to college, and a system of lifetime learning, because the average worker will change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime. It's not a lot of money, but it needs to be spent. I plead guilty. I think it is worth the investment.

These kinds of things matter to a society over the long run. The irony of the last 12 years is that because of, first, our reliance on defense spending to boost the economy, and then when defense spending was cut, our explosion of health care costs and interest payments, we have actually reduced our investments in a lot of the things that make us a richer country, even as this deficit has exploded.

So, those are the things that have been cut. A member of the more liberal wing of the Democratic Party called me the other day and said, "We have done you a terrible disservice. You told us we had to cut this spending and we did it. And because there was no conflict, there was no publicity on it, now nobody in America thinks you cut any spending. And you cut retirement, you cut Medicare, you cut Medicaid, you went after Social Security, you cut all these discretionary spending programs and nobody knows it." Well, I'll predict you'll hear more about it in the days and weeks ahead from the people who feel that they have been rolled and gotten no credit for it. There are a lot of budget cuts in this program and there will be some more. But the lion's share of the work has been done there.

As I said before and as you can see -

-

and I might as well make full disclosure since I'm here with you -

-

the effect of the new taxes is highly progressive, with almost all the real burden falling on people in the top one percent of the income category, and 75 percent of the money being paid for by the top six percent. Now, that tracks income growth and tax reductions in the '80s. That is, it reverses the fact of the '80s where middle-

class taxes were increased though the Social Security tax while middle-

class incomes declined.

But we do ask, through the energy tax, a contribution from virtually all Americans, not including those with incomes under \$30,000 with one or two kids in the family. Otherwise, everybody else is asked to pay something.

Now, as I said, I want to mention a couple of other things. In addition to the spending programs, there are some incentives in this program that a lot of people asked for -

-

maybe some of you in this room did. But I want to run through them, because they cost money, too, but I think they're worth it. And you have to decide whether you think they are.

The small business community for years has been asking us to increase the expensing provisions from \$10,000 to \$25,000 on the theory that they're creating most of the new jobs and this will help them to do it. So that's what this bill does. The Venture Capital Association for years has been asking us to adopt a venture capital gains tax that would provide huge incentives for people to start new enterprises. We do that in this bill. It costs some money. I think it's worth it.

After the Tax Reform Act of 1986, many businesses, including businesses in this room, said there had to be some changes in the alternative minimum tax provisions of the tax code if we wanted people to continue to invest in plant and equipment in this country because of the unfair way the alternative minimum tax works. And we changed it in this tax code. We were asked to do it by many

ARMS Email System

people. I think it makes sense. We did it. It's in the code. It costs money.

For years, Republicans and Democrats alike who actually live out there where people are struggling to make a living have believed that if we wanted to do something meaningful for inner cities and poor rural areas, we had to try to get the private sector more involved and we had to use market mechanisms. And there are any number of suggestions under the so-

called "enterprise zone" rhetoric about that.

We have, in this proposal, an empowerment zone concept which is by far the most ambitious incentives program ever offered to try to get the private sector involved in distressed areas in America on an experimental basis -

-

to pick 15 or 20 communities and say, if you hire people from there, you get a credit; if you invest there you get a permanent credit; and to provide all kinds of other resources in terms of training and support to people who will try to make the private sector work. It's almost 100 percent a private sector initiative. But it costs money.

Is it worth it? I think it is. There's not enough government money in the world to rebuild, South Central Los Angeles or some of the most distressed areas in other cities in our country, or the Mississippi Delta where I live. But it costs money. But we have to try, I think.

So you have spending reductions, you have tax increases, you have some new spending, and you have a significant amount of private sector incentives in this bill. I think it's all worthwhile.

The most interesting thing is the signals that have been sent to the markets and the result. Now, if I had told you in December -

-

to me, this is the most amazing thing of all, and I can't take credit for this. This chart, in some ways belongs to my friend, John Scully at Apple Computers. He came in last week and he said, Bill, I know you must be low and I read all the press and the polls and everything. He said, I am happy as a clam. And I said, are you happy as a clam because you're a Republican and I'm in trouble? He says, no, I'm happy as a clam because I'm an American.

He said, if somebody had told you four months ago that by June 1st unemployment would drop below seven percent for the first time in 17 months, that we'd have 755,000 new jobs, over 90 percent of them in the private sector, that we'd have a 20-

year low in mortgage rates and a seven-

year high in housing sales, and that people would be responding to the program to seriously reduce the deficit and grow the economy, would you have been happy? He said, I don't know why everybody's not happy. He said, I make a living thinking about the long run and thinking about what's happening. This is working.

I believe it's working, too. Now, the program is going into the Senate, and they will change it some in cooperation with the House members, I might add. There's an unusual amount of cooperation here among people who really want to do something. There will be at least one meeting a day between senators and House members before the Senate even votes -

-

something that's almost unheard of. People just trying to work together to work this out.

Here's what I think ought to come out of that. There should be some less tax and some more spending cuts. We should have \$500 billion in overall deficit reduction, all the cuts in the taxes ought to be in a trust fund so they can't be put anywhere else. There ought to be an enforcement mechanism for the first time that requires the President -

-

because who can foresee what's going to happen five years from now? It would be hard for all of you to adopt five-

year budgets with absolute certainty. Nobody can do that. This bill has an enforcement mechanism that says if we miss the deficit target every year, the President has to come in and offer a plan to fix it. Not just shrug your shoulders and say, oh, it's too bad, the economy was down, or something else went wrong, but a plan to fix it, to live with the discipline that the numbers will impose. That's something new and it ought to stay in there.

The third thing that ought to be in there is the

progressivity of this program. Middle-

class Americans are being asked to pay a modest amount, much less than most of them think now because of the rhetoric of the last few months, but a modest amount. It still ought to be progressive because of the tax history and the income history of the last 12 years. So it should be progressive.

We should leave the empowerment initiatives there. The empowerment zones, the small business incentives, the new business incentives, that changes in the alternative minimum tax in my judgment ought to be left in there. We should have the targeted investments. And I believe there must be some sort of broad-

based energy tax.

I must say that when I first started on this -

- and my economic advisor over here, Bob Rubin, as most of you know, has laughed a lot when he sees people say, oh, this is such a liberal program -

- Rubin, Bentsen and Panetta, my three deficit hawks, were the people who convinced me that it was worth it even to raise a little more tax if we had to do it to get the deficit down and the interest rates down to get the country going again -

- not the liberals in my Cabinet who were worried about all of that. The others, the business people did it. The people who understood the financial markets. They said, we've got to get the interest rates down, and we've got to get the deficit down, even if we have to take a little more heat for the taxes.

So we are trying to come to grips with this. But I know when we started I was told by person after person after person in New York, if you want to have an influence on interest rates, you've got to do two things: deal with entitlements and have an energy tax. Because that looks real to us. Well, we did those things and cut a lot of other spending besides.

So, is this a perfect program? No, there's no such thing. Is it a good one? You bet it is. You can tell by the results. Is the Senate going to work on it? Yes, it is. The Senate will work on it. Then the House and the Senate and the White House will confer. And we'll try to come out with a program which meets these principles. I believe we will.

The main thing I want to say is, it is hard to quarrel with results. And I hope to goodness it is going to be very hard to go back to the same old siren song we've heard time and time again. I've heard all these people say, well, just cut spending. It turns out they always want somebody else's spending cut. And we have cut a lot of spending. There are some kinds of spending that everybody in this room wouldn't support. If we don't have it quite right, you can tell us what you think.

Now, let me just also say, the House passed the modified line-

item veto. And if the Senate would pass that, I'll give you some more spending cuts. If the Senate will give me that, I'll be happy to give you some more spending cuts and bring it down a little more. And I'm hoping that will come out of this whole budgetary process, so the President can have some more discipline on spending.

But the thing we have to do most of all is to act. We have to act. We have to act, because that is the only thing that will produce results. I believe that we're going to do that. I think you will see the Senate act. I think you will see the Senate and the House come forward with a program that meets the basic principles that I have outlined. I think you will see America in control of its economic destiny. I think interest rates will stay down and growth will stay up, and we'll continue to generate jobs for this economy.

But it requires a lot of courage. When all you hear, day in and day out, are people trying to paralyze action with the same old rhetoric that put us to sleep for 12 years and got us in the fix that the first chart showed. I like these results better than that first chart. And if you do, I hope you'll support our efforts.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, we thank you for a very substantive and significant speech. The President, ladies and gentlemen, has offered to answer some questions, so I'll turn it over to him for that purpose.

THE PRESIDENT: Is somebody carrying a microphone?

Q Mr. President, as one who just refinanced my own

ARMS Email System

home mortgage, I want to thank you for that. (Laughter.)

My question really goes to the apparent demise of the Btu tax, which was announced by Secretary Bentsen yesterday, and, obviously, the work with Congress that's required in the last administration or this one to make anything really happen. I heard you say that another broad-

based energy tax would be recommended. I appreciate any comment you'd have on that and why you think another broad-

based energy tax might get more reception or, rather, not have the same treatment that the Btu tax did.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say I'm still not sure how it's all going to come out. And let me try to answer this very carefully. Secretary Bentsen did not so much announce as to grudgingly acknowledge -

-
(laughter) -

-
the state of play in the Senate. And it's quite interesting, because he's from an energy state and he came to this Btu tax after going through a lot of other issues.

Let me tell you what the state of play in the Senate is, first of all. You've got essentially a Senate Finance Committee where no Republicans will vote for this bill because they are not going to be for any taxes. And the Boren substitute is a massive shift of the burden to elderly people and the working people just above the poverty line. And if it got on the floor of the Senate, I bet it wouldn't get 20 votes. So there is no other viable alternative out there.

But with an 11-

to-

9 majority, the Democrats cannot lose any votes on the Senate Finance Committee and get any bill out. Now, Secretary Bentsen had what I thought was a great suggestion for modifying the Btu tax, which would essentially have drastically alleviated -

- all but eliminated the burden on production, whether industrial or agricultural, but would have otherwise left the tax in shape, so that it applied to all forms of energy and, therefore, was less burdensome to any region of the country, but got out of the whole business of whether we were being uncompetitive with people from -

-
when we exported our products or whether imports would acquire a competitive advantage, and whether we were putting too much of a burden on energy-

intensive forms of industry which had led the House to make too many exceptions to it. So if you just essentially had a blanket alleviation of the production sector, which is what Secretary Bentsen was talking with them about, it looked to us like that was the best thing.

There had been so much said about the wording of the Btu tax

and, I must say, some legitimate concern about the whole administrative difficulty of starting a new one -

-
the Senate seems disinclined to go forward. That does not mean that the House will give up on a modified Btu tax. I don't know what's going to happen from hear on in. And we have not agreed to anything, or disagreed with anything. We have been in consultation with the Senate, and would go to any meeting they asked us to. But they're going to have to come up with their own program. And they know what the principles I have outlined are. And I just gave them to you. So I don't know what's going to happen now.

Senator Breaux has some ideas that he wants to float and some others have some ideas. I think you'll have plenty of time to react to them. A lot of them want to rely more on a broad-

based transportation tax, but that also has some economic difficulties if you -

-

ARMS Email System

even if you raise less money.

The number one thing -

100 percent of us agreed and the House members agreed that we would lower the dollar volume of the energy tax -

the value -

the total money raised -

and make it up in various kinds of cuts. And that would -

and I think that's where everybody is now. Everybody is there.

And let me just run a few other things out here. There is also a discussion about whether or not there should be a delay in the effective date of the taxes -

the income taxes. That's being discussed -

the economic grounds for that. And there are all kinds of discussions about that.

I want to red flag one issue for all of you who provide comprehensive health policies for your employees, though -

again, because sometimes things are not what they seem. We cut about \$60 billion in Medicare expenditures over and above the red line I showed you. That is -

that was a big part of our deficit reduction. There are those who say, well, we ought to cut a lot more, and we can freeze provider fees and we can do all this kind of stuff with Medicare. I would urge all of you as employers to look at that very closely because, again, it's a slight of hand. You know -

yes, we can cut the fool out of Medicare. But if we don't have some sort of comprehensive resolution to the health care crisis, what will happen? The same thing that's been happening the last 12 years: all those people will send you the bill.

There will be massive cost-

shifting with certain kinds of Medicare cuts unless it is part of an overall health care strategy, which just means a hidden tax on employers and their employees, which is the very thing I'm trying to get away from -

anything hidden. And it contradicts one of the essential goals of our long-

term strategy, which is to bring health costs in line with inflation and fairly apportion the burden throughout society, which it's not now. Most of you are paying too much and your employees are because of the way the thing is.

So I'm not trying to avoid your question. I'm just trying to tell you I do not know what the Senate will do. My position has been to try to tell them what my principles are; make Secretary Bentsen and Mr. Panetta available to them to discuss everything; ask them to be faithful to the House by involving the House members in the discussions, because a lot of House members passed this budget on the understanding there would be some less tax and some more spending cuts and that they would be a part of it. And I don't know what's going to come out of there yet.

Q My question is this: We in the Roundtable, of course, have made deficit reduction a major issue for a long, long time. And we applaud your efforts in that regard and certainly are

ARMS Email System

hopeful that the \$500 billion sort of reduction over the four or five-

year period will be forthcoming. And we're working, as you know, with your administration and Bob Rubin and Leon and others. But even if that objective is achieved, it's clear we have a very significant continuing deficit problem. What is it -

-

\$1 trillion over the next four or five years? The deficit only goes from the baseline number of 3.3 percent to about 2.7 percent of GDP. We still have a big, big deficit problem.

My question is, how do you feel about the proposals for process reform that I gather are gaining some currency in the Congress, to put the spending caps on the entitlement programs -

-

the nondiscretionary programs -

-

as well as the discretionary programs, with the fire walls and with the sequestration. How do you look at that whole issue of process reform to deal with this underlying problem of a deficit that doesn't seem to come under manageable proportions?

THE PRESIDENT: I want to answer it, but I'd like to ask for -

-

where did those charts go? Are they still up here? I just wanted the first one back to try to highlight the point you're making. Just bring me back the first one -

-

the one with the red and blue lines.

This is what he's talking about. This line here ought to go down to here. And if you -

-

and I want to answer your question, but I've got to put it into context. This deficit here is actually about -

-

it's more, it's about -

-

it's over 5 percent of GDP, and we're going to cut it from 5.2 percent down to about 2.7 percent or 2.6 percent here -

-

to a pretty good cut. But it does continue to increase the total national debt by what's down here.

Now, in the mid-

'70s, I started looking at what other countries had done on this. This is not an unusual problem for a Western country with a lot of support systems coming out of the government and difficulty generating jobs and income. I mean, a lot of these Western countries are in the same shape we're in, and I include Japan with that.

Japan had a huge operating deficit in the mid-

'70s. And they had a 10-

year plan to bring it into balance, which they did over a 10-

-

year period, thinking that to rush it any faster might cause a recession, but to delay it would be a terrible mistake. So I thought to myself, maybe we could do it in eight or nine or something like -- in that range -

-

if we could just deal with this. This is where you have to take the curve down.

Now, to get the curve down, I can just tell you

-

we have to do a number of things. But let me say what we cannot do, and then what we must do, and then I'll come back to your cap device. There is a limit to how much we can responsibly cut defense within a short time. I think we are right at that edge. I do not want to cut anymore in this five-

year budget. Based on what we now know, we are that limit, unless there -

-

the only other way you can do it that I know of, is -

-

the Vice President has this reinventing government task force on -

-

if we can have significant procurement reform, we might be able to have some savings. But in just terms of slash and burn, we don't need to do anymore in my opinion.

Secondly, as I said earlier, there are some things that any government has to do to maintain its competitiveness. And thirdly, there are just human concerns that have to be taken care of, even though they're subject to constraints of the budget. For example, a lot of people don't know this, but actual out-

of-

pocket costs on welfare and food stamps haven't kept up with inflation in the last 10 or 15 years. The reason those costs have gone up is that there's a whole lot more poor people. You've got one in 10 Americans on food stamps now.

But this number, anyway, to go back to his comment, is being driven by two things. One is the entitlements and the fact that things like retirement, wages, Social Security and whole lot of other things have automatic cost escalators. The one that is not a problem is Social Security. Social Security is no more of our national income than it was 20 years ago, and the tax is higher. And it's producing a \$60 billion a year surplus that makes our deficit look smaller than it is. If anything, the payroll tax is too big. But it is producing that.

On the income tax side, what you've got, though -

-

here's the problem with paying for the rest of that stuff that's paid for with income taxes. We are now indexing income taxes, which is fair -

-

that is, people don't get pushed into higher brackets by inflation. But the flip side of that is, if you index income taxes downward and you index income upward for people who are getting tax money, you don't have to be a mathematical genius to realize that there is a conflict there. Then, if you have health care costs increasing at two and three times the rate of inflation -

-

because you've got more people on the government roles, about 100,000 a month losing their health insurance; you have more people on the government roles, prices going up and the ability to churn the system, if there's a fee-

for-

service system, you've got some real problems.

Now, that brings me to his -

-

there are several suggestions which have been made that would essentially require us over the next five years to adopt a disciplined system of bringing the cost of entitlements in line with inflation, plus population, to be fair. They're all acknowledging that if there's a growth in poverty or an unexpected downturn in the economy, we would take that into account.

I would be open to that as a part of the health care reform issue. That is, what I would like to see is the budgetary discipline on the entitlement issue taken up with health care reform for this reason: If we impose the entitlement caps and we don't face health care reform, because it's too controversial or we can't bear to do it, then if the entitlement caps trigger, we will be massively shifting our cost to you, like I said earlier.

So I'm willing -

-
the other tough decisions can be made within the budget discipline. But the health care cost issue which is driving it, in my judgment, should be dealt with at the time we impose the overall entitlement restrictions over a five-

year period.
That protects the employers and the employees of the country from having mass cost-

shifting and forces us to make the tough decisions in government.

But, anyway, I know it's a long answer, but I had to explain it in the context that we're operating.

There was a question over here, I think.

Q The Business roundtable believes that the only way to fix superfund is to make some fundamental change in the law. If you agree would you support a legislative fix?

THE PRESIDENT: To change the superfund?

Q Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, sure I would, but I would want to know what the details are first. (Laughter.) But I agree that it needs to be changed, and I'm certainly open to changing it. It's

lawyers are making more money than cleanup folks are right now.

Let me say as a general proposition on the spending issue, too -

-
there are two other opportunities that the Congress and the President will have to deal with -

-
government spending and the efficiency of government programs this year

-
in addition to this reconciliation process which is going on, and that is that all the appropriations committees are reviewing all their spending.

Keep in mind, what you see now in the budget only includes tax cuts or tax increases and the entitlement programs and the overall spending limits. The specific programs, whether they're cut, increased or kept the same, that's all handled by the Appropriations Committee, and that's going on now, too. And that will offer other opportunities for dealing with the spending issues.

And the third thing that's going to happen is, in September the Vice President is going to come in with this report about reexamining the whole functioning of the federal government, and that will open a new avenue of opportunities for dealing with a lot of these issues also.

Is there another question back there? I thought I saw one more hand up. The boss here says we can do one more. Am I going to get out without one more? I accept if -

-
go ahead. I'll do two more. Mr. Morecote once let me play golf with him, so I owe him a question. (Laughter.)

Q Mr. President, we heard this morning, some of us, from Mickey Kantor about trade issues, North American Trade Agreement, Uruguay Round and negotiating with Japan. Can you just comment on those subjects briefly, starting with NAFTA?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I'm for it, number one. (Laughter and applause.) I'm for it. Number two, we can't pass it in the House of Representatives today, but I think we'll be able to when the time comes.

Number three, the reason we can't pass it and what we're doing with the Mexicans and the Canadian governments are tied together but not -

-
it's not an exact fit, but let me -

you know
that there's just an awful lot of economic insecurity out there now
in this country. And a lot of the members are rebelling against
NAFTA because they see it as the first trade agreement we've ever
made where we're making investment easier in another country for the
purpose of setting up production to sell in our market, not theirs.

So that's the basic tension, because of the wage
differentials. My argument back is the argument that most of you
would make, I think, which is that, first of all, you've got a free-

market oriented government in Mexico that is unilaterally dropped
trade barriers and taken us from a \$5 billion deficit to a \$6 billion
surplus in trade, creating an awful lot of jobs in America.

Secondly, two-

thirds of our new jobs in the last three
or four years have come from expansion of trade. Our unemployment
problems today are directly related to the fact that our economy even
though it's in a fragile recovery is in better shape than a lot of
other economies which is making our trade situation worse because
people don't have the money to buy our products.

What will happen in Asia and in Europe is unpredictable
in the years ahead but we believe we need to establish a relationship
not only with Mexico, but with the other market economies to the
south. Opportunities with Chile, with Venezuela, with Argentina,
with all kinds of other countries could open up. So I'm for it.

What Mickey Kantor -

-

he's already talked to you about
this -

-

but we're trying to get an agreement on labor standards and
the environment with the Mexican and Canadian governments which would
enable us to have some sort of enforcement mechanism, not on if there
is one violation, but if there is whole pattern and practice of
violations as found by a neutral finder of facts. So that's what
we're trying to work out. My gut feeling is that will get worked out
pretty soon. We'll go forward with it and we will pass it. That's
what I think will happen.

On GATT, as you probably saw in the press this morning,
the French government has withdrawn some of it's objections on the
agriculture points of view. That makes me elated. I think that's
where -

-

that's a real winner for us and is likely to face less
opposition in the Congress.

Not very long ago I met with the central bankers and the
finance ministers of the G-

7, and I told them that on behalf of the
United States I would make exceptional efforts to get a GATT
agreement if they would and I thought we ought to stop talking about
it and do it and do it before the year is over because we all needed
the global growth. And so I'm hopeful there, and I think the French
action is a big plus. And I thank them for that.

On Japan, basically, we've trying to move toward a more
results-

oriented trade policy with Japan, not to get to the managed
trade quota point that they're criticizing us for, but in recognition
of the fact that there are several areas whereby any objective
measure we are competitive in price and quality for various products
and services. And while they don't have stated tariffs and quotas
and barriers that keep us out, we, nevertheless, aren't in and don't
get in and can't get in. And so what we're trying to do is to find
our way into dealing with that issue on the theory that it's just -

-

I
don't want to close American borders to Japanese products, but I do
expect more opportunities for Americans in Japan if we're going to
play this.

And if you look -

-

I know the Japanese have been very
harsh in their criticism of our new approach. But that could be
because it might work. And I know that they've been harsh in their
criticism, but I also know that, notwithstanding all of the problems
around, they not only have a massive surplus with us, they're about
the only country I know that's got a massive trade surplus with all
the Third World countries they deal with -

-
all of them.

So I just think a new approach is called for. And I say that not in the spirit of hostility. I think I probably have more pure admiration for Japan and what they do right and well than any other person that's ever held this job. But I know what's happened to American productivity growth in the last five or six years. And I know what we can do there if given the chance. And I think we've got to do our best to do it.

If you think we're on the wrong track, feel free to tell us. But I believe we've got to keep pushing forward to try to show you some results from all this talking. We've been talking until we're blue in the face for a long time now. I'd like to show a little bit of result.

Q That was the question I had -

-
THE PRESIDENT: Let me just say to all of you, we're going to need your help on NAFTA because to pass it, the Congress, and particularly the House, must believe that over the long run it is good for American jobs and incomes. I believe it is. I believe it is. I wouldn't be for it if I didn't think it was. And it just doesn't make sense to me that we can ever grow this economy unless we expand the number of our trading partners and unless we are doing more trade with people whose incomes are rising rather rapidly.

And I think

-
the Mexicans have reached out their hand to us. I want to reach out my hand to President Salinas. And I think we can get over this negotiating impasse we're at now and then go forward. And that's what I intend to do.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END4:13 P.M. EDT

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:09-JUN-1993 19:19:00.00

SUBJECT: Press Briefing by OMB Director Panetta 6.9.93

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christian M. Baldia (BALDIA_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JGILL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bowyer (BOWYER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas O. Levenberg (LEVENBERG_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=EASYLINK@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030,21@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JACK BELCHER@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\WH-OUTBOX-DISTR(A)LEX-LUTHOR.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JCMA(A)REAGAN.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\HES(A)AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (ALEXIS BYRNE@1=US@2=ATTMAIL@3=GOV+USDA.SIES@5=SIESNET@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JPOLEY(A)ESUSDA.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\DIATRL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MARLA E. ROMASH@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1-US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\CBS:NET_DIST@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 9, 1993

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET DIRECTOR LEON PANETTA
West Wing
5:47 P.M. EDT

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Basically, why we wanted to call this together because there's been a sense that somehow there's been a move away from the principles that the President enunciated. And I wanted to make clear that that is not the case: that the President enunciated four key principles and is adhering to those principles, one of which is \$500 billion in deficit reduction and it has to be real and has to be set aside for deficit reduction purposes. Secondly, that it has to be progressive.

-

the overall approach --

and that we want to maintain the progressivity and not return to the '80s so that the principal burden falls on those in the upper income brackets. Thirdly, that we want to insure that the investments are there. And those key investments are the ones we saw on the House side -

-

investments such as empowerment zones, family preservation, immunization, the Mickey Leland hunger relief bill as well as the other initiatives that they were a part of the House bill. The President feels very strongly about maintaining those.

We do have a problem with the rules on the Senate side. There is the Byrd rule, which prevents some of those initiatives from going forward. However, the President intends to fight for those. If not in the Senate because of the Byrd rule, then certainly in the

conference.

Lastly, that the President is committed to, again, a broad-

based energy tax, that that was essentially what passed on the House side, and he will continue to work towards that, one that promotes energy efficiency and one that promotes conservation. Those principles are still there.

Now, the concern, I think, that's developed, as you go through this process, obviously the legislative process is a tough one to watch as the different changes are made. There were a significant number of modifications on the House side; that's the nature of the process. And we expect that the same thing will be done on the Senate side.

On the House side, just to remind you, we had major changes with regards to the ITC, the investment tax credit, which was done away with. There were changes in the energy tax. There were changes with regards to almost all of the spending proposals in some way in each of the committees. And, nevertheless, 90 percent of the President's plan was held together. We achieved the savings there, and we achieved the policies that we were after, and it passed the House.

We expect the same process to take place over in the Senate. They've basically got to work through the challenges that they face there in terms of getting the votes together that they need to move this forward. And so as a result of that, clearly the Senate is now in the process of trying to find out what modifications need to be made for that purpose, and they will have to -

-

clearly, they're going to make some modifications here as the process goes forward.

We think the bulk of the program is on track. I have to deal with all of the committees -- not just the Finance Committee, but all of the committees. We've got 12 committees over on the Senate side, have been in discussions with the chairmen and the members of those committees. Most of the proposals are on track. We expect that each of the committees will meet their targets that will achieve the \$500 billion in deficit reduction.

Obviously, the principal focus has been on the Finance Committee and there, clearly, there are going to be negotiations on what, if anything, they can do on the energy side. Clearly, the votes are not there to pass a Btu tax, and I think that's essentially what Secretary Bentsen was acknowledging last night. I want to make that clear. That was basically an acknowledgement of what is the fact on the Senate side, not what the administration position was.

Q In the Committee, or overall Senate?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Yes, in the Committee. That the votes were not there in the Committee to get a Btu tax out, and obviously the sense was we need to try to move a proposal through the Finance Committee to get it to the floor. Obviously -

-

whatever they do to replace that, they've got to make up the cuts in some way so that we get the deficit reduction.

At this point, while the administration has not endorsed any proposal that is being worked on, on the Senate side, we are obviously encouraging them to try to put a package together that, hopefully, can make it through the Senate and get us to conference. We've got to move this process forward.

But I want to make very clear for all of you, because I think there have been a lot of interpretations during the day that concern me. I just came from the House, having met with the leadership and members of the House -

-

their policy committee -- that we want to make very clear the President has not changed any of his positions, not changed his principles. We're still going to fight for the basic policies that we believe in. And if we can't, for whatever reason, make that fight on the Senate floor, we will make it in conference.

Q

to a compromise that would include just a tax on transportation fuels and maybe on electricity, too? Isn't that what's in play right now?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: They are obviously looking at other alternatives to a Btu. It was discussed in various terms where either some kind of transportation approach, as suggested by John Breaux, or possibly going to a gas tax or, even beyond that, looking

ARMS Email System

at an ad valorem again. But those are the ones that are being discussed on the Senate side.

I mean, I have to tell you that this is basically the Majority Leader and the Chairman of the Committee trying to do yeoman work in trying to see what they can do to try to build their votes together, and that's what counts. I mean, that's what we're after. We want to move this process forward. But not every move they make -

I want to make very clear -

is endorsed, necessarily, by the administration.

Q And so reports to that effect that you've agreed to a program are wrong?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: That's right. What we're trying to do is to give them the room they need. We want to give them the room they need to try to put a proposal together that can get out of the Finance Committee and pass the Senate to get us to conference. That's -

Q And conference is where you're going to do

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Conference is where we have to do the work. That's right. And it's where we're -

Q And fight for a Btu tax in conference?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Pardon me?

Q You would fight for a Btu tax?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: I think we would fight for a broad-

based energy tax in conference. And it's obviously going to be somewhere between -

you know, we have to see what the Senate passes. I have to tell you, I know the Senate's talking about it -

some form of transportation or gas tax. That's not going to be easy. And -

Q Well, the question -

DIRECTOR PANETTA: I commend them if they can pull the votes together, they're -

Q Because the -

question seems to be on the House side over what the President promised House members as to his commitment to the Btu tax, they seem to feel that he said he would stay with them through the Senate fight, and that now he's pulled the rug out from under it.

DIRECTOR PANETTA: The President made very clear to them

and I was at the caucus

he said I am for a broad

based energy tax; the Btu tax represents that on the House side, and I intend to fight for that. And I think that's where the President is. We'll have to fight for that position in conference.

Q What about the size of the tax? It was going to be \$70 billion in the House plan; now you're talking about much less. You've got Rangel up there saying you're going to take it out of programs for the poor, which he's all bent out of shape about.

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Well, obviously we would share Congressman Rangel's concern if that were the case. We know there's going to be modifications here. They are going to obviously reduce the amount of taxes and increase the amount of spending cuts. That has not been resolved, obviously, they're still working on that.

But the key for us right now is to make sure that in the process of doing that, a. they replace the revenues that are lost so that we maintain at least \$500 billion in deficit reduction; and secondly that it's done in a progressive way, that doesn't put the burden, again, back on either the middle class or working families or the poor.

Q Would the President accept a \$35-billion hit on Medicare?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: The President -

one of the things we've made very clear is that any reductions in Medicare above and beyond what's there have to be modest and have to target providers and cannot undercut what we're trying to do on health care reform. Those are key -

Q That sounds like no.

Q That sounds like a no from here.

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Again, whether it's \$10 billion, whether it's \$15 billion, whether it's \$20 billion, those are areas that we have to look at what they're proposing and obviously how they would try to get those savings.

But again, it's very important that when we try to get the savings out of the Medicare area, that you can't do so much in terms of savings there that you undercut our ability to get health care reform.

Q I understand that. So what do we report, then? That the President would not accept a \$35 billion cut in Medicare, as has been proposed?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: A \$35 million cut in Medicare. I think, would be looked at as undercutting what we're trying to do on health care.

Q What is the limit, do you think?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Again, I've got to look at the pieces, obviously, on what makes up that \$35 billion. But from my own experience at looking at health care reform and where the savings would be, I think it would be very difficult to achieve \$35 billion and not undercut health care reform.

Q That's spread out over five years.

Q -

not undercut what?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Not undercut health care reform.

Q But that's spread out over five years, right? So it would be \$7 billion a year, let's say. Is that too much?

Q Are you trying to offset the -

Q Is that too much?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: -

\$35 billion?

Q Yes.

DIRECTOR PANETTA: To get there I think the concern we would have is that you'd almost inevitably have to do something that would impact on beneficiaries.

Q

you're going to fight it out in conference anyway.

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Yes. That's right.

Q Why does it matter what they do?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Well, I think that to some extent, that's why we are kind of standing aside from the process. I mean, I think if they feel that that's what they have to resort to, even though the administration might not embrace it, then let them move it through the Senate and we'll fight it out in conference.

Q Do you know what's being announced on the Hill, and are you trying to offset it?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: No. What I'm trying to offset is at least the viewpoint that somehow the administration has changed its position with regard to these principles.

Q The President was asked about the transportation tax at the Marriott this afternoon

Q

House who are -

tonight than they were before you met with them -

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Pardon me? Yes. Yes, they are. Thankfully I think they're a little calmer. I think the concern, obviously, on the members of the House was that, in fact, there had been a reversal in terms of the position, and that was just not the case. And I made that clear. I said we -

the President has made those principles clear and he stands for those principles and they've accepted that. And they understand the process over in the Senate. They know what has to be done over there.

Q Well, Mr. Panetta, if they understand the process, who or what raised the alarm bells that there was this feeling that the President -

DIRECTOR PANETTA: I think there was -

the feeling when the headlines indicated that the Btu tax was dead that somehow that that was a reversal of the administration's policy. I think what Secretary Bentsen was doing when he made that comment is basically acknowledging the vote problem over in the Senate.

Q When the President was asked this afternoon about Breau's transportation tax proposal, he said -

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Breau's?

Q I'm sorry, Breau's -

ARMS Email System

that he said it would have some economic difficulties even if you raise less money. Can you explain to us what he meant by that? (Laughter.)

DIRECTOR PANETTA: No. (Laughter.) I can't explain it. I mean, I don't know what the President said at that point and I just can't -

-

Q There you go again. (Laughter.)

Q The President seemed to be leaving open the option that the Btu tax would be perhaps revived in conference.

DIRECTOR PANETTA: The Btu tax is going to be in conference. It's not a question of reviving in conference. It will be in conference. It passed the House.

Q Will you try to get a vote on the Senate floor?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Pardon?

Q Will you try to get a vote on Btu on the Senate floor?

-

whatever comes out of -

-

DIRECTOR PANETTA: That's really a call -

-

again, I think the indication from both George Mitchell and Pat Moynihan -- and I trust their opinions with regards to where the Senate's at -

-

is that a vote on the Btu would lose not only in committee, but perhaps on the floor. And it's based on that that they're looking at these other alternatives. I accept that.

Q The Btu tax -

-

Senate conferees will be members of the Finance Committee, and the Senate conferees almost assuredly would not go along with a Btu tax since it couldn't pass in the first place. Would the administration still stand behind a Btu tax in conference even though there's no way it could get out of conference?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: I have seen diametrically opposed positions go into conference and through the wonders of the legislative process, they find a way out. And I suspect that that will be the case here.

Q As a practical matter, how much difference is there other than the label between the Btu tax and the sort of tax that they're talking about in the Senate this afternoon, which would be a transportation tax plus a tax on electric utility generation. That would seem to cover most forms of energy? Is there a real practical difference there, or are we just talking about the label because people have been conditioned to say we can't vote for this thing called the Btu tax, so we're going to vote for something else called --

DIRECTOR PANETTA: You know, I've always -

-

and I've said this -

-

is that there's always a feeling that somehow the tax that's not on the table is easier to pass than the tax you're dealing with. And I think they're looking at other alternatives to the Btu tax. And if they can pull together the votes to pass those other alternatives, God bless them. But I think the bottom line here is that we need to have some kind of energy tax as part of this proposal, not just for the purposes of deficit reduction, but because it's right for the country.

MS. MYERS: One more question -

-

Q Isn't it fair to say, though, that -

MS. MYERS: -

and then the Director has to go.

Q Is it accurate to say, then, that whatever this alternative is to the Btu, that you're not necessarily -

you won't object to it, you just won't specifically endorse it; but if it's what it takes to get it out of committee, then so be it -

DIRECTOR PANETTA: You've got it. Our key -

the key right now is to move the process forward, and whatever it takes to move the process forward, we would encourage. We don't necessarily opt to endorse it. And we are going to fight for the principles that the President expressed in conference one way or the other.

MS. MYERS: Thank you.

Q Are you talking to the Congressional Black Caucus right now as well, which is concerned that

apparently enough to cancel tomorrow's meeting about entitlements?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: Obviously, they have some of the same concerns, and that's why I'm making clear to them the same points I'm making to you.

Q Did you offer -

did you contact Congressman Mfume?

DIRECTOR PANETTA: I -

we're going to be doing that.

Q Has this meeting

might this meeting happen, or is it -

DIRECTOR PANETTA: I don't know -

END6:02 P.M. EDT

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:09-JUN-1993 17:50:00.00

SUBJECT: News Calendar

TO: Dawn A. Alexander (ALEXANDER_DA) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: S. Collier Andress (ANDRESS_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John C. Angell (ANGELL_J) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joan Baggett (BAGGETT_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Heather Beckel (BECKEL_H) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Berman (BERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Robert O. Boorstin (BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bowyer (BOWYER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ken Chitester (CHITESTER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Nestor M. Davidson (DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: William Galston (GALSTON_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark Gearan (GEARAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gipple (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marcia L. Hale (HALE_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alexis Herman (HERMAN_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven M. Hilton (HILTON_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Dwight Holton (HOLTON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Julie Hopper (HOPPER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Sharon Kennedy (KENNEDY_SM) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (2560,Kristie Kenney) (TLXA1MAIL_\\F:2560\\C:KRISTie Kenney\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Leavy (LEAVY_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carola McGiffert (MCGIFFERT_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Regina T. Montoya (MONTOYA_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Lisa Mortman READ: UNKNOWN	(MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
TO: Dee Dee Myers READ: UNKNOWN	(MYERS_D) (WHO)
TO: Kathleen L. O'Neill READ: UNKNOWN	(ONEILL_K) (WHO)
TO: R. Paul Richard READ: UNKNOWN	(RICHARD_R) (WHO)
TO: John Podesta READ: UNKNOWN	(PODESTA_J) (WHO)
TO: Meeghan E. Prunty READ: UNKNOWN	(PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
TO: Bruce Reed READ: UNKNOWN	(REED_B) (OPD)
TO: Marla Romash READ: UNKNOWN	(ROMASH_M) (VPO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: David Seldin READ: UNKNOWN	(SELDIN_D) (WHO)
TO: Stephen B. Silverman READ: UNKNOWN	(SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
TO: Patti Solis READ: UNKNOWN	(SOLIS_P) (WHO)
TO: Jason M. Solomon READ: UNKNOWN	(SOLOMON_J) (WHO)
TO: Gene Sperling READ: UNKNOWN	(SPERLING_G) (OPD)
TO: Todd Stern READ: UNKNOWN	(STERN_T) (WHO)
TO: Richard Strauss READ: UNKNOWN	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Stephanie Streett READ: UNKNOWN	(STREETT_S) (WHO)
TO: Kimberly Tilley READ: UNKNOWN	(TILLEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Maria M. Tio READ: UNKNOWN	(TIO_M) (WHO)
TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan READ: UNKNOWN	(TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
TO: Christine A. Varney READ: UNKNOWN	(VARNEY_C) (WHO)
TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez READ: UNKNOWN	(RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ: UNKNOWN	(VOLES_L) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ: UNKNOWN	(WALDMAN_M) (WHO)
TO: Ann F. Walker READ: UNKNOWN	(WALKER_A) (WHO)
TO: Anne Walley READ: UNKNOWN	(WALLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Carter Wilkie READ: UNKNOWN	(WILKIE_C) (WHO)
TO: Marilyn Yager READ: UNKNOWN	(YAGER_M) (WHO)
TO: Kathy McKiernan READ: UNKNOWN	(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)
TO: David B. Anderson READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
TO: Jess Sarmiento READ: UNKNOWN	(SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
TO: Andre C. Oliver READ: UNKNOWN	(OLIVER_A) (WHO)
TO: Kelly A. Crawford READ: UNKNOWN	(CRAWFORD_K) (WHO)

ARMS Email System

TO: Deborah L. Coyle (COYLE_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Betty W Currie (CURRIE_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Erich Vaden (VADEN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Payne, Julia M (JULIA M. PAYnE@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carver, Holly D (HOLLY D. CARVer@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alpert, Dennis W (DENNIS W. ALPErT@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Wilson, Anthony T (ANTHONY T. WILSon@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Harris, Skila S (SKILA S. HARRIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Gire, Cynthia L (CYNThia L. GirE@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Aman, Sally J (SALLY J. AMAn@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (PRINCE_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer A. Allan (ALLAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Cathy R. Mays (MAYS_C) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carol H. Rasco (RASCO_C) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Gearan (GEARAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: George Stephanopoulos (STEPHANOPO_G) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David M. Kusnet (KUSNET_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Dreyer (DREYER_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Andre C. Oliver (OLIVER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (6947,Tom O'Donnell) (TLXA1MAIL\F:6947\C:TOM O'Donnell\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

NEWS CALENDAR, Edition: Thursday, June 10, 1993

The information below is for internal planning purposes only. To submit additions, corrections, suggestions, or names for the distribution list, please contact Communications Research, OEOB 197; PHONE 456 7845, FAX: 456-2239.

THUR

6/10

4pm

POTUS: Nat'l. Mult: Sclerosis Soc's Mother & Father of the Year.

Mrs. Clinton: Johns Hopkins Symposium of Health Care Reform. 11am.

Mrs. Gore: Family Circle interview.

Christopher: Athens-North Atlantic Cncl.

Shalala: Los Angeles, CA 9pm

Reno: ADL's National Commission meeting.

Reno: Anti-defamation League's Nat'l. Com. mtg, 9:30am

Reno: Nat'l. Rainbow Coalition & Citizenship Educ Fund, 12pm.

Reno: Child Sexual Abuse & Exploitation Conf., 2pm.

Reno: Adminsitratve Conf. of the US, 7pm.

Dept. of Labor: weekly jobless claims report, 8:30am.

H Approp: markup of 1994 foreign assistance.

ARMS Email System

H Labor: Weekly jobless claims, 8:30am.
H Commerce: Plant & equipment spending, 8:30am.
H Gov. Aff: Cost-Eff of nuclear triad: 9:30am
H Approp.: FY94 funding, NASA 10am
H Vet.Aff: Vet.Reemploy.Rghts 10am
H For.Rel: START, Eagleburger, former Sec. of State, 10am
H Banking/Ec.Growth&Credit.SubC: Impact, Def. Redux, 10am
H Approp/Def.SubC: Intelligence Programs 10am
H Jud/Crime.SubC: Abortion Clinic Access, 10am
H Approp./Trea.Post.&Gen.Govt.SubC. ATF&Waco, Texas, 1:30pm
S Appro/Def.SubC: FY94 funding, 10am.
S Appro.:Proposed FY94 NASA funding, 10am.
S Foreign Relations: Hearing on START II treaty, 10am.
S Approp/Sci.&Tech.SubC.: SBA funding, Bowles. SBA Admin 10am
S For. Rel.: Budget 11am
S Arm.Ser.: Full Comm. Mark-Up, FY94 Reconciliation, 2pm
S For.Rel.: Closed Briefing, NAFTA, 2pm
S Nat. Res: Public Lands Leg. 2:30pm
S Ministerial mtg NATO N. Atlntc Cncl & Coop. Cncl, Athens.
S Arm.Ser.: Homosexuals in Military. TBA
S Arm.Ser.: Homosexuals in Military, Field Trip. TBA
S Arm.Ser.: Roles & Missions, Military. JCS testimony, TBA
Nat'l. Rainbow Coalition Leadership Summit Conf. (thru 6/12)
Jesse Jackson: news conf. on Haitian refugees, 12pm.
Resources for the Future: energy tax briefing, 9:30am.
Con Liason Task Force on Sci & Tech: briefing, 9:30am.
Leadership Cncl of Aging Orgs: news conf-budget and tax props.

10am.

Administrative Conf. of the US, 1pm.
Info Sec Ovrsght Off: classic proced. for nat'l. sec docs., 9am.

FRI

6/11

US, Japan officials: trade surplus. Washington.
Christopher: Athens - North Atlantic Coop. Cncl.

Epsy: Ft. Mitchell, KY - Gov. Local Issues Conf.
Riley: Philadelphia - Ed. Newsmaker of the Year
Shalala: Hollywood, CA - Town Hall
Pena: Los Angeles, CA
Labour: Issues May Producer Price Index.
S Gov Aff: preservation/access SuprCt Justices' papers 9:30am.
S For Op Sub: Foreign aid appropriations, 10am.
S Indian Aff: Budget Request 2pm.

SAT

6/12

POTUS: radio address.
POTUS: Oxford reunion.
Christopher: Ankara and Istanbul (thru 6/13).
Gen. Powell: Harvard Commencement (CSPAN 10:30 pm).
N. Korea potential withdrawal fr Nuclr Nonprolif. Treaty.
Nigerian Presidential election.
Salute to Am. Vet. and Armed Forces, Chrisholm, MN
Anniv: June 12, 1898. Phillipine Independence Day.

SUN

6/13

VP: Michigan
David Brock, author of "Real Anita Hill" CSPAN 8pm.
K Brown: Paris Air Show.
J Brown: Chicago Medical School.
Browner: Denver, CO - Air & Waste Mgmt (thru 6/15).

MON

6/14

POTUS: travel TBA
VP: New York - UN
VP: Sust. Dev. Comm., 11am.
Mrs. Gore: College Young Democrats.
Christopher: UN World Conference on Human Rights.
Browner: Air and Waste Management Assoc., Denver
Pena: Kingspoint, NY - Maritime Academy Grad.
Commission on Sustainable Development, 1st Session, New York.
S Defense Sub: Army long-term modernization requirements, 2:30pm.
S Defense Sub: FY1994 appro. for programs, 10am.
College Dems Nat'l Conv., Georgetown (thru 6/16).
S. Pacific Regnl Environmental Program begins, Western Samoa.
Flag Day.

TUES

6/15

POTUS: travel TBA.
POTUS: Proclamation of USTR/GSP Annual Review w/ results.
Aspen: Rec. DOD recomm. for future cuts.
VP Gore: Nat. Audubon Society (via satellite).
Epsy: New York - Latino Leadership Award.
USTR: 1st qtr U.S. share of Japanese semiconductor market.

WED

6/16

POTUS: Pres. Nujoma, Namibia.
VP: Meets with Pres. Nujoma.
Kantor & EC External Trade Commissioner: Uruguay GATT.
Drug Czar nominee Lee Brown: Treasury Approp. Subcommittee.

S Treas PS Gen Gov't Sub: FY1994 appro. Nat'l Drug Control Pol

10am

THUR

6/17

American Nurses Association (thru 6/19), 11am.
O'Leary: Chicago Lab Directors mtg.
Riley: New Hampshire - J.J. Dinner.

FRI

6/18

POTUS: Jordan's King Hussein.
VP: Today Show. 7am.
Mrs. Gore: Race for the Cure BHQ.
Shalala: Syracuse, NY Maxwell School Remarks
Epsy: Chicago HS for Ag. Studies.
Riley: Burlington, VT DGA Conf. (thru 6/19).
U.S. Conf. of Mayors, New York. (thru 6/22).
WH Jazz Festival

ARMS Email System

SAT
6/19 POTUS: Boston, Northeastern Univ. Commencement speech.
Protest against cost of Boston Harbor cleanup, Boston.
Mrs. Gore: Race for the Cure 5K.
Browner: Meeting w/ Mayors, Gracie mansion, NY
Browner: New York - Nat'l. Conf. of Mayors.

SUN
6/20 POTUS: National Sports Award.
Mrs. Gore: National Service WH Reception.
Howard Kurtz, author of "Media Circus" (CSPAN, 8pm).
World Scholar Athlete Games begin, Newport, RI.
Father's Day.

MON
6/21 VP: San Francisco.
Epsy: PA - Nat'l. Dairy Forum.
S Lab HHS Educ Sub: FY 1994 appro. for agencies, 9:30am, 1:30pm.
National Service: Summer Service kickoff.
US-Mexico Binational Commission Meeting.
APEC Senior Officials Meeting, Seattle (thru 6/25).

TUES
6/22 VP: Los Angeles.

WED
6/23 VP: San Diego
Riley: Vermont
Epsy: Haines, FL - Food Link Hunger Symposium.
US, EC, Canada, Japan nail down trade deal for G-7 Summit.

THUR
6/24 Mrs. Gore: Mental Health, DC, 9am.
Mrs. Gore: Carter Center.
Pena: Detroit
S Indian Aff: Amer.Ind. Religious Freedom Act, 9:30am
S Indian Aff: FY 1994 funding, Indian programs, 10am

FRI
6/25 VP: Philadelphia
Bentsen: New York - Lieberman fundraiser.
Browner: Latham & Watkins Luncheon.
Reno: Florida Bar
Shalala: New York - Trustees Lunch.

SAT
6/26 POTUS: Minnesota - CVC.
VP: Philadelphia Convention Hall, 10am.
Brown: Jesse, CA - CA American Legion.
O'Leary: Martha's Vineyard - Bus. & Econ.

SUN
6/27 George Schultz, author of "Turmoil & Triumph" (CSPAN, 8pm).

MON
6/28 Cabinet Meeting
The President's Dinner, DNC: Washington Conv. Center.
Pena: New Jersey

TUE
6/29 POTUS: Argentina's Pres. Menem.
Shalala: Chicago - Cities Health Conf.
J. Brown: KS - American Gold Star Mothers 56th Conv.

WED
6/30 Asia-Pacific Ministerial on the Environment, Japan (thru 7/1).
Browner: Nat'l PClub.

THU
7/1 Deadline for base-closing commission's final report for POTUS.

FRI
7/2 POTUS, DeClerk & Mandela, South Africa.

SUN
7/4 Independence Day.
POTUS: Freedom Festival, Philadelphia, PA.
Unless renewed, USTR/GSP expires.
White House Staff Picnic.

MON
7/5 POTUS: San Francisco - NEA.
POTUS: Toyko (thru 7/9).
Future Business Leaders of America, DC (thru 7/8) 5,000.
Congressional Recess begins.

WED
7/7 G-7 Economic Summit, Tokyo (thru 7/8).

THUR
7/8 G-7 Economic Summit, Tokyo.

SAT
7/10 POTUS: Korea (thru 7/11).

MON
7/12 Pena: Boston.

TUES
7/13 Pena: Maine.

WEDS
7/14 O'Leary: Indianapolis - 84th Annual NAACP Conv.
Reginald Denny: trial of assailants begins.

THURS
7/15 Deadline for POTUS to approve/reject base closing list.
Deadline for report on homosexuals in the military.

FRI
7/16 USTR: "Special 301" "out-of-cycle" Italy review concluded.

THURS
7/22 American Wholesalers Marktrs Assn. Conv. (thru 7/24).

FRI
7/23 Cabinet Meeting.

SUN
7/25 POTUS: American Legion Boys Nation Reunion.

ARMS Email System

Nat'l Conf. State Leg., San Diego (thru 7/30).

MON
7/26 ASEAN Post-ministerial Conf., Singapore (thru 7/28)
TUES
7/27 Shalala: San Diego - NCSL Speech.
USTR: ITC final injury decisions in flat-rolled steel AD/CVD.

WED
7/28 Browner: Speech at Nat. Conf. of State Leg., San Diego
SAT
7/31 USTR: "Special 301" Thailand review concluded.
USTR: Hungary/Taiwan submit plans under "Special 301."

SUN
8/1 National Urban League Convention (thru 8/4).
FRI
8/6 CPTA Chapter 10 panel should issue its decision in the magnesium injury case.
SAT

8/7 Congressional Recess (thru 9/6)
TUES
8/10 Browner: Am. Bar Ass'n, NY
THUR
8/12 World Youth Cong. (Pope JP II attends), Denver (thru 8/15)
SPacific Forum Post-Forum Dialogue, Nauru (thru 8/13)

MON
8/23 American Soc. for Industrial Security Convention (thru 8/25).
SAT
8/28 30th Anniv. of the 1963 Civil Rights March on DC.
SUN
8/29 2nd USIA NIS Diplomatic Training Sem., Salzburg (thru 9/10)
MON
8/30 "Special 301" review of Egypt, Korea, Poland, Spain concluded.
TUES
9/7 Trial of former Reagan HUD official Deborah Gore Dean.
FRI
9/10 1st Intn'l Islamic Book Fair, Philadelphia (thru 9/16)
SAT
9/18 Browner: Keynote, Vermont Nat. Resources Council

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:09-JUN-1993 18:31:00.00

SUBJECT: Press Briefing by Dee Dee Myers 6.9.93

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christian M. Baldia (BALDIA_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JGILL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLBERGER@EOP.OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bowyer (BOWYER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas O. Levenberg (LEVENBERG_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=EASYLEINK@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030,21@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JACK BELCHER@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\WH-OUTBOX-DISTR(A)LEX-LUTHOR.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JCMA(A)REAGAN.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\HES(A)AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (ALEXIS BYRNE@1=US@2=ATTMAIL@3=GOV+USDA.SIES@5=SIESNET@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JPOLICY(A)ESUSDA.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JOLYTF(A)NIP.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MARLA E. ROMASH@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\CBS:NET_DIST@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 9, 1993

PRESS BRIEFING
BY DEE DEE MYERS

The Briefing Room

2:07 P.M. EDT

MS. MYERS: Now, the news you've all been waiting for. We welcome the announcement by the government of Kuwait that it has lifted the economic boycott of companies that do business with Israel. Elimination of this boycott has been a high priority for the President since he assumed office. The administration has repeatedly pressed Arab governments and our allies to end this economic discrimination.

In this regard, during his visit to the Middle East in February, within a month of assuming office, Secretary of State Warren Christopher emphasized the priority that this administration places on elimination of the boycott during his visit to Kuwait and other Arab capitals. We've continued to press the issue, and since then, through a variety of bilateral and multilateral contacts, Kuwait's action also represents an important step forward in opening additional business opportunities for American companies in the Middle East.

We will continue to urge others in the Middle East to follow Kuwait's lead and eliminate their adherence to the boycott. We will also continue to work with our allies in Europe and Japan to take further steps to eliminate the boycott.

Q Is there any quid pro quo in term of Palestinians, refugees and so forth -

-

MS. MYERS: No.

ARMS Email System

Q

on the West Bank or Gaza? Do they still live under military occupation?

MS. MYERS: Well, that's part of the Middle East peace process that is ongoing. As you know, the parties have agreed to resume talks on June 15th -

Q The mult's not on.

MS. MYERS: The mult's not on? You missed that entire statement? We'll do it again.

Q Restart the clock.

Q A new ten minutes.

MS. MYERS: Five hundred billion in deficit reduction -- (laughter) -

broad-

based energy tax. (Laughter.) You asked for it. I was only to bring them up if you all asked for a repetition of the principles.

Q Dee Dee, what can you -

can you confirm reports that the U.S. is sending AC-

130 gunships to Somalia? And what's that all about?

MS. MYERS: There has been a request for additional equipment. We're reviewing -

including attack helicopters. We're reviewing that request now.

Q But these are AC-

130 gunships, which are fixed-

wing, they were used in Vietnam. And there are reports that these gunships, these fixed-

wing aircraft, are being sent to Somalia. And that was not part of the U.N.'s request. Is there -

MS. MYERS: I'll have to get back -

Q

something over and above the U.N. that the U.S. is involved in?

MS. MYERS: No, the only information I have is that there has been a request for additional equipment, that we're reviewing it. Obviously we're going to comply with the U.N. resolution, which is that we're going to find out who is responsible for the attacks over the weekend and take appropriate action. But I don't have any more specifics on this at this time.

Q Could you take that question, though, to see if these -

MS. MYERS: Sure. Sure.

Q Dee Dee, on Haiti, is the Clinton administration going to abide with the ruling by the judge, or are you going to appeal?

MS. MYERS: No. We will not seek a stay in the Haiti ruling. And the Justice Department is reviewing the broader ruling to decide if we'll seek an appeal at some point. But we will not

ARMS Email System

seek a stay of the decision. So, in other words, the people in Guantanamo will be paroled -

-

brought into the United States.

Q -

-

still under review? Where does that stand?
That was something that the President was willing to change.

MS. MYERS: Well, the Senate, as you know, voted on that and it is part of the NIH bill, which the President will sign.

Q So has he dropped this -

-

MS. MYERS: Yes. The Senate has spoken on it, and it is part of the NIH authorization bill which, again the President plans to sign.

Q Are the detainees going to be brought into the Miami area? Is that where they're going to be released? And will any federal funds go along with their release to help care for them?

MS. MYERS: There is a resettlement task force made up of the Justice Department's community relations service, the INS, HHS, and some nongovernment organizations that deal with refugees -

-

the same groups that have been paroling the HIV positive Haitians. And we've already paroled in over 100 since January, I believe. So that process is ongoing.

Q How many in this new group?

MS. MYERS: There's 148 remaining, I believe, is the number. It's down from at one point a high of -

-

actually it was 158, down from a high of 300 at one point. We've been paroling them in for several months and the remainder will be brought in.

Q Dee Dee, when will the remainder be arriving in the United States?

MS. MYERS: I don't have a specific date. For the specific details, I will refer you to the Justice Department since they're coordinating -

-

Q Let me just ask another question. Will you appeal the judge's decision?

MS. MYERS: That's still under review at the Justice Department.

Q So the only thing you're going to do now is you're not going to ask for a stay in the decision.

MS. MYERS: Correct.

Q But you're leaving open the opportunity of appealing it.

MS. MYERS: Correct.

Q Now on this NIH bill that bars the U.S. from permitting HIV positive immigrants into the United States, how does that effect your decision today?

MS. MYERS: Well, it doesn't. I think, even under the law the Attorney General has some flexibility in paroling people in, making determinations on a case by case basis. And then there are other provisions of the law that deal with people who are in U.S. custody or on U.S. soil. So I don't think that this -

-

I don't think the two are necessarily related.

Q Dee Dee, the judge had some harsh words for the Clinton administration's policy, which he described generally as cruel and inhuman. What's your reaction to that?

MS. MYERS: Well, we're going to comply with the judge's

ARMS Email System

ruling. Obviously, we thought we -

-

the policy predated the Clinton administration. We thought under the circumstances it was prudent to continue doing what we were doing, which was reviewing the cases one at a time and paroling people in on a needs basis, but we will comply with judge's order.

Q Did he determine that all of these detainees are otherwise eligible for asylum in the U.S.?

MS. MYERS: Yes, I believe that's the case.

Q Can you comment on Senator Breaux's proposal today

--

MS. MYERS: We haven't had a chance to review it in any detail. I've just seen the broad outlines of it. Again, the President's position has not changed. He remains committed to some form of a broad-

based energy tax, and we'll take a look at what the specific details of this proposal are.

Q -

-

does it appear on the face to satisfy the President's -

-

MS. MYERS: We just haven't had a chance to review it in any detail and to review what the impacts of it will be.

Q What now do you say to members of the House who said we asked the President not to pull the rug out from under us on the Btu tax; he promised he wouldn't and now he did?

MS. MYERS: Well, first of all, the President hasn't endorsed any particular proposal. I think it was clear that when the package came out of the House there will be changes in the Senate. We didn't expect the Senate to vote for the House version of the bill and we certainly don't expect the House to accept the Senate version of the bill. That's what the conference process is about. I think the President made clear through the House process that he was committed to some principles, including a broad-

based energy tax. He proposed a Btu tax. He thought that that was the best way to achieve something that was fair and balanced and affected different parts of the country equally. But he wants the process to go forward. He believes that they're making progress in the Senate Finance Committee, that the process is going forward. He wants to make sure that the -

-

that his principles are maintained, that the package is fair, that it achieves a certain amount of deficit reduction.

Q Can you confirm from this podium that the Btu has been dropped?

MS. MYERS: It's up the Senate Finance Committee. I think what the President has indicated is that he's willing to look at alternatives. He wants a broad-

based energy tax. Whatever comes out of the Senate will include a broad-

based energy tax. Then it will go back to the conference committee where I'm sure there will be further changes. And this is something that the Congress is going to have to work out among itself. But the President has not changed the principles of this package.

Q No, I'm not asking you that. I'm asking is Secretary Bentsen right in saying it's been dropped?

MS. MYERS: I think it's clear that there's not support on the Senate Finance committee for a Btu tax. I think that that's clear. What the President would like to see is a broad-

based energy tax. We have a lot lower energy taxes than most other -

-

than perhaps all other industrialized countries. I think whatever the final version of this package is will include some kind of broad-

based energy tax. It's up to the Senate Finance Committee to move

ARMS Email System

the process forward at this point.

Q So are the House members unjustified in being so angry, as they have been this morning? How do you -

-

I mean, they're furious at you.

MS. MYERS: I mean, I think that we need to make clear to them what the President is doing. And we will continue to work with them throughout this process. The President has not changed his commitment to a broad-

based energy tax. It's something that he made clear to the House, that he would stick by. The program still includes massive deficit reduction. It still includes some tax increases, particularly on the wealthiest people in this country. It's still going to create jobs and get the economy moving again. The broad principles were maintained in the House process. We're confident they'll be maintained in the Senate process.

Q Dee Dee, were all these House members then -

-

were they just misinterpreting what the White House said when they thought they were voting for a Btu tax which would remain through the process. Were they wrong in assuming that?

MS. MYERS: I think that they knew that there would be changes in the Senate process. That's always the case. The President hasn't endorsed any particular version of -

-

the Senate hasn't produced a package yet. But what the President would like to see is that this process go forward. He wants to make sure that it does include a broad-

based energy tax, that it's fair, that it achieves massive deficit reduction -

-

yada, yada, yada, yada.
(Laughter.) And I think we're going to continue to work with the House to make sure that that is clear.

Q Given that your goal is to get this on the Senate floor, wouldn't it make political sense to support a plan by a member of the Finance Committee who has a swing vote?

MS. MYERS: We'll take a look at it. At this point, Senator Bentsen met with Moynihan and Mitchell this morning and Senator Breaux. The conversations are ongoing, but we haven't had a chance to fully review it. It's up to the Senate Finance Committee to work out some kind of a next step.

Q But also Senator Boren has indicated that he's willing -- he hasn't exactly endorsed the Breaux proposal, but it does have \$30 billion in entitlement changes in it as well. And if you could get Boren as well as obviously Breaux supporting the -

-

MS. MYERS: I mean, no, we're for getting people to support this. I mean, that is the goal here. But, again, the specific details of it -

-

exactly what reductions, what cuts will be made, exactly how a new energy tax might be structured have yet to be worked out. That process is ongoing. We're very interested in it. We'd like to see it resolved.

Q Dee Dee, can you clarify what you mean by broad-

based? Specifically, does the President mean that the energy tax would have to apply to all forms of fuel, or would he be willing to accept an energy tax that applied to transportation fuels only?

MS. MYERS: I think what he's interested in seeing is making sure that the tax doesn't hit one industry or one region of the country disproportionately.

Q But would a transportation -

-

a tax on all fuels used in transportation meet that criteria?

ARMS Email System

MS. MYERS: We'll have to look at it. We'll be reviewing it for exactly that.

Q You're not ruling out that kind of a -

-

MS. MYERS: We just haven't had a chance to look at it and to assess what the impacts of it might be.

Q Just back on the House members for a minute. The message to House members a few weeks ago, according to the administration, was we know you're worried that we're going to sell you out in the Senate; I'm calling you up to tell you that we're not going to do that. Now they feel that that's happened, what's the response to that?

MS. MYERS: The President has not changed his commitment to this package. Again, I think everybody knew that there will be changes in the package coming out of the House. The President said he would continue to support an energy tax. That's clear.

Q Did the President tell any House members, for example, that he might abandon a Btu tax, but would continue to have an energy tax -

-

MS. MYERS: I think that it was clear that there would be changes in the energy tax. And the fact that Senator Boren was talking with House members even as the process was unfolding made it clear that there was serious opposition and that there would be -

-

that there would inevitably be changes, as there always are in this process. Every budget -

-

first of all, this is the first budget that's gone up to the Hill that hasn't been dead on arrival in more than a decade. Secondly, there's always a lot of back and forth and toing and froing in this process. I think everybody was prepared for that. The President maintains his commitment to an energy tax. We'll see what form the Senate works out. And then it has to go back to the conference process where a final version gets worked out before it gets adopted by either body.

Q Dee Dee, Charlie Rangel, who is no babe in the woods up there, is furious about what happened on this. Where is the disconnect? Is it on his part or on your part or -

-

what's going on here? Why are you getting shelled, taking heavy shelling from key Democrats, key members of your own party on this?

MS. MYERS: Well, I think we're going to continue to work with them. I think we'll continue to reach out to people and make sure that they understand what it is the President is doing, that he hasn't endorsed any particular alternative at this point, but that he wants to see the process go forward. I think everybody's interested in seeing the process go forward.

Q Is the President going to fight for a Btu tax in conference?

MS. MYERS: We'll see what comes out of the Senate. I think that he's interested in making sure that there's some kind of broad-

based energy tax, but he wants the package to pass. He proposed a Btu tax. He's made it clear he thinks -

-

thought that that was the best way to achieve his objectives, but that may not be possible.

Q Dee Dee, will we get an announcement on Walter Mondale today?

MS. MYERS: The appointment to Tokyo is not complete. There's still diplomatic channels that have to be locked up.

Q How about the appointment to Italy?

Q Do you expect it today -

-

Q -

-
Ambassador Bartholomew?

MS. MYERS: I don't think so. I don't expect any ambassadorial appointments today.

Q How about Supreme Court?

MS. MYERS: Possible this week. Supreme Court, I think. We're still hopeful that it will happen later this week. I don't expect it today -

-

it won't happen today. I think it's less likely tomorrow, although not completely out of the question. It could go as late as Saturday.

Q Dee Dee, what's delaying it? Two weeks ago you said we were going to get it that week and it keeps getting pushed back. Are there problems with the nomination -

-

MS. MYERS: No

-

few complications in the process that have nothing to do with substance.

Q Are you worried about some of these reports coming out about Babbitt? They're all over the place.

MS. MYERS: Absolutely not, those are old, rehashed. I think they've been discredited previously.

Q In fact, there was one report today that wasn't old.

MS. MYERS: There is nothing new that has the President worried about the substance of any of the people that he's considering.

Q Do you know when Judge Breyer's being released from the hospital?

MS. MYERS: I don't. Soon I think, in the next day or two.

Q Dee Dee, can you be a little bit more specific about what it is that's holding up the Mondale appointment?

MS. MYERS: Just closing the diplomatic loop. I'm not sure that Tokyo has signed off yet on -

-

Q

Q Would there be any concern on Tokyo's part about Mondale's rhetoric pre-

1984 at the -

-

MS. MYERS: I don't believe there is any problems. I just think that the process isn't complete.

Q Are you aware of the some of the things that he said about trade with Japan or on the -

-

MS. MYERS: I am not personally familiar other than in broad terms. I think that's something that's considered but I -

-

again, I don't think it's a substantive problem, it's just appropriate protocols have to be observed and it just takes a little time.

Q -

-

clarify this House debate issue. You said that everyone knows going into these things that there are changes that happen in conference and what not. It was precisely that knowledge that prompted the House members to say to Clinton, we want to be sure if we go out on this limb -

-

and I believe the phrase Charles Wilson of Texas used was: If we go out on this limb, you'll be there with us. And at the House Democratic Caucus two weeks ago, the President said if you go out on that limb, I'll be there with you; they gave him a standing ovation and all. What you're saying is that limb was labeled broad-

based energy tax, not Btu tax?

MS. MYERS: I think that when it's said and done that the -

-

Q What was the label then?

MS. MYERS: I don't remember the exact words of the debate. And I can't certainly know how people interpreted it. But I think the President is clearly committed to a broad-

based energy tax.

We're going to move this process forward. I think it's going to contain all the elements that the President -

-

that it contained coming out of the House. And we will work very hard on the final details. And we'll consult with the House throughout this process. And, again, I would emphasize the President has not signed onto any particular version of the Senate plan. The Senate hasn't even -

-

the Senate Finance Committee hasn't even worked out a final deal yet. So the process is going to move forward. The President wants to see it moved forward. But he wants to see his principles preserved.

Q Do you deny that in the hours and days leading up to the vote in the House, the President and senior members of the administration promised some House members that the energy part of the bill would be changed and promised other members that it wouldn't be changed?

MS. MYERS: I think that it was clear that there would be changes in the Senate. I don't think that that was in doubt.

Q -

-

fully informed the members who this morning are complaining that there would be changes? There was no failure of communication on the administration's part to the members who are unhappy today?

MS. MYERS: Well, I can't -

-

I mean, I haven't had conversations with members, and I probably haven't seen everything that they're saying. But I think from our perspective it was clear that there would be changes. I don't know what individual members might -

-

conversations they might have had with other people in the administration. But I think was clear -

-

it was certainly our intention to make it clear coming out that there would be changes in a variety of elements of the package, including the energy tax.

Q Is it true, though, that early on you were trying to convince members that you would not make changes that would bother them; and later while the vote was going on, you were assuring some more conservative members that you definitely would make changes?

MS. MYERS: I think throughout the process the President tried to emphasize that he was going to fight for the broad principles of this package, which he's continued to do. Again, I don't think -- you all have been here longer than I have, but I don't think anybody expected this package would go -

ARMS Email System

-
go through the House
and then into the Senate without changes. And I think it was very
clear from what members of the Senate were saying prior to the vote
in the House that there would be a fight on the energy tax.

Q Did he say anything about it in his broadcast -

-
or
interviews to the affiliates?

MS. MYERS: He didn't -

-
he did, actually. And I don't
have a transcript in front of me, but he said essentially what I've
said, is that he's going to continue to fight for an energy tax, that
he hasn't endorsed any particular proposal at this point.

Q You're putting out a transcript of that, of the
interview?

MS. MYERS: I don't know, I'll have to check and get
back to you.

Q Dee Dee, given the White House opposition to a
gasoline tax, is there any way that it could support the Breaux
transportation tax, which relies heavily on taxes on fuels such as
gasoline -

MS. MYERS: One of the reports that I saw on the Breaux
-- or I think it was a quote from Breaux -- this actually would
result in a lower gasoline tax than the Btu tax. So we'll take a
look at that and see what the specific elements of it are.

Q -

-
open to a gas tax if it -

-
if the figures work
out nice?

MS. MYERS: Well, no, this is -

I don't think anybody
is proposing a straight gas tax. The Btu tax included a tax on
gasoline. A transportation tax would include a tax on gasoline. But
neither of those proposals is specifically a gas tax, which exempts
all other forms of energy. And I think that's -

-
again, we're
looking at something that doesn't tax one particular industry or hit
one particular region of the country harder than others.

Q The Secretary of the Treasury said this morning
that the decision to pull the Btu tax is a victory by special
interests in Washington. Given that the President has for months
implored Americans to stand up against special interests and fight
with him, do you take this as an indication that people out in
America aren't overly excited by the President's package?

MS. MYERS: I don't think anybody's overly excited about
taxes. But the bottom line is if you're going to reduce the deficit
and get the economy back into some kind of sound shape, prudent
spending cuts and some revenue increases are going to be necessary.
Nobody -

-
I mean, if you could do this without raising taxes, I think
everybody would prefer that option. The President doesn't believe,
under the circumstances, that's possible. We have a \$4 trillion
debt, an exploding deficit. He's committed to doing something about
that. Already his proposal for \$500 billion of deficit reduction has
meant the lowest interest rates in 20 years, 755,000 new jobs, best
housing sales in seven years. I mean, this is having a real positive
impact on the economy, because it's disciplined.

Q People don't seem to be getting that message.

MS. MYERS: I think we're going to keep fighting to make
sure they do get it. I think that when you talk about the package in
broad terms and people understand that it's fair, that it will bring
the deficit down and result in long

ARMS Email System

term economic growth, they do support it. And I think we've conceded that we haven't done as good a job as we possibly could have in talking about this, and I hope we do a better job.

Q -

-

talk on this subject when he talks to the business roundtable?

MS. MYERS: I think he'll talk about the plan. I don't know that he'll talk specifically about the energy tax. It's not currently part of his comments, but -

-

Q Given that it's -

-

the Breaux proposal -

-

MS. MYERS: He is a textual deviant. (Laughter.)

Q -

-

can't you do that during the first five minutes? (Laughter.)

MS. MYERS: Oh, there's a good reason.

Q Well, might it be that given the Breaux proposal is a tax on the -

-

on all -

-

Q -

-

define textual deviant? (Laughter.)

MS. MYERS: I'm sorry. Who -

-

Q Is there a point at which the White House draws the line on entitlement cuts -

-

on further entitlement cuts?

MS. MYERS: I don't know that it's a -

-

that there's a specific line where it will take X billion but not Y billion. But the President has reiterated today that he wants to make sure that the progressive nature of his package is protected. So, yes.

Q For example, Charlie Rangel this morning says \$30 billion more in cuts, and I'm going to walk away from this. Is that

-

-

MS. MYERS: I don't know that we've drawn a line in the sand like that. But the President is not going support a package that he does not believe is progressive. You know, the one he proposed -

-

75 percent of the new taxes come from people making over \$100,000 a year -

-

that was deliberate, and he's going to make sure that that's protected. Again, we're not going to draw a line in the sand because -

-

depending on how the package is structured -- but we will look very closely to make sure progressivity is maintained.

Q Dee Dee, if the Breaux proposal gets off the ground, I think that generates \$40 billion as opposed to \$70 billion. So that's a \$30 billion shortfall. Where will you recommend making up that \$30 billion?

MS. MYERS: It's not up to us to recommend. The Senate's going to work that out. And we will take a look at what they propose.

Q They will ask you for recommendations.

Q Why isn't up to the President to make -

-

show some preference here in -

-

MS. MYERS: I think Secretary Bentsen is representing the administration in this process. The President has made clear that he wants to protect the progressive nature of his package. Now, if it's -

-

I mean, we're not going to sit down at this point and say you can only take so much from here and so much from there. What he's going to say is give me a package that cuts the deficit, it's progressive, contains that broad-

based energy tax, and give me something I can support based on the principles.

Q Where exactly are the limits -

-

this new openness on your part?

MS. MYERS: The limits are within those principles. The majority of new taxes, new revenue, has to come from the wealthiest Americans. He would like to see that protected. It has to have \$500 billion in deficit reduction. You can't hit -

-

the most vulnerable in society too hard. And those are subjective judgments. But I think the President's package makes clear what his values are in that respect.

Q Dee Dee, does he believe that he has tied himself in the past too closely to specific aspects of the package so that when one of those goes down, it appears to be a personal loss for him?

MS. MYERS: I think that that's a debatable notion. I think that sometimes you get too caught in the specifics and the fact

-

-

if you look at the way the House debate went, I think we maintained probably 90 percent of what we started with. And yet, I'm not sure that that was effectively communicated. So perhaps that's our fault. But I think it's important that people know what it is the President's fighting for. Who benefits from this economic plan? And the only way to do that is just to keep reemphasizing what it is that this package is designed to achieve, who it's designed to benefit, and how we expect to get there.

Q Dee Dee, despite President Clinton's endorsement in an appearance with him in L.A., Michael Woo lost the mayoral race by a fairly large margin. How do you account for that? And has President Clinton become an electoral liability to his own party?

MS. MYERS: As the President said at the time, Mike Woo is a good Democrat, somebody who had good ideas. Mike Woo very much wanted the President's endorsement and had been a solid supporter of the President's during the campaign. And the President endorsed him. That was very much a race about local issues. It was about the state of the Los Angeles economy, about crime.

Q Did he have anything to say about it this morning, Dee Dee?

ARMS Email System

MS. MYERS: No. And I don't know that he's called either candidate yet. But I think he said during the campaign that he would work with whoever the new mayor was to move forward in rebuilding that city. And I think he fully expects to do that.

Q Will he be much more selective in his endorsements in local races such as the one in Texas and in L.A.?

MS. MYERS: You know, it depends on if candidates want him to endorse them. I mean, I don't think we have any particular criteria, but, you know, you have to stand by your friends and sometimes they win and sometimes they lose. But I would also point out -- I'm shocked that I haven't been asked -- about the Monterey congressional race. We now are three for three in those -

-

Q The President didn't endorse him -

-

MS. MYERS: Oh, absolutely. We're totally for Sam Farr.

Q -

-

Republican.

MS. MYERS: So, if you want to keep score here, of the federal races we've won all three of the seats that were in special elections because of appointments.

Q Squeakers.

MS. MYERS: Squeakers. That wasn't a squeaker up there.

Q What can you tell us about Chelsea's graduation?

MS. MYERS: She graduated. I don't know any other details. I just don't have any.

Q First in her class?

MS. MYERS: I don't know that they tally those things. And since she's been here such a short time, I think -

-

she's a very good student, though. I'm sure she did well.

Q Is the administration now ready to take action and make a decision on Judge Sessions?

MS. MYERS: We're still awaiting a recommendation from the Attorney General.

Q Dee Dee, can you outline what's on the schedule for the rest of the week and if there's anything next week as far as travel?

MS. MYERS: I wish I had more details on the rest of this week. I don't at this point.

Q Is the Black Caucus coming over tomorrow?

MS. MYERS: They're meeting today. We said we'd meet with them, but we'll see what comes out of this meeting.

Q I'm sorry, they're meeting -

-

MS. MYERS: No, no, they're meeting with each other -

-

they're having a meeting.

Q With themselves today.

MS. MYERS: Yes.

Q But tomorrow are they not meeting

-

MS. MYERS: There's nothing hard on the schedule. We're trying to work it out, but it's up to them, I think.

ARMS Email System

Q On another topic, does the administration -

Q Let's see if she can answer -

MS. MYERS: I'm sorry. Let me go back. There are no specific -

there are no travel plans for next week at this point. I think it's unlikely that any will be added before Saturday when the President goes to Boston to address the commencement at Northeastern, and then he'll attend a fundraiser in Boston and one in Maine.

Q That's a week from Saturday?

MS. MYERS: That's a week from Saturday.

Q Is that an overnight?

MS. MYERS: No, it's a day trip. Fundraiser for Kennedy and fundraiser for Mitchell.

Q -

on the space station redesign options?

MS. MYERS: He will be briefed on that tomorrow

Q Is there any timetable -

MS. MYERS: I don't know. I'll have to check and get back to you.

Q Dee Dee, if you were to nominate Judge Breyer, would he feel he has to talk to him personally before doing so? And could he do it on the telephone or in person?

MS. MYERS: I'm not going to comment on the specific process.

Q You mentioned yesterday about how he feels in his heart and so forth. If he's never talked to Judge Breyer, how could he decide so certainly over who he wants?

MS. MYERS: The President will make a decision. I just don't have anything to -

I don't want to say anything about what process may or may not take place.

Q Is there a timetable yet on staff reorganization? Do you know when there's going to be an announcement on that?

MS. MYERS: There's nothing scheduled, and I have not talked to Mack about it in the last couple days.

Q What about Skip Rutherford? Is he going to be hired by the White House?

MS. MYERS: I don't know. I'll have to refer you to Mack on that.

Q Dee Dee, you say Tokyo hasn't signed off yet on the ambassador. How about countries like Germany, Italy, Spain?

MS. MYERS: I just don't have any ambassadorial announcements today. Those are all in process and we're waiting to just go through the diplomatic channels.

Q Do you expect to make them this week?

MS. MYERS: I wouldn't rule it out.

Q Is one of the President's principles on the deficit reduction package that it must contain \$500 billion in deficit reduction over the period?

MS. MYERS: That's been something we've been committed to, yes.

Q And the President continues to oppose a gas tax?

MS. MYERS: A straight-

ARMS Email System

up, solo gas tax is something
that he has not supported. In particular -

well, yes.

Q Does the President believe that it's appropriate
for members of his administration to belong to clubs that exclude
women?

Q Could you repeat the question?

MS. MYERS: Does the President believe that it's
appropriate for members of his administration to belong to clubs that
exclude women. I have not spoken to him specifically about Mr.
Gergen's membership in the -

-

Q Ohhh. (Laughter.)

MS. MYERS:

so I will have to take that question.

Q -

-

as a general practice, does he think it's
appropriate for one of the President's -

-

MS. MYERS: I was trying not to answer the general one,
Susan.

Q -

for one of the President's most senior advisors
to belong to a club that excludes women? A club that involves
business networking and has some professional overtones -

-

is that
something he's comfortable with?

MS. MYERS: I'll have to take the question. I just
don't know.

Q Are you aware of any other members of the
administration that belong to single-
sex clubs?

MS. MYERS: I have no idea.

Q The CIA and FBI have apparently concluded that Iraq
was behind the effort to assassinate President Bush in Kuwait. Has
that report come to the White House yet?

MS. MYERS: The FBI investigation is ongoing. We don't
have anything to say pending the results of that.

Q Do you have any idea of when you anticipate getting
results?

MS. MYERS: I think they're making good progress but I
don't have a hard time line.

Q Dee Dee, leftover question from yesterday that you
were going to, I think, take. I don't know how formally, but the
status of the review of the travel office situation.

MS. MYERS: Yes, I did check on that. There's no -

-

it's
ongoing; there is no particular time line on it. The people involved
in Mack's office and in Panetta's office continue to interview people
and are making their determinations.

Q Are the personnel involved still receiving paid
administrative leave?

MS. MYERS: Oh, yes, we put them on administrative leave
pending the outcome of this. That has not changed.

Q What about the FBI part of the investigation?

MS. MYERS: I refer that to the FBI.

Q Is there some point at which they would say if this happens, investigation over, no charges or whatever or would they just never say -

-

MS. MYERS: I don't know. I would have to refer you to them. I think it's been made clear. I'm not entirely familiar with FBI practices. (Laughter.)

Q I don't know where we got that idea.

Q -

-

difference between clubs that -- based on sex -- based on race? I'm asking because I know Clinton has not played golf at -

-

MS. MYERS: Right.

Q And I guess I was surprised that Gergen seems not to want to -

-

MS. MYERS: I think it's clear that this question is being asked in the context of Mr. Gergen's membership. I would prefer to take the question. I don't want to philosophize from the podium here.

Q Dee Dee, on the deficit, a senior White House official yesterday said that your current interest rate forecast is way ahead of what you originally anticipated and because of that the deficit will be substantially lower than you first anticipated. And I wondered what -

-

can you give us a ballpark as to how much lower the deficit will be? And if it's substantial, does that affect the need to reduce the deficit \$500 billion over five years?

MS. MYERS: I just don't think we've made all those calculations yet. Obviously we said at the time we wanted to make the most conservative estimates possible. Interest rates have come down, have exceeded our expectations, which is good news. It saved consumers already \$16 billion in interest. But I don't have the tabulations, and I don't know how that would affect our commitment.

Q -

-

translates into how much lower the deficit -

-

MS. MYERS: No. I just don't know that we've run all those numbers yet.

Q I'm asking about General Campbell, called "the critical general." I wonder if you've heard from the Air Force, any report of whether or not he did say -

-

MS. MYERS: No.

Q What sort of public reaction has you had about this?

MS. MYERS: I don't know that we've had much. I don't think we've had a particular surge of calls or anything.

Q Do you see any parallel between Truman and MacArthur?

MS. MYERS: No, I think this is a little bit different. I don't even want to speculate on it, actually. The Air Force is handling it, and we'll let them move forward.

Q The President's not going to fire him?

ARMS Email System

MS. MYERS: We're going to wait for the Air Force to conclude its review, and we won't have anything to say -

-

Q Can the President take action as Commander-

in-

Chief
without the Air Force review? If he wanted to, could he say, "You're outta here, buddy"?

MS. MYERS: I would imagine so, but I don't know what the specific -

-

how that would work.

Q And could you tell me why he does not?

MS. MYERS: I think he feels the appropriate way to handle this is let -

there's a process within the branches, the Air Force is reviewing it. We're going to let that process go forward.

Q Why, when the man is clearly insubordinate?

MS. MYERS: I don't think that is clear. That's what the review process is going to establish.

Q It doesn't take four days to get an answer to that question.

MS. MYERS: I think that -

-

what the Air Force has said
is that the general who is conducting the review will have a report by mid-

June. (Laughter.) I think it's appropriate that the Air Force handle that, and we will allow them to do it according to their own timetable.

Q Do you expect a report before the Supreme Court --

Q Who's he reporting to? Who are they reporting to?

MS. MYERS: I assume he's reporting to the service chief, to -

-

Q Service chief?

MS. MYERS: Yes, to General McPeak.

Thank you.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:42 P.M. EDT

#81-

06/09

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:09-JUN-1993 11:44:00.00

SUBJECT: AGAM 6.9.93

TO: Patricia A. Clark (CLARK_P) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Arthur L. Jones (JONES_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Berman (BERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Nestor M. Davidson (DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan (TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Arnold Shore (SHORE_A) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Keith Boykin (BOYKIN_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Leavy (LEAVY_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas F. McLarty (MCLARTY_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Doris G. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret A. Williams (WILLIAMS_MA) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce K. Sasser (SASSER_B) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marla Romash (ROMASH_M) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Akey (AKEY_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christine A. Varney (VARNEY_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) (WHO)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATOR: NEWS (6=NEWS@2=ATTMAIL@1=US@MRX@EOPMRX)

ATT CREATION DATE/TIME:09-JUN-1993 07:40:00.00

ATT BODY PART TYPE: B

ATT SUBJECT: AGAM 5/9

ATT TO: BAUER (HANK_BAUER@4=NCC-KC@5=OIRM@3=GOV+USDA.OIRM.KC@2=ATTMAIL@1=US@MRX@EOPMRX)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: PAO (6=PAO@4=W01B@3=USDA.FS.X400@2=ATTMAIL@1=US@MRX@EOPMRX)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: ALEXANDER (ALEXANDER_DA@A1@CD)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: BOYKIN (BOYKIN_K@A1@CD)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: ELLER (ELLER_J@A1@CD)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: GILL (GILL_J@A1@CD)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: INADOMI (INADOMI_L@A1@CD)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: PODESTA (PODESTA_J@A1@CD)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: RASCO (RASCO_C@A1@CD)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TO: TREVELYAN (TREVELYAN_S@A1@CD)

READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TEXT:

Enclosed file name.

0609.TXT

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====

ATT CREATOR: UNKNOWN (UNKNOWN)

ATT CREATION DATE/TIME:09 JUN 1993 07:40:00.00

ATT BODY PART TYPE: A

ATT SUBJECT:

ATT TEXT:

Wednesday, June 9, 1993

* * * * * COPYRIGHT NOTIFICATION * * * * *
Redistributing AG a.m. outside USDA violates copyright on the source material.

STUDY SHOWS PREFERENCE FOR LOW-FAT LUNCHES (AP-6/8) -- A study of lunches chosen by elementary school students indicates that a significant percentage will choose low-fat items voluntarily. A spokeswoman for Public Voice for Food and Health Policy said the study sends a strong message to USDA. Public Voice applauds changes USDA has made to offer low-fat items in the school lunch program, but it says the department needs to go further.

FOREST PLAN EXPECTED (Reuter-6/8) -- Sec. Babbitt said he expects the administration's plan for managing federal forests in the Northwest, to be presented in the next few weeks, to require some legislation to resolve the conflicts. He said the plan would not be "painless in all locations" and it's likely some workers will be dislocated.

REPORT ON FARM INCOME FIGURES (Reuter-6/7) -- A GAO report, requested by Sen. Bob Kerrey (D-Nebr.), says there are a number of reasons why IRS and USDA figures for farm income differ. GAO also said, "Data users must use caution when using either agency's aggregate figures to portray the financial

condition of US farms," because financial conditions vary among different groups within the farm sector. A USDA official pointed to annual USDA surveys to gather information about conditions of various-sized farm operations. He noted that use of an industry-wide figure could be misleading.

ENERGY TAX SITUATION (Dailies) -- President Clinton departed from his quest for a Btu tax; Sec. Bentsen said a replacement should be designed to deter consumption. The Btu tax had been criticized for being unfair to farmers and others. A Post article says the transportation fuels tax that is gaining momentum in the Senate would generally spare farmers and others opposed to the Btu tax.

(Reuters-6/8) -- A coalition of farm groups is seeking a broad exemption from energy taxes for on-farm use of diesel fuel, gasoline, electricity, propane and natural gas. They also want fuels used in fertilizers and pesticides exempted, and methanol and ethanol exempted. The groups are opposed to raising the barge fuel taxes as well.

(Reuters-6/7) -- Sources say the Senate Agriculture Committee probably will delay action on cuts to farm programs until the Finance Committee completes work on the energy tax. A staffer said the Ag committee is likely to look in places other than crop-support acreage for cuts, for instance, federal crop insurance. The article outlines thoughts on a path to take to avoid antagonizing farmers.

SEN. BOREN ON AGRICULTURE BUDGET CUTS (AP) -- The article outlines Sen. David Boren's (D-Okla.) position on budget cuts for farm programs and the efforts he and others took to reduce the cuts proposed by the administration.

FOOD SAFETY PLANS (ChiTrib-6/8) -- The article says FDA soon will unveil its plans for quality-control programs for seafood processors and wholesalers. FDA's commissioner says more scientifically rigorous methods must be used to prevent dangerous situations. He pointed to the Jack-in-the-Box case and said it resulted from a system "where everyone is able to blame everyone else." The article says Sec. Espy is pushing for changes also. Industry and consumer groups agree on the basic thrust of FDA's approach to regulating seafood.

PESTICIDES (Reuters-6/8) -- Dep. Sec. Rominger told a House Agriculture subcommittee, "Pesticide policy is a major focus of the administration." An EPA official said the administration is seeking changes to enhance consumer protection. The article says the administration is not ready yet with a plan for revising laws limiting pesticide residues in food.

(Reuters-6/8) -- An EPA official said it will take EPA until the year 2004 to complete re-registration of pesticides (seven years beyond the deadline set by Congress). The article reviews the number of cases EPA is handling. The official said the cases expected to be completed by 1997 would cover most of the high-volume food-use chemicals.

(NY Times) -- A columnist questions assumptions about the science behind claims linking pesticides to cancer in humans. He presents findings of natural pesticides in foods and says there is no scientific rationale for banning synthetic pesticides in foods while leaving the natural ones alone. He says the Delaney clause needs updating.

ENVIRONMENTALISTS' UNEASE (LA Times-6/8) -- A columnist examines some of the concerns brought about by the administration's movement toward the center, and points to actions on the new timber policy which have some groups worried.

(Reuters-6/7, USA) -- The articles review concerns of some that nomination of Sec. Babbitt to the Supreme Court may slow environmental reforms. The articles note that Babbitt has supported reforms of mining, grazing and timber-sale regulations.

GRAZING REPORT (USA) -- BLM scientists released a report confirming mismanagement of Western public rangelands has threatened the land and wildlife.

BARLEY TRADE CONCERNS (JOC) -- US barley producers are concerned that Canada's move to free up barley exports will result in a surge of US imports that will lower prices to US growers. One producer rep asked, "For every bushel of imported Canadian barley, are we going to EEP a bushel of our barley?"

EC RATIFIES OILSEEDS AGREEMENT (Dailies, Wires-6/8) -- EC foreign ministers endorsed the pact with the US on oilseeds after France agreed that its demands had been met and approved the pact. Despite denunciations by farm groups and the Socialists, France's foreign minister said France did not give in, "it is accepting a favorable agreement." Other EC diplomats see the oilseeds agreement as an important first step toward an agreement on farm trade and an overall GATT agreement.

(Reuters-6/8) -- Although most French farm unions reacted with cautious resignation to the oilseeds pact, the Young farmers' union CNJA and radical movement Coordination Rurale called for nationwide protest action. The president of the oilseed producers assn. called the agreement "too vague."

BRAZIL'S FARM POLICIES (KRF-6/7) -- Brazil's new farm minister said Brazil's farmers cannot compete with imports from subsidizing nations, and he said one way to make them competitive will be to create or raise import duties. He also said he would work for changing rural credit policies and developing a fund to cover a minimum price for commodities.

ANALYSTS BEARISH ON WHEAT (FWN-6/8) -- Analysts outlined several reasons for their very bearish outlook on wheat trade. They expect USDA to boost its production estimates for June (over May), something that has happened only once in the past 10 years. They foresee poor export demand in the summer quarter and see China as a major unknown market. They ask if USDA will get aggressive and ink a wheat EEP for China.

FIX FOR SOYBEAN CLASSIFICATION (KRF-6/7) -- Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) said he has drafted legislation to reverse a Dept. of Transportation regulation that classified soybean oil as a hazardous material. An aide said the bill is intended to pressure DOT to reverse the regulation.

DISCLAIMER -- AG a.m. content is derived from major wires, news magazines and mass distribution press. Inclusion of an item in AG a.m. does not imply USDA agreement; nor does USDA attest to the accuracy or completeness of the item.

ARMS Email System

News Division will not read, mail or fax source material to any user.

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Nestor M. Davidson (DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:09-JUN-1993 07:23:00.00

SUBJECT: Senate Watch, June 9

TO: Barbara C. Chow (CHOW_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (RICCHETTI_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Tracey E. Thornton (THORNTON_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Susan Brophy (BROPHY_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Timothy J. Keating (KEATING_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Unice B. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_U) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ann M. Cattalini (CATTALINI_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine C. Miller (MILLER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Hancox (HANCOX_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan (TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen L. O'Neill (ONEILL_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: LeeAnn Inadomi (INADOMI_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Banks (BANKS_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne Walker (WALKER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ricki Seidman (SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Berman (BERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: George Stephanopoulos (STEPHANOPO_G) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Heather Beckel (BECKEL_H) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: S. Collier Andress (ANDRESS_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark Bernkopf (BERNKOPF_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein (BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Robert O. Boorstin (BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Keith Boykin (BOYKIN_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Dreyer (DREYER_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah L. Fine (FINE_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Kusnet (KUSNET_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Leavy (LEAVY_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mike Lux (LUX_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Doris Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Jason Solomon (SOLOMON_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly Tilley (TILLEY_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Paul R. Carey (CAREY_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ken Chitester (CHITESTER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Hopper (HOPPER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah J. Behr (BEHR_D) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (92240291, Mike Feldman) (TLXA1MAIL\F:92240291\C:Mike Feldman\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (94885056, Tom Janenda) (TLXA1MAIL\F:94885056\C:Tom Janenda\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David B. Anderson (ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Dwight Holton (HOLTON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Andre C. Oliver (OLIVER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Gearan (GEARAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Harold Ickes (ICKES_H) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen M. Neugold (NEUGOLD_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marilyn Yager (YAGER_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 18_POINT_ROMAN
SENATE WATCH
HORIZONTAL_PITCH 10
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC
Wednesday, June 9, 1993

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
FLOOR: The Senate convenes at 9:30 a.m., for a period of Morning Business.
At 11:00 the Senate will return to consideration of S. 3, the Campaign Finance Reform bill.

EVENTS:

8 a.m. TAX POLICY Sen. David Boren, D

-Okla., and Michael Elliott, Washington bureau chief of The Economist, give keynote address to a symposium on tax policy for economic growth sponsored by the American Council for Capital Formation Center for Policy Research.

9:15 p.m. Live. 80th birthday dinner for former President Gerald Ford, sponsored by the Gerald Ford Foundation. Speakers include

ARMS Email System

Rep. Thomas Foley, D

-Wash.: Sens. Robert Dole, R

-Kansas. and George
Mitchell. D

-Maine: and Susan, Betty, and Gerald Ford.

10 a.m. STOCK EXCHANGE Commerce Secretary Ron Brown speaks to the American Stock Exchange conference. Other speakers include White House Economic Adviser Robert Rubin at 10:45 a.m. Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole at 11:15 a.m., Office of Management and Budget Director Leon Panetta at 3 p.m., Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala at 4 p.m., and Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary at 4:30 p.m.

10:30 a.m. ENERGY TAX A delegation of Texas legislators lobbying against the proposed energy tax holds news conference.

11 a.m. GOVERNMENT SPENDING Sen. Hank Brown, R

-Colo., others,

hold a news conference to discuss introduction of the Spending Priority Reform Act of 1993.

11 a.m. BUDGET Sen. John Breaux, D

-La., holds a news

conference to discuss budget proposal alternatives.

11:30 a.m. TRADE Trade Representative Mickey Kantor and former Trade Representative Carla Hills address members of Congress on the status of multilateral trade negotiations at a program sponsored by the Export Task Force.

HEARINGS:

9:00 AM Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

Topic:

Student Loan Reform Act, National Service, Budget Reconciliation, and Freedom of Access to Clinics

Scheduled Witnesses: None

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
Clean Water, Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee

Topic:

National Wildlife Management Refuge Management

Scheduled Witnesses:

Don Berry - Counselor, Assistant Secretary, Fish, Wildlife and Parks,
Department of the Interior

William Reffalt - National Wildlife Refuge Association

Jim Waltman - Wildlife Specialist, National Audubon Society

Max Peterson - Executive Vice President, International Association of
Fish and Wildlife Agencies

Dr. Rollin Sparrowe - President, Wildlife Management Institute

Dr. Rodger Schlickelisen - President, Defenders of Wildlife

Dr. John Grandy - Vice President, Wildlife and Protection, Humane Society
of the U.S.

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Operations Subcommittee

Topic:

Fiscal Year 1994 Foreign Aid Authorization, United Nations Peacekeeping
and Management

Scheduled Witnesses:

Madeleine Albright - U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations

Paul Volcker - Co

-Chairman, Independent Advisory Group on UN Financing

Robert Oakley - Former Special Envoy to Somalia

Frank Conahan - Assistant Comptroller General, General Accounting Office

Dick Thornburgh - Former Under Secretary

-General, Administration and

Management, United Nations

Edward Luck - President, United Nations Association

9:30 AM Senate Committee on the Judiciary

Topic:

Nomination of Anne Bingaman to be Assistant Attorney General, Anti

-Trust

Division, Department of Justice

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Topic:

Nomination of George Frampton to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior
for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Recommendations for Budget Reconciliation
and Pending Legislation

Scheduled Witnesses: None

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

Topic:

Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations for the United States Customs Service and
the Internal Revenue Service

Scheduled Witnesses:

George Weiss - Commissioner, United States Customs Service

Milner Richardson - Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service

10:00 AM Senate Committee on the Judiciary

Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

Topic:

ARMS Email System

Children and Guns
Scheduled Witnesses:
Sen. John Chafee (D

-RI)

Jennifer Ramsay
Dewey Stokes - National President, Fraternal Order of Police
Janie Hatton - Principal, Milwaukee Trade and Technical High School
Alex Haller - Director, Maryland Pediatric Trauma Center
Susan Lamson - Director, Federal Affairs, National Rifle Association
Sarah Brady - Chairperson, Handgun Control Inc

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Topic:
Pending Legislation and Recommendations for Budget Reconciliation
Scheduled Witnesses: None

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Topic:
Recommendations for Budget Reconciliation
Scheduled Witnesses: None

10:30 AM Senate Committee on Small Business

Topic:
Investment in Critical Technology through the Small Business
Administration's Existing Programs
Scheduled Witnesses:
Erskine Bowles - Administrator, Small Business Administration
Terry Jones - President, SYNCOM Capital Corporation
Harvey Wertheim - General Partner, Harvest Ventures, Inc.
Jeffrey Walker - Managing Partner, Chemical Venture Partners
Donald Lawhorne - President, MESBIC Ventures, Inc.
Patricia Cloherty - National Venture Capital Association
James Parsons - Chairman, National Association of Small Business
Investment Companies

2:00 PM Senate Committee on Armed Services

Nuclear Deterrence, Arms Control and Defense Intelligence Subcommittee
Topic:
Fiscal Year 1994 Defense and Future Years Defense Program Authorization;
Strategic Defense Initiative
Scheduled Witnesses:
Major General Malcolm O'Neil - Acting Director, Strategic Defense
Initiative Organization, Department of the Army
Edward Gerry - Systems Architect, Strategic Defense Initiative
Organization

2:00 PM Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

African Affairs Subcommittee
Topic:
U.S. Policy Toward Liberia, Togo and Zaire
Scheduled Witnesses:
George Moose - Assistant Secretary, African Affairs, Department of State
Steve Askin
Janet Fleischman - Africa Watch
Sister Stephanie Mertens - Order of Adorers of the Blood of Christ
Kennedy Graham - Parliamentarians for Global Action

2:00 PM Senate Committee on Armed Services

Military Readiness and Defense Infrastructure Subcommittee
Topic:
Fiscal Year 1994 Authorization for the Department of Defense, Focusing on
Environmental Programs
Scheduled Witnesses:
Sherri Wasserman Goodman - Deputy Undersecretary, Environmental Security,
Department of Defense
Gary Vest - Deputy Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety and
Occupational Health, Department of the Air Force
Brigadier General Gerald Brown - Director, Environmental Programs,
Department of the Army
Elsie Munsell - Deputy Assistant Secretary, Environment and Safety,
Department of the Navy
Jan Reltman - Director, Environment and Safety Policy, Defense Logistics
Agency

3:00 PM Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Topic:
Nomination of Jean Kennedy Smith to be Ambassador to Ireland

UPCOMING HEARINGS

June 10

9:00 AM Senate Committee on Armed Services

Nuclear Deterrence, Arms Control and Defense Intelligence Subcommittee
Topic:
Department of Energy National Security Programs in Review of the Defense
Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 1994 and the Future Years Defense
Program
Scheduled Witnesses:
Hazel O'Leary - Secretary, Department of Energy

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Topic:
General Accounting Office Report on the Cost

-Effectiveness of U.S.

Strategic Nuclear Forces in the Air, on Land and Sea (TRIAD)

Scheduled Witnesses:
Eleanor Chelimsky - Comptroller General, General Accounting Office
William Perry - Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense

ARMS Email System

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
Superfund, Recycling and Solid Waste Management Subcommittee
Topic:
The Contract and Fiscal Management of the Superfund Program by the
Environmental Protection Agency

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
Topic:
Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space
Administration
Scheduled Witnesses:
Daniel Goldin - Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space
Administration

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs
Topic:
Legislation to Improve Veterans Reemployment Rights

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
Topic:
The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with the Former Soviet Union, START II
(Treaty Doc. 103

-1)
Scheduled Witnesses:
Lawrence Eagleburger - Former Secretary of State

11:00 AM Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
Topic:
Budget Reconciliation

2:30 PM Senate Select Committee on Intelligence
Topic:
Pending Intelligence Matters

June 11

9:00 AM Joint Economic Committee
Topic:
Central and East Europe and the Former Soviet Union

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Armed Services
Coalition Defense and Reinforcing Forces Subcommittee
Topic:
Requirements for Modernization of Tactical Combat Aircraft in Review of
the Fiscal Year 1994 Defense Authorization Request and the Future Years
Defense Program
Scheduled Witnesses:
Admiral David Jeremiah Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and
Chairman, Joint Requirements Oversight Council

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
Regulation and Government Information Subcommittee
Topic:
Preservation of and Access to Public Papers of Supreme Court Justices

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
Topic:
Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations for Foreign Aid, Focusing on Transnational
Issues: Population, Environment, Health, Narcotics, and Anti

-Terrorism
Scheduled Witnesses:
Tim Wirth - Counselor, Department of State

2:00 PM Senate Committee on Indian Affairs
Topic:
Fiscal Year 1994 Budget Request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs

June 14

2:30 PM Senate Committee on Armed Services
Coalition Defense and Reinforcing Forces Subcommittee
Topic:
Army Long

-Term Modernization Requirements in Review of the Fiscal Year
1994 Budget Request and the Future Years Defense Plan
Scheduled Witnesses:
General Frederick Franks, Jr. - Commander, U.S. Army Training and
Doctrine Command
Lieutenant General William H. Forster - Military Deputy to the Assistant
Secretary, Research, Development and Acquisition, Department of the Army

June 15

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Indian Affairs
Topic:
The Proposed Indian Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Act

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
Topic:
Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations for Programs under the Committee's
Jurisdiction

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Appropriations

ARMS Email System

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

Topic:

Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations for Programs under the Committee's
Jurisdiction

Scheduled Witnesses:

Public Witnesses

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Topic:

Pending Legislation

June 16

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Indian Affairs

Topic:

The Proposed Indian Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Act

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Federal Services, Post Office, and Civil Service Subcommittee

Topic:

Federal Performance -- Getting Results

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Indian Affairs

Topic:

Pending Legislation

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

Topic:

Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations for the Office of National Drug Control
Policy

2:30 PM Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands, National Parks and Forests

Topic:

Pending Legislation

June 17

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Topic:

Environmental Protection Agency Contract Management Problems

2:00 PM Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands, National Parks and Forests

Topic:

Pending Public Lands and Parks Legislation

June 18

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies
Subcommittee

Topic:

Waste, Fraud and Abuse in the Government and Ways to Streamline the
Government

June 21

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies
Subcommittee

Topic:

Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations for Agencies under the Committee's
Jurisdiction

1:30 PM Senate Committee on Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies
Subcommittee

Topic:

Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations for Agencies Under the Committee's
Jurisdiction

June 22

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Indian Affairs

Topic:

Legislation to Reform the Accounting and Management Processes of the
Native American Trust Fund

June 23

9:30 AM Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

Regulation and Government Information Subcommittee

Topic:

Adjusting Federal Statistics for Differences in Cost of Living

10:00 AM Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Topic:

Draft Legislation to Improve the Department of Veterans Affairs Health
Care System.

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:09-JUN-1993 10:58:00.00

SUBJECT: Talking Points 6/9

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mary H. Anton (ANTON_M) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah J. Behr (BEHR_D) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Akey (AKEY_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (2685,Julia Payne) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:2685\C:Julia Payne\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Unice B. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_U) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Rabinowitz (RABINOWITZ_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael R. Lufrano (LUFRANO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (99275744,Al Brown) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:99275744\C:Al Brown\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha Scott (SCOTT_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Julie A. Nash (NASH_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: R. Paul Richard (RICHARD_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GRIMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MEX@BOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly Tilley (TILLEY_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Berman (BERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne Walker (WALKER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Kusnet (KUSNET_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Richard Strauss READ: UNKNOWN	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Jonathan P. Gill READ: UNKNOWN	(GILL_J) (WHO)
TO: Maria M. Tio READ: UNKNOWN	(TIO_M) (WHO)
TO: Jess Sarmiento READ: UNKNOWN	(SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
TO: Kimberly S. Hopper READ: UNKNOWN	(HOPPER_K) (WHO)
TO: David B. Anderson READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
TO: Julie Oppenheimer READ: UNKNOWN	(OPPENHEIME_J) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Hancox READ: UNKNOWN	(HANCOX_K) (WHO)
TO: Susan Brophy READ: UNKNOWN	(BROPHY_S) (WHO)
TO: Howard Paster READ: UNKNOWN	(PASTER_H) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine C. Miller READ: UNKNOWN	(MILLER_L) (WHO)
TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan READ: UNKNOWN	(TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
TO: Steve Ricchetti READ: UNKNOWN	(RICCHETTI_S) (WHO)
TO: Nestor M. Davidson READ: UNKNOWN	(DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ: UNKNOWN	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Melissa G. Banks READ: UNKNOWN	(BANKS_M) (WHO)
TO: Kathleen L. O'Neill READ: UNKNOWN	(ONEILL_K) (WHO)
TO: Margaret C. Sherry READ: UNKNOWN	(SHERRY_M) (WHO)
TO: Timothy J. Keating READ: UNKNOWN	(KEATING_T) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Margaret A. Williams READ: UNKNOWN	(WILLIAMS_MA) (WHO)
TO: Evelyn Lieberman READ: UNKNOWN	(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: Karen Finney READ: UNKNOWN	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Melanne Verveer READ: UNKNOWN	(VERVEER_M) (WHO)
TO: Ann Stock READ: UNKNOWN	(STOCK_A) (WHO)
TO: G. N. Lattimore READ: UNKNOWN	(LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
TO: Isabelle R. Tapia READ: UNKNOWN	(TAPIA_I) (WHO)
TO: Anne Walley READ: UNKNOWN	(WALLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Stephanie Streett READ: UNKNOWN	(STREETT_S) (WHO)
TO: Marcia Hale READ: UNKNOWN	(HALE_M) (WHO)
TO: Nancy HERNREICH READ: UNKNOWN	(HERNREICH_N) (WHO)
TO: Joshua A King READ: UNKNOWN	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: David Leavy READ: UNKNOWN	(LEAVY_D) (WHO)

ARMS Email System

TO: Kathy McKiernan READ: UNKNOWN	(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)
TO: David Seldin READ: UNKNOWN	(SELDIN_D) (WHO)
TO: Steven A. Cohen READ: UNKNOWN	(COHEN_SA) (WHO)
TO: Dee Dee Myers READ: UNKNOWN	(MYERS_D) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Marla Romash READ: UNKNOWN	(ROMASH_M) (VPO)
TO: Nancy L. Ward READ: UNKNOWN	(WARD_N) (WHO)
TO: Jeremy Gaines READ: UNKNOWN	(GAINES_J) (WHO)
TO: Chad H. Griffin READ: UNKNOWN	(GRIFFIN_C) (WHO)
TO: Debra D. Bird READ: UNKNOWN	(BIRD_D) (WHO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Heather Beckel READ: UNKNOWN	(BECKEL_H) (WHO)
TO: Amanda Crumley READ: UNKNOWN	(CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voies READ: UNKNOWN	(VOLES_L) (WHO)
TO: Dawn A. Alexander READ: UNKNOWN	(ALEXANDER_DA) (WHO)
TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez READ: UNKNOWN	(RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
TO: Regina Montoya READ: UNKNOWN	(MONTOYA_R) (WHO)
TO: Jeff Watson READ: UNKNOWN	(WATSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ: UNKNOWN	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Joan Baggett READ: UNKNOWN	(BAGGETT_J) (WHO)
TO: Elaine Weiss READ: UNKNOWN	(WEISS_E) (WHO)
TO: Carola McGiffert READ: UNKNOWN	(MCGIFFERT_C) (WHO)
TO: David Dreyer READ: UNKNOWN	(DREYER_D) (WHO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Heather Beckel READ: UNKNOWN	(BECKEL_H) (WHO)
TO: Robert Boorstin READ: UNKNOWN	(BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ: UNKNOWN	(WALDMAN_M) (WHO)
TO: Jason Solomon READ: UNKNOWN	(SOLOMON_J) (WHO)
TO: Ken Chitester READ: UNKNOWN	(CHITESTER_K) (WHO)
TO: Keith Boykin READ: UNKNOWN	(BOYKIN_K) (WHO)
TO: S. Collier Andress READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDRESS_S) (WHO)
TO: Jeffrey L. Eller READ: UNKNOWN	(ELLER_J) (WHO)
TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein READ: UNKNOWN	(BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
TO: Jonathan M. Prince READ: UNKNOWN	(PRINCE_J) (WHO)

ARMS Email System

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curriel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen M. Neugold (NEUGOLD_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Gearan (GEARAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas F. McLarty (MCLARTY_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark Gearan (GEARAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Watkins (WATKINS_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christine Varney (VARNEY_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Dwight Holton (HOLTON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Andre C. Oliver (OLIVER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen A. Sudbay (SUDBAY_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Charles W. Burton (BURTON_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce Lindsey (LINDSEY_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John B. Emerson (EMERSON_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jan O. Piercy (PIERCY_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta (PODESTA_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bernie Nussbaum (NUSSBAUM_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Vince Foster (FOSTER_V) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ron Klain (KLAIN_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carol Rasco (RASCO_C) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce Reed (REED_B) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: William Galston (GALSTON_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Shirley Sagawa (SAGAWA_S) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Robert E. Rubin (RUBIN_R) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Gene Sperling (SPERLING_G) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: W. Bowman Cutter (CUTTER_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ira Magaziner (MAGAZINER_I) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (MATHEWS_S) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Marla Romash (ROMASH_M) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JULIA M. PAYNE@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Gill (GILL_M) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SKILA S. HARRIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eli J. Segal (SEGAL_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen D. Ewing (EWING_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Allen (ALLEN RL : (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
Comments on the President's Schedule
June 9, 1993

* In separate addresses before the Business Roundtable and a meeting of ABC network affiliates, the President continues to press for swift and decisive action on his plan for economic growth and deficit reduction.

* Congressional negotiations. The Administration is engaged in talks with Congressional leaders to find common ground for passage of the economic program. The President is committed to \$500 billion in deficit reduction; a fair balance between spending cuts and revenue increases, with the savings locked up in a Deficit Reduction Trust Fund; protection of the vulnerable; maintaining incentives for job creation; and retaining investments in ideas like education, training, community empowerment, and the like, to build a modern economy.

* Broad-based energy tax. The President is committed, as part of his economic growth and deficit reduction plan, to the inclusion of a broad-based energy tax -- a levy that will promote conservation and energy efficiency.

* Keep your eyes on the prize. Since the President announced his economic plan, interest rates and unemployment are down, and home sales are up. Passing his economic growth and deficit reduction plan will keep this progress going.

(*)

ARMS Email System

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 10-JUN-1993 11:00:00.00

SUBJECT: Talking Points 6/10

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mary H. Anton (ANTON_M) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah J. Behr (BEHR_D) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Akey (AKEY_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (2685,Julia Payne) (TLXA1MAIL\F:2685\C:Julia Payne\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Unice B. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_U) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Rabinowitz (RABINOWITZ_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael R. Lufrano (LUFRANO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (99275744,Al Brown) (TLXA1MAIL\F:99275744\C:Al Brown\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha Scott (SCOTT_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Julie A. Nash (NASH_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: R. Paul Richard (RICHARD_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly Tilley (TILLEY_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Berman (BERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne Walker (WALKER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Kusnet (KUSNET_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes (BARNES_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gibble (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: C. Patricia Cogdell (COGDELL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Richard Strauss READ: UNKNOWN	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Jonathan P. Gill READ: UNKNOWN	(GILL_J) (WHO)
TO: Maria M. Tio READ: UNKNOWN	(TIO_M) (WHO)
TO: Jess Sarmiento READ: UNKNOWN	(SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
TO: Kimberly S. Hopper READ: UNKNOWN	(HOPPER_K) (WHO)
TO: David B. Anderson READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
TO: Julie Oppenheimer READ: UNKNOWN	(OPPENHEIME_J) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Hancox READ: UNKNOWN	(HANCOX_K) (WHO)
TO: Susan Brophy READ: UNKNOWN	(BROPHY_S) (WHO)
TO: Howard Paster READ: UNKNOWN	(PASTER_H) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine C. Miller READ: UNKNOWN	(MILLER_L) (WHO)
TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan READ: UNKNOWN	(TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
TO: Steve Ricchetti READ: UNKNOWN	(RICCHETTI_S) (WHO)
TO: Nestor M. Davidson READ: UNKNOWN	(DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ: UNKNOWN	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Melissa G. Banks READ: UNKNOWN	(BANKS_M) (WHO)
TO: Kathleen L. O'Neill READ: UNKNOWN	(ONEILL_K) (WHO)
TO: Margaret C. Sherry READ: UNKNOWN	(SHERRY_M) (WHO)
TO: Timothy J. Keating READ: UNKNOWN	(KEATING_T) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Margaret A. Williams READ: UNKNOWN	(WILLIAMS_MA) (WHO)
TO: Evelyn Lieberman READ: UNKNOWN	(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: Karen Finney READ: UNKNOWN	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Melanne Verveer READ: UNKNOWN	(VERVEER_M) (WHO)
TO: Ann Stock READ: UNKNOWN	(STOCK_A) (WHO)
TO: G. N. Lattimore READ: UNKNOWN	(LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
TO: Isabelle R. Tapia READ: UNKNOWN	(TAPIA_I) (WHO)
TO: Anne Walley READ: UNKNOWN	(WALLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Stephanie Streett READ: UNKNOWN	(STREETT_S) (WHO)
TO: Marcia Hale READ: UNKNOWN	(HALE_M) (WHO)
TO: Nancy HERNREICH READ: UNKNOWN	(HERNREICH_N) (WHO)
TO: Joshua A King READ: UNKNOWN	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: David Leavy READ: UNKNOWN	(LEAVY_D) (WHO)

ARMS Email System

TO: Kathy McKiernan READ: UNKNOWN	(MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)
TO: David Seidin READ: UNKNOWN	(SELDIN_D) (WHO)
TO: Steven A. Cohen READ: UNKNOWN	(COHEN_SA) (WHO)
TO: Dee Dee Myers READ: UNKNOWN	(MYERS_D) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Marla Romash READ: UNKNOWN	(ROMASH_M) (VPO)
TO: Nancy L. Ward READ: UNKNOWN	(WARD_N) (WHO)
TO: Jeremy Gaines READ: UNKNOWN	(GAINES_J) (WHO)
TO: Chad H. Griffin READ: UNKNOWN	(GRIFFIN_C) (WHO)
TO: Debra D. Bird READ: UNKNOWN	(BIRD_D) (WHO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Heather Beckel READ: UNKNOWN	(BECKEL_H) (WHO)
TO: Amanda Crumley READ: UNKNOWN	(CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ: UNKNOWN	(VOLES_L) (WHO)
TO: Dawn A. Alexander READ: UNKNOWN	(ALEXANDER_DA) (WHO)
TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez READ: UNKNOWN	(RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
TO: Regina Montoya READ: UNKNOWN	(MONTOYA_R) (WHO)
TO: Jeff Watson READ: UNKNOWN	(WATSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ: UNKNOWN	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Joan Baggett READ: UNKNOWN	(BAGGETT_J) (WHO)
TO: Elaine Weiss READ: UNKNOWN	(WEISS_E) (WHO)
TO: Carola McGiffert READ: UNKNOWN	(MCGIFFERT_C) (WHO)
TO: David Dreyer READ: UNKNOWN	(DREYER_D) (WHO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Heather Beckel READ: UNKNOWN	(BECKEL_H) (WHO)
TO: Robert Boorstin READ: UNKNOWN	(BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ: UNKNOWN	(WALDMAN_M) (WHO)
TO: Jason Solomon READ: UNKNOWN	(SOLOMON_J) (WHO)
TO: Ken Chitester READ: UNKNOWN	(CHITESTER_K) (WHO)
TO: Keith Boykin READ: UNKNOWN	(BOYKIN_K) (WHO)
TO: S. Collier Andress READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDRESS_S) (WHO)
TO: Jeffrey L. Eller READ: UNKNOWN	(ELLER_J) (WHO)
TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein READ: UNKNOWN	(BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
TO: Jonathan M. Prince	(PRINCE_J) (WHO)

ARMS Email System

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn Curiel (CURIEL_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen M. Neugold (NEUGOLD_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Gearan (GEARAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas F. McLarty (MCLARTY_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark Gearan (GEARAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Watkins (WATKINS_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christine Varney (VARNEY_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Dwight Holton (HOLTON_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Andre C. Oliver (OLIVER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen A. Sudbay (SUDBAY_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Charles W. Burton (BURTON_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce Lindsey (LINDSEY_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John B. Emerson (EMERSON_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jan O. Piercy (PIERCY_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta (PODESTA_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bernie Nussbaum (NUSSBAUM_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Vince Foster (FOSTER_V) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ron Klain (KLAIN_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl Mills (MILLS_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carol Rasco (RASCO_C) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce Reed (REED_B) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: William Galston (GALSTON_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Shirley Sagawa (SAGAWA_S) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Robert E. Rubin (RUBIN_R) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Gene Sperling (SPERLING_G) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: W. Bowman Cutter (CUTTER_W) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ira Magaziner (MAGAZINER_I) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (MATHEWS_S) (OPD)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

ARMS Email System

TO: Marla Romash (ROMASH_M) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JULIA M. PAYNE@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Gill (GILL_M) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SKILA S. HARRIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eli J. Segal (SEGAL_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen D. Ewing (EWING_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Allen (ALLEN_RL) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
Comments on the President's Schedule
June 10, 1993

* Today, the President meets with his Domestic Policy Council at the White House to discuss his community policing, earned income tax credit, and empowerment zone proposals.

* Economic growth and deficit reduction plan. Senators continue their discussions on proposals to substitute other revenue or spending cut ideas for the Stu tax.

* Business Roundtable Address. The President discussed his economic program before a meeting of the BRT yesterday. During his remarks, he made the following key points:

1. A major roadblock to our long-term recovery is the federal deficit. Despite the rhetoric, the deficit has not been attacked in the past. "And I want you to know today that I am committed to tackling this deficit not matter how much political capital I have to spend to do it, because unless we regain control over our economic destiny, none of the other things that I would hope to do as President will be possible."
2. The President believes the best approach for economic renewal is his plan that dramatically reduces the deficit while also achieving an equally important aim: Investing in a very disciplined way in some of the areas we neglected in the 1980s -- education, training, new technologies for the 21st Century, and strategies to ease the transition from a defense based high-tech economy to one based on a dramatically reduced level of defense spending, but increased domestic spending.
3. There are significant and very real spending cuts in this program and 75 percent of the new taxes are paid for by people with incomes above \$100,000, two-thirds by people with incomes above \$200,000.
4. And, as the Senate Finance Committee continued its work on the President's budget, the President articulated some basic principles that must be adhered to by any proposal: \$500 billion of deficit reduction; a deficit reduction trust fund to enforce the deficit reduction targets; the progressivity of the program: 75% of all new revenues from the wealthiest members of society; the targeted investments including empowerment zones and small business incentives; and a broad-based energy tax.

(*)