

**NLWJC - KAGAN**

**EMAILS RECEIVED**

**ARMS - BOX 049 - FOLDER -001**

**[04/13/1999 - 04/14/1999]**

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Todd Stern ( CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 08:20:17.00

SUBJECT: rollout meeting

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Let me know what your take on this is. tds

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michelle Peterson ( CN=Michelle Peterson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 09:17:52.00

SUBJECT: Re: bioterrorism

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I've been talking to Devorah and Leanne, but given situation, I wanted to also let you know that Chuck has some concerns about where we are going on this one. He will want to weigh in personally before any decision is made.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Maria Echaveste ( CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 11:30:22.00

SUBJECT: INS meeting today

TO: Michael Deich ( CN=Michael Deich/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

My recollection from our last meeting was that Elena was to pull together a meeting (and let my office know when, in case I had time to stop by) with leg and opl and others who would have an opinion about who should be advised of our problem with naturalization and how we propose to deal with it--basically I wanted a plan for when we would go public with this, especially in light of what INS and Meissner in particular has not been saying. Has that taken place? If not, I don't see the purpose of us getting together this pm--if Michael you have something to report from your conversations with INS and DOJ, email is fine for me, unless you think we really need a meeting. I hope that this clarifies what we were meeting about.1

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 11:37:08.00

SUBJECT: WtW and Census Funding

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Andrea Kane ( CN=Andrea Kane/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Timing

DOL is pushing us to give legislative language to Cardin by the end of the week. I tend to agree that -- after urging Cardin to take a leading role -- we can't keep him holding any longer. If Cardin introduces the bill early next week it will be public for a week before the W&M hearing, thus giving groups and other testifiers a chance to comment on it at the hearing.

What are the odds we'll have a decision by week's end?

Barbara Chow thinks if we don't have an overall decision on how to pay for the Census, we could go ahead, warning Labor and Cardin that we may propose a WtW budget cut later. Seems awkward but certainly less awkward than not telling anyone. Needless to say I think cutting back on the \$1 billion is very very awkward so I'd support any other possible candidates if possible.

Where to Cut

OMB's idea is to not fund any competitive grants in FY 2000, thus keeping the formula grants about the same as we proposed in the budget. We think this is a bit goofy -- we have tremendous demand for the competitive grants (over 1,400 applications of which we've only funded 126 so far), while states are saying they don't necessarily need the formula \$\$\$. We'd rather keep the competitive grant funds at about \$250 million and lower the formula grant amount. If, say, 10 states don't come in for formula \$\$\$ we could redistribute those funds to the remaining 40 states. What do you think?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 11:59:02.00

SUBJECT: Riley, Announcements, andNational Teacher of the Year

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Julie D. Eddy ( CN=Julie D. Eddy/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Tanya E. Martin ( CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Bethany Little ( CN=Bethany Little/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kris M Balderston ( CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Bruce,

I have faxed over the profile of this year's national teacher of the year, a male, kindergarten teacher from Georgia. I hope this is helpful in determining the appropriate announcement for the event on Monday.

Something important to note: I have been informed that Sec. Riley is currently scheduled to be in Puerto Rico on Monday, but would change his schedule to be here if we were releasing the social promotions guide.

Let me know what you think about the announcement potentials, and what you would like me to do on the Sec. Riley participation front.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Linda L. Moore ( CN=Linda L. Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 12:25:37.00

SUBJECT: reminder

TO: Virginia Apuzzo ( CN=Virginia Apuzzo/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Monica M. Dixon ( CN=Monica M. Dixon/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ( [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lynn G. Cutler ( CN=Lynn G. Cutler/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano ( CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Forbes ( CN=Jeffrey A. Forbes/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik ( CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert B. Johnson ( CN=Robert B. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Loretta M. Ucelli ( CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Cahill ( CN=Mary E. Cahill/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann F. Lewis ( CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maurice Daniel ( CN=Maurice Daniel/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews ( CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Luray ( CN=Jennifer M. Luray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Echaveste ( CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephanie S. Streett ( CN=Stephanie S. Streett/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mickey Ibarra ( CN=Mickey Ibarra/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bob J. Nash ( CN=Bob J. Nash/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stacie Spector ( CN=Stacie Spector/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neal Lane ( CN=Neal Lane/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [ OSTP ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti ( CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta ( CN=John Podesta/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Political Affairs and Cabinet Affairs are co-hosting a 1999-2000 political briefing for top agency staff tomorrow evening, Wednesday, April 14, at 6:00 p.m. in the Indian Treaty Room.

Presentations will be made by the campaign committees on the political landscape and by counsel's office on the proper procedures for involving Cabinet Members in political activities.

We would welcome any participation by White House staff as well. You and your staff should feel free to join us.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Irene Bueno ( CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 13:24:24.00

SUBJECT: INS Strategy Mtg. Wednesday

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Elena -

Please let me know if you would like me to prepare anything in particular for this meeting.

FYI - I worked out with Laura a meeting with you for tomorrow , Wed. 11:15 am to discuss outstanding immigration and race issues.

Thanks.

Irene

----- Forwarded by Irene Bueno/OPD/EOP on 04/13/99 01:12 PM -----

Laura Emmett

04/13/99 12:43:50 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc: Sherron Duncan/OMB/EOP, Mindy E. Myers/WHO/EOP, Joseph D. Ratner/WHO/EOP, Ilia V. Velez/WHO/EOP  
Subject: INS Strategy Mtg. Wednesday

There will be an INS strategy meeting Wednesday, April 14 at 4:00 PM in room 211 OEOB. Please let me know if this presents a problem. Thanks.

participants

Elena Kagan

Maria Echaveste

Michael Deich

Janet Murguia

Mary Beth Cahill

Irene Bueno

Caroline Frederickson

Broderick Johnson

Maritza Rivera

Message Sent

To: \_\_\_\_\_

Michael Deich/OMB/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP  
Broderick Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Maritza Rivera/WHO/EOP  
Irene Bueno/OPD/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith ( CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 13:27:13.00

SUBJECT: Fourth Affirmative Defense

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is a minor change to the Fourth Affirmative Defense under the Equal Pay Act, which Daschle and the women's groups would like to add. NEC, CEA, EEOC, and the women's groups have signed off on the following. If you are OK with it, I will send it to Daschle today. Daschle's staff has been very anxious to get it now that they are back in session. Thanks, Mary

4-12-99

Proposed Change to Fourth Affirmative Defense under the Equal Pay Act

The current statute lays out three specific exceptions (affirmative defenses) to the prohibition against wage disparities, by allowing disparities when payment is based on a seniority system, a merit system, or a system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production. Right now, the fourth defense is a catch-all. It provides for an exception to the prohibition against gender-based wage disparities if the differential is based on any other factor other than sex.

The women's groups and Daschle's staff would like to limit this fourth affirmative defense to pay differences that (1) are job-related; (2) concern a legitimate business interest; (3) were actually used in setting the wages; and (4) are not the result of sex discrimination.

4-13-99

The following language is proposed:

Except where payment is made pursuant to:

(iv) a differential based on a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training or experience, provided that this defense shall be available only if:

(a) the factor causing the wage differential is (1) job related for the position in question or (2) serves a legitimate business purpose unless the employee demonstrates an alternative employment practice that would serve the same purpose without producing such differential and the employer refuses to adopt such alternative employment practice;

(b) such a factor was actually applied and used reasonably in light of the

asserted justification; and , the employee fails to demonstrate that the differential produced by reliance on the factor is itself the result of sex discrimination by the employer.□8

[pick up with further provisio that an employer paying a wage rate differential in violation of this subsection shall not, in order to comply with the provision of this subsection, reduce the wage of any employee]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Charles M. Brain ( CN=Charles M. Brain/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 13:52:22.00

SUBJECT: Nat'l Commission of Voter Turnout

TO: Minyon Moore ( CN=Minyon Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano ( CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lawrence J. Stein ( CN=Lawrence J. Stein/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Loretta M. Ucelli ( CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David W. Beier ( CN=David W. Beier/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

Dario J. Gomez ( Dario J. Gomez [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

Mindy E. Myers ( CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Last month a bipartisan group of five house members wrote to the President to urge him to appoint a "National Commission of Voter Turnout." The signatories were: Sanders, Boehlert, Bonior, Campbell and Conyers. Sanders is the moving force. I'll get the letter to each of you.

The letter points out that U.S. voter turnout is the lowest of nay industrialized nation and continues to decline. The members feel that a commission could identify possible steps to reverse this trend.

This strikes me as an idea in which we might be interested? Any reaction? Thoughts about how to proceed?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cathy R. Mays ( CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 14:51:45.00

SUBJECT: DPC Team Leaders Mtg -- Time Change

TO: Irene Bueno ( CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole R. Rabner ( CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Bethany Little ( CN=Bethany Little/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Essence P. Washington ( CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Teresa M. Jones ( CN=Teresa M. Jones/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

There will be a DPC Team Leaders Meeting on Monday, April 5, at 4:00 p.m.  
in Bruce's office. See you then.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ruby Shamir ( CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 15:37:14.00

SUBJECT: Child Care Update

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Murguia ( CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Nicole R. Rabner ( CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Neera Tanden ( CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Nicole is traveling with the First Lady and asked me to pass the following information on:

This morning there were some stories that reported that Kasich and Domenici had decided to drop the Dodd Amendment from the Conference Report for more general language that some consideration needs to be given to the child care needs of working families. Jeannie Ireland from Dodd's office called this morning to say that contrary to these reports, Kasich and Domenici had not made any such decision and that Dodd may offer a motion to instruct when the conferees are appointed this afternoon.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 16:01:04.00

SUBJECT: National Teacher of the Year

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur ( CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bethany Little ( CN=Bethany Little/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin ( CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Cathy R. Mays ( CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is some preliminary information about Monday's Teacher of the Year Event:

Schedule

10:00am - Briefing  
10:25am OVAL OFFICE

10:30am - Individual Photos with Teachers of the Year  
10:50am HALL OUTSIDE OEOB 450

(Photos with each state teacher will be taken w/digital camera, and will be released immediately for regional press purposes)

10:50am - Teacher of the Year Event  
11:30am PRESIDENTIAL HALL (OEOB 450)

Speaking Program

Secretary Riley (T) -- currently scheduled to be in Puerto Rico, but this is not final (participation partly pending on our announcement)  
POTUS -- remarks and crystal apple presentation to nat'l teacher of the year  
National Teacher of the Year -- short thank you and remarks

Press

Event will be open press. There will be an opportunity for the state teachers to do regional press after the event.

Announcement

This is the major item still pending, that will help determine our backdrop and audience make-up.

Let me know if there is any movement on the announcement piece, or if anyone has any questions.

Thanks!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sandra Yamin ( CN=Sandra Yamin/OU=OMB/O=EOP [ OMB ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 16:06:27.00

SUBJECT: REMINDER: ESEA REAUTHORIZATION MEETING WED 3/31 at 3:30PM

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur ( CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin ( CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Broderick Johnson ( CN=Broderick Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden ( CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Barry White ( CN=Barry White/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Janet R. Forsgren ( CN=Janet R. Forsgren/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Constance J. Bowers ( CN=Constance J. Bowers/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Cathy R. Mays ( CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Leslie S. Mustain ( CN=Leslie S. Mustain/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Noelle Hull ( CN=Noelle Hull/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Wayne Upshaw ( CN=Wayne Upshaw/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Barbara Chow ( CN=Barbara Chow/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Sandra Yamin/OMB/EOP on 03/31/99 11:55  
AM -----

Sandra Yamin  
03/26/99 03:19:44 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
Subject: REMINDER: ESEA REAUTHORIZATION MEETING WED 3/31 at 3:30PM

Just a reminder -- there will be another ESEA Reauthorization meeting on Wed., Mar 31 from 3:30 - 5:00PM in Barbara Chow's office (OEOB 260). The topics to be covered will include remaining issues: Title II (Teacher Quality), Title III (Technology) and Safe and Drug Free Schools. Please forward this message to anyone I may have missed.

FYI -- We may need to schedule a meeting for Thurs, April 1. I will get back to you when I have a confirmed time. Thank you.

Attendees:

Barbara Chow, OMB  
Bruce Reed, DPC  
Elena Kagan, DPC  
Neera Tanden, DPC  
Jon Schnur, OVP  
Tanya Martin, DPC  
Broderick Johnson, WHLA  
Mike Smith, ED  
Mike Cohen, ED  
Ann O'Leary, ED  
Diane Rogers, ED  
Scott Fleming, ED  
Tom Corwin, ED  
Judith Johnson, ED

Message Sent

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Broderick Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Jonathan H. Schnur/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Neera Tanden/WHO/EOP@EOP

Message Copied

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Barry White/OMB/EOP@EOP  
Wayne Upshaw/OMB/EOP@EOP  
Leslie S. Mustain/OMB/EOP@EOP  
Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP@EOP  
Janet R. Forsgren/OMB/EOP@EOP  
Barbara Chow/OMB/EOP@EOP  
Noelle Hull/OMB/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Maria Echaveste ( CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 16:13:07.00

SUBJECT: Re: INS meeting today

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

thanks--

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sean P. Maloney ( CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 18:27:09.00

SUBJECT: The President's Trip to CA, MI, MA

TO: Richard L. Siewert ( CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Orson C. Porter ( CN=Orson C. Porter/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Loretta M. Ucelli ( CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James T. Heimbach ( CN=James T. Heimbach/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David R. Goodfriend ( CN=David R. Goodfriend/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih ( CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wesley P. Warren ( CN=Wesley P. Warren/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano ( CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti ( CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Murguia ( CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George T. Frampton ( CN=George T. Frampton/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dominique L. Cano ( CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sidney Blumenthal ( CN=Sidney Blumenthal/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto ( CN=Maria E. Soto/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Craig Hughes ( CN=Craig Hughes/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phillip Caplan ( CN=Phillip Caplan/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman ( CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv ( CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marjorie Tarmey ( CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephanie S. Streett ( CN=Stephanie S. Streett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern ( CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dan K. Rosenthal ( CN=Dan K. Rosenthal/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri ( CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Morrison ( CN=Mary Morrison/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda L. Moore ( CN=Linda L. Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne E. McGuire ( CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart ( CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann F. Lewis ( CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kirk T. Hanlin ( CN=Kirk T. Hanlin/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno ( CN=Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich ( CN=Nancy V. Hernreich/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov ( CN=Paul K. Engskov/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Echaveste ( CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn E. Cleveland ( CN=Carolyn E. Cleveland/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Bird ( CN=Debra D. Bird/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston ( CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irma L. Martinez ( CN=Irma L. Martinez/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff ( CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy Pakulniewicz ( CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn T. Wu ( CN=Carolyn T. Wu/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jocelyn A. Bucaro ( CN=Jocelyn A. Bucaro/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bridget T. Leininger ( CN=Bridget T. Leininger/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glastris ( CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss ( CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth A. Viola ( CN=Beth A. Viola/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine R. Pacific ( CN=Catherine R. Pacific/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer ( CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Fred DuVal ( CN=Fred DuVal/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles M. Brain ( CN=Charles M. Brain/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Malcolm R. Lee ( CN=Malcolm R. Lee/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lawrence J. Stein ( CN=Lawrence J. Stein/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Kapla ( CN=Robert S. Kapla/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julianne B. Corbett ( CN=Julianne B. Corbett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cecily C. Williams ( CN=Cecily C. Williams/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorian V. Weaver ( CN=Dorian V. Weaver/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell ( CN=Michael V. Terrell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [ CEQ ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni ( CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aviva Steinberg ( CN=Aviva Steinberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz ( CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Simeona F. Pasquil ( CN=Simeona F. Pasquil/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman ( CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Minyon Moore ( CN=Minyon Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney ( CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock ( CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce R. Lindsey ( CN=Bruce R. Lindsey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham ( CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phu D. Huynh ( CN=Phu D. Huynh/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura A. Graham ( CN=Laura A. Graham/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards ( CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda B. Costello ( CN=Brenda B. Costello/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara A. Barclay ( CN=Barbara A. Barclay/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders ( CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

On Thursday, April 15, 1999, the President will travel to San Francisco, California, to deliver remarks to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He will then proceed to Detroit, Michigan, where, on Friday, he

will attend a Unity luncheon, a message event, and tape the radio address. Friday evening he will travel to Boston, Massachusetts, where he will attend a Unity dinner before returning to the White House. Deadlines for the President's trip book are as follows:

CA, MI, MA Background Memos:

DUE WED., APR. 14, AT 2:00 P.M.

- Political Memos
- CEQ Hot Issues
- Cabinet Affairs Hot Issues
- Accomplishments

CA, MI, MA Event Memos:  
P.M.

DUE WED., APR. 14, AT 6:00

- Newspaper Editors (CA)
- Unity Luncheon (MI)
- Message Event (MI)
- Radio Address (MI)
- Unity Dinner (MA)

Please call or email me if you have any questions. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Cohen, Mike" <Mike\_Cohen@ed.gov> ( "Cohen, Mike" <Mike\_Cohen@ed.gov> [ UNK

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 19:30:05.00

SUBJECT: FW: Ravitch testimony

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Cook, Sandra

> Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 1999 6:54 PM

> To: Johnson, Judith; Ginsburg, Alan; Fleming, Scott; LeTendre,  
Mary

> Jean; Corwin, Thomas; Wilhelm, Susan; O'Leary, Ann; Cordes, Bill; Kelley,

> Thomas; Plisko, Valena; Wetmore, Cynthia; Smith, Mike; Cohen, Mike

> Subject: FW:

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Nock, Alex [SMTP:Alex.Nock@mail.house.gov]

> Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 1999 6:34 PM

> To: Sandra\_Cook@ed.gov

> Subject:

>

> TESTIMONY TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

> BY DIANE RAVITCH

> APRIL 14, 1999

>

>

> Thank you for inviting me to testify today. My name is Diane Ravitch. I  
> am

> a historian of education at New York University and a member of the

> National

> Academy of Education. I hold the Brown Chair in Education Studies at the

> Brookings Institution and am a Senior Fellow at Brookings. I am also a

> Fellow at the Manhattan Institute and the Progressive Policy Institute.

I

> was appointed to the National Assessment Governing Board in 1997 by

> Secretary Riley. From 1991 to 1993, I served as Assistant Secretary of

> Education in charge of the Office of Educational Research and

Improvement.

> I am testifying today as an individual, not on behalf of any of the

> organizations with which I am associated.

>

> Although I served in a Republican administration, I was not a Republican.

> As a matter of information, I am an independent, and I try to bring a

> sense

> of political independence to the important issues under consideration in

> this hearing today.

>

> Title I is a vitally important federal responsibility. It represents the

> nation's promise to help poor children achieve equal educational  
> opportunity. Enacted in 1965, it was one of the signal achievements of  
> President Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" program. Every Congress since  
> that time has recognized the importance of Title I and has sought to  
> strengthen it. It is in that context that I offer today some specific  
> suggestions for its reauthorization.

>

> Let me say first that I agree with the Administration's emphasis on  
> standards and accountability for children in Title I schools. The  
purpose

> of Title I is to substantially narrow the achievement gap between poor  
> kids

> and their advantaged peers; it is not possible to do that unless there  
> are,

> first, well-defined goals for achievement; second, clear performance  
> measures; and third, accountability--or real consequences--for good or  
> poor

> performance. It does poor children no good to allocate federal funds to  
> states, districts and schools without paying close attention to whether  
> children are actually learning and whether the achievement gap between  
> poor

> kids and others is shrinking. I think it is important to point out that  
> Title I, as it operates today and has operated for many years, is not  
> actually a program with a coherent strategy and uniform activities.

> Rather,

> it functions as a funding mechanism to channel federal dollars into  
> districts that have significant numbers of poor children. Consequently,  
> it

> is confusing to refer to it as a program because the money is used in so  
> many different ways for so many different purposes. It supports pull-out  
> programs, remediation, whole school reforms, teacher training,  
technology,

> classroom aides, and countless other activities. Some of them are  
> effective

> practices, some are ineffective practices, and most of the time, the best  
> that researchers can say about any of them is, "It all depends on local  
> circumstances as to whether this is effective or not." So, when we say  
> that

> Title I is "working" or "not working," it is usually impossible to  
> generalize and always difficult to know what is working and what is not  
> working.

>

> The most recent national assessment of Title I by the Department of  
> Education indicated that there had been big gains in reading and math  
test

> scores for Title I children between 1994 and 1998. Math scores in  
> fourth-grade have increased since 1992.

> However, in reading, the test scores for children in the highest-poverty  
> schools were no higher in 1998 than they had been in 1990. For poor kids  
> who are the intended beneficiaries of Title I, it is not good enough that  
> their scores are back to where they were in 1990. The 1999 national  
> assessment of Title I also pointed out that nearly 70% of fourth-grade  
> children in high-poverty schools are "below basic" on NAEP tests of  
> reading,

> as are nearly 60% on NAEP tests of mathematics. In low-poverty schools,  
> only 23% of fourth-graders are "below basic" in reading and in math. In  
> other words, despite recent gains, poor kids are still far behind in the  
> fourth grade; when children can't read and can't do mathematics in fourth  
> grade, they tend to fall farther behind as they get older. For their  
sake

> and for the sake of our nation, we must continue to press to reduce the  
> large performance gaps between poor kids and others.  
>  
> The current system breeds bureaucracy. It is so complicated and involves  
> so  
> many regulations that it requires a large number of state and local  
> administrators to "run" the program, decide which school gets what, and  
> manage the flow of paper. Because of the complexities of the formula,  
> millions of poor children do not receive any Title I services at all  
> because  
> they are not in a Title I school. When poor children in Title I schools  
> move to a school that is not a Title I school, they lose Title I  
services;  
> if they decide to enroll in a public charter school, their Title I funds  
> may  
> or may not follow them. At present, Title I dollars fund school  
> districts,  
> not poor children.  
>  
> As Congress deals with the reauthorization of Title I, I hope you will  
> consider permitting some states to try different approaches to managing  
> the  
> federal funding stream of Title I. Is it possible that other approaches  
> might have a larger impact on reducing the performance gaps between poor  
> kids and others? We will never know unless we allow some states to try  
> something different and to see if they can get better results for poor  
> kids.  
> Both Congress and the President consider welfare reform to have been  
> successful, yet it had to begin somewhere; it had to begin with a few  
> states  
> demonstrating that they do better than the status quo.  
>  
> What I suggest is that states be allowed, if they wish, to turn Title I  
> into  
> a portable entitlement. This would mean that the federal Title I money  
> would follow poor children to the school in which they are enrolled,  
> consistent with the state's laws and the Constitution. Instead of  
sending  
> Title I money to the states and the districts, it would go to the school  
> where the poor child is enrolled. This would mean that Title I would be  
> available to every poor child in a state that tried "portable  
> entitlements."  
> This would mean that Title I funding would support the education of every  
> poor child in those states, not just the poor children who happen to  
> attend  
> schools that are designated Title I schools by district officials. If  
the  
> eligible child changed schools, the federal funds would follow her to the  
> new school. If the child enrolled in a public charter school, the  
federal  
> funds would follow her there.  
>  
> Turning Title I funds into a portable entitlement for poor children would  
> make the Federal Government neutral regarding school choice. It would  
> neither promote nor impede school choice. Current policy is not neutral;  
> it  
> actually denies Title I funds to a child who moves to a different public  
> school or to a public charter school. Turning Title I funds into a  
> portable  
> entitlement for poor children would reduce bureaucracy. With a portable

> entitlement, the whole process is simplified and automatic. Schools would  
> get money depending on how many poor kids are enrolled. Period.  
>  
> Let me be clear about what I am saying and what I am not saying. I am not  
> proposing to "voucherize" Title I. I am not suggesting that Title I funds  
> should go to the family, to use as they see fit. I am not saying that  
> Congress should initiate this kind of change overnight, but rather that it  
> should allow some states, if they so choose, to try out this approach and  
> evaluate its effects on schools and on children.  
>  
> What I am suggesting is that Title I funds should follow the child to any  
> state-approved school, consistent with the state's laws and the  
> Constitution. Under this approach, more federal money would be spent in  
> schools that enroll poor children, whether they be regular district  
> schools,  
> public charter schools, or any other schools in which the state permits  
> the  
> expenditure of public funds. These schools could use federal funding in  
> the  
> ways they think will be most effective: for whole-school reforms,  
> reading programs, intensive tutoring, training teachers, smaller class  
> size,  
> and so on. Certainly there must be accountability for performance, to  
> help  
> poor kids meet the same academic standards that the state sets for all  
> children.  
>  
> Accountability requires good information. One way to improve information  
> about performance is to provide incentives for every state to participate  
> in  
> NAEP and to continue to disaggregate NAEP results by income levels. This  
> information would function as an external audit for Title I and for other  
> efforts to increase the achievement of poor kids. Armed with this  
> information, state and local officials should continue to be responsible  
> for  
> accountability for they have the immediate and ultimate authority for  
> accrediting, reorganizing, and even closing schools.  
>  
> My proposals have the following purposes:  
>  
> First, to concentrate federal funds on poor children, their teachers and  
> their schools, rather than state and district bureaucracies. The  
> immediate  
> effect of a portable entitlement would be to increase federal funding to  
> every school that enrolls poor children.  
>  
> Second, to use the Pell Grant program in higher education as a model for  
> supporting poor children in elementary and secondary education. In 1972,  
> there was a great debate about how to direct federal funding for higher  
> education. On one side was  
> Congresswoman Edith Green, Democrat from Oregon, who said, "Fund the  
> institutions based on the number of students they enroll." On the other  
> side was Senator Claiborne Pell, Democrat of Rhode Island, who said,  
> "Fund  
> needy students and let the funds follow  
> them to the institution they attend." It is now widely recognized that

> Senator Pell promoted the democratization of higher education when he won  
> the great debate of 1972.  
>  
> The basic principle that I suggest is more federal dollars for the  
schools  
> that poor kids attend, fewer federal dollars for administration and  
> compliance. I do not claim that my proposal will overnight produce the  
> results that we all hope for. What we do know is that current policies  
> have  
> a created an overly bureaucratized, rule-bound system that leaves far too  
> many children far behind. The only way to change a federal program of  
> this  
> kind is slowly and carefully, but with a willingness to try new  
approaches  
> that hold the promise of better results.  
>  
> The demonstrated success of Pell Grants over nearly three decades leads  
me  
> to believe that a similar approach is worth trying and evaluating for  
poor  
> students in elementary and secondary education. Surely, no one today  
> would  
> suggest that federal funds for higher education should go to  
institutions,  
> not students. Yet when it comes to elementary and secondary education,  
we  
> fund institutions, not children. Why shouldn't we be willing, on a  
> limited  
> basis, to allow federal funds to follow poor kids to school as they now  
> follow them to college?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Andrea Kane ( CN=Andrea Kane/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-APR-1999 20:28:09.00

SUBJECT: Out-of-wedlock birth data

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here's information requested at this morning's staff meeting (maybe more than you wanted, but it'll help us to have this all in one place).

#### INDICATORS

There are three different indicators for births to unmarried women:

- 1) Number of births to unmarried women
- 2) Rate of births to unmarried women per 1,000 unmarried women aged 15-44
- 3) Percent of all births that are to unmarried women

#### AVAILABLE DATA

We currently have national data from 1975 through 1997 preliminary figures on all three indicators, including breakdowns by age and race. State level data through 97 (preliminary) is available for the number and percent, but not the rate. Preliminary 97 data were released in October 1998. Final 97 data are being finalized now and should be ready by end of the month. We understand the final data for out of wedlock births will look pretty much the same as the preliminary data. These data are included in a comprehensive NCHS report on Births and Deaths, which includes information on teen birth rates, use of pre-natal care, HIV-related deaths etc. We're talking to Melissa about timing and strategy for releasing these various data -- there was some thought of releasing the teen birth data to coincide with the Campaign for Teen Pregnancy Prevention's events on April 28th and 29th.

#### NATIONAL TRENDS

1) as the table below shows, the number peaked in 1994 at 1.29 million, after increasing every year since 1975. It fell 3% from 94 to 95, then increased slightly in the next two years. It does appear that the number is leveling off.

2) the rate peaked in 1994 at 46.9 after increasing every year since 1975 (w/ the exception of a slight downward blip from 1975 to 1976). It fell 4% from 94 to 95 (this is the first decline in 20 years highlighted in the 10/96 radio address). The decline has continued, though at a less dramatic rate. Total reduction from 94 to 97 (preliminary) is 6%, which is definitely worth mentioning in the VP's speech as an indication things are heading in the right direction after 20 years of heading in the wrong direction. The illegitimacy bonus rule will encourage states to do more to build on these positive trends. However, note that the bonus is actually rewarded based on the percent not the rate because state level data is not available for the rate (see below).

3) the percent also peaked in 1994 at 32.6% after increasing every year since 1975. It fell 1% from 94 to 95, then increased slightly to 32.4% in 96 and remains at this level for 97.

Trends by race: between 96 and 97, while the overall percent of births to unmarried women remained constant, it decreased slightly for blacks, increased slightly for Hispanics, and stayed constant for whites.

Year	Number	annual % change	Rate	annual % change	Percent	annual % change
1997 (preliminary)			1,260,593	+ .2%	44.0	-2% 32.4 0%
1996	1,260,306	+ .5%	44.8	- .6%	32.4	+ .6%
1995	1,253,976	-3%	45.1	-4%	32.2	-1%
1994	1,289,592	+4%	46.9	+4%	32.6	+5%
1993	1,240,172		45.3		31.0	
1975	447,900		24.5		14.3	

#### BONUS OUTLOOK

For FY 99, the bonus will be based on the change in the ratio of out of wedlock births to total births for the 2 year period 94 - 95 compared to 96 - 97 (the statute requires the use of these two 2 year base periods). The 5 states with the largest decrease qualify for a bonus, but only if they did not experience an increase in abortions since 95. Looking at the preliminary data, it is not likely very many states will register a decrease. The numbers tend to bounce around slightly from year to year, and there are few states with clear, sustained downward trends. Only 18 states had a decrease from 96 to 97, and most of these do not look like they would show a decrease over the two 2 year periods required for the bonus. A few states who appear they might qualify (based on my rough calculations) are D.C., IL, MI, MS, VA. Interestingly, some of these have actually had slight increases from 96 to 97, but the combined rate for the most recent two year period still appears lower than the two-year base period.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 09:34:12.00

SUBJECT: Pretty Good USA Today article--not in WH Clips though

TO: J. Eric Gould ( CN=J. Eric Gould/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here's the USA Today article (wasn't in our clips for some reason). It ran on page A8 with a file photo of the President with kids and a Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids sign. There was a teaser on page 1.

Also here's the final VP release

Copyright 1999 Gannett Company, Inc.  
USA TODAY

April 14, 1999, Wednesday, FIRST EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 8A

LENGTH: 445 words

HEADLINE: Teens light up name brands Heavy advertisers get most smokers

BYLINE: Wendy Koch

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

WASHINGTON -- Most teen-age smokers continue to choose cigarette brands that are heavily advertised, despite repeated tobacco industry denials that it markets to kids, says a government study that Vice President Gore will release today.

The study finds that 88% of 12th-graders who smoke, 86% of 10th-grade smokers and 82% of eighth-grade smokers choose Marlboro, Newport or Camel -- brands that are among the most advertised.

Marlboro ranks first overall, picked by three of every five teen smokers, including girls. Newport is the top brand among African-American teens. The menthol cigarette appears to be heavily marketed in the black community.

The 1998 findings closely resemble those of the last similar study, done in 1993 by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

But in the intervening five years, the industry has faced mounting pressure not to target kids. Under a settlement reached last year with 46 states, the industry can be taken to court if it does. It's now banned from using cartoon characters in its ads, and must take down the last of its billboards by April 23.

Anti-smoking forces say the industry is still going after kids. "Our children are targets of a massive media campaign to hook them on cigarettes," Gore says. Today, he'll talk to teens in Akron, Ohio, at one of 1,200 anti-smoking events nationwide marking the fourth annual "Kick Butts Day." Health and education groups are sponsoring the events, organized by the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids.

"The new study puts a tremendous onus on Philip Morris," the nation's largest tobacco company and maker of Marlboros, says Bill Novelli, the campaign's president.

The company recently began a \$ 100 million campaign of anti-smoking TV ads nationwide geared towards kids. Critics question, though, whether the industry is trying to woo public opinion and avoid pending anti-smoking efforts.

Scott Williams, an industry spokesman, says tobacco companies don't target kids. He says that just because teens use advertised cigarettes does not mean they are targeted. "They will probably buy the market leader of any consumer product," he says.

Last year, after the Senate killed a broad anti-smoking bill, President Clinton ordered annual government-funded studies of teen smoking.

The new study was conducted by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, which does annual surveys on teen use of illicit drugs, alcohol and cigarettes. More than 7,000 teens who smoked at least one cigarette the previous month participated. The surveys show teen smoking rates dipped slightly in 1998.

GRAPHIC: Clinton: Speaks with teens in person, on phone on 'Kick Butts Day' in 1996

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 14, 1999 ===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D61]MAIL44140281Z.136 to ASCII,  
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504342050000010A02010000000205000000082F0000000200000AEE0ABE294295658BE327B  
D79DFCA303F6D9364929514F697F04C46F92DC76031AC1D2D5975B86B28D5CC961AD521785EAC8  
2721AF82A0144373A36F050815970BD2845D5D737FDB589D790293A28B67613D5F32631D58999D  
FBE389AD56795FDA78BDB37041F6689C441F1A42381E9B68A4314827C5A9CD6B6C38C7B913CDDDB  
E5C270FFB4369E43ADB5B3ECD8EAF31CA6508B75608929A0E1B240FF6DA9149876B7B5F8AF7472  
EE20595A3E9B681DFB2B2A3E724A54F0945EAA6F60119E394923C3F7D453EA44AB5B185B0066A3  
B8619C0CCA107351521F097E10248C56AAC34B3B48784465E72C9B41E3E2198A14E7E3D68B0C4E  
AE2342D4807E67E40CE41115D88B95CC57595A49A33AAB94ED9CB6BCC54B1BD74AD51B346E929E

43B85E95DC935957D4AFC671957D273618266CD8EDB8CABC31BD0F56F5F95CA4DD02B8D6071611  
04C07A73711E04D0769DC7A889EE5BD841225B4F1A23A624B55C080F6D8C3A3595E05B095EF75B

**THE WHITE HOUSE**

**Office of the Vice President**

---

**For Immediate Release**  
**Wednesday, April 14, 1999**

**Contact: Alejandro Cabrera**  
**(202) 456-7035**

**VICE PRESIDENT GORE UNVEILS NEW STUDY  
SHOWING THAT THREE CIGARETTE BRANDS DOMINATE YOUTH SMOKING**

Akron, OH – Vice President Gore unveiled today a new study showing that some of the most heavily advertised cigarette brands -- Marlboro, Newport, and Camel -- are also the most popular among current teen smokers.

“Our children are targets of a massive media campaign to hook them on cigarettes,” Vice President Gore said today at a Kick Butts Day issues forum. “This study shows why Congress should stand with our kids and stand up to the tobacco companies – let’s act now to make sure tobacco settlement funds are used to reduce youth smoking.”

The study, commissioned by the Department of Health and Human Services, examined overall brand use and preference among teens. It found that approximately 88 percent of 12th graders, 86 percent of 10th graders, and 82 percent of 8th graders who currently smoke cigarettes use these three brands, among the most heavily advertised.

In addition, the study found that:

- Marlboro, the dominant brand of the three, is preferred by an average of 60 percent of current smokers across the three grade levels. Some 70 percent of white 12th graders who were current smokers in 1998 preferred Marlboro, and more than 60 percent of white students in both the 8th and 10th grades preferred this brand. This week, Advertising Age designated the Marlboro advertisement campaign the most successful ad campaign of the century.
- More than 80 percent of African-American 12th graders who were current smokers in 1998 preferred Newport -- a mentholated cigarette heavily marketed to the African-American community. More than 70 percent of African-Americans in both the 8th and 10th grades preferred Newport.
- In all three grades, Newport and Marlboro were just as popular among girls as among boys.

The Vice President also highlighted new study released today by the Campaign for

Tobacco Free Kids that shows the children are still being targeted by cigarette ads. Highlights from this study include that:

- **Our children are being targeted by tobacco companies. Kids are two and a half times as likely as adults to have seen tobacco advertising in the past two weeks -- (75 percent of kids compared 31 percent of adults). Seventy-eight percent of kids say companies target them and want them to smoke.**
- **Young people are more likely to smoke the brands they have seen advertised. Sixty-nine percent of those who recall tobacco advertising say they have seen ads for Marlboro, the leading brand used by kids.**
- **Kids' perceptions of smoking influenced by what they see in the media. On average, the youth surveyed believe that two-thirds of adults smoke when, in reality, less than 25 percent do.**

**The Vice President also highlighted other steps that the Administration is taking to reduce teen smoking and urged the Congress to take action to pass critical measures to protect our children. Taken together, these efforts will help cut youth smoking in half within five years. These include:**

**Requiring that money from the state tobacco settlement be spent on keeping kids from smoking. The Administration believes that any legislation that waives the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds must make a commitment from the states to fund such efforts. Without such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion settlement to reduce youth smoking.**

**Raising the price of cigarettes so fewer young people start to smoke. Public health experts agree that the single most effective way to cut youth smoking is to raise the price of cigarettes. The Administration is asking Congress to pass a \$0.55 cigarette tax to build on increases already agreed to between the tobacco companies and the States and those passed by the Congress.**

**Reaffirming the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) full authority to keep cigarettes out of the hands of children. The Vice President also reiterated the call on Congress to pass legislation to reaffirm the FDA's authority to regulate tobacco products in order to halt advertising targeted at children, and to curb minors' access to tobacco products. Only by affirming FDA's authority can Congress ensure that America's children are protected from the next generation of tobacco industry marketing.**

**Supporting critical public health efforts to prevent youth smoking. The Vice President also urged the Congress to help support tobacco prevention**

**programs in States and local communities by passing the Administration's proposal to double the funding for FDA's tobacco budget to \$68 million and increase funding for the Centers for Disease Control's tobacco control efforts by one-third, from \$74 to \$101 million.**

**Protecting farmers and farming communities. The Administration remains committed to protecting farmers and their communities, and we are encouraged that the states and industry were able to agree recently upon a \$5 billion package to compensate farmers. The Administration will work with all parties, as needed, to ensure the financial well-being of tobacco farmers, their families, and communities.**

**Kick Butts Day is a nationwide initiative designed to curb tobacco use among children and adolescents. Organized annually by the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, it involves young people nationwide staging a variety of anti-tobacco activities, such as testifying before State legislatures, exposing tobacco sales to minors, and dumping merchandise containing tobacco brand-name logos into garbage dumpsters. This year, for the fourth annual Kick Butts day, there are more than 1,200 events being held around the country.**

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 09:34:13.00

SUBJECT: FW: AG press club speech

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro ( CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
 READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI -- draft of AG's speech...jc3

----- Forwarded by Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP on 04/14/99  
 09:35 AM -----

Ricki.L.Seidman @ intmail.usdoj.gov  
 04/13/99 09:37:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Jose Cerda III

cc:

Subject: FW: AG press club speech

Please review and comment, either to me or directly to Richard.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerome Richard

Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 1999 9:35 PM

To: Seidman Ricki L; Marlin Myron L; DiBartolo Christine; Jackson  
 Brian A; Tenorio Chris; Delia Bernie; Gess Nicholas M; Lee Bill Lann;  
 Jerkins Jayne; Fernandes Julie; King Loretta; Rosenbaum Steven; Posner  
 Mark; Moskowitz Albert; Burke Dennis K; Scot  
 t-Finan Nancy; Simon Charles A; Ochi Rose; Wong Byron; Henderson George;  
 'ellen.scrivner2@Usdoj.gov'; Ward Dick; Brann, Joe; McDonald Phyllis;  
 Kelly Candace; Harkins Ann; Perrelli Thomas J; Raymond Fisher; William R.  
 Yeomans

Subject: AG press club speech

Attached is the latest draft of the AG's speech for Thursday. Pelase  
 review it as early as possible and provide comments to me by 1:00 or 2:00  
 if possible. Thanks so much, and sorry for the short turnaround . I may  
 also be sending you a revised version  
 before the morning.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
 ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D62]MAIL412402812.136 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

```
FF5750432D110000010A0201000000002050000000D990000000020000A47A9CA3A3788D83947ABC
A3A8349293120E0C8A913B44678CF3BB35D90B2C75CB7C8D87A04EAF7D00B4CD8342152B8F50A0
CA053406E7DEC921F93FD8C69F4069FD218F2E91C161E61111953869987FB12362D27B8F280B42
8A0ACA0EDB71BF7E04CF4C4E4EEEEC0CF6224162AF599FFC9EFE91A700FDA921B67CC2B90E8BDF
E1ED49D6B829F3F40DB8306B92380BBB75C4B8A48EF38B9C51943DD9F955E6F89AACF85BD42243
644248DC78EB14B416D274942C827DBB6F41F5B78CD3C73714FA7563163743BDF70FE318D68570
8BA34B6D393C7F7A8691E9E88581EF18338BEAF0FF94B3468A4F1AE820A472573BF9D77BC7F224
AEED346BB1B8C1886801732F3E41EE0C4637300032B7B41C2964FE40799C17959A5A51F9B9EB36
E66852DB82EAAF5E87464CB19EB84AB80F667AE73246CF5C5969964A051C1B67A43E9FDADFC84
```

I. Defining the Problem

Good afternoon.

Across the country, communities are considering the way in which police officers do their jobs...how they handle deadly confrontations...and how they interact with the people they serve.

[I have worked in law enforcement for over – years, and I know that] the job of the police officer is one of the most difficult jobs there is, and certainly one of the most noble. A police officer is charged with protecting life and property, but he is also empowered to use force, and if necessary, to take life, to carry out that mission. The police are there to protect us from crime, but they must protect our rights at the same time. And to do their work effectively, the police must have the trust and confidence of the communities in which they serve. They must develop a partnership with the citizens they protect.

Ever since I became Attorney General, I have tried my best to get all segments of our society to work together in the fight against crime. State and local law enforcement working together with federal law enforcement – identifying a problem and working together to solve it. I have tried to get businesses, and clergy, schools and social agencies to come together at the table, because crime is a problem that all of us can contribute to solving and no one of us can solve alone.

That's what we have been doing for the past six years...and we have been succeeding. For the past 6 years, crime has fallen. Every year, and in virtually every category. That is success.

But despite all of our success, there are communities -- especially minority communities

-- where residents experience as much anxiety about police officers, as they experience fear of crime.

Today, in too many communities, the trust that is so essential to effective policing has been broken because of incidents of excessive force. Confidence in the police has been eroded because residents believe they are being treated unfairly -- that law enforcement is biased...disrespectful ...or simply too aggressive.

The gulf in how the criminal justice system is viewed by whites and minorities is confirmed by recent polls. In a 1995 Gallup survey, 63% of whites said they have a great deal or quite a lot of confidence in the police; only 26% of African Americans said the same. One in three African Americans said they have little or no faith in the police. A 1998 survey by Gallup, CNN and USA Today found that a majority of whites thought that police officers treat blacks and whites equally, while only --% of African Americans believed the police acted fairly.

Whether these feelings are based on individual experiences, or based on the stories and perceptions of others, what matters is that those feelings are very real. And the tensions that arise between the police and minority residents have serious consequences – both in terms of effective policing and the danger of community unrest.

- When minority communities, in the wake of a shooting, immediately assume the police officer, not the suspect, is at fault -- we have a problem.
- When “Driving While Black” is a term so common that entire communities know it by its initials, we have a problem.
- When even a U.S. Attorney who is African American, feels he has to instruct his son to be careful of the police when he drives out of the city and into the neighboring white

suburb – we have a problem.

We all know about the tragic shooting death of Amadou Diallo in the streets of New York City two months ago. And, today, as I speak, thousands of people are taking to the streets of New York to protest what they view as a case of police use of excessive force. But, the issue is not just about one shooting. The issue is not just about one city. It is much larger than New York. It is an issue that is national in scope.

The Diallo case is now with the courts to decide. But no matter what the outcome of the case, we have to face the tragic fact that Amadou Diallo will no longer be with us. And we must take from this incident, from others like it, and from the attention that they have generated, lessons about the proper role of the police in our diverse democracy.

Over the past several weeks, I have been meeting with police chiefs and civil rights leaders...listening to their concerns, their ideas and their plans. I have been finding out that both law enforcement and the civil rights community understand that we are, and must be, in this together. We have to work through these issues and “get them right.” [There is probably no task more important to create safe neighborhoods and address civil rights concerns than to improve relations and build greater trust between minority communities and law enforcement. And every police chief that I have talked to and every community leader I have met shares this commitment.] [rework last 2 sentences?]

## II. Good cops don't like bad cops

Now some people -- especially those in the minority community -- are wondering whether our success in reducing crime has been due, in part, to overly aggressive cops who no longer care about the civil liberties of Americans. Too many people are beginning to believe that you

cannot have falling crime rates, without increased reports of police abuse. Well...they are wrong.

Effective policing does not mean abusive policing. It does not mean violating the civil liberties of the very people police officers are sworn to protect.

Effective policing means law enforcement living up to a contract with the communities they serve. A contract of integrity and fairness. Americans agree to abide by the law, and, in turn, law enforcement agrees to maintain the trust of the community and treat citizens with respect and dignity.

Across the country, there are nearly 700,000 law enforcement officers. And the overwhelming majority are hard working public servants who do a dangerous job with honor, fairness and skill. They put their lives on the line every day in the pursuit of justice. And they do that because it is part of their job, part of that contract with the people they are committed to serving. I support these dedicated officers.

But I will not tolerate officers who cross the line and abuse their position by mistreating law-abiding citizens, or who bring their own racial bias to their job of policing. No person should be subject to unreasonable force, and no person should be targeted by law enforcement based on the color of his or her skin. Equal justice under law must mean the same thing in minority communities as it does in the larger community.

In fact, police chiefs and rank and file officers alike agree. They tell me that if we want to maintain the trust and confidence of the community, we must take decisive action against those few officers who violate their oath.

[should we cite as example of law enforcement agreement on this principle the IACP

report on traffic stops? They say that traffic enforcement “that is race or ethnic based is neither legal, consistent with democratic ideals, values and principles of American policing, nor in any way a legitimate and defensible public protection strategy. It is not, cannot, and will not be tolerated by the police profession.”]

### III. Consequences of breakdown in trust

The loss of confidence in the police by minority communities has damaging consequences that affect the entire community. When citizens do not trust the cop on the street, they are less willing to report crime and less willing to be witnesses in criminal cases. That is a major problem because often this occurs in the very communities that are disproportionately affected by crime. If law enforcement cannot apprehend and convict the criminals, then crime increases, and the neighborhood deteriorates.

But that’s not all. When there is a breach of trust, it means that violent confrontations are more likely to occur. It means citizens are more distrustful of the police, more tense when there is an encounter, and perhaps less likely to cooperate. As a result, police officers are more tense and more likely to react with more force than necessary. Suddenly, an innocent encounter can become a deadly clash.

That is why we must act. We must take the steps to repair the breach and ensure that the problem of police integrity is addressed.

### VI. What we can do –

The first step in addressing this problem is to bring law enforcement and leaders of the community together to discuss the problem, explore promising solutions and begin to disseminate best practices. This dialogue has already begun around the country. Just last week,

the Police Executive Research Forum brought 20 police chiefs from around the country to Washington. Each police chief was asked to bring with him one or two community leaders from their city so they could discuss the issues surrounding police misconduct. I attended part of the discussion and I believe it was an extremely constructive conversation. But it is only the start.

In the next two months, I will be convening a conference of police leaders, civil rights advocates, experts in police practices, to advance this dialogue and to add to the knowledge we have of strategies that are working.

Today, I would like to focus on five areas that I think will form the foundation of our efforts to foster police integrity and eliminate police misconduct.

[They are: first, developing policing strategies, such as community policing, that emphasize partnerships with the community; second, enhancing police accountability through effective management and discipline; third, shaping our young officers so that we bring in police recruits with sensitivity to the community, and properly train them to be prepared for their job; fourth, vigilant civil rights enforcement; and last, improving our efforts to measure our success.]

A. Police Partnerships

[Intro.] Partnership and dialogue is at the heart of community policing. For the past 5 years, we have been busy fulfilling the President's goal of putting 100,000 police officers on the street. But, these are not just any police officers -- they are community police officers.

As many of you know, community policing is a type of policing that seeks to establish better relationships between police officers and the communities they serve. It means building a sense of community and establishing stronger lines of communication, through such measures as community meetings, neighborhood functions, and door-to-door visits. It also includes creating

partnerships between the police and institutions such as the schools and clergy. In cities across this country, police departments are encouraging officers to organize and participate in community activities, and encouraging the community to participate in police decision-making.

By breaking down suspicions and building up trust, the neighborhood police officer can once again become known as a peacemaker and problem solver, without relinquishing his or her enforcement responsibilities.

For instance, in Richmond, the police chief is not just sending police officers into the community, he is inviting the community into the police department. There, they help draft the policies that the police officers live by. [Fill in]

Just last week, I traveled to Winston Salem, North Carolina to see an initiative that brings different segments of the community together to solve a particular law enforcement challenge. The police department had established its basic law enforcement training program at a school for at-risk youth. As part of that basic law enforcement training, these police officers were working as mentors with young people in the school. It was fascinating to hear from one young man who said, "I didn't like the police and I didn't trust them. I used to turn and walk the other way when I saw them." And then he got into trouble. He said, "When they first started to talking to me I didn't listen to them; I turned away from them. And then I started listening, and they had something to say." It was one of the best experiences that I've had in several months in terms of seeing police and young people relate together. Improving relations is something which you can accomplish overnight, but there are so many dedicated, wonderful police officers who are building bridges just as those trainees were doing it in Winston-Salem, and it gives me great encouragement.

[In Baltimore, through a PAL program, police are working with young people in the community and learning to relate to them and how to talk to them. So much is being done. And what I said earlier was, we've got to identify what's working and exchange that with other police agencies, and identify what doesn't work or what exacerbates the problem and dismiss that.]

[Add Clergy outreach; and Oregon agreement.]

Last month, President Clinton announced that we will create citizen- police academies. These centers will enable citizens to better understand the police and the challenges they face every day. B. Police Accountability

Second, we must encourage police accountability. This must start with the Police Departments themselves, from the Chiefs on down. There is no substitute for police leadership to make clear that misconduct is unacceptable. It is the police themselves who must guarantee a culture of integrity, accountability and responsibility. They must be intolerant of misconduct by fellow officers, and make it unacceptable to keep silent with respect to other officers' misconduct. In addition, there are several aspects of a police department's operations that are essential to fostering police accountability.

Every police department should have a complaint process whereby citizens can file a complaint without fear. If a citizen fears retaliation, then they won't file a complaint and the department will never know that it has a problem on its hands. Some police departments have accomplished this by moving their internal affairs unit to a separate building so that citizens do not have to worry about coming face to face with the officer they are complaining about. Other departments have set up a phone-in or Internet reporting process. [Add Baltimore]

Every police department should make sure it has in place a vigorous system for

investigating allegations of misconduct thoroughly and fairly. That means ensuring there is sufficient funding and staffing to pursue each complaint so the citizen sees they have not been ignored. [Add where?]

Police departments must have the will to swiftly discipline officers against whom verified complaints are lodged. If they do not do that, then police officers will think they can cross the line with impunity.

Police departments also should be prepared to account for every instance when an officer uses force. That means getting officers to report such uses of force, and having police supervisors determine whether the force was appropriate or not. [Add example]

Police departments can also implement what are known as “early warning systems” to identify potential problem officers. [explain early warning systems] If the complaints are coming in at a higher rate, those officers can be given more training or reassigned if necessary. [Add Pittsburgh]

Finally, police departments need ways to get an independent view of their performance. In Washington, D.C., the police chief asked the Justice Department to come on in and review its record on excessive force. As a result of the Christopher Commission reforms, the LAPD created an Inspector General for the Department. And the Pittsburgh police department has hired an outside monitor, to whom complaints can be brought and evaluated.

Many of these measures have come about as a result of some of the agreements we have reached with police department over the years. And although each police department must consider its own situation and how these measures might work.

### C. Shaping Young Officers

Third, we need to ensure that police departments recruit officers who reflect the community they serve, with high moral standards and who are then properly trained to deal with the stresses and dangers of police work.

In years past, too many police departments had no blacks and no Hispanics. But today, that is improving. Now we have not just men in blue, but women in blue. Not just whites, but people of all colors. That's so important. Police departments should, in many ways, reflect the neighborhoods they serve. And when someone who grows up in the neighborhood, become an officer there, they better understand the people and they know the languages spoken there. They are men and women our youth can look up to as role models. Old stereotypes and prejudices are not as likely to be passed on to the next generation of police departments if those departments represent a diverse mix of society. I'm proud of this progress, and you should be too.

We also need to emphasize integrity in our recruitment. As Tom Frazier, Chief of Baltimore's Police Department puts it: "We must recruit those who come to policing in the spirit of service, not in the spirit of adventure."

Having recruited the right officer, we must then do a better job of training them. They must know when it is appropriate to use force and when other non-forceful means will do. That is not always easy. The job of a police officer is very difficult; try to picture it from the police officer's perspective:

You've just received a call about a drug store that was robbed. The suspects are two Hispanic teenagers. You happen to be in the area when you see two Hispanic youth walking briskly down the street. You yell out to them. And, suddenly they start to run. You give chase. They split up. You focus on one of the two, letting the other go. You follow him in to

an alley in a high crime neighborhood. All of a sudden, you realize he is trapped. You yell out that you're a cop and order him to put his hands in the air. But instead, the panicked youth suddenly swirls around, holding a shiny object that appears to be a gun. Equally panicked, you pull out your gun, and without time to reflect, pull the trigger.

Was it a gun? Why did the suspect run? Did you hit the youth? Was he in fact the robber? Were you right to pursue him in the first place?

Because this is just a tale...we can't know the answers to these questions. The most relevant question may be, however, whether you were trained for such an encounter and whether you did everything you reasonably could to avoid the use of force.

What is also important, is that residents understand that police officers are people too. They must realize that police officers, in situations like that, can be fearful of their own lives. In a recent speech, Washington D.C.'s police chief, Charles Ramsey, noted the importance of dealing with officers' fears in trying to prevent excessive force incidents. He said that "they are fearful of many of the same things the community is afraid of: the unpredictable nature of crime and violence on the streets they patrol." They are fearful with good reason. Over the last decade, 688 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty, 633 with firearms. We need to develop strategies to address these fears and deal with some of the stress of police work.

What we cannot do is allow officers' fears' to become exaggerated, and develop into mistrust of the community and suspicions based on stereotypes. As Chief Ramsey noted, these fears are brought on by a narrow view of the world.

"For many police officers, especially those working in high crime areas, their lives have become a 'good guy vs. bad guy' drama played out in the communities they serve. And

these officers see so many of the latter that they lose sight of the former -- the good, law-abiding people who make up the vast majority of residents even in the most crime-infested communities. ... [This] fear, among both police officers and community members – tends to breed mistrust, which in turn fosters stereotypes, which in turn leads to an exaggerated sense of the differences between our two groups.”

Thus, our training must prepare officers for violent confrontations, but it also must deal with non-deadly confrontations. Officers must know how to interact with citizens, how to use alternatives to force, and how it is wrong to assume that the race or ethnicity of a person determines on which side of the law that person falls.

Last December, we assembled a group of law enforcement officers, community leaders and scholars to discuss the best way to train officers on law enforcement stops. Police stops are such an important component to effective policing, but only if it is done in a non-discriminatory manner. As a result of that conference, a team of experts are meeting this week in our federal training center in Georgia developing model training materials for local police departments on issues such as racial profiling.

#### D. Civil Rights Enforcement

The steps I have outlined so far are things we can do to prevent misconduct in the first place. But, when it occurs, we must take swift and sure action, and that means prosecution when appropriate.

Most cases of police excessive use of force are prosecuted by the state and local authorities, but the Justice Department also has a role to play. At any given time, the Civil Rights Division and the FBI are investigating several hundred allegations of criminal police

misconduct around the country. Since 1993, the Justice Department has criminally prosecuted more than 300 law enforcement officers who have engaged in misconduct -- resulting in over 200 convictions. [check numbers as to excessive force]

During FY 1998, alone, a total of 74 law enforcement officers were charged with federal criminal civil rights violations — the most law enforcement defendants charged in a single year.

We pursue these cases with great dispatch. But, we recognize that the law sets a very high standard of proof. To prove a federal crime, we must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the officers had the specific intent to use more force than was reasonably necessary under the circumstances, given their training, experience, and perceptions.

It is a high standard that often means we are unable to bring a case to court. But, even with this high standard of proof, when we do bring the case, we are very successful. Last year we had a 89 percent conviction rate.

Additionally, we also have the authority to pursue police departments when we believe they are engaged in a pattern of misconduct. Under this authority, known as our “pattern and practice” authority, we can go to a court to force the police department to change the way it does business.

Using this authority, we are currently investigating several law enforcement agencies across the country. For example, we have reached agreements with police departments in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Steubenville, Ohio. And many of the requirements of those consent decrees are similar to the ones I previously outlined.

E. Getting a handle on the scope of the problem

Fifth, and last, we must take steps to gather the data that will help define the scope of the

problem. Right now we only have anecdotes and allegations. We need more.

Today, there is little data collection or reporting by police agencies across the country.

So we have lots of questions, but few answers.

How often are police officers accused of using excessive force?

Are the allegations of wrongdoing any greater than they have been in years past?

Are minorities being stopped by police because of their race as opposed to what they may have done?

For the past several years the Department of Justice has tried to develop ways of measuring the level of excessive force incidents. Because police departments often don't keep such records, and because they are not required to report to the federal government statistics on use of force by their officers, we have had only limited success in developing this information.

That is why the Department of Justice is trying a new way of keeping track of the problem. Every year, the Justice Department issues a survey that goes to households across the country. It is a survey that asks whether someone has been a victim of crime. Those of you who cover the Department, know that this Crime Victimization Survey is perhaps one the most accurate reflections of law enforcement trends.

This year, we are going to update that survey to include questions on police misconduct. Questions like: "Have you ever had an encounter with the police in which any force was used?"  
[get specifics on questions from BJS]

By doing this, we can get a better sense of the relationship citizens have with law enforcement. And we will know whether the efforts police departments take are succeeding.

It is also so very important that we address the feelings of Americans who feel that police

officers are stopping them on the highway, or harassing them in their neighborhoods because of race. Let's address it, let's hit it head-on. If police officers say they are not, let's stand behind them, but stand behind them with hard facts. And, where we see the problem, let's do something about it. I believe data collection in the area of police stops is very important. By keeping track by race of who is pulled over, and which motorists are subjected to searches, we can see how real the perception actually is. If the numbers show that there is not a problem, then minority communities will have a better outlook on the law enforcement. And if the numbers are in fact disproportionate, then police departments will be able to study the issue and set out ways to reduce the discrepancy.

Just last month I traveled to San Diego. There I met with a police chief who is developing a program whereby an officer on the beat who stops someone is required to put that stop into the computer which he has with him. I watched it in action and it's easily done. It takes very little time and I don't think it's disruptive of the officer's day. They are not compiling specific case information, they are compiling numbers to see if they are skewed in a way that indicate an inappropriate reliance on a racial profile. I think that speaks volumes for what police can do in other ways to identify the scope of the problem; and to take steps to correct it.

#### VI. Conclusion/ Dialogue needed

In the past few weeks, I have met with police officers, and community leaders to discuss the issue. We all acknowledge that there is a problem we must face. But we also know that there so many examples of great policing in the field that can renew the level of trust in the community. Both sides must continue reaching out to each other; talking to each other. And we will solve this problem.



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michelle Peterson ( CN=Michelle Peterson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 09:58:44.00

SUBJECT: Re: bioterrorism

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

On the issues of reckless handling and background checks, his views are much more in line with HHS than DOJ/NSC. But I understand that DOJ and HHS may be coming closer to resolving their differences, so I will wait to see what they come up with and perhaps we will be able to live with that.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 10:49:26.00

SUBJECT: Organ Event

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As there is no time on the President's schedule next week (National Organ and Tissue Donation Awareness Week) to participate in an organ donation event, Chris and I talked about offering this up to a surrogate. We are currently exploring whether the First Lady or the Vice President have interest in doing this event. Please let me know if you do not want us to offer this up to surrogates.

thanks!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 10:57:21.00

SUBJECT: Comparable Worth and Harkin

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary L. Smith ( CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Podesta had told Harkin the Administration would review his comparable worth bill to see if we could endorse it. So far, no one has told the staff/Harkin that we can't endorse. Caroline Fredrickson asked that she and I go up today/tomorrow and deliver the bad news to Harkin's staff. I'll do it, but am very open to alternatives or suggestions on how to describe our conclusion. Ideally, I'll keep the conversation focused on the positive team aspect of the effort (the shared goal of getting rid of the wage gap, the steps we should take together including our budget measure); the shared problem we face (keeping the issue alive so the bills keep getting attention -- noting the difficulty of even passing Daschle as a first step); and while we don't think we can get a consensus to endorse Harkin's bill -- we think it is a winning situation to work together to keep our focus on the problem. Suggestions?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 11:05:23.00

SUBJECT: Civil Rights: Diversity in the workforce

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irene Bueno ( CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary L. Smith ( CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI. Eddie Correia in Counsel's office sent me the attached meeting announcement. I don't know if you discussed the division of issues while I was out. Is this an issue that the NEC would want to run? Paul?  
----- Forwarded by Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP on 04/14/99  
10:58 AM -----

Edward W. Correia

04/14/99 10:57:37 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: Diversity in the workforce

We hope to meet with a number of industry representatives on May 4th, probably at 3:00, room TBA, to discuss industry commitments to expanding diversity in the workforce. If you have ideas about firms to contact (please supply firms, individuals and phone numbers if possible) and ideas we should raise at the meeting, please let me know. I will schedule a time for our group to get together in advance of the industry meeting.

Message Sent

To:

---

Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Thomas A. Kalil/OPD/EOP  
Jonathan M. Young/WHO/EOP  
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP  
Dorothy Robyn/OPD/EOP  
Arthur Bienenstock/OSTP/EOP  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/WHO/EOP

Judith-winston @ ed.gov @ inet  
Ida.Castro @ eeoc.gov @ inet  
Anderson-bernard @ dol.gov @ inet  
richard.feller @ ost.dot.gov @ inet  
Audrey\_hutchinson @ ed.gov @ inet  
gbb @ fenixa.dol-esa.gov @ inet  
emilie.heller @ eeoc.gov @ inet  
Rob\_wexler @ ed.gov @ inet

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Nicole R. Rabner ( CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 12:08:30.00

SUBJECT: child care update

TO: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Murguia ( CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

More good news on child care in the context of the Republican budget resolution. Yesterday, when the conferees were appointed, Senator Dodd offered a motion to instruct the conferees on his child care amendment for an increase of \$12.5 billion over 10 years in child care funding. The vote passed, 66-33. As of last night, the final conference report included specific language directing \$6 billion over 10 years in new money for child care (the conferees cut in half Dodd's figure, but it's still a big victory). I'll include an item in the weekly report.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Melissa G. Green ( CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 12:13:21.00

SUBJECT: FINAL DOCUMENT

TO: Victoria A. Wachino ( CN=Victoria A. Wachino/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kelley L. O'Dell ( CN=Kelley L. O'Dell/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stacie Spector ( CN=Stacie Spector/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cahill ( Cahill [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert ( CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Barreto ( CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv ( CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara Chow ( CN=Barbara Chow/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Gotbaum ( CN=Joshua Gotbaum/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William A. Halter ( CN=William A. Halter/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jgreen@pfaw.org ( jgreen@pfaw.org [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrei H. Cherny ( CN=Andrei H. Cherny/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir ( CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin J. Bachman ( CN=Robin J. Bachman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman ( CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mickey Ibarra ( CN=Mickey Ibarra/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Forbes ( CN=Jeffrey A. Forbes/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lynn G. Cutler ( CN=Lynn G. Cutler/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. White Jr. ( CN=William H. White Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley ( CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles R. Marr ( CN=Charles R. Marr/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham ( CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik ( CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz ( CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine ( CN=Alison Muscatine/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda L. Moore ( CN=Linda L. Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne E. McGuire ( CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cathy R. Mays ( CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews ( CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce R. Lindsey ( CN=Bruce R. Lindsey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann F. Lewis ( CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan ( CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli P. Joseph ( CN=Eli P. Joseph/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel D. Heath ( CN=Daniel D. Heath/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Deich ( CN=Michael Deich/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MCrisci@arnellgroup.com ( MCrisci@arnellgroup.com [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl M. Carter ( CN=Cheryl M. Carter/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha E. Berry ( CN=Marsha E. Berry/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda M. Anders ( CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert L. Nabors ( CN=Robert L. Nabors/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri ( CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrea Kane ( CN=Andrea Kane/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Chandler G. Spaulding ( CN=Chandler G. Spaulding/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano ( CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sidney Blumenthal ( CN=Sidney Blumenthal/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Neschis ( CN=Mark D. Neschis/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Noa A. Meyer ( CN=Noa A. Meyer/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden ( CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael V. Terrell ( CN=Michael V. Terrell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro ( CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia N. Rustique ( CN=Virginia N. Rustique/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia M. Terzano ( CN=Virginia M. Terzano/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Minyon Moore ( CN=Minyon Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa J. Levin ( CN=Lisa J. Levin/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aviva Steinberg ( CN=Aviva Steinberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert B. Johnson ( CN=Robert B. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly J. Barnes ( CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda ( CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa M. Kountoupes ( CN=Lisa M. Kountoupes/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman ( CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni ( CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorothy Robyn ( CN=Dorothy Robyn/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta ( CN=John Podesta/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bob J. Nash ( CN=Bob J. Nash/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Murguia ( CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph J. Minarik ( CN=Joseph J. Minarik/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason ( CN=Julie E. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jacob J. Lew ( CN=Jacob J. Lew/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeanne Lambrew ( CN=Jeanne Lambrew/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles Konigsberg ( CN=Charles Konigsberg/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas A. Kalil ( CN=Thomas A. Kalil/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich ( CN=Nancy V. Hernreich/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Betty W. Currie ( CN=Betty W. Currie/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda B. Costello ( CN=Brenda B. Costello/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phillip Caplan ( CN=Phillip Caplan/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston ( CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT: [ATTACH.D81]MAIL405674813.136 to ASCII,  
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF5750431F120000010A0201000000020500000091B60000000200006807B6C253765A3DEE4622  
E9D3448A9F9161620396559B81DDBF122E4C0864C887F5FABD50E42753392DFBB3FB080DC1691D  
81C34CF8015B32869A817CC628E3255F3BC599AA13476D75CF92956E4B49F5BC87A025F93EE130  
93B928EE83F0AE94E89938422C5DA47350B1F6F421C27C0CFC84DDE5C28975214D2CB6716F60E2  
982854BC0A25839F1CDB7184F5AB19E76EC12F405738515E3D85C1170B5C0DC45B273315008D7F  
B262F45158A7ED89060A76B9124C6ADDED8D1CBAF94178D28D1C478E824CE33F6FDFCD740EE832  
A0457E39C7895BF3F7C228E356197DBEE4CF7B80299734A70EE118C71D48B4316DFEB478BC0192

**PRESIDENT CLINTON  
INTRODUCES  
UNIVERSAL SAVINGS  
ACCOUNTS**

**Summary Documents**

***April 14, 1999***

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. 1-Page Description of President Clinton's USA Accounts Proposal
  
- II. Hypothetical Examples of How Families Benefit from President Clinton's USA Accounts
  
- III. 1-Page on "the Need for Universal Savings Accounts"
  
- IV. 2-Page Background on President Clinton's USA Accounts

## **PRESIDENT CLINTON INTRODUCES UNIVERSAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS: PROVIDING MILLIONS OF AMERICANS A NEW OPPORTUNITY TO SAVE FOR RETIREMENT**

*April 14, 1999*

**Today, President Clinton announced his Plan to Provide Universal Savings Accounts for Most Americans.** These accounts will give 124 million Americans the opportunity to build wealth and to save for their retirement through a progressive tax cut. A married couple that participated for 40 years, could accumulate over \$253,680 in today's dollars -- enough to produce \$20,121 a year of after-tax income in retirement.

**Currently, Too Few Americans have Additional Savings.** Because Americans are living longer, it is more important than ever for them to build wealth for a secure retirement. Currently, over two-thirds of Americans rely on Social Security as their principal source of retirement income, and 18 percent rely on Social Security as their only source of income. Too few Americans are saving for their retirement. The typical family headed by someone 55-64 years of age has financial assets worth just \$32,000.

**President Clinton Believes that Social Security Reform Needs to be Complemented with Actions to Strengthen Private Savings and Private Pensions.** Social Security reform will ensure that Social Security remains a rock solid foundation for retirement security. Universal Savings Accounts will give working American families the opportunity to save for a secure retirement. **Under this new program, 73 million people who do not participate in employer-provided pension plans would qualify for USAs, as well as 51 million people with pensions.**

### **Here's How USAs Work:**

- 98 million adults would receive an automatic government contribution to their Universal Savings Account every year.
- In addition to the automatic contribution, the government would match, dollar for dollar, voluntary contributions to the USAs by low and moderate income workers. Eligible workers with higher incomes would have a match rate of at least 50 percent.

**USAs Provide a Progressive Approach for Retirement Savings for the Majority of Working Americans.** The current tax system provides 66 percent of the tax benefits for pensions and retirement savings to taxpayers with incomes above \$100,000. In contrast, the USA proposal would provide 80 percent of its benefits to families with incomes below \$100,000. USAs makes the tax system more progressive by providing the most generous tax breaks for low and middle income workers-- who are the least likely to have access to employer pensions and who have the most difficult time saving.

**USAs Will Help Make Additional Retirement Savings Universal.** Each spouse in a married couple with family earnings over \$5,000 and adjusted gross income of less than \$100,000 who is between the ages of 18 and 70 will be eligible for a USA tax credit (single taxpayers must have adjusted gross income below \$50,000; head of household filers must have income below \$75,000). In addition, workers with higher incomes who do not have pension coverage are eligible for an account.

**USAs Allow American Families to Build Wealth to Meet Their Retirement Needs.** USAs give these workers an opportunity to build wealth and save for retirement.

- A couple earning \$40,000 would automatically receive \$600 of tax credits deposited into their accounts, even if this family contributed nothing to their accounts. After 40 years, with only automatic contributions their accounts would total \$76,104 (in today's dollars) and provide \$6,036 a year of after-tax retirement income.
- **However, if each year this family saved \$700 (\$350 in the account of each spouse), then the government would provide a \$1,300 tax credit (\$650 each). After 40 years they would have wealth totaling over \$253,680 in today's dollars, enough to provide \$20,121 of after-tax income in retirement.**

# USA Tax Credits

## A Family of Four with an Income of \$40,000

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

*Consider a married couple with two children. One spouse makes \$40,000 a year working for a small business. The other spouse stays at home with their young children. Like millions of other families, they live paycheck to paycheck. Before payday, their bank account rarely has more than a couple hundred dollars.*

**How the New USA Accounts Work for this Family.** The USA accounts are designed to deliver tax credits to help families save and build wealth for their retirement. This family would receive:

- **Automatic Tax Credit:** Every year the husband and wife would each receive an automatic annual tax credit of \$300, for a total of \$600. They would claim the tax credit on their tax return, and it would be deposited in their new USA accounts.
- **Matched Tax Cut:** As a powerful new incentive to save, this couple would receive an additional \$1 in tax credit for every dollar the couple saved -- up to \$700 (\$350 each) of savings would be matched. For each dollar the couple deposited in their USA accounts, they would receive a corresponding \$1 in a matching tax credit, which would also be deposited in their USA accounts.
- **This Adds Up to A Big Tax Cut for Retirement Savings and a Great Investment:** The couple's \$700 of savings would be supplemented by a \$1300 tax credit for a total of \$2000 a year in retirement savings. That's \$600 credited automatically (\$300 each) plus a \$700 savings credit (\$350 each). The USA credit almost triples the couple's contribution, and it allows for tax favored build up of account balances.

### THE AUTOMATIC TAX CREDIT PROVIDES CORE SAVINGS SUPPORT

<i>Automatic Tax Credit</i>	<i>Family Contribution</i>	<i>Matched Tax Cut</i>	<i>Total Annual Savings in USA</i>
\$600	\$0	\$0	\$600

- This savings could build to \$76,104 after 40 years -- assuming a 5 percent real rate of return.

### THE MATCHING TAX CUT PROVIDES A POWERFUL INCENTIVE TO SAVE

<i>Automatic Tax Credit</i>	<i>Family Contribution</i>	<i>Matched Tax Cut</i>	<i>Total Annual Savings in USA</i>
\$600	\$700	\$700	\$2000

- This will provide a total tax credit of \$1,300.
- These savings could build to \$253,680 after 40 years -- assuming 5 percent real rate of return.
- And would provide \$20,121 of after-tax income in every year of retirement.

**Building Wealth for Retirement.** Regular savings over a lifetime combined with these tax credits will help working families build wealth and retirement security. If this family saved \$700 every year and received the maximum tax credit of \$1,300, after 40 years they would have a nest egg of wealth totaling \$253,680 in today's dollars. This would provide \$20,121 of after-tax income in every year of retirement from depositing only \$700 per year while they worked.

**Benefits of USA Tax Credits Compared to the 10% Across-the-Board Tax Cut.** This family would receive a much larger tax cut from the USA account tax credits than from the 10% across-the-board tax cut. While this family would receive just \$315 from the across-the-board tax cut, they would be eligible to receive \$1,300 from the USA account tax credits.

## USA Tax Credits

### A Family of Four with an Income of \$60,000

Consider a married couple with two children. One spouse makes \$60,000 a year working for a small business. The other spouse stays at home with their young children. Like millions of other families, they live paycheck to paycheck. Before payday, their bank account rarely has more than a couple hundred dollars.

**How the New USAs Work for this Family.** USAs are designed to deliver tax credits to help families save and build wealth for their retirement. This family would receive:

- **Automatic Tax Credit:** Every year the husband and wife would each receive an automatic annual tax credit of \$150, for a total of \$300. They would claim the tax credit on their tax return and it would be deposited in their new USAs.
- **Matching Tax Credit:** As a powerful new incentive to save, this couple would receive an additional \$0.75 in tax credit for every dollar the couple saved -- up to \$972 (\$486 each) of savings would be matched.
- **This Adds Up to A Big Tax Cut for Retirement Savings and a Great Investment:** The couple's \$972 of savings would be supplemented by a \$1,028 tax credit for a total of \$2,000 a year in retirement savings. That's \$300 credited automatically (\$150 each) plus a \$728 savings credit (\$364 each). The USA credit more than doubles the couple's contribution, and it allows for tax favored build up of account balances.

#### THE AUTOMATIC TAX CREDIT PROVIDES CORE SAVINGS SUPPORT

<i>Automatic Tax Credit</i>	<i>Family Contribution</i>	<i>Matching Tax Credit</i>	<i>Total Annual Savings in USA</i>
\$300	\$0	\$0	\$300

- This savings could build to \$38,052 after 40 years -- assuming a 5 percent real rate of return.

#### THE MATCHING TAX CREDIT PROVIDES A POWERFUL INCENTIVE TO SAVE

<i>Automatic Tax Credit</i>	<i>Family Contribution</i>	<i>Matching Tax Credit</i>	<i>Total Annual Savings in USA</i>
\$300	\$972	\$728	\$2000

- This will provide a total tax credit of \$1,028.
- These savings could build \$253,680 after 40 years -- assuming 5 percent real rate of return.
- And would provide \$20,121 of after-tax income in every year of retirement.

**Building Wealth for Retirement.** Regular savings over a lifetime combined with these tax credits will help working families build wealth and retirement security. If this family saved \$972 every year and received the maximum tax credit of \$1,028, after 40 years they would have a nest egg of wealth totaling \$253,680 in today's dollars. This would provide \$20,121 of after-tax income in every year of retirement from depositing only \$972 per year while they worked.

**Benefits of USA Tax Credits Compared to the 10% Across-the-Board Tax Cut.** This family would receive a much larger tax cut from the USA account tax credits than from the 10% across-the-board tax cut. While this family would receive just \$547 from the across-the-board tax cut, they would be eligible to receive \$1,028 from the USA account tax credits.

**USA Tax Credits**  
**A Family of Four with an Income of \$80,000**

*Consider a married couple with two children. One spouse makes \$80,000 a year working for a small business. The other spouse stays at home with their young children.*

**How the New USAs Work for this Family.** USAs are designed to deliver tax credits to help families save and build wealth for their retirement. This family would receive:

- **Matching Tax Credit:** As a new incentive to save, this couple would receive an additional \$.50 in tax credit for every dollar the couple saved -- up to \$1,333 (\$667 each) of savings would be matched.
- **This Adds Up to A Big Tax Cut for Retirement Savings and a Great Investment:** The couple's \$1,333 of savings would be supplemented by a \$667 tax credit for a total of \$2,000 a year in retirement savings. That's a \$667 savings credit (\$333 each). The USA credit increases the couple's contribution, and it allows for tax favored build up of account balances.

**AT THIS INCOME LEVEL THE AUTOMATIC TAX CREDIT IS NOT AVAILABLE**

<i>Automatic Tax Credit</i>	<i>Family Contribution</i>	<i>Matching Tax Credit</i>	<i>Total Annual Savings in USA</i>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**THE MATCHING TAX CUT PROVIDES A POWERFUL INCENTIVE TO SAVE**

<i>Automatic Tax Credit</i>	<i>Family Contribution</i>	<i>Matching Tax Credit</i>	<i>Total Annual Savings in USA</i>
\$0	\$1,333	\$667	\$2000

- This will provide a total tax credit of \$667.
- These savings could build \$253,680 after 40 years -- assuming 5 percent real rate of return.
- And would provide \$20,121 of after-tax income in every year of retirement.

**Building Wealth for Retirement.** Regular savings over a lifetime combined with these tax credits will help working families build wealth and retirement security. If this family saved \$1,333 every year and received the maximum tax credit of \$667, after 40 years they would have a nest egg of wealth totaling \$253,680 in today's dollars. This would provide \$20,121 of after-tax income in every year of retirement from depositing only \$1,333 per year while they worked.

**Benefits of USA Tax Credits Compared to the 10% Across-the-Board Tax Cut.**

This family would receive \$947 from a 10% across-the-board tax cut. At first glance, this might seem to be somewhat larger than the \$667 USA tax credit. However, the USA also provides for tax-free compounding of account balances, making the tax credit worth well over \$1000 to this family.

## **THE NEED FOR USAs**

*Making Savings For A Secure Retirement Available to More Americans*

**Currently, Too Few Americans Have Enough Savings For A Secure Retirement.** Because Americans are living longer it is more important than ever for them to build the wealth necessary for a secure retirement. But there are gaps in the system that leave too many American families behind.

- **Social Security Provides A Core Foundation For Retirement And Reform is Necessary To Keep It Strong, But It Is Only One Leg of The Retirement Stool.** While providing basic economic security for older Americans, the program was never meant to provide enough to maintain the standard of living individuals had during their working years. Social Security replaces just one-half of pre-retirement income for an individual who earned \$17,000, and less than one-quarter of the income of an individual who earned \$72,600. Yet Social Security is the only source of income for 18 percent of elderly Americans, and the principal source of income for 66 percent of elderly Americans.
- **Pension Coverage Provides Additional Support, But Many American Workers Are Not Covered.**
  - Half of all American workers have no pension coverage at all through their current job. This situation is worse for workers in small businesses, where only 18 percent of people who work for organizations employing fewer than 25 workers have access to pensions through their current job.
  - Less than 20 percent of workers have their own IRA, and many do not contribute regularly.
  - Just one quarter of all workers are covered by 401(k) plans in their current job. And while two-thirds of people with earnings \$75,000 and over have 401(k)s, just 43 percent of those with earnings between \$35,000 and \$39,000 have 401(k)s.
  - While 91 percent of all families have some financial holdings, the median value of these holdings is just \$13,000. The median value of financial assets of families headed by someone over age 65 is just \$20,000.

**The Tax Incentives For Retirement Savings Help Many American Families, But The Tax Benefits Are Skewed To The Better Off.**

- Two thirds of existing pension tax subsidies go to families with incomes over \$100,000, while just one third goes to those making under \$100,000 and just 7 percent goes to families earning less than \$50,000.

**USA Accounts provide a progressive tax credit so that the overall retirement system will be more balanced and give all American families an incentive to save.**

- 80 percent of the tax benefits of USA Accounts go to those making *under* \$100,000.

## SUMMARY OF UNIVERSAL SAVINGS ACCOUNT PROPOSAL

Universal Savings Accounts (USAs) are voluntary individual retirement savings accounts with a progressive tax subsidy.

**Automatic Government Contribution.** Workers and their spouses in low- or moderate-income households receive an automatic government contribution of \$300, in the form of a refundable tax credit deposited directly into their USAs. The automatic credit is phased out between \$40,000 and \$80,000 of adjusted gross income (AGI) for joint filers (\$20,000-\$40,000 for singles; \$30,000-\$50,000 for head of household filers).

**Government Match of Individual Contributions.** Voluntary individual contributions to a USA are matched by additional government contributions to the taxpayer's USA. The matches will also be in the form of a refundable tax credit deposited directly into the USA. Low- and moderate-income individuals receive a dollar-for-dollar match. The match rate phases down to 50 percent over the same income ranges as the phase-down for the automatic contribution, and then remains at 50 percent until the income level at which eligibility ends (\$100,000 for joint filers with pension coverage; \$50,000 for single filers with pension coverage; \$75,000 for head of household filers with pension coverage; no limit for people without pension coverage). Total contributions (including the credit) to an account are capped at \$1,000 per year.

**Eligibility.** To be eligible, a taxpayer must have at least \$5,000 of earnings (which can be combined earnings on a joint return) and must not be the dependent of another taxpayer. Thus, an individual without earnings can have a USA if his or her spouse earns at least \$5,000. Taxpayers younger than age 18 or older than 70 are ineligible. Taxpayers with an employer-sponsored retirement plan must have AGI of less than \$100,000 for joint filers (\$50,000 for single filers; \$75,000 for head of household filers). All eligible workers without an employer-provided pension would receive at least a 50 percent match, regardless of income.

**Investment Choice.** Individuals will have the option of investing their accounts in a universal retirement plan similar to the Federal Thrift Savings Plan (TSP), a 401(k)-type plan for federal government employees. Individuals would be able to choose among a limited number of broad-based investment options similar to those offered in the TSP and in many private sector 401(k) plans. We look forward to working with Congress and experts from the private sector to devise the best way to administer the accounts, as well as to explore whether it would be possible to provide account holders with the option of investing directly with private sector fund managers.

**Withdrawal Rules.** No amount could be withdrawn from a USA before age 65, unless the account holder dies. Once withdrawals commence after age 64, no additional contributions could be made to the account.

**Tax Treatment of Accounts.** Automatic and matching government contributions would not be taxable when deposited to accounts. Earnings would grow tax free until retirement. Withdrawals would generally be taxable, but 15 percent of each withdrawal would be excluded from taxes in order to approximate a tax-free return of an individual's own contribution. Voluntary USA contributions will not be tax deductible because the tax subsidy is provided in the form of the tax credit rather than a deduction, enabling the program to be more progressive.

**Coordination with 401(k)-type Plans.** Eligible employees will receive a government matching contribution deposited to their USA when they contribute either to their USA or to a 401(k)-type plan . The government match supplements any employer matching contributions. Therefore, USAs will not cause workers to shift contributions from private-sector 401(k)-type plans to USAs. In fact, USAs will encourage workers to save through 401(k)-type plans by giving the millions of workers who are currently eligible to contribute, but who fail to do so, a greater incentive to contribute without imposing administrative burdens on employers or plan administrators. Because contributions to a 401(k)-type plan are excludable from taxable income while USA contributions are not, joint filers with AGI of more than \$50,000 (\$25,000 for single filers; \$37,500 for head of household filers) who elect to receive government matches will be required to include in taxable income 80 percent of the portion of the 401(k) contribution that is matched.

**Protections for Women Including Divorcees and Widows.** The design of USAs recognizes that women are more likely to spend time out of the labor force than men and have lower average earnings than men, and ensures women will have the opportunity to accumulate significant savings in their USAs. First, spouses of workers are eligible for the USA tax credit even if they do not work. Second, the progressive credit formula targets the tax benefits to low and moderate income workers. We look forward to working with Congress and outside experts to determine what the best means are to ensure that women are protected in case of divorce or widowhood.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Melissa N. Benton ( CN=Melissa N. Benton/OU=OMB/O=EOP [ OMB ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 12:15:59.00

SUBJECT: Reminder--comments on OSHA Q&As (LRM MNB44) ARE DUE

TO: lrm@os.dhhs.gov ( lrm@os.dhhs.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: clrm ( clrm @ doc.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet ( CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Caroline R. Fredrickson ( CN=Caroline R. Fredrickson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa B. Fairhall ( CN=Lisa B. Fairhall/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Larry R. Matlack ( CN=Larry R. Matlack/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: justice.lrm ( justice.lrm @ usdoj.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (OA)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Courtney B. Timberlake ( CN=Courtney B. Timberlake/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert G. Damus ( CN=Robert G. Damus/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra Yamin ( CN=Sandra Yamin/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano ( CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra J. Bond ( CN=Debra J. Bond/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry White ( CN=Barry White/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

This is a reminder that your comments on the subject Q&As are due.

Please provide any comments via fax (395-6148), e-mail, or phone (395-7887) no later than 2 p.m. TODAY. If we do not hear from you by the deadline, we will assume you have no comments on the document.

Please call if you have any questions. Thanks!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jennifer M. Palmieri ( CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 13:15:24.00

SUBJECT: USA Today Article on Teen Smoking

TO: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

fyi -- we eventually get things right!

----- Forwarded by Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP on  
04/14/99 01:15 PM -----

Mark A. Kitchens  
04/14/99 12:25:21 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc:  
Subject: USA Today Article on Teen Smoking

USA TODAY  
APRIL 14, 1999, FIRST EDITION

Teens light up name brands Heavy advertisers get most smokers

By Wendy Koch

WASHINGTON -- Most teen-age smokers continue to choose cigarette brands that are heavily advertised, despite repeated tobacco industry denials that it markets to kids, says a government study that Vice President Gore will release today.

The study finds that 88% of 12th-graders who smoke, 86% of 10th-grade smokers and 82% of eighth-grade smokers choose Marlboro, Newport or Camel -- brands that are among the most advertised.

Marlboro ranks first overall, picked by three of every five teen smokers, including girls. Newport is the top brand among African-American teens. The menthol cigarette appears to be heavily marketed in the black community.

The 1998 findings closely resemble those of the last similar study, done in 1993 by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

But in the intervening five years, the industry has faced mounting pressure not to target kids. Under a settlement reached last year with 46 states, the industry can be taken to court if it does. It's now banned from using cartoon characters in its ads, and must take down the last of its billboards by April 23.

Anti-smoking forces say the industry is still going after kids. "Our children are targets of a massive media campaign to hook them on cigarettes," Gore says. Today, he'll talk to teens in Akron, Ohio, at one of 1,200 anti-smoking events nationwide marking the fourth annual "Kick Butts Day." Health and education groups are sponsoring the events, organized by the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids.

"The new study puts a tremendous onus on Philip Morris," the nation's largest tobacco company and maker of Marlboros, says Bill Novelli, the campaign's president.

The company recently began a \$ 100 million campaign of anti-smoking TV ads nationwide geared towards kids. Critics question, though, whether the industry is trying to woo public opinion and avoid pending anti-smoking efforts.

Scott Williams, an industry spokesman, says tobacco companies don't target kids. He says that just because teens use advertised cigarettes does not mean they are targeted. "They will probably buy the market leader of any consumer product," he says.

Last year, after the Senate killed a broad anti-smoking bill, President Clinton ordered annual government-funded studies of teen smoking.

The new study was conducted by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, which does annual surveys on teen use of illicit drugs, alcohol and cigarettes. More than 7,000 teens who smoked at least one cigarette the previous month participated. The surveys show teen smoking rates dipped slightly in 1998.

GRAPHIC: Clinton: Speaks with teens in person, on phone on 'Kick Butts Day' in 1996

END

Message Sent

To:

---

Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP  
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Chandler G. Spaulding/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP@EOP  
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet  
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP

Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP  
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jonathan A. Kaplan/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP  
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP@EOP  
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP  
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP  
Patricia M. Ewing/OVP@OVP  
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP  
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP  
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP  
Julie B. Goldberg/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Susanna B. McGuire/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Justin Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Clara J. Shin/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP  
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP@EOP  
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP  
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP  
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP

Rajiv Y. Mody/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet  
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP  
Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cathy R. Mays ( CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 15:10:12.00

SUBJECT: Weekly Health Care Strategy Meeting

TO: Jonathan M. Young ( CN=Jonathan M. Young/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman ( CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv ( CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Cahill ( CN=Mary E. Cahill/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Devorah R. Adler ( CN=Devorah R. Adler/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi ( CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel N. Mendelson ( CN=Daniel N. Mendelson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David W. Beier ( CN=David W. Beier/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley ( CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neera Tanden ( CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeanne Lambrew ( CN=Jeanne Lambrew/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Teresa M. Jones ( CN=Teresa M. Jones/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Gina C. Mooers ( CN=Gina C. Mooers/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Rhonda Melton ( CN=Rhonda Melton/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jason H. Schechter ( CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Joseph D. Ratner ( CN=Joseph D. Ratner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We will be having the weekly Health Care Strategy Meeting tomorrow, April 15, at 4:00 p.m. in Bruce Reed's office.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cathy R. Mays ( CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 15:11:45.00

SUBJECT: Weekly Education Strategy Meeting

TO: Vicky\_Stroud ( Vicky\_Stroud @ ed.gov@inet [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Young ( CN=Jonathan M. Young/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Cahill ( CN=Mary E. Cahill/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. White Jr. ( CN=William H. White Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria A. Lynch ( CN=Victoria A. Lynch/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Shirley S. Sagawa ( CN=Shirley S. Sagawa/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa M. Towne ( CN=Lisa M. Towne/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [ OSTP ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Broderick Johnson ( CN=Broderick Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mike\_Cohen ( Mike\_Cohen @ ed.gov@inet [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glastris ( CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tanya E. Martin ( CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lorrie McHugh ( CN=Lorrie McHugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri ( CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur ( CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv ( CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet ( CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Murguia ( CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara Chow ( CN=Barbara Chow/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Joseph D. Ratner ( CN=Joseph D. Ratner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Iratha H. Waters ( CN=Iratha H. Waters/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mindy E. Myers ( CN=Mindy E. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Leslie Bernstein ( CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: MaryEllen C. McGuire ( CN=MaryEllen C. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jason H. Schechter ( CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Marjorie Tarmey ( CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We will be having the weekly Education Strategy Meeting tomorrow, April 15, at 5:15 p.m. in Bruce Reed's office.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Loretta M. Ucelli ( CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 16:35:42.00

SUBJECT: radio address

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano ( CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Tracy Pakulniewicz ( CN=Tracy Pakulniewicz/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

following this afternoon's meeting, contenders for the radio address include: racial profiling which, if ready to announce, has the best shot at breaking through. (we should consider whether it's more effective as an event, although the calender presents a problem); cops grants which is ripe and has local appeal and the supplemental which is a long shot but obviously has a kosovo connection if it's ready and we want to go that route. what do you think?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dan Marcus ( CN=Dan Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 18:11:28.00

SUBJECT: grijalva

TO: Jeanne Lambrew ( CN=Jeanne Lambrew/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Devorah R. Adler ( CN=Devorah R. Adler/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings ( CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Ruff ( CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Derek V. Howard ( CN=Derek V. Howard/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I am circulating to you the SG's reply brief, as filed yesterday. It is pretty much the same as the draft we saw a few days ago.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cynthia A. Rice ( CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 18:30:34.00

SUBJECT: Possible Welfare Stories Tomorrow -- Daily Report

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: J. Eric Gould ( CN=J. Eric Gould/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Eugenia Chough ( CN=Eugenia Chough/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Andrea Kane ( CN=Andrea Kane/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

USA Today

Rich Wolf isn't interested in writing about the OOW rule, at least not now -- perhaps with more reporting or new data he might be in the future.

He is finishing up a story that I believe I had mentioned to you, Bruce (may have been when you were on vacation Elena), that he started working on several weeks ago, about the criminal child support enforcement task forces that we're expanding as part of our child support law enforcement initiative. It may be in as soon as tomorrow. I'd given HHS and Justice some guidance about how to be helpful. We'll have to see tomorrow whether it worked!

Here's the paper we released in January

Others

Today the Manhattan Institute held a conference on "Next Steps in Welfare Reform." Genie attended, said there were press there (Jason DeParle and Rich Wolf at least). Gov Thompson clearly was misinformed. She reported:

Overall, remarks by State and local officials, academics, faith-based and business community representatives were laudatory about the impact of welfare reform and declining caseloads. Speakers such as Charles Murray and Jason Turner generally characterized the next challenge as "constructively spending our wealth in this robust economy." However, the keynote address delivered by Governor Tommy Thompson was particularly critical of the Administration and its final TANF regulation which was released this past Monday. Below is a more detailed summary of his remarks.

GOVERNOR THOMPSON

-- Began by observing the irony in the President claiming credit for the success of welfare reform when he vetoed it twice before finally enacting

the bill -- analogous to the Vice President claiming he invented the Internet.

-- Painted a bleak picture of WI before he took office. WI was chasing businesses away with high taxes and luring welfare recipients in with high AFDC checks.

-- Shared the successes of welfare reform in Wisconsin under his administration. Since 1986, there has been a 90 percent reduction in statewide welfare rolls, dropping from about 100,000 families to roughly 9,000 families today (out of total population of approximately 5.5 million people). In 1997, he launched W-2, the State's TANF program that added on to the 1995 Welfare-not-Work program. W-2 includes a family cap which limits increases for women who have more children while on welfare, and participants who leave welfare earn an average wage of \$7.42 per hour.

-- Remarked that, in the true spirit of Washington, HHS released its final TANF rule more than 3 years after the signing of the welfare reform law -- illustrating once again that "Washington is an inhibitor of reform rather than instigator of reform." While the rule reflects that HHS did hear the States, and in some instances, listened to States, the regulation is primarily "bad, especially for those States at the forefront of reforms."

-- Continued to describe the upcoming challenges. Of those who remain on the caseloads, "80 percent are minorities, 40 percent experience problems with substance abuse or mental health, 50 percent never worked, and 50 percent have no high school education."

-- As a result, the Governor stated, "States need more flexibility in supportive services...[the rule] is bad because it ties our hands and doesn't help people retain jobs...and it doesn't prevent future lapses.."

-- The Governor described some of his current welfare reform efforts, such as youth grants, fatherhood initiatives, foster family recruiting. He cited specifically that his "Better Badger Babies" proposal to create high-tech learning centers for at-risk young children would not be an allowable cost under the new TANF rule.

-- In sum, because of "Washington, the Disneyland of the East," the TANF rule "prohibits the flexible use of the TANF block grant."

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D94]ARMS13767591S.136 to ASCII,  
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043C0040000010A020100000002050000005917000000020000EF734D6FC65728AC8F6E34  
75D4981416737D3AADA8A7CA27759BA70761324332247200BA8C616E21BDC558627200C1F1A988  
9C4FCE7AC1DFD341FF70497BB1DA31C7F2E0488B7888E9FA0EC78D759BEF69A53901E78C4D1C2C  
6493C9E33C4FA08A541C6110C4DD26CE3D4330A33DCEE861A14FF5E3C1AAFEABC136FBE780F713  
3AB6A5826D6D2BC7BA5644702C99050087D81EE875BF300BF10ED25B3B51CF34C5461E3370C5EA  
EE8A76432B25BE30E1148780213A818DEB33766C702BF86A7FB47279EC9DCB64B23228D06DEC9C

Automated Records Management System  
Hex-Dump Conversion

*President Clinton Proposes New Child Support Crackdown and  
Announces a Record 80 Percent Increase in Child Support Collections  
December 31, 1998*

Today, President Clinton announced a new child support crackdown aimed at the nation's most egregious child support violators. Despite record child support collections, there are still too many parents who flagrantly ignore their obligations to their children, and the President will propose to spend \$46 million to identify, investigate, and prosecute these deadbeat parents. The President took this action today as he released new evidence that his Administration's child support efforts are working: child support collections have gone up a record 80 percent since he took office, from \$8 billion in 1992 to an estimated \$14.4 billion in 1998.

*New Record Child Support Collections*

Since taking office, President Clinton has made child support enforcement a top priority, and those efforts are paying off for children across America. New figures released by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services today show that child support collections have gone up a record 80 percent since the President took office, from \$8 billion in 1992 to an estimated \$14.4 billion in 1998. Moreover, new figures show that the federal government has collected \$1.1 billion this year by withholding federal tax refunds from deadbeat parents. Nearly 1.3 million families in all 50 states benefited from these tax refunds, which totaled \$151 million in California, \$63 million in Ohio, \$52 million in Florida, and \$48 million in New York (a state by state chart is available).

*New Child Support Law Enforcement Initiative*

To ensure that every parent pays the child support he owes, in June President Clinton signed into law the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act, creating two new categories of federal felonies for the most egregious child support violators, a measure he had called for in his 1997 State of the Union address. Many prosecutors say they would be able to prosecute even more child support cases if they had legal staff dedicated to the issue and if they received referrals after a complete financial investigation had been conducted.

*New Investigative Resources:* Under this new initiative, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services will establish investigative teams in five regions of the country to identify, analyze, and investigate cases for prosecution. These sites, costing approximately \$12 million over five years, will serve 17 states plus D.C., which together have 63 percent of the nation's child support cases. State child support offices will refer their most serious child support cases to these sites, where trained investigative staff will locate the violator, document information needed for prosecution, and then provide the investigated case to the appropriate prosecutor. These sites will be based upon a model law enforcement effort established earlier this year to serve five states, which in six months has produced an 18-fold increase in federal convictions and collections.

*New Prosecutorial Resources:* To ensure U.S. Attorney's offices have the skilled legal staff they need to prosecute more deadbeat parents, the President proposes to provide new funds for legal support personnel, who will conduct fact finding and investigations, do legal research, and assist in the drafting of court papers. The President's new budget will include \$34 million over five years, \$5 million in FY 2000 rising to \$8 million in later

years, to fund an eightfold increase in legal support staff dedicated to child support. With this new staff, the U.S. Department of Justice expects to increase child support prosecutions significantly.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Barry J. Toiv ( CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 18:39:31.00

SUBJECT: Re: Revised POTUS Q&A's

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. ( CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Thanks -- tomorrow we get to see if anybody guessed right.  
----- Forwarded by Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP on 04/14/99  
06:39 PM -----

Erica S. Lepping  
04/14/99 03:24:26 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP@EOP  
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
bcc:  
Subject: Re: Revised POTUS Q&A's

Thanks - these look good.

Laura Emmett  
04/14/99 03:20:50 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: Erica S. Lepping/WHO/EOP@EOP, Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP,  
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP, Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP  
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
Subject: Revised POTUS Q&A's

Message Copied

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OPD/EOP@EOP  
Jonathan H. Schnur/OPD/EOP@EOP  
Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP@EOP

Message Copied

To:

---

barry j. toiv/who/eop@eop  
 heather m. riley/who/eop@eop  
 jason h. schechter/who/eop@eop  
 cynthia a. rice/opd/eop@eop  
 jose cerda iii/opd/eop@eop  
 leanne a. shimabukuro/opd/eop@eop  
 paul j. weinstein jr./opd/eop@eop  
 jonathan h. schnur/opd/eop@eop  
 tanya e. martin/opd/eop@eop

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
 ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D79]ARMS167385913.136 to ASCII,  
 The following is a HEX DUMP:

```
FF575043DA040000010A020100000002050000000A0A000000020000003CFA4C90C403FA51E8C50
87A6EEFECBD77D888C7E6F179EA8ADA87894A953166E0D0D4E26CFAF2F16409EF758685F96D40A
279A1C07C4AD5B250185BEF554E720CCBA6F9C1B8E754C7E36286E0A2DE49521C5DBC9FCC24DB3
3C5F69ABD9F01A1625C4A24BB840CD8C3E21EEF935375C59C42729C29AD0239BEB37B011B7A38D
5751C23147CD938C4F134AB1292F2833D0E1B6A60EF27E6C7EDB09A70451E77691A2FBD3D00410
FDCC8476C303F3DC139A0627A6469A997B94899BA401F4E5360C3EE6EDE80A5AAE0DB747EADC71
AB9E828D0C1BC090C01A522AB39DB958B5BAE6593AE4F01DC5A041DE5AC6B4A1E3A2ED0D1BC04B
```

**Campaign Finance Reform Q&A**  
**April 14, 1999**

**Q: Why do you believe the current campaign finance reform system should be changed?**

**A:** The rules governing our system of financing federal election campaigns are sorely out of date. Enacted more than two decades ago when election campaigns were much less expensive, they have been overtaken by events -- particularly, by dramatic changes in the nature and cost of political campaigns. Spending in congressional campaigns has risen sixfold in the last two decades -- more than three times the rate of inflation -- and spending on television is the primary reason. Money is raised and spent in ways that simply were not contemplated when Congress last overhauled our campaign finance laws. We must bring the rules up to date to reflect the changes in elections and campaigning that have overtaken our political system.

**Crime Q&A**  
**April 14, 1999**

**Q: Does gun control really work to reduce gun-related crime and violence?**

**A: Yes, my Administration has taken some of the boldest, most comprehensive steps ever to keep guns off the streets and out of the hands of juveniles and criminals, and we are seeing the results. These steps, along with the comprehensive efforts of communities across the country to combat gun violence have contributed to a 27 percent decline in the number of violent crimes committed with guns since 1992. Some of our accomplishments in this area include:**

- **Passing the Brady Law.** We stood up to the gun lobby and secured passage of the Brady Law, which has helped to prevent over a quarter of a million felons, fugitives, and stalkers from getting handguns nationwide.
- **Creating the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.** Last November, we put into place the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, which has already conducted over 2.6 million background checks on gun purchasers, and stopped over 27,000 prohibited buyers from getting firearms.
- **Banning dangerous assault weapons.** I fought for the 1994 assault weapons ban to bar the manufacture and importation of 19 of the deadliest assault weapons. Last year, we took executive action to ban the importation of over 50 models of deadly modified assault weapons. A recent Justice Department study found that the 1994 assault weapon ban contributed to a decrease in criminal use of the banned guns and a reduction in the overall gun murder rate.
- **Increasing crime gun tracing and combating illegal gun trafficking.** My Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative (YCGII) is working in 37 cities to crack down on the illegal gun markets that supply firearms to juveniles and criminals. As a result of YCGII, crime gun tracing by ATF has increased from about 50,000 traces to 200,000 traces annually. In FY 98, ATF initiated over 300 ATF investigations in the YCGII cities, involving over 3,300 illegally trafficked firearms.

**Combined with our overall crime strategy to put 100,000 additional police officers on our streets, tougher punishment for hardened criminals, and smarter prevention for our young people to avoid crime in the first place, these efforts have led to crime coming down across the country -- in all categories and in all regions -- and the violent crime rate plummeting to its lowest point in a quarter century.**

**Education Q&A**  
**April 14, 1999**

**Q: What is the role of federal government in education?**

**A:** States and localities must have primary responsibility for education and must have the flexibility to decide what to teach and how to teach it. But as we enter the 21st century, leadership at the national level is essential to provide the quality education that our people need to succeed.

That means first that the federal government must make targeted investments to improve access to, and the quality of, education. Federal investment in education has a proud history: for example, in the nineteenth century the federal government provided land for educational institutions, and in the 1950's, Sputnik led us to invest in math and science education. Now we are trying to make targeted investments to help communities and schools improve education quality by reducing class size, providing after-school programs, modernizing school facilities, and expanding parental choice in public education. The federal government also must provide extra resources to help children, schools, and communities in greatest need through programs like Title I and extra funding for high-poverty communities in all of the initiatives I just mentioned.

Second, and just as important, the federal government has a critical role to play in holding states and schools that receive federal funding accountable for results. That is why my education accountability act will ensure that states and school districts adopt proven and effective accountability measures that will help to lift student achievement in every public school and close the opportunity gap by giving special attention to disadvantaged students. We need to take the education reforms that some states and cities are showing produce the best results -- turning around failing schools, phasing out the use of unqualified teachers, ending social promotion while providing extra support to help students achieve -- and spread those reforms throughout the nation.

**Tobacco Q&A**  
**April 14, 1999**

**Q: Why is tobacco regulation necessary? Are you just trying to put a legal industry out of business?**

**A:** My efforts are not intended to go after tobacco companies; they are intended to protect children. Cigarette companies have the right to market their products to adults. But I draw the line on children because many of them do not yet have the maturity to understand the dangers of tobacco products and withstand the industry's marketing efforts. Studies show that if kids don't start smoking by age 19, they're not likely to start at all. And the data also indicates that children start smoking in part because of advertisements; for example, data released this week show that 88 percent of smokers in 12th grade smoke one of the three most heavily advertised cigarette brands. That's why the FDA rule we put forward in 1995 proposed to limit advertising that appeals to children in places where they are likely to see it. We need Congress to take this rule out of the courts and to take the range of other measures that will have a significant, long-term effect on youth smoking rates.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 19:43:18.00

SUBJECT: Ewent Ideas

TO: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro ( CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
BR/EK:

As requested...first cut on proposed events leading up to Y2 Crime Bill  
Intro on May 12th....jc3

Seniors and Crime -- For this Saturday's radio address (4/16), the President could unveil a series of proposals to tackle senior crime. The proposals, which will be transmitted to Congress this May as part of the President's 21st Century Crime Bill -- and which are referenced in the Democratic unity agenda -- include:

(1) Cracking down on fraud against the elderly by authorizing the Attorney General, after petitioning a court, to block or terminate telephone service to parties involved in telemarketing fraud, and by boosting penalties for virtually all forms of fraud that result in death or serious injury. [NB: DOJ also has language to block or terminate internet service to those engaged in fraud, but OVP and Commerce are currently opposed.]

(2) Combating health care fraud by allowing the Attorney General to take immediate action to stop false claims and illegal kickback schemes involving federal health plans (injunctive authority); by granting federal prosecutors new tools to uncover, investigate and prosecute more health care fraud cases (new civil penalties of \$25,000 to \$50,000, sharing of grand jury information in criminal cases with civil prosecutors, and administrative subpoenas in civil cases); by increasing penalties for health care fraud cases, especially if they target the elderly (directive to Sentencing Commission); and by prohibiting persons who defraud the Medicare or Medicaid system from having their debts discharged through bankruptcy.

(3) Creating new criminal and civil penalties for nursing home operators that repeatedly violate federal nursing home rules and harm nursing home residents. [NB: HHS is still opposed to DOJ having civil enforcement authority, unless they can veto enforcement actions. DOJ, while willing to pre-agree to MOU on how to deal with referrals, insists that any provision to veto their enforcement authority is unprecedented.]

(4) Protecting pension and retirement plans by establishing new criminal

and civil penalties for defrauding pension and retirement plans, and by increasing penalties for bribery and graft associated with the management of these plans (from 3 to 5 years).

Victims/Bioterrorism -- In next week's radio address (4/24), the President could highlight provisions in his crime bill to address the threat of bioterrorism, and provide additional assistance to victims of crime. This would be a timely message that coincides with both Crime Victims' Rights Week which ends on 4/24, and the anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing on 4/19. We could invite the victims rights awardees that the Attorney General is scheduled to honor at an event earlier that week.

Bioterrorism. The President's crime bill contains new tools for law enforcement to address the emerging threat of bioterrorism and prevent future bioterrorism catastrophes. Specifically, the bill contains new criminal and civil penalties for:

- (1) Possession of harmful dangerous biological agents not justified for a peaceful purpose, in order to limit the availability of biological weapons to the general public;
- (2) Unregistered possession of certain biological agents to ensure that appropriate authorities can track who is handling the most deadly agents;
- (3) Reckless handing of harmful biological agents, similar to those already in place for radioactive materials and pharmaceutical products; and
- (4) Possession of selected biological agents by restricted individuals, such as felons, fugitives, and the mentally unstable. [NB: This provision is still under negotiation between HHS and DOJ.]

Victims. The bill contains a number of provisions to support victims, including expanded federal assistance to the victims of non-federal crimes and additional compensation and assistance to victims of terrorism and mass violence. The President could also renew his call for the Congress to pass a Constitutional Victims Rights amendment.

New Firearms Proposals -- During the week of May 5th, in a White House Ceremony with sympathetic Members of Congress, the President could unveil the new firearms proposals that will accompany the 21st Century Crime Bill he will introduce the following week on May 12th. Generally, these include:

- (1) Making permanent the Brady waiting period requirements that expired last November;
- (2) Closing the gun show loophole and providing for background checks at all gun shows;
- (3) Banning the importation of all large capacity ammunition clips (including those originally grandfathered by Assault Weapons Ban);
- (4) Banning violent juveniles from owning guns for life;
- (5) Requiring federal gun dealers to sell child safety locks with every gun sold;

(6) Holding adults who allow children easy access to firearms criminally responsible for their reckless actions;

(7) Limiting the purchase of handguns to one per month [NB: We have not yet decided to include this provision]; and

(8) Enhancing certain gun penalties, providing for the forfeiture of guns used to commit crimes, strengthening the federal firearms licensing system and procedures, providing for Brady background checks to purchase explosives, and more.

Also, we might be able to simultaneously release a new Justice Department report detailing how many illegal gun sales were stopped through Brady Background checks in 1998 and since the Brady Law's enactment (probably well over 300,000). However, we need to confirm this with Justice.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Irene Bueno ( CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 20:02:14.00

SUBJECT: Event Ideas

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett ( CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As you requested, the following is a brief list of event ideas. I will continue to beat the bushes for other ideas.

1. Asian American and Pacific Islander Executive Order - signing ceremony or some event during Asian Pacific American heritage month (May) announcing this EO. This Order is still in the process of being cleared but should be cleared by May.
2. Public Charge Regulation Roll-out - this is good news but the timing is unclear. This event could take place in a state with a high immigration population such as California.
3. Race Book Roll-out - a process has already begun to develop roll-out ideas but the timing is unclear.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need more information about these proposals.

Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 20:46:29.00

SUBJECT: Possible announcements

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary L. Smith ( CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here are some options for annoucnements, we should have a couple of  
slightly bigger ones coming.===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS\_EXT:[ATTACH.D38]ARMS134946910.136 to ASCII,  
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504308050000010A02010000000205000000D521000000020000C614FB0025F3367270D8E1  
924B91F1642EE5D0685276FA91BE6AC792EA9FBD1C46F004C26C07C2623D02D0A2C9BE309C4A6B  
1D36770488DDE2C0F218296D8814FE1CF565D45C4301932EEFCAA55B30F90B17855FF96D4AA796  
CBBB00BDC8436D99EA5785DED9311FF0FF303FB61E4ADBCC7F31527F4B28249C57A1A9B7437095  
7D2182CEAAC93B5B891DE436C047B1EEFF004D0B7DD8122B97FA3D6DB579CC54F7772F763933BC  
C7CEAEA618ED03E70CBAD16001048E696ED18665CD533DD6FA830CBDF2D119CDA86EE2F691014  
1977EE11B679C9FA6FECB912124DF59C13C71AC6DDF1062CA1C10AE5971430B3AF997A0B386B7A  
5F05212A95D59204FCC7E57F15B906DF3B7DABD9ADF05F481701141B4BEE1A1CF0D1DB709B4670

## Event Ideas

- 1. Homeless Report.** We could announce the results of the National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients, which is the first-ever comprehensive survey of both clients and providers of homeless programs funded by the federal government. Representatives of 11,909 programs out of an estimated 40,000 nationwide were interviewed, and 4,207 people who use the programs were interviewed. The survey will show that 15 percent of the homeless respondents have one or more children under the age of 18 with them; that 28 percent of respondents say they sometimes or often do not get enough to eat, compared to 12 percent of poor Americans; and 38 percent report alcohol use problems, 26 percent drug use problems, and 39 percent mental health problems, and 66 percent report one or more of these problems. The report does not estimate the total number of homeless persons. The announcement of the survey could be combined with another push for our FY2000 budget for HUD which includes \$1.125 billion for homeless assistance. If enacted, the \$1.125 billion will be the largest ever appropriation to HUD for homeless assistance. (Tentatively ready in a month, likely sooner if we pushed for it).
- 2. Food Safety Event.** We can urge Congress to pass funds for our food safety initiative, support Harkin's bill to give USDA recall authority for tainted food, and announce a new rule regulating eggs to prevent salmonella. The FDA rule now at OMB (and its USDA companion already completed and set to go into effect in August) will require eggs to be kept at 40 degrees and put warning labels to consumers on each carton. There are at least 800,000 cases of salmonella a year and eggs are the leading culprit. They project a median savings of \$700 million in reduced health care costs (OMB analysis includes a range of \$87 million to \$6 billion). The cost of the rule to companies is \$60 million the first year, \$10 million a year afterwards. USDA also has a reinventing government rule clearing OMB to move from a regulatory approach on sanitation of meat and poultry plants to a performance setting standard method which companies will like and shows we are interested in flexible means of achieving goals. (Timing: OMB wants time but could be pushed to get the rule out).
- 3. Nutrition Executive Order.** USDA and consumer groups have urged us to establish an inter-agency council on nutrition. While there has been a relatively recent scientific recognition of the important connection between diet and disease prevention, (well-covered in Newsweek, Time, and elsewhere), the Administration has little coordination between our health and nutrition programs at HHS and USDA. If given a choice, the groups would prefer a WH Conference on Nutrition and have approached Chris Jennings about it. The Council would operate like our food safety council and hold public hearings, report on what we know about the topic, and recommend ways to link our programs at HHS and USDA better.

4. **Presidential Rank Awards for Distinguished Executives.** (OPM has submitted a scheduling request for this but we could likely tie it in with our issues, particularly, PBOR): The President could announce the 52 awardees from many federal agencies. These winners are members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) whose work has improved the programs and the federal departments where they work in innovative ways. Both the President and Vice President have announced these awards in past years. There is already a scheduling request in at Cabinet Affairs for April 29. OPM proposes to tie the announcement of the winners with highlights of the Administration's policies -- e.g., OPM's winner, Ed Flynn, helped develop the federal government's Patients Bill of Rights. Mr. Flynn and OPM also helped develop the federal government's long-term care proposal.
  
5. **Native American Education Foundation.** The Department of the Interior proposes legislation to establish a non-profit Native American Education Foundation. This legislation would create a foundation similar to the National Park Foundation and would permit the Foundation to solicit donations for the furtherance of Native American education for grades K-12. While there is an American Indian College Fund, there is no existing non-profit that focuses on this issue of K-12 education for Native American children. The Foundation would be able to give funds to support projects such as developing American Indian cultural curriculum, research on American Indian education, and initiating model programs to improve Native American education. This effort would build upon the Native American executive order that the President signed last August. Senator Inouye has indicated that he would like to sponsor this legislation, and Interior expects that they will be able to garner additional support. This proposal has received support from the Native American education community, particularly from the National Indian Education Association (NIEA) and the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC). OMB is worried that staffing the Foundation would cost money, Interior is trying to reach an accommodation. (Needs to go through OMB clearance, possibly ready by May).
  
6. **Endangered Species Act Delistings**  
  
Bald eagle -A proposal to delist the bald eagle is set to be announced on July 4, 1999. Perhaps we should push to move up.  
  
Peregrine falcon -Similarly, the final proposal to delisting the peregrine falcon is set to be announced in August 1999.

FYI.

**Report on Health Effects of Cigars.** FTC is currently working on a report to Congress that would recommend that health warnings should be adopted for cigars. (Ready in 6-7 weeks).

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman ( CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1999 20:53:11.00

SUBJECT: New Ideas

TO: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan ( CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

fyi

----- Forwarded by Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP on 04/14/99  
07:57 PM -----

Ruby Shamir  
04/14/99 07:16:15 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP  
cc: Neera Tanden/WHO/EOP, Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP  
Subject: New Ideas

Following are some new ideas from the Children and Families team [in chronological order]:

Introduction of Legislation to Prohibit Discrimination Against Parents.  
Senator Dodd is almost ready to introduce the President's proposal to prohibit employment discrimination against parents.  
Date: Late April Early May.

New Child Care Report. At our request, HHS is developing a report on the high cost of child care for low and moderate income working families, and their needs for child care assistance.  
Date: Report will be ready May 1.

New After School Grants. Release of 21st Century Learning Grants of \$100 million for after school programs around the country.  
Date: Late May.

New Adoption Numbers. Announcement of significant increases in adoptions since 1996, and the awarding of bonus dollars to states.  
Date: TBD