

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 088 - FOLDER -007

[02/02/1999 - 02/03/1999]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mike Cohen (Mike Cohen [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 08:17:47.00

SUBJECT: boston guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Attached are q's and a's for Boston.

DO YOU YAHOO!?

Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

- bostqa.wpd===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D46]MAIL45389343C.036 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504302060000010A02010000000205000000873800000002000006B261323EA625EF4C5A316
8762918E2D9A635EF46360A5604DB5C35AE7FD88ED1F98E47D93B0E0AC7514E601EEF4EA376623
26B65D130559E49986904212B8BD65E7AC01550CE6B4AA6C8709A39F25CB59AA71C8F0982FC32D
9F4D8AFDA1602FDF5353EAC8ADDF465D756C44625B2AA5BCF592D4FBBB47A5165ABE7508706154
900F9DC8197B9887B21F056475C4A9E9F18D8CEABB404362FD0B146653856550968A989670AE53
33FF16339C56613D9A3BFE4E1118633608DDE0471B76EAE19C74DA117A4E37F55F69BB25CB8C4E

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Guidance for Boston Education Event

- Q. What will states/districts actually do with this money?
- A. That depends on the needs of each school, usually determined after a careful audit of what's working and what isn't in each low performing school. In many cases, the funds will be used for purposes such as (1) providing intensive training to teachers, (2) providing additional time for school staff to implement a proven model of school improvement, such as Success for All or other programs with a track record of improving student achievement in reading and other basic skills, and (3) providing extra help and tutoring to students who are behind.
- Q. If 19 states are already doing something to turn around low performing schools, why does the federal government need to require it as a condition of receiving federal funds?
- A. No student should be trapped in a failing public school, no matter what state or school district the student lives in. And the federal government should not continue to invest in approaches that don't work. Thirty-one states do not yet have an accountability system in place that ensures that low performing schools will get the attention and support they need in order to improve, or that they will be closed down if they don't. Requiring states and school districts that receive federal education funds to have an effective system of holding schools accountable for results, and to take responsibility for all public schools is an effective and appropriate way to ensure that students get a good education and taxpayers get results for their investment.
- Q. How will the Education Department enforce this requirement, and the other accountability requirements the President has proposed. Will you cut off funds to states and districts that don't comply?
- A. First, these are perfectly reasonable requirements on states and school districts that receive federal education funds, and we do not expect a compliance or enforcement problem. While not all states are implementing the policies the President has called for, this is the unmistakable direction in which state and local education policy is heading. So we expect that these accountability requirements will speed up the trends we already see among the states. This is exactly what happened in 1994, when the Goals 2000 Act required states to raise academic standards in order to receive funding. Now, 48 states have set higher standards, and in the remaining two, this job is delegated to local school districts.

Second, as in existing Education Department grant programs, the Secretary of Education has a range of tools at his disposal to ensure compliance with the terms

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

and conditions of a grant. This starts with discussion, persuasion and informal negotiations, which is generally sufficient to bring about an agreement between the Education Department and a state. The Secretary also has the ability, if needed, to withhold a portion of the funds a state or school district would receive, starting with the administrative funds that goes to the state or local education agency, but potentially including some or all of the funds intended for schools. No Secretary, certainly not this Secretary of Education, would take that step lightly, though he would if it were necessary to ensure that taxpayer funds were not spent year after year on approaches that don't work.

Q. Republicans are stressing flexibility and local control, while the President is calling for more accountability and more federal control. Are the two in conflict?

A. The President is insisting on greater and more effective accountability, but he is not calling for more federal control. This is not a debate about federal control vs. local control. States and school districts will remain completely in charge of setting academic standards, selecting the curriculum, setting promotion and graduation requirements, determining teacher certification requirements and what tests new teachers must pass. They will still establish the policies and governance of their school systems, hire the teachers, set the school schedule, assign students and teachers to classes, without any federal control.

Further, we do not believe there is a conflict between more accountability for results, and greater flexibility in how to achieve them. In fact, the two must go hand-in-hand. That is the approach this Administration has pursued over the past six years -- as we worked to help states and school district raise academic standards and hold schools accountable for results, at the same time we made federal programs more flexible, cut elementary and secondary regulations by 2/3, and provided waivers of federal requirements to states and school districts if these requirements interfered with state or local school reforms.

Q. Will the President support the Ed-Flex bill that Republicans passed in the Senate last week?

A. We are in favor of greater flexibility along with greater accountability. We would prefer

Automated Records Management System

Hex-Dump Conversion

to see an expansion of the Ed-Flex demonstration program (which permits 12 states to waive selected federal education requirements if they interfere with state or local school reforms) taken up as part of the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This approach would help ensure that a new Ed-Flex program reflects the ESEA that will be in effect for the next five years, rather than extending a flexibility program designed with the requirements of the old ESEA in mind.

- Q. Massachusetts has a test for new teachers, that some 60% failed last year. The President's has proposed a requirement to that school districts no longer hire teachers on "emergency certificates" or assign teachers to teach out of field. How are we going to get enough qualified teachers if so many can't pass a basic skills test? Doesn't the President's proposal to reduce class size only make the problem of finding enough qualified teachers even worse?
- A. Even though it will be difficult, it is wrong to continue to hire unqualified teachers. Our most disadvantaged students, in our most disadvantaged urban and rural schools, are the students most likely to have teachers who are not fully qualified or who are teaching subjects for which they lack adequate preparation. These are the students most in need of the best teachers, and they are the ones most hurt by this practice.

Massachusetts and other states that have instituted competency testing for new teachers are doing exactly the right thing, because this is one important way to ensure that teachers have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective teachers. A high initial failure rate is often a sign that our schools and colleges must do a better job, that prospective teachers need to work harder, and that we must do everything possible to recruit our most talented people into teaching.

The President's budget will help recruit good candidates into teaching. It includes \$35 million to provide scholarships to 7,000 talented students who will commit to teach in under served communities. It includes \$18 million for the Troops to Teachers program, to help 3,000 military retirees (who are more likely than other new teachers to have a background in math and science, to be minority and male, and to have a successful track record of working with young people) become teachers, and an additional \$10 million to help 1,000 Native Americans become teachers and teach in tribal schools or other schools with high concentrations of Native Americans.

The President's Class Size Reduction program will also help. While it does increase the

Automated Records Management System

Hex-Dump Conversion

demand for teachers, it also provides funds to help meet the demand and to improve teacher quality overall. School districts can use up to 15% of the funds (\$180 million in the current fiscal year) to recruit candidates for teaching (including providing scholarships to prospective teachers), and to provide training to both new and experience teachers. Further, smaller classes — which makes it possible for teachers to get to know their students better and teach more effectively — will help make teaching a more attractive career choice for many.

The Nation must hire some 2 million teachers over the next decade, to respond to growing enrollments and the aging of the teaching force. Our emphasis must be on making sure all of these teachers are well qualified. Scholarships and other recruitment tools can and will help. In addition, at the local, state and federal level we must do everything we can to make teaching an attractive career choice. Improved salaries will help in many places. But so will more professional working conditions, conditions in which teachers can work together with their colleagues, in safe working conditions, with smaller classes, modern buildings and up-to-date technology, and with the support and respect of parents and the entire community.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mike Cohen (Mike Cohen [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 08:20:40.00

SUBJECT: boston guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Attached are q's and a's for Boston.

DO YOU YAHOO!?

Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

- bostqa.wpd===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D96]MAIL46100443G.036 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504302060000010A02010000000205000000873800000002000006B261323EA625EF4C5A316
8762918E2D9A635EF46360A5604DB5C35AE7FD88ED1F98E47D93B0E0AC7514E601EEF4EA376623
26B65D130559E49986904212B8BD65E7AC01550CE6B4AA6C8709A39F25CB59AA71C8F0982FC32D

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Guidance for Boston Education Event

- Q. What will states/districts actually do with this money?
- A. That depends on the needs of each school, usually determined after a careful audit of what's working and what isn't in each low performing school. In many cases, the funds will be used for purposes such as (1) providing intensive training to teachers, (2) providing additional time for school staff to implement a proven model of school improvement, such as Success for All or other programs with a track record of improving student achievement in reading and other basic skills, and (3) providing extra help and tutoring to students who are behind.
- Q. If 19 states are already doing something to turn around low performing schools, why does the federal government need to require it as a condition of receiving federal funds?
- A. No student should be trapped in a failing public school, no matter what state or school district the student lives in. And the federal government should not continue to invest in approaches that don't work. Thirty-one states do not yet have an accountability system in place that ensures that low performing schools will get the attention and support they need in order to improve, or that they will be closed down if they don't. Requiring states and school districts that receive federal education funds to have an effective system of holding schools accountable for results, and to take responsibility for all public schools is an effective and appropriate way to ensure that students get a good education and taxpayers get results for their investment.
- Q. How will the Education Department enforce this requirement, and the other accountability requirements the President has proposed. Will you cut off funds to states and districts that don't comply?
- A. First, these are perfectly reasonable requirements on states and school districts that receive federal education funds, and we do not expect a compliance or enforcement problem. While not all states are implementing the policies the President has called for, this is the unmistakable direction in which state and local education policy is heading. So we expect that these accountability requirements will speed up the trends we already see among the states. This is exactly what happened in 1994, when the Goals 2000 Act required states to raise academic standards in order to receive funding. Now, 48 states have set higher standards, and in the remaining two, this job is delegated to local school districts.

Second, as in existing Education Department grant programs, the Secretary of Education has a range of tools at his disposal to ensure compliance with the terms

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

and conditions of a grant. This starts with discussion, persuasion and informal negotiations, which is generally sufficient to bring about an agreement between the Education Department and a state. The Secretary also has the ability, if needed, to withhold a portion of the funds a state or school district would receive, starting with the administrative funds that goes to the state or local education agency, but potentially including some or all of the funds intended for schools. No Secretary, certainly not this Secretary of Education, would take that step lightly, though he would if it were necessary to ensure that taxpayer funds were not spent year after year on approaches that don't work.

Q. Republicans are stressing flexibility and local control, while the President is calling for more accountability and more federal control. Are the two in conflict?

A. The President is insisting on greater and more effective accountability, but he is not calling for more federal control. This is not a debate about federal control vs. local control. States and school districts will remain completely in charge of setting academic standards, selecting the curriculum, setting promotion and graduation requirements, determining teacher certification requirements and what tests new teachers must pass. They will still establish the policies and governance of their school systems, hire the teachers, set the school schedule, assign students and teachers to classes, without any federal control.

Further, we do not believe there is a conflict between more accountability for results, and greater flexibility in how to achieve them. In fact, the two must go hand-in-hand. That is the approach this Administration has pursued over the past six years -- as we worked to help states and school district raise academic standards and hold schools accountable for results, at the same time we made federal programs more flexible, cut elementary and secondary regulations by 2/3, and provided waivers of federal requirements to states and school districts if these requirements interfered with state or local school reforms.

Q. Will the President support the Ed-Flex bill that Republicans passed in the Senate last week?

A. We are in favor of greater flexibility along with greater accountability. We would prefer

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

to see an expansion of the Ed-Flex demonstration program (which permits 12 states to waive selected federal education requirements if they interfere with state or local school reforms) taken up as part of the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This approach would help ensure that a new Ed-Flex program reflects the ESEA that will be in effect for the next five years, rather than extending a flexibility program designed with the requirements of the old ESEA in mind.

- Q. Massachusetts has a test for new teachers, that some 60% failed last year. The President's has proposed a requirement to that school districts no longer hire teachers on "emergency certificates" or assign teachers to teach out of field. How are we going to get enough qualified teachers if so many can't pass a basic skills test? Doesn't the President's proposal to reduce class size only make the problem of finding enough qualified teachers even worse?
- A. Even though it will be difficult, it is wrong to continue to hire unqualified teachers. Our most disadvantaged students, in our most disadvantaged urban and rural schools, are the students most likely to have teachers who are not fully qualified or who are teaching subjects for which they lack adequate preparation. These are the students most in need of the best teachers, and they are the ones most hurt by this practice.

Massachusetts and other states that have instituted competency testing for new teachers are doing exactly the right thing, because this is one important way to ensure that teachers have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective teachers. A high initial failure rate is often a sign that our schools and colleges must do a better job, that prospective teachers need to work harder, and that we must do everything possible to recruit our most talented people into teaching.

The President's budget will help recruit good candidates into teaching. It includes \$35 million to provide scholarships to 7,000 talented students who will commit to teach in under served communities. It includes \$18 million for the Troops to Teachers program, to help 3,000 military retirees (who are more likely than other new teachers to have a background in math and science, to be minority and male, and to have a successful track record of working with young people) become teachers, and an additional \$10 million to help 1,000 Native Americans become teachers and teach in tribal schools or other schools with high concentrations of Native Americans.

The President's Class Size Reduction program will also help. While it does increase the

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

demand for teachers, it also provides funds to help meet the demand and to improve teacher quality overall. School districts can use up to 15% of the funds (\$180 million in the current fiscal year) to recruit candidates for teaching (including providing scholarships to prospective teachers), and to provide training to both new and experience teachers. Further, smaller classes — which makes it possible for teachers to get to know their students better and teach more effectively — will help make teaching a more attractive career choice for many.

The Nation must hire some 2 million teachers over the next decade, to respond to growing enrollments and the aging of the teaching force. Our emphasis must be on making sure all of these teachers are well qualified. Scholarships and other recruitment tools can and will help. In addition, at the local, state and federal level we must do everything we can to make teaching an attractive career choice. Improved salaries will help in many places. But so will more professional working conditions, conditions in which teachers can work together with their colleagues, in safe working conditions, with smaller classes, modern buildings and up-to-date technology, and with the support and respect of parents and the entire community.

TOBACCO MENU OPTIONS

I. Issues

- **MENU.** What programs should be included on a menu and what percentage should be allocated between tobacco / kids?
- **STRUCTURE.** How should these menu items be defined?
- **OFFSETS.** How should the \$2.9 billion federal share be offset?

II. Menu

Possible proposals include:

- **50% Tobacco / 50% Kids.** State a broad position allowing latitude in future negotiations (Tobacco could include prevention and enforcement as well as farmers; kids could include: child care, health (CHIP) and child welfare.)
- **Tobacco Control / Farmers / Kids.** A broad menu of three items. Non-tobacco growing states would not have to spend on farmers.
- **Fixed Percentage on Tobacco Control with Menu of other Items.** Additional items could include:
 - Tobacco farmers
 - Maternal and Child Health Bureau's Title V program
 - Child Care and Development Block Grant
 - Child Welfare Programs (Title IV-B)
 - SAMHSA grant programs
 - Safe and Drug Free Schools program
 - CHIP matching funds

Menu Requirements. (1) Funds from the grants may not be used as state match for Federal programs (except CHIP); (2) there will be a MOE on a program-specific basis; and (3) federal spending will be netted for amounts spent on federal programs (possible OMB proposal).

III. Structure

Tobacco Control Programs. To be determined is the level of specificity to these programs and whether farmer assistance is included or is separate to ensure that dedicated monies assist farmers. Tobacco control programs could be described in broad terms, such as:

1. Activities for tobacco use prevention and control including community based programs similar to programs currently funded by the NIH and assistance to local governmental entities to conduct appropriate anti-tobacco activities; and

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

2. Counter-marketing programs designed to discourage the use of tobacco products by individuals, to encourage those who use such products to quit, and to educate the public about the hazards of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke implemented through contracts or grants to eligible entities.

Or, a more specific menu similar to McCain, which includes:

- A media based counter advertising campaign to discourage the use of tobacco products;
- State, community and school-based education and prevention programs to discourage the use of tobacco products;
- Evidence-based tobacco use cessation programs, consistent with the most recent tobacco use cessation guidelines issued by the Agency for Health Care Policy Research or are approved as safe and effective for tobacco use cessation by the FDA; and
- Activities to enforce youth access restrictions in order to reduce the sale and distribution of tobacco products to individuals under 18 years of age.

Assistance to Farmers. Legislation could allow states to direct funds to assist tobacco farmers through:

- **Farmer State Trusts.** States could make additional contributions to the Phase II State Trusts recently agreed to by the industry and governors of tobacco growing states. The 11 tobacco growing states will establish separate state trusts with \$5 billion in industry payments; or
- **Authority to USDA.** States could fund a program authorized in legislation, to be designed by the Secretary of USDA, to assist tobacco farmers.

IV. Estimates and Offsets

The Administration's budget assumes that Medicaid costs were the basis for the states' recovery, whereas CBO assumed that only half of the state settlement funds were attributable to Medicaid. Moreover, CBO assumed that there is a 25 percent probability that HCFA will successfully retrieve the funds from the states, while the Administration's budget assumes full recovery. As a result of CBO's estimate, any bill that would waive HCFA's ability to recoup the Federal share in exchange for a commitment by the States to use the Federal share to support shared state and national priorities would require a \$2.9 billion pay-for.

OMB: Estimated Effects of Recoupment Policy (in billions)

FY	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001-2004
		4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8	18.9

CBO 1/ 98 Baseline: Estimated Effects of Recoupment Policy (in billions)

FY	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001-2004
		.68	.74	.76	.79	2.9

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Possible offsets include:

1. Requiring the states to pay \$2.9 billion to the federal treasury; or
2. Requiring the states to accept \$2.9 billion less in federal block grants; or
3. Increase the excise tax on tobacco products to cover the lost federal share (HHS is checking whether an excise tax triggers offset provisions contained in the state settlement).

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mike Cohen <mikec_20904@yahoo.com> (Mike Cohen <mikec_20904@yahoo.com> [U

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 08:34:31.00

SUBJECT: one more q&a

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

DO YOU YAHOO!?

Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

- bost2.wpd===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D52]MAIL479014436.036 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504302060000010A02010000000205000000420E00000002000002EE1597432979CE4013E4E
0FDC5857FD0A8640E44C5CA59F2CA81C3C54091B934596B632B8069595C83B432CDF2B4EAB0D0B
8C61F1318DE48138ED1EAD2EF871E31428594F09C73EC092A5FC58743EE7FE66A557925092B28A

**Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion**

Q. How do you know that this proposal will work — that low performing schools can and will be improved?

A. We know that low performing schools can be improved if they get the help and support they need, because it has been done, in places as diverse as North Carolina, New York City, Houston and Miami. In every one of these cases, when the staff in a low-performing school receives intervention from the top leadership of the system, support from experienced educators and experts, the resources to get the job done, a clear timeline for improvement coupled with consequences for failure to achieve results, schools show improvement. If they don't then state and local leaders must be prepared to follow through, by evaluating the staff and making necessary staff changes, or by closing the school down and bringing in an entirely new staff is necessary.

We have seen schools that are effective, even with the most disadvantaged students, throughout the nation. They are not created by magic, and they are not accidents. They exist because they have high standards and expectations for their students, good teachers and principals, and effective programs. There is no reason why we can't create these conditions in every school, if state and local education leaders, backed by a strong national commitment, accept the challenge.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 09:13:32.00

SUBJECT: Shalala on NIH budget

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/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:

Robert Pear reports today that Secy. Shalala disagrees with our NIH budget. Nice.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 09:15:30.00

SUBJECT: Draft Excerpts for Boston speech

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Here's a draft of the excerpts to release from today's speech. This reflects Joe's suggestion. It has Podesta's sign-off, but we still have to run it by the President before release.

ADVANCE EXCERPTS
REMARKS OF WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
JACKSON MANN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, BOSTON
FEBRUARY 2, 1999

This year we will have a great debate in Congress about the next steps to improve education in America. There are some in Congress who believe the national government has no business investing more in public education. I believe they're wrong -- we should finish the job of hiring 100,000 teachers to reduce class size, and pass our tax credit to build or modernize 5,000 schools.

But this debate is not just about money. Some of those same people argue that even though we spend \$15 billion a year on public education, the national government has no business holding the system accountable for results. I disagree with that, too. Can you imagine any company spending money without looking at results? I believe that as a nation, we should say once and for all that no child in America should be taught by an unprepared teacher. No child in America should be passed from grade to grade without having mastered the material. No child in America should be trapped in a failing school. The education of our children must be a national priority, and holding our schools accountable for results must be a national commitment.

From now on, we must say to states and school districts: Identify your worst-performing, least improving schools, and turn them around, or shut them down. Today I am pleased to announce that the balanced budget I submitted yesterday contains a new \$200 million pool of flexible Title I

funds that states and schools districts can use to turn failing schools around. We must make sure all schools are on the right track. If we fail to do this, and do it quickly, we are going to lose another generation of children to low expectations, low educational achievement, and low prospects of moving ahead in life.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 09:36:13.00

SUBJECT:

TO: ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN (ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I just cancelled staff mtg. -Laura

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 10:39:48.00

SUBJECT: Tobacco Meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Caroline R. Fredrickson (CN=Caroline R. Fredrickson/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: Daniel N. Mendelson (CN=Daniel N. Mendelson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dawn V. Woollen (CN=Dawn V. Woollen/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

You are invited to a meeting to discuss tobacco recoupment -- tomorrow, February 3, at 12:00 noon, in Bruce Reed's office, West Wing. Rich Tarplin and Jim O'Hara are also invited to to this meeting.

Let me know if you are unable to attend. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: David R. Goodfriend (CN=David R. Goodfriend/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 11:01:17.00

SUBJECT: Re: Edits to Cover Letter for Drug Strategy

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We are the final arbiter on these edits; I will make sure they are incorporated.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Jason H. Schechter"@lmgate3.eop.gov ("Jason H. Schechter"@lmgate3.eop.gov

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 11:04:32.00

SUBJECT: Fact Sheet: President Clinton's Plan for Turning Around Low Per

TO: "Jordan D. Matyas"@lmgate4.eop.gov ("Jordan D. Matyas"@lmgate4.eop.gov [UNKNOWN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=news.wsj.com/U=bob.davis/FFN=bob.davis/"@mr.eop.gov [
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=elsoldetexas.com/U=info/FFN=info/"@mr.eop.gov [
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=efeamerica.com/U=mpena/FFN=mpena/"@mr.eop.gov [
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Farrow (CN=Jeffrey L. Farrow/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neal Sharma (CN=Neal Sharma/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Y. Stevens (CN=David Y. Stevens/OU=OSTP/O=EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=ccMail.census.gov/U=kenneth.prewitt/FFN=kenneth.prewit
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew W. Pitcher (CN=Matthew W. Pitcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marty J. Hoffmann (CN=Marty J. Hoffmann/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph C. Fanaroff (CN=Joseph C. Fanaroff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Brian S. Mason (CN=Brian S. Mason/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evan Ryan (CN=Evan Ryan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=usia.gov/U=IGCP/FFN=IGCP/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matt Gobush (CN=Matt Gobush/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew J. Bianco (CN=Matthew J. Bianco/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Samuel O. Spencer (CN=Samuel O. Spencer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Skye S. Philbrick (CN=Skye S. Philbrick/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=aol.com/U=Deborin/FFN=Deborin/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=ost.dot.gov/U=kara.gerhardt/FFN=kara.gerhardt/"@mr.eop
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher K. Scully (CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=usatoday.com/U=spage/FFN=spage/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carrie A. Street (CN=Carrie A. Street/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maya Seiden (CN=Maya Seiden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles H. Cole (CN=Charles H. Cole/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon P. Jennings (CN=Jon P. Jennings/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jackson T. Dunn (CN=Jackson T. Dunn/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jena V. Roscoe (CN=Jena V. Roscoe/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ilia V. Velez (CN=Ilia V. Velez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maritza Rivera (CN=Maritza Rivera/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tania I. Lopez (CN=Tania I. Lopez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sondra L. Seba (CN=Sondra L. Seba/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah B. Mohile (CN=Deborah B. Mohile/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin Leeds (CN=Robin Leeds/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher Ferris (CN=Christopher Ferris/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward F. Hughes (CN=Edward F. Hughes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gregory B. Craig (CN=Gregory B. Craig/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Dario J. Gomez (CN=Dario J. Gomez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: "Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov ("Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger V. Salazar (CN=Roger V. Salazar/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie B. Goldberg (CN=Julie B. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani (CN=Sheyda Jahanbani/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: William C. Haymes (CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Maureen T. Shea (CN=Maureen T. Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janelle E. Erickson (CN=Janelle E. Erickson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: McGavock D. Reed (CN=McGavock D. Reed/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan E. Smith (CN=Jonathan E. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gino J. Del Sesto (CN=Gino J. Del Sesto/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha Scott (CN=Marsha Scott/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=pub.pub.whitehouse.gov/U=wh-outbox-distr/FFN=wh

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas R. Matties (CN=Douglas R. Matties/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David S. Beaubaire (CN=David S. Beaubaire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Glen M. Weiner (CN=Glen M. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Walker F. Bass (CN=Walker F. Bass/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Jonathan Orszag (CN=Jonathan Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (CN=Carmen B. Fowler/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lana Dickey (CN=Lana Dickey/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (CN=Maureen A. Hudson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood (CN=Debra S. Wood/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (CN=Patrick E. Briggs/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield (CN=Judithanne V. Scourfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen (CN=Jeannetta P. Allen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (CN=Woyneab M. Wondwossen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (CN=Tracy F. Sisser/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Knight (CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Ikemiyashiro (CN=Diane Ikemiyashiro/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kyle M. Baker (CN=Kyle M. Baker/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr. (CN=Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Brooks E. Scoville (CN=Brooks E. Scoville/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth Steele (CN=Elisabeth Steele/OU=WHO/O=EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William W. McCathran (CN=William W. McCathran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sherman A. Williams (CN=Sherman A. Williams/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edwin R. Thomas III (CN=Edwin R. Thomas III/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas J. Band (CN=Douglas J. Band/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ashley L. Raines (CN=Ashley L. Raines/OU=OA/O=EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=access.digex.com/U=usia01/FFN=usia01/"@mr.eop.g
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=wilson.ai.mit.edu/U=backup/FFN=backup/"@mr.eop.
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kim B. Widdess (CN=Kim B. Widdess/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Brian D. Smith (CN=Brian D. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen (CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: G. Timothy Saunders (CN=G. Timothy Saunders/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (CN=Cheryl D. Mills/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap (CN=Elisa Millsap/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (CN=David E. Kalbaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Lori E. Abrams (CN=Lori E. Abrams/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine A. Stanek (CN=Christine A. Stanek/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: meglynn@usia.gov (meglynn@usia.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RUNDLET_P@a1.eop.gov (RUNDLET_P@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Timothy L. Newell (CN=Timothy L. Newell/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RILEY_R@a1.eop.gov (RILEY_R@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WEINER_R@a1.eop.gov (WEINER_R@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (DON)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRAY_W@a1.eop.gov (GRAY_W@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov (SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JOHNSON_WC@a1.eop.gov (JOHNSON_WC@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BARBUSCHAK_K@a1.eop.gov (BARBUSCHAK_K@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=MSNBC.COM/U=patricia.peart/FFN=patricia.peart/"@mr.eop
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=news.wsj.com/U=jeanne.cummings/FFN=jeanne.cummings/"@m
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=aol.com/U=durph/FFN=durph/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOW
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=pacifica.org/U=mgarcia/FFN=mgarcia/"@mr.eop.gov
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=aol.com/U=marhast/FFN=marhast/"@mr.eop.gov [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=krwashington.com>/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=upi.com/U=photo/FFN=photo/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=aol.com/U=rsimoncol/FFN=rsimoncol/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNO
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=latimes.com/U=James.gerstenzang/FFN=James.gerstenzang/
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=chron.com/U=Nancy.mathis/FFN=Nancy.mathis/"@mr.eop.gov
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=reuters.com/U=Larry.mcquillan/FFN=Larry.mcquillan/"@mr
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=MS01.DO.treas.sprint.com/U=JOHN.LONGBRAKE/FFN=JOHN.LON
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov ("Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=usatoday.com/U=bnichols/FFN=bnichols/"@mr.eop.gov [UN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=usatoday.com/U=mhall/FFN=mhall/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=newsweek.com/U=drosen/FFN=drosen/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOW
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=kcrw.org/U=kyle.mckinnon/FFN=kyle.mckinnon/"@mr.eop.go

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=tnr.com/U=dmilbank/FFN=dmilbank/"@mr.eop.gov [UNKNOWN
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=email.msn.com/U=cmbeach/FFN=cmbeach/"@mr.eop.gov
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=VAXGTWY/U=Pubs_Backup/FFN=Pubs_Backup/"@mr.eop.gov [U
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Jodi R. Sakol"@lmgate4.eop.gov ("Jodi R. Sakol"@lmgate4.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov ("Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=ed.gov/U=Julie_green/FFN=Julie_green/"@mr.eop.g
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=access.digex.com/U=usnwire/FFN=usnwire/"@mr.eop
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=usnewswire.com/U=newsdesk/FFN=newsdesk/"@mr.eop
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: " ("/R=EOPMRX/R=LNGTWY/R=inet/R=eln.attmail.com/U=62955104/FFN=62955104/"@mr.eo
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BUDIG_N@a1.eop.gov (BUDIG_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HEMMIG_M@a1.eop.gov (HEMMIG_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRIBBEN_J@a1.eop.gov (GRIBBEN_J@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NAPLAN_S@a1.eop.gov (NAPLAN_S@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK_N@a1.eop.gov (WOZNIAK_N@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SULLIVAN_M@a1.eop.gov (SULLIVAN_M@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov (INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov [UNKNOWN]) (SYS)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: US" <" ("1=US" <"/C=US/ADMD=WESTERN UNION/O=ATT.COM/DD.ELN=62955104/"@mrx.eop.g
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 2-FEB-1999 10:59:00

PRESIDENT CLINTON□!,S PLAN FOR TURNING AROUND LOW PERFORMING SCHOOLS
February 2, 1999

In his State of the Union Address, President Clinton called on all states

and school districts to identify and turn around their worst-performing schools -- or shut them down. Today, in a visit to the Jackson/Mann Elementary School in Brighton, Massachusetts, President Clinton will announce a \$200 million initiative in the FY 2000 budget to ensure that states and school districts take the necessary corrective actions to improve low-performing schools.

\$200 Million to Turn Around Low Performing Schools. The President's FY 2000 budget includes \$200 million in new funds for the Title I program, to be set aside for intervening in low-performing schools. The President's proposal would require states and school districts to identify the schools with the lowest achievement levels and least improvement, assess each of their needs, and implement individual corrective action plans to turn these schools around. The corrective action plans could include such steps as intensive teacher training, disciplinary assistance, and implementation of proven school reforms. If these actions fail to improve student achievement within two years, the President's proposal would require states and school districts to take additional corrective actions, such as permitting all students to attend other public schools; reconstituting the school, by evaluating the staff (faculty and administration) and making appropriate changes; or closing the school and reopening it as a charter school or with an entirely new staff. The funds provided in the President's budget would support these interventions.

An Approach that Works. Experience demonstrates such interventions raise student achievement and improve schools when coupled with adequate resources to support change. After North Carolina sent assistance teams into its 15 worst-performing elementary and middle schools in 1997, 14 turned around within the year and met state standards in reading and math. Similar results have occurred in individual school districts across the country. The Miami-Dade School District identified 45 low-performing schools in 1995, implemented intensive three-year corrective action plans including schoolwide reading programs and improved technology, and determined last year that all of the schools had made progress. And in New York City, the Chancellor (superintendent) of the school system took direct control of the ten worst-performing schools in 1996 and determined just two years later that half the schools had made sufficient progress to be removed from his supervision.

Making Common Sense Common Practice -- Now. Holding every school accountable for results, providing extra help to schools that need it, and

reconstituting
or closing down schools that still fail to improve -- this is a
common-sense
approach to strengthening public education. President Clinton's
proposal will
dramatically accelerate efforts by states and school districts to turn
around
low-performing schools. In March 1996, President Clinton challenged every
state and school district to take responsibility for intervening in
low-performing schools. According to a recent Education Week study, 19
states
currently have policies in place to help improve low-performing schools. A
growing number of urban school systems, including New York City, San
Francisco,
Dade County, Philadelphia, and Chicago, also are taking steps to intervene
aggressively in schools with the lowest achievement levels and least
improvement. The Boston Public Schools will begin next year to place their
lowest-performing schools under intensive corrective action plans. The
President's proposal will ensure that every state and school district
take
responsibility to turn around low-performing schools, and that more of our
children get a quality education.

###

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 13:02:48.00

SUBJECT: Legislative Rollout reminder for TODAY...

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dominique L. Cano (CN=Dominique L. Cano/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: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maya Seiden (CN=Maya Seiden/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet L. Graves (CN=Janet L. Graves/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Just a quick reminder that Steve will have a legislative rollout meeting at 1:30PM today in the Roosevelt Room.

Thanks-

Rebecca

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ann F. Lewis (CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 13:05:21.00

SUBJECT: Atlanta Trip/National Gun Show

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:

I assume this strengthens our point ??

----- Forwarded by Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP on 02/02/99 12:42
PM -----

Laura A. Graham

02/02/99 12:25:47 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: Atlanta Trip/National Gun Show

While we are in Atlanta on Friday evening, a National Gun Show will be occurring at the same time. I think it runs through the weekend. Apparently it has quite a large audience from around the country. I had heard that the radio address message is regarding this very subject, so I wanted to let you all know. Thanks.

Message Sent

To: _____

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP

Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP

Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP

Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP

Paul E. Begala/WHO/EOP

Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP

Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP

Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP

Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP

Message Copied

To: _____

Stephanie S. Streett/WHO/EOP

Jeffrey A. Forbes/WHO/EOP

Dominique L. Cano/WHO/EOP

Tracy Pakulniewicz/WHO/EOP

Jocelyn A. Bucaro/WHO/EOP

Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP

Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Teresa M. Jones (CN=Teresa M. Jones/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 14:54:27.00

SUBJECT: Meeting on 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: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dan Marcus (CN=Dan Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

Teresa M. Jones (CN=Teresa M. Jones/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Are you available to meet with Chris Jennings on Thursday, 2/4 at 2:00pm
in Room 216

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 15:38:36.00

SUBJECT: is this accurate?

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Below is a graph from the tribute to Thurgood Marshall I am working on for POTUS. (tomorrow night's ribbon cutting) Is it accurate?

The 14th Amendment -- and its promise of equal protection under the law -- was his key, his sword, his shield. Like Lincoln, who saw how the ideals embedded in the Declaration of Independence compelled us to crack open the bonds of slavery, Thurgood Marshall saw how the fourteenth amendment could dismantle the walls of segregation, brick by brick. He breathed life into a moribund amendment and transformed it into a living charter of freedom -- as vital a guardian of our ideals as the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Teresa M. Jones (CN=Teresa M. Jones/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 15:59:06.00

SUBJECT: Grijalva Meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dan Marcus (CN=Dan Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

Teresa M. Jones (CN=Teresa M. Jones/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

To Confirm: This meeting is set for Thursday, 2/4 at 2:00 in Chris Jennings' office - Room 216.

Participants:

Sarah

Chris

Elena

Dan Marcus

Jeanne (Optional)

Talking Points:

**The Fundamentals of President Clinton's FY 2000 Budget:
*Investing in the Future while Maintaining Fiscal Discipline***

A Return to Fiscal Strength:

- The 2000 budget anticipates the third consecutive budget surplus -- the first time we have seen back-to-back-to-back surpluses in half a century.
- Our remarkable fiscal and economic strength -- a balanced budget and unprecedented economic prosperity, including unemployment and inflation at a three decade low and homeownership at a record high -- is not an accident.
- The President began this virtuous cycle with his 1993 economic plan, founded on reducing the deficit, making strategic investments in the American people, and engaging in the international economy. In 1992, the budget deficit stood at a record \$290 billion. Now we have achieved balance and can anticipate surpluses for decades to come.

Balancing Strategic Investments for the Future with Fiscal Discipline:

- The President's 2000 budget adopts the same framework that has led to our fiscal and economic success. It advances strategic investments and maintains fiscal discipline.
- The 2000 budget, with its many important priorities and initiatives in education and training, research, the environment, health, childcare and other programs for families, economic development, law enforcement, foreign policy and defense -- is fully paid for. It complies with budget rules that have served as tools to help enforce fiscal discipline; it meets the discretionary caps on spending and the pay-as-you-go budget rules.
- Our challenge as we move forward to the next century is to maintain the same fiscal discipline that led to this budgetary and economic success, while continuing strategic investments in the American people that will strengthen our nation for the future, and benefit the next generation.
- As the President suggested in his State of the Union address two weeks ago, this is defining moment that will greatly determine the character of our country at the end of the *21st* century. We can build on this strong fiscal foundation, or we can sweep it away.

Use the Surplus to Save Social Security First:

- We must save Social Security First. The President has already committed 62 per cent of our projected budget surplus for the next 15 years -- enough to extend Social Security's solvency to 2055. He is calling for a bipartisan process for additional reforms to extend

**Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion**

solvency through 2075.

- After we achieve Social Security reform, the budget makes further commitments of the surplus for strategic investment priorities to strengthen the nation for the future.
- The President proposes to dedicate 15 percent of the surplus to the Medicare trust fund, whose financial security is threatened even sooner than Social Security. In 1997, the President and the Congress worked together to make Medicare financially sound through 2010. The President's 2000 budget would extend that lifetime ten years further, to 2020. The commitment of the surplus will help a bipartisan effort — including the current Medicare Commission — go even farther. The President wants to consider, as a part of this reform process, expanding Medicare coverage to include prescription drugs.
- The President also proposes using 12 percent of the surplus to finance his new Universal Savings Accounts — “USAs.” He believes that the USA is the right kind of tax cut -- fiscally responsible, targeted toward the future, and helping the many American families who have the most difficulty saving for their retirement. This proposal includes seed money for Federal contributions, plus additional funds for matching contributions for individual workers who invest their own funds. The matching contributions will provide a larger percentage inducement for low-wage workers.
- The budget proposes that the remaining 11 percent of the surplus be dedicated to other important priorities — including education, National security, and health care. The President's budget is a sound, disciplined way to provide the resources needed for these priorities.
- We must use this opportunity to fix Social Security and then proceed to address Medicare, USA accounts, and our pressing investment priorities.

Rise to the Moment:

- The 2000 budget is a model for the new era of surplus. It maintains fiscal discipline, strategic investment, and uses the surplus to save Social Security First. As the President said in the State of the Union, “With our budget surplus growing, our economy expanding, our confidence rising, now is the moment for this generation to meet our historic responsibility to the 21st Century. Let's get to work.”

**Budget Roll-Out
February 1, 1999**

Please see summary document "President Clinton's FY 2000 Budget: Meeting the Nation's Long-Term Challenges" (8 pages) for highlights of the Initiatives. Also see "Talking Points: The Fundamentals of President Clinton's FY2000 Budget."

1. You have exceeded the caps by \$213 billion over five years. How can you say your budget respects fiscal discipline?

The 2000 budget proposes discretionary spending that -- along with cuts in other discretionary programs, offsets from mandatory programs and resources that are contingent upon Social Security reform -- meets the caps set by the Balanced Budget Agreements. Every dime of discretionary spending in this budget is paid for.

2. Do you believe the caps should be adjusted?

We are not proposing raising the caps from FY 2000. The budget would pay for discretionary spending within the caps, as mentioned above. The Administration proposes to raise the caps in 2001-2003, if there is agreement on Social Security reform. We believe the caps have served as a useful constraint on discretionary spending and would support their extension through 2004.

3. But aren't you spending the surplus?

The President is adhering to his pledge last year to Save Social Security *first*. The President's plan calls for 62% of the surplus over the next 15 years to be dedicated to the Social Security Trust Fund. He believes the time to act to save Social Security is now.

Once we have saved Social Security, we would invest 15% of the surplus for the next 15 years in the Medicare Trust Fund. After that we would turn to investing 12% of the surplus in Universal Savings Accounts, which is a powerful new tax incentive to encourage retirement savings. 11% percent of the surplus would be reserved for strategic investments like improving the military readiness of our Armed Forces and pressing domestic needs like education.

We will allocate these resources only after we reach a comprehensive bipartisan consensus on saving Social Security. The allocation of these resources is contingent upon Social Security reform.

4. If this Administration is being so disciplined, why is spending going up to its highest level in history in this budget?

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Federal spending under President Clinton has declined according to every meaningful yardstick:

- Spending in every year for which President Clinton wrote a budget has been a smaller share of our economy than in any year under the two previous Administrations.
- Spending as a percentage of the economy has declined in every year of this Administration.
- Last year, 1998, Federal spending as a share of the economy was at its lowest in a quarter of a century.
- The 1999 budget was 19.7 percent of the Gross Domestic Product; it drops to 19.4 of the GDP in the year 2000.

The actual expenditures in the budget rise because an increasing number of elderly people go on Social Security and Medicare, because of interest rates on the debt we have inherited and because the cost of medical care for the low-income population is considerable.

5. Given your surplus forecast of \$2.5 trillion during the next 10 years, there are clearly sufficient resources to provide for a tax cut. Why are you opposed?

The question that will shape our economic policy, and will be crucial to the prosperity and strength of the nation in the 21st century is: what should we do with the surplus. We can continue a policy that balances fiscal discipline with critical investments for the future or we can squander our hard-earned resources with short-sighted policies.

The President has outlined a framework to save Social Security, strengthen Medicare, boost retirement savings and provide for crucial domestic priorities. This plan provides resources to meet our current obligations to future generations for Social Security and Medicare.

By contrast, policies to spend the surplus on large tax cuts would do nothing to provide for the future. A large across-the-board tax cut would spend the surplus now and leave our existing commitments to Social Security and Medicare for our children and grandchildren to pay in the future.

This is not the time to turn from the path of fiscal discipline and strategic investments that brought us our remarkable economic success. A large across-the-board tax cut would bring us back to the days of fiscal irresponsibility, and undermine our hard-earned gains.

6. What is the amount of increased taxes in this budget?

The Administration continues its commitment to reducing tobacco use, especially among young people. All public health experts agree that raising the cost of cigarettes is an effective deterrent. The Administration proposal would impose a price increase of 55 cents a pack, and

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

would accelerate a 15 cent increase already legislated by Congress. The funds raised by this, a total of \$8 billion in FY2000, would offset tobacco related health care costs that the Federal government already carries.

Setting apart tobacco, there is no net increase of taxes in this budget. (If asked: The increased revenues to the Treasury that have boosted the surplus are the result of a healthy economy -- more people working at higher wages --- but are not the result of increased taxes. We now have the lowest tax burden in two decades for a typical middle-income family.)

7. Do you have your own tax cuts in this budget?

The President's plan to allocate 12 % of the projected surpluses to create new Universal Savings Accounts (USA's) so that all working Americans can save for retirement. Elements of this powerful new tax incentive could include, for example: Automatic flat annual contributions for low and moderate working Americans, and an additional tax incentive to match a portion of each dollar on a progressive basis that an individual contributes.

In addition, the budget provides \$34 billion over five years in additional paid-for targeted tax relief including:

- a \$1,000 long-term care tax credit to pay for long-term care services for about 2 million Americans;
- a \$1,000 tax credit for work-related expenses for people with disabilities;
- tax credits to build modern schools for our children;
- tax relief for child care for 3 million working families, plus tax relief for parents who stay home;
- and others to preserve green space and create and restore outdoor sites, spur new equity for investment in underserved communities, increase the low-income housing tax credit, provide tax credits for more fuel efficient vehicles and homes, and others.

The \$34 billion over five years in targeted tax cuts are paid for with proposals to curb corporate tax shelters and reductions in unwarranted tax subsidies.

8. What about spending cuts. How much and what are they?

This Administration is committed to a government that does more with less. In six years, through consolidation and efficient management we have been able to eliminate the equivalent of 365,000 full time employees. In addition, we have also cut programs and spending when and where appropriate, and when it meets our overall goals.

For example, the Year 2000 budget has provided additional resources at the Federal level for the 21st Century Policing Initiative, also known as Cops II. This will continue to put more officers on the street, while improving the equipment and technology they rely on and devoting more resources to community efforts for prosecution of criminals. For this reason, we made cuts in local law enforcement block grants. The end result will be a well-coordinated, well-funded anti-crime program.

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Other examples are the EPA and the NASA. In the case of there is an general budget reductions, but priority programs within their budgets have been increased. Overall spending for NASA has decreased by 1 percent. However, there is an increase of 2.46 billion -- an increase of 8 percent for the Space Station --- because this joint project between the United States and Russia marks the start of an era of international cooperation in space.

In addition, there are cuts in the EPA to address the fact that certain programs have fulfilled their objectives, while other areas have had support increased. For example, funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds in FY2000 has been cut by \$550 million because the funds are approaching their goals for full capitalization, meaning that they are reaching the level originally targeted that will enable them to make loans through States to local governments. At the same time, key programs within EPA have had their support increased. There is a 5% increase -- nearly \$200 million for 2000 -- in the core operating program, which includes regulatory functions, including public environmental and public health issues, and clear air regulations. In addition, Climate Change Technology will see its funding nearly double for the Year 2000.

9. What about the mandatory offsets you referred to earlier? How much does that raise?

Offsets from mandatory programs total \$17.7 billion dollars, \$8 billion of which comes from our public health initiative to raise the cost of cigarettes by 55 cents (discussed elsewhere.) There are also savings from Medicare, both in fraud and abuse and from management reforms at the Health Care Financing Administration, and from the FAA user fee, among other items.

10. The Presidents 2000 budget assumes that \$8 billion will be received in additional tobacco revenues by raising the price of cigarettes to 55 cents a pack. What programs in your budget will be funded with these funds?

The President is committed to reducing smoking in this country, especially among young people. Raising the price of cigarettes is an effective deterrent, and one that we are pursuing again this year in our drive against tobacco.

Tobacco related problems cost the Federal government billions of dollars each year. In the case of tobacco, the Administration is seeking reimbursement to the taxpayer for costs that are directly related to tobacco companies.

Apart from Medicare, we have calculated that there are a total of \$8 billion in tobacco related health care costs in FY 2000 in Veterans Affairs, the Federal Health plan, the Defense Department and Indian Health Service. The funding for these programs is not contingent upon tobacco receipts.

11. What about the Federal government's plans to recoup some of the State settlements with the tobacco companies?

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

The Administration plans to pursue recoupment of the Federal share of all state third-party liability collections, including the recent state tobacco settlements. Since U.S. taxpayers paid a substantial portion of the Medicaid costs that were the primary basis for the state settlements, the budget assumes the Federal government will follow the law and claim its share of the proceeds. However, the Administration again proposes to work with the States and the Congress to enact tobacco legislation that, among other things, resolves these Federal claims in exchange for a commitment by the States to use the Federal share to support programs that are currently shared state and national priorities.

The recoupment is not reflected in the budget until 2001, allowing a year for the Administration to work with Congress and the States on a recoupment policy.

12. Is this budget dead on arrival?

The President has already set the terms of debate, with his proposal to save Social Security First by dedicating 62% of the surplus to Social Security for the next fifteen years, and then to allocate the surplus to Medicare, to boost retirement savings, and to critical domestic priorities. The President believes that we should stick to the path of fiscal discipline and invest in the future -- an approach we have taken for six years and which has brought us this great economic prosperity. Those are the terms of debate.

The President is committed to working with Congress to pass the initiatives in this budget. You'll notice that last year, there were predictions that the President was not going to get anything out of Congress, and by the time the legislative session closed we had done pretty well, with victories on class size, other educational spending, environmental issues, LIHEAP.

We have every intention of working seriously with Congress this year on initiatives that matter to our nation's future, starting with Social Security reform.

QUESTIONS ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Q: Aren't you double-obligating or double-counting the same money?

A:

- **Since 1983, the Social Security trust fund has experienced a growing excess of annual receipts over expenditures. This excess is used each year to purchase special Treasury securities. The resulting buildup in the trust fund is the intended result of the 1983 reforms, which set out to build up a large reserve before the baby boom retires.**

Automated Records Management System

Hex-Dump Conversion

- **At the same time, the difference between Social Security receipts and expenditures represents an extra inflow of cash each year, which contributes to the unified budget surplus.**
- **The critical problem during the 1980s and the early 1990s was that Government simply spent those funds on current needs. This did nothing to ensure that we could pay off those securities in the future without huge spending cuts, tax increases, or borrowing more money.**
- **Hard-won fiscal discipline during the past 6 years means that the government can pay back bonds in the trust fund and still run surpluses.**
- **The question now is whether to use the current unified budget surplus to finance our existing commitment to pay future Social Security and Medicare benefits further into the future. The President's plan would channel almost \$3 trillion into debt reduction, and would lock in some of the gains from this fiscal discipline to pay Social Security benefits until 2055 and Medicare benefits until 2020.**

Q: How will the government meet its new obligations to Social Security and Medicare?

A:

- **The President's plan does not create new obligations of the government. We begin with the obligation to pay Social Security benefits beyond 2032 and Medicare benefits beyond 2008. The President's plan just sets aside the resources to make that possible.**
- **The President's plan would generate a dramatic decline in the national debt. By 2006, the debt-to-GDP ratio would be below its level in 1980; by 2014, it would be about 7%, below its level when the U.S. entered World War I in 1917; by 2017, it would be below 0. In absolute nominal terms, the debt held by the public in 2014 would be only 30 percent of its current value.**
- **By buying back such a large amount of debt, the government would substantially boost national saving and national wealth. Compared to a policy of spending the surpluses, government saving would average about 2% more of GDP from 2000 through 2014. The USA accounts would boost saving even more. In 1992 net national saving was 3.1% of GDP; in the first three quarters of 1998, it was 6.7%, a doubling that was more than accounted for by the increase in Federal government saving. Thus, a 2% of GDP difference is quite substantial, and if sustained for 15 years would produce a large increase in national wealth.**

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

- **If the unified budget surpluses were not dedicated to Social Security and Medicare, it would be very difficult to sustain them for 15 years. Thus, the economic benefits of debt reduction are closely linked to the President's decision to commit some of these benefits to Social Security and Medicare.**
- **Even if one focuses on the non-Social Security part of the budget, and ignores the unfunded liability of the Social Security trust fund, the President's plan is very fiscally responsible. The extra debt held by the trust fund raises the debt service costs of the on-budget government, but reduced debt service to the public offsets 3/4 of that cost in 2014. (It does not offset all of the cost because debt held by the public does not decline as rapidly as debt held by the trust fund increases. This differential is an artifact of the way that intergovernmental interest payments are scored.) The increase in national wealth would also increase national income and therefore tax revenue. Crude estimates suggest that this could offset another 15% of the increased interest payments to the trust funds in 2014.**
- **Under the President's plan, we project on-budget surpluses for decades to come.**

Q: Won't the government have to cut spending, raise taxes or borrow more in the future to pay for the extension of Social Security benefits to 2055 and Medicare benefits to 2020?

A:

- **No. Our projections show that if we simply maintain current tax rules, we will be running surpluses until the middle of the next century even after paying Social Security and Medicare benefits.**
- **By setting aside funds now, the President's plan produces the resources to pay Social Security and Medicare benefits in the future. It does this in four ways:**
 - **First, by investing some the surplus in equities, the plan builds up real assets that can be sold when the time comes to pay benefits.**
 - **Second, by reducing the ratio of publicly-held debt to GDP from 44 percent to 7 percent, the plan reduces debt servicing costs --leaving more resources available for other purposes, including paying Social Security and Medicare benefits.**
 - **Third, by paying down debt, we increase capital formation. The resulting increase in the capital stock raises workers' productivity and**

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

national income. These additional real resources will increase the future standard of living, and make it easier for society to pay Social Security and Medicare benefits in the future.

- **Fourth, by nearly eliminating the national debt by 2014, the plan leaves us in a position to do a limited amount of additional borrowing, if necessary, without threatening economic prosperity.**

Q: How does paying down the debt help us to pay Social Security benefits in the future?

A:

- **First, a little history. The 1983 Social Security reform act aimed to prepare the nation to meet its future commitment to Social Security recipients by having the system collect more revenue than it paid in benefits for a couple of decades. These extra funds were supposed to be used to put the country on a fiscal trajectory to be able to pay back the Social Security trust fund when the trust fund needed to redeem its bonds.**
- **Unfortunately, irresponsible fiscal policy in the 1980s and early 1990s produced large unified budget deficits, (these included the Social Security surpluses.) By the time President Clinton took office in 1993, large deficits were forecast as far as the eye could see, and there were serious doubts about how the country would be able to pay back what it owed to Social Security,.**
- **Six years of tough choices and fiscal discipline have turned things around. Because of the 1993 budget act, disciplined appropriations, and the 1997 budget agreement, we are now projecting large surpluses well into the next century, even after paying back every penny we owe to Social Security.**
- **The President believes we should go even further, buying down around \$3 trillion in debt and allocating these savings to ensure that Social Security is secure until 2055 and that Medicare is secure until 2020.**
- **By setting aside funds now, the President's plan produces the resources to pay back Social Security in the future. It does this in four ways:
[SUMMARIZED ABOVE]**

Q: Why not just pay down the debt without incurring extra obligations?

A:

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

- **The President's plan does not create new obligations of the government. We always expected to pay Social Security benefits beyond 2032 and Medicare benefits beyond 2008. The President's plan just sets aside the resources to make that possible.**
- **Some people would simply take Social Security out of the budget and pay down \$2.7 trillion of debt without extending the life of the Social Security or Medicare trust funds by a single year. Then they would debate only how much of the remaining surplus would go to tax cuts, military and other spending, and individual accounts.**
- **If this approach truly managed to keep the Social Security surpluses from being spent, and thereby left them for debt reduction, then this approach would put the country in a better fiscal situation, just as the President's plan does. However, this approach would leave open the allocation of the large future surpluses for various forms of spending and large tax cuts.**
- **We believe that we should take advantage of today's prosperity to prepare for the aging of America, and therefore that we should lock in much of the benefits of an improved fiscal outlook for Social Security and Medicare.**

Q: You said that debt held by the public falls under the President's plan, but since the government is giving additional bonds to the trust funds, doesn't the government's total indebtedness stay the same?

A:

- **No, that is not the right way to think about the economic impact of the President's plan.**
- **Debt held by the public is the most important measure of government indebtedness because it tells us the extent to which government borrowing crowds out private capital formation. Under the President's plan, the ratio of debt held by the public to GDP will fall from 44 percent today to 7 percent in 2014 --the lowest level since 1917. This will unleash a tremendous amount of new private sector investment and will make the government much more able to meet our commitment to Social Security and Medicare recipients in the future.**
- **The President's plan essentially gives Social Security and Medicare a "first call" on the gains from reducing debt. We think it makes perfect sense to allocate part of the gains from our fiscally responsible policies to extending the lives of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.**

Automated Records Management System

Hex-Dump Conversion

- **In any event, a more comprehensive measure of the government's future obligations would include promised Social Security and Medicare benefits. The excess of those benefits over expected revenues is an unfunded liability comparable in some respects to the explicit national debt.**
- **The President's plan does not increase promised benefits by one dollar. Instead, it finances the existing commitment to pay benefits by paying down publicly-held debt and directing some of the benefits if that debt reduction to the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.**

Q: A column in last week's *Newsweek* argues that the President's budget allocates 150 percent of the budget surplus. Is that true?

A:

- **No, it is not. The President's plan allocates 100 percent of the unified budget surplus. In focusing on the unified budget surplus, we are doing exactly what every President since Lyndon Johnson has done in formulating budget policy.**
- **The fundamental budget policy choice we are facing is how to allocate \$4.5 trillion in surpluses over the next 15 years among debt reduction, new spending, and tax cuts. The President's plan allocates the bulk of these surpluses to debt reduction, and gives Social Security and Medicare claims on the wealth created by our current fiscal discipline.**
- **Under the *Newsweek* type of accounting, every budget in the last 30 years would be guilty of "double counting" or spending more than 100 percent of the surplus. The crucial difference is that during the 1980s and early 1990s, the extra inflows from Social Security were spent on current needs. Under the President's plan, they would be dedicated to debt reduction, which would strengthen our economy for the future.**

Q: Isn't this plan based entirely on double counting of money that is already dedicated to Social Security?

A:

- **This is not the right way to think about the economic impact of the President's plan.**
- **Currently, the government as a whole is running a surplus --it is bringing in more in revenue than it is paying out. The fundamental question for our**

budget policy is what to do with the excess.

- **The President is proposing that most of the excess be set aside to pay for future retirement and health needs stemming from the aging of America. This will add to national savings and improve the country's wealth --in contrast to the effect of plans that propose to use the surplus for tax cuts or immediate spending needs.**
- **The President's plan allocates the unified budget surplus to different uses, just as every budget has done for the last 30 years. The funds the President is setting aside for Social Security and Medicare are real and would presumably go to tax cuts or new spending if they were not set aside for debt reduction. This is the first time a President has called for some of the surplus to be set aside for debt reduction.**
- **We believe that it is sensible to allocate some of the benefits of fiscal responsibility to Social Security and Medicare. In addition, by allocating the gains from debt reduction to Social Security and Medicare it locks away the surpluses and prevents them from being squandered on tax cuts or new spending.**

Q: What will happen when the trust funds redeem assets to pay benefits?

A:

- **When Social Security revenue from the payroll tax and the taxation of benefits falls short of what is needed to pay benefits (around 2013), the Social Security trust fund will start redeeming assets.**
- **Some of these assets will be stocks that it can simply sell without having to find other financing.**
- **The rest of the assets will be government bonds. Redeeming these bonds means that Social Security gets money to pay benefits from the general fund of the government. Thus the government must come up with the cash for Social Security.**
 - **If the government is running a unified budget surplus at the time, it can simply use the surplus to pay off the bonds. This will reduce the surpluses available to pay for other things. Under our current projections, we will be running surpluses even after paying back Social Security well into the next century.**

Automated Records Management System

Hex-Dump Conversion

- **Otherwise, the government has three standard choices for how to obtain the cash for Social Security --it can issue debt, raise taxes, or reduce other spending.**

- **The ratio of debt held by the public to GDP is projected to be close to zero at the time when we start paying back Social Security. Thus we could issue debt to pay back Social Security and still keep debt-to-GDP ratios below those that we have today.**

- **Moreover, after we make the tough, bipartisan choices to extend the system for 75 years we will likely have closed the gap between taxes and spending in the period before 2055.**

MEMORANDUM FOR ELENA KAGAN

FROM: Mark Kitchens
RE: Today's MSNBC.com On-line Interview

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the on-line interview with MSNBC.com which will take place at 7:30 PM EST. This interview will take place in your office and will last between 30 and 40 minutes.

The on-line interview will take place via conference call with the MSNBC Moderator, Chris Donahue. At approximately 7:25 pm Laura Emmett and I will set up the phone call with MSNBC and the On-line Interview/Chat will commence at 7:30 PM. Questions presented to you will be focused on policy matters with specific attention paid to the President's Budget.

The MSNBC Moderator will take questions from the participants in the Chat Room and will then relay the questions to you. Upon responding to the question, the MSNBC typist (off-site) will enter your response. Once your response appears on-line, the Moderator will then ask the next question. Delay time between questions asked by the Moderator should not exceed 30 seconds.

NBC has mentioned the on-line interview on the *Today Show* and will also promote the interview on Brokaw's *Nightly News*. MSNBC will also mention this interview on several of its specialty shows, and has posted your bio and promo box on the MSNBC specialty web site for the President's Budget.

Attached, for your reference, you will find:

- 1.) Bio on the MSNBC chat Moderator, Chris Donahue.
- 2.) Budget Q&A's
- 3.) Budget Talking Points

Please let me know if I can answer any questions or provide any additional information. I can be reached at x. 65694.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 16:53:31.00

SUBJECT: Re: is this accurate?

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

tomorrow night's "marching toward justice" ribbon cutting ceremony...

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 17:47:23.00

SUBJECT: Re: is this accurate?

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Tomorrow night, the president is supposed to drop by the opening of a traveling exhibit dedicated to the history of the fourteenth amendment/career of TM at the Thurgood Marshall Building. He's supposed to cut the ribbon with Cissy Marshall. and then give brief remarks. I saw your name on the guest list.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 18:21:23.00

SUBJECT:

TO: ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN (ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Cong. Rangell returned call; call him @ 225-4365 ASAP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1999 19:12:47.00

SUBJECT: marching toward justice draft

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Draft 2/2/99

Shih

PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON

REMARKS AT □&MARCHING TOWARD JUSTICE□8 RIBBON CUTTING

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FEBRUARY 3, 1999

Acknowledgments: Mrs. Thurgood Marshall, Judge Damon Keith; Irvin D. Reid , President, Wayne State University; H. Patrick Swygert, President, Howard University;
Leonidas Ralph Mecham, Director, Admin. Office of the U. S. Courts, Thurgood Marshall Federal Building; Members of Congress; Bill Lann Lee; Minyon Moore; Ben Johnson

□&We are all created equal.□8 It is the simplest, most powerful idea ever set forth by humankind. And yet, from the moment Thomas Jefferson put ink to paper 223 years ago in Philadelphia, the struggle to honor these ideals has been America□,s most difficult -- and enduring -- challenge.

Throughout our history, Americans of courage and vision have stepped forward -- sometimes risking their lives -- to lead us in America□,s ongoing march toward justice. I thank you for working to chronicle their journey in this exhibit.

Perhaps no one in this century did more to open the doors to the glorious temple of American Liberty [Frederick Douglass, quoted by previous speaker] and move America further along the path of freedom and justice than the man we honor and remember tonight, Thurgood Marshall.

Tonight, we honor the courage of a man who traveled to the towns of the segregated south -- places where he could not find a bite to eat when hungry, a bed to rest in when tired, or a police officer's protection when threatened -- to argue passionately for the basic dignity of all Americans. We honor the genius of a man who masterminded a strategy to dismantle Jim Crow case by case, trial by trial, decision by decision, from Baltimore to Topeka to Little Rock to the United States Supreme Court. And we honor the commitment of a man, who as a member of the highest court in the land, remained a tireless champion of the freedoms and rights of every individual, especially the least among us:

The 14th Amendment -- and its promise of equal protection under the law -- was Thurgood Marshall's sword and shield. Like Lincoln, who saw how the ideals embedded in the Declaration of Independence compelled us to crack open the bonds of slavery, Thurgood Marshall saw how the fourteenth amendment could knock down the walls of segregation. He breathed life into a moribund amendment and transformed it into a living charter of freedom -- as vital a guardian of our ideals as the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

The legacy of the 14th Amendment, the legacy of Justice Marshall -- the legacy of his mentor Charles Houston and colleagues such as Wiley Branton and Jack Greenberg -- can be seen all across this country: In classrooms where children of all races learn side by side; in libraries and restaurants and drinking fountains that serve all people; in the educations and careers and lives of every man and woman in this room. But the road to freedom and justice is long -- we have far to go. Today, we can honor Thurgood Marshall not only with grand buildings and museum exhibits, but by continuing his life's work.

We can honor Thurgood Marshall and equality under the law by fighting discrimination in all its forms. No one should be denied a job, a home, an education, a chance at the American Dream because of race, disability, gender, sexual orientation or religion.

We can honor Thurgood Marshall and equality under the law by ensuring men and women receive equal pay for equal work.

We can honor Thurgood Marshall and equality under the law by working to give every single one of today's children -- of every race, color and creed -- the opportunity to learn in a 21st Century school with well-trained teachers, high academic standards and modern facilities.

During some of the darkest days of Jim Crow, a single phrase whispered in African American communities all across the South gave hope to thousands -- "Thurgood is coming." Today, at the dawn of a new century, it is up to each and everyone of us to ensure that Thurgood does indeed come. Let us take up his sword and shield, honor our highest ideals and work as One America to bring justice and freedom to every corner of this great land in the 21st Century.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 08:49:04.00

SUBJECT: ed-flex

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

TEXT:

can we get ed-flex guidance

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 09:08:07.00

SUBJECT: anti-abortion website case

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dan Marcus (CN=Dan Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Can we get guidance for Joe on the anti-abortion website case? I don't know if DPC or Counsel's office would handle this - let me know - thanks. Joe is briefing early today - at noon. We need all guidance by 10:30 - thanks

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 09:24:03.00

SUBJECT:

TO: ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN (ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We have guidance requests from the press office for you to review -Laura

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Shannon Mason (CN=Shannon Mason/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 10:22:05.00

SUBJECT: Davis Bacon Meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dario J. Gomez (CN=Dario J. Gomez/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Sally Katzen will host a meeting to discuss Davis Bacon on school construction tomorrow, February 4th at 2:30 in Room 239. If you haven't already done so, please confirm your attendance. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 11:22:42.00

SUBJECT: MSNBC On-line Kagan Interview Transcript

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/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: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger V. Salazar (CN=Roger V. Salazar/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward F. Hughes (CN=Edward F. Hughes/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gregory B. Craig (CN=Gregory B. Craig/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher Ferris (CN=Christopher Ferris/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/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: 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: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/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: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett (gamble-bennett @ dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan (CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel J. Gunia (CN=Daniel J. Gunia/OU=OA/O=EOP @ EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/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: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan E. Smith (CN=Jonathan E. Smith/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: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew I. Fraidin (CN=Matthew I. Fraidin/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Orszag (CN=Jonathan Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
 READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

MSNBC ON-LINE INTERVIEW WITH ELENA KAGAN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE DOMESTIC
 POLICY COUNCIL

Aired on February 2, 1999

Our guest is Elena Kagan, Deputy Director of the Domestic
 Policy Council and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic
 Policy, to chat about the budget.

Host Elena_Kagan says:

Hi, it is great to be here. I'm ready for the first
 question.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

Question from Leeds: Most economic experts, including
 Alan Greenspan, have said Clinton's social security plan which
 involves government investing in the stock market would seriously
 undermine our free market economy. Have you rethought this proposal?

Host Elena_Kagan says:

First, let's talk about what Greenspan said. For the
 most part he approves the SS, plan. The main point of the proposal is
 to take 62% of the Surplus and to pay down debt, and to use the
 savings for Social Security -- he said that that was exactly the
 right thing to do.
 Greenspan has been very supportive of our Social Security
 proposal.

Greenspan criticized one aspect of that proposal. Which
 was to put a small portion into the stock market. We respectfully
 disagree with

Mr. Greenspan. We feel that this can occur with real safeguards so there is no politicization of the returns. This will make it possible to preserve SS for the future. So in short Mr. Greenspan agreed with the main proposal - to use the 62% surplus for SS. And for the part he didn't agree with - to use a small part for the stock market, we think that Mr. Greenspan's concerns are not correct and that we can put enough safeguards in to make stock market investments appropriate.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:
Question from ed: The budget as submitted depends almost entirely on new taxes from cigarettes. Why do you feel cigarette smokers should be penalized?

Host Elena_Kagan says:
The Budget submitted does not depend entirely on new taxes from cigarettes. Cigarettes are one way in which to raise funds.. Only one (And not the largest. We don't believe smokers should be penalized. We believe that increasing the price of cigarettes will reduce smoking (especially by youth. We know that increasing the price will prevent some kids from smoking and we are committed to reducing youth smoking in America and that's why the President's budget has an increase in cigarettes. Let me say one more thing, in our budget the money that we get from that increase cigarette tax is used to reimburse the Government that are incurred as a result of smoking. Every year the govt. spends billions of dollars paying for the costs of lung cancer, heart disease, and other diseases ...we do that for Federal employees, military, veterans, every year we do it in Medicare. We use the money in that tobacco tax to reimburse the government for those costs. We feel it should be the tobacco companies who pay for those costs and not the American people.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:
Question from tired: Why aren't any funds from the budget allocated to paying off the national debt?

Host Elena_Kagan says:

the
surplus in
way that
goes is to
savings that the
government to
surplus (from
have the rest
adopted, the
fall to
since
reduce the
process the debt

There actually are a large part of funds that will pay off
National Debt. The President has said that 62% of the
the next 15 years ought to go to Social Security...but the
works is in these next 15 years...where the money first
pay down the national debt. Then as a result of the
government realizes there will be more money for the
spend on SS. So when the President says 62% for the
the savings from paying down the national debt (we will
for Social Security.
This is an extraordinary thing. If the budget were
national debt would fall sharply.
Right now it is 44% of gross domestic products (that would
7.1%. And that would be the lowest level of national debt
WW I.
What the budget really does is take these surplus dollars,
national debt and take the savings for SS (and in the
would go down to its lowest level since World War I..

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

penalty

Waltzer: Ms. Kagan
Why doesn't the President support eliminating the marriage
presently in the tax laws?

Host Elena_Kagan says:

very serious
extremely
pay for a
in our
so
the context
the surplus
these
make sure

We have felt that eliminating the marriage penalty is a
proposal that needs thought. The problem is that it is
expensive and we have never been able to figure out how to
proposal to eliminate the marriage penalty. Every tax cut
budget is paid for and eliminating the marriage penalty is
expensive that we have not been able to propose it within
of a balanced budget. Some people would want us to use
monies or give some other very large cut tax...but we feel
surplus dollars ought to go to save SS and Medicare to
those programs are solvent well into the next century.
This is the course of fiscal restraint that has brought us

the

economic good health that we now have.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

create a better

Question from lynn: How come the President doesn't

of life

tax break for stay-at-home moms? \$500. for the first year

gesture at

does not really mean much to most..it seems like a phony

best.

Host Elena_Kagan says:

we're

Well \$500 could mean a great deal to many families. What

help (new parents

saying by this proposal is that all new parents need

parents who

who go to work need help to pay for childcare (but new

is designed

stay at home also need assistance. This proposal of \$500

mean

to give that assistance. For some families that might not

deal. So

anything, but for a great many families that means a great

choices and

whatever choice the parents make, we should respect those

assist those families.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

the SS

Question from ok: Do you feel the majority will accept

changes the pres. has suggested?

Host Elena_Kagan says:

for the most

We have been encouraged that the Republicans in Congress

the

part have agreed with the Presidents idea of taking 62% of

we would

surplus and strengthening social security with it. What

in a

like to do is get together with the Republicans and work

will make the

bipartisan way to further save SS. Taking the surplus

work with

SS trust fund solvent until about 2055 - 57 years from now.

would also like

We would like to make it solvent for 75 years. We hope to

into

the Republicans in a bipartisan way to meet that. We

does to

to work with them to take a part of the surplus and put it

accepting, but we

Medicare so it is also able to keep paying the benefits it

that the

our older citizens. The Republicans have been less

hope that after giving this some thought they will agree

(15%)

President is right when he says that a part of the Surplus

ought to be used for Medicare.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

President's

jack_hershey (Jack Southwick): Ms. Kagan, Does the

Thank you.

budget address any of the more creative "alternative" education areas such as home schooling or charter schools?

Host Elena_Kagan says:

budget asks

The President is a big believer in Charter schools. His

schools. The

for increases consistently for more funding for Charter

were only a

result is an enormous expansion of those schools. There

thousands. This

few when the President took office, now there are

again.. And

years budget will include a substantial increase once

encourage other kinds of public school choice:

reach

Another innovative idea: Some work sites have started to

work-site so

agreements with schools to put schools on or near a

lot of

parents can be near their children (and there has been a

success with these type of schools.

increase

The President has a little bit of money in his Budget to

choice of schools in a variety of ways.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

programs have

Question from Leeds: Historically school budgets and

the Clinton

been the prerogative of local and state governments. Does

making by its

administration want to nationalize educational policy

proposed educational programs at the national level?

Host Elena_Kagan says:

that local and

We don't want to nationalize education. We understand

want to make

state governments want primary responsibility, but we do

wisely as

sure that Federal dollars spent on education are spent

results. We want

well. The system needs to be held accountable for

works; end

to make sure schools across the nation do what we know

social promotion, stop using unqualified teachers & etc

identifying and

State and school districts take responsibility for

turning around their low performing schools. In short, we

want to

make sure that there is accountability in the school

system and that

we do get results for the money we spend. And we're not

apologetic

improve our

for that desire to use Federal taxpayer money well to schools.

"re-inventing

money..not

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

Question from JamieIsbell: But your plan is just

a bigger government" right? The surplus is taxpayer

yours! Most of us want a tax cut.

spend the

think that we

it away.

us to the

economy because

discipline. We

kind of tax

deficits.

times can last

reduce the

future.

Host Elena_Kagan says:

We have an important decision to make here (on how to

surplus.

There are some, as the person asking the question, who

should do a very large tax cut - take the surplus and give

But we don't think that that is the strategy that brought

economic position that we are in today. We have this

we followed a policy of fiscal restraint and fiscal

kept our spending within bounds and we have not done the

cuts done in the Reagan administration that caused these

We feel if we stick to our policy, these economic good

a while longer. We would like to use the surplus to

national debt and to secure SS and Medicare into the

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

Question from BigG: how come the president doesn't

propose a tax

cut for fathers that pay their child support ?

Not

fathers should

Host Elena_Kagan says:

Well, we think that paying child support is an obligation.

something that ought to be rewarded. Something that

have to do.

President

Host Chris_MSNBC says:

Question from Audrey Michaels: Ms Kagan, What does the

have in the budget for veterans? Thank you

had for the

spending and

Host Elena_Kagan says:

The President has a strong budget for veterans as he has

last six years...with continued increases for Veteran

particularly Veteran health benefits.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:
Question from scrounge: I understand that budget policy
is developed via memos. However i am interested in how often
you have the opportunity to meet with the president and have you
expressed a view that he has acted upon in this meeting. in other
words will he respond directly without counsel

Host Elena_Kagan says:
The President meets with his budget team frequently from
about the middle of November through Christmas - during the period
the budget comes together. The President meets with the Treasury
Secretary, Deputy Treasury Secretary, and the Director of the Office
of Management and Budget and with officials from the National
Economic Council, and the Domestic Policy Council, where I work.
In those meetings there is intensive discussions about the options
with the budget, what tax cuts to offer, what investments to
propose, and about what the overall structure of the budget should look
like. The President responds frequently and vigorously to his
advisors, questions and comments. There is a lot of debate about
particular proposals. The President is very involved in determining
what the budget looks like and what goes into it.

Host Chris_MSNBC says:
Question from Christopher: On what issues do you and the
president differ?

Host Elena_Kagan says:
Even if we did differ on something, I wouldn't say it on
the Internet

Host Chris_MSNBC says:
Question from Allison: What nation's business is not
getting done because of the impeachment inquiry?

Host Elena_Kagan says:
Well the President is doing the Nation's business
throughout this year. The President has stuck to his work and every day
he gets up and does what the people of the United States asked him to

do when
Congress than
House every
at all.
matters,
President
Congress does is

they elected him. I think it's more distracting for
the President and his Staff. I work hard at the White
day doing domestic policy and my work hasn't been effected
The President puts in a full day thinking about what
education, health care, crime, and social security. The
does what the people elected him to do... and what
for Congress to answer.

required more

Host Chris_MSNBC says:
Question from sandflea: What particular proposal has
time and effort to resolve?

surplus has

Host Elena_Kagan says:
I think that the question of what to do with this amazing
required the most time to resolve.
It is such an important question because its such a large
surplus...and we can waste it or use it in a way that
future. The President and his budget team put an enormous
time into thinking about the different options for the
considering how we could use the surplus that continues
success and that secures these critically important
security and Medicare. That's what we spent the most
year.

secured our
amount of
surplus...and
our economic
programs - social
time on this

Host Elena_Kagan says:
Thank you, I very much enjoyed this. The questions have
had a good time here tonight!

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 11:37:33.00

SUBJECT: Re: MSNBC On-line Kagan Interview Transcript

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:

Oh come on, I read the transcript and you did great!

And let me just say thanks to you for participating in the on-line interview. I hope it was a good experience for you and we can do more in the future.

And Laura, thanks to you for all of your help in getting the interview set up,

best,

mark

Elena Kagan

02/03/99 11:35:07 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: MSNBC On-line Kagan Interview Transcript

good lord -- why did you send that out???

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 11:57:45.00

SUBJECT: Bilingual Education in ESEA Reauthorization

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Attached is a summary of the Education Department's ESEA reauthorization proposal regarding Bilingual Education. This is still a work in progress--the Department is still working to nail down a number of important details on this, and is consulting with the relevant groups as it continues its work. As this proceeds, I wanted to make sure each of you knows the status of the proposal and has a chance to weigh in in a timely fashion.

These proposals address changes to Title VII (Bilingual Education) and to Title I, which serves more LEP students than does Title VII. The proposals closely reflect the principles we developed last year in announcing our opposition to the Unz initiative, including increased flexibility, greater emphasis on ensuring qualified teachers for whatever approach a local community chooses, increased accountability for results, and a 3-year goal for becoming proficient in English. Briefly, here is how the Department's proposal reflects those principles:

1. Increased Local Flexibility. The Department's proposal would:

Remove the cap in current law that limits funding for special alternative English programs to 25% of the Title VII funds. This means that preference is no longer given to traditional bilingual programs, and makes it easier to fund ESL, English-language immersion and other approaches.

Maximize parental choice by requiring parental approval for participation in Title VII programs.

2. Teacher Quality. The Department's proposal would:

Increase the supply of qualified bilingual and LEP teachers through a new initiative to recruit mid-career, bilingual professionals into teaching

Expand the use of Title VII funds to support pre-service and in service teacher training programs that help equip all teachers to teach LEP

students.

3. Goal of English Language Proficiency in 3 years/Increased Accountability for Results. The Department's proposal would:

Require annual assessment of English Language Proficiency for LEP students served in both Title VII and Title 1 programs, with results provided to parents, teachers and administrators. The tests should be used by educators to guide needed modifications in instruction, to help each student become proficient in English within 3 years.

Require that LEP students who have been in a US school for less than 3 years be included in the Title 1 assessment system to the extent practicable, in the language and form most likely to yield information about what these students know and can do. This is an extension of current law, and generally means that students would be tested in their native languages rather than in English, if such tests are available.

Require that LEP students who have been in a U.S. school for three years or more be tested in reading and language arts in English, without any special accommodations, and included in the overall evaluation of the school as required under Title 1. This is a change in current law, and reflects our emphasis on a 3-year goal and strengthened accountability,

Require Title 1 schools with LEP students that are not making progress in helping students become proficient in English within 3 years to implement an improvement plan. If no improvement occurs, states and school districts would be required to intervene, as an integral part of the President's proposal to require intervention in low performing schools.

Make continued funding under Title VII dependent on the school district's success in helping students become proficient in English within three years, and in moving students into mainstream classes.

Several things are important about how the three year goal is approached. First, this proposal places responsibility for reaching the three-year goal with the schools and school systems, not the student. Students who do not meet the goal receive extra help, but are not removed from bilingual education classes. Second, the proposal defines the goal as demonstrating proficiency in reading in English within 3 years, as opposed to exiting from a bilingual or ESL class within 3 years. This means that the goal is defined in terms of student performance rather than school program placement decisions. It also means that school districts, subject to parental approval, will have the flexibility to keep students in bilingual or ESL classes after three years if this is appropriate for the student. I believe this is the right approach.

Note also that, while being fully consistent with the Unz principles we developed last year, the Department's proposal contains an additional emphasis which promotes the goal of helping all students learn a second language. The Department would approach this objective by strengthening an existing Title VII program that provides grants to school districts to promote foreign language instruction, and by giving priority to two-way bilingual education programs. These programs combine LEP and English-speaking students in the same classroom, and teach both languages. There is growing evidence that when implemented well, students in these programs develop dual language proficiency and do well academically also. I think this approach makes sense.===== ATTACHMEN
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT: [ATTACH.D83]MAIL48924463U.036 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

```
FF575043D2060000010A02010000000205000000573800000002000008E3AA95F42EAD0042C2413
27FDE4D5006E275B0BBFAD87EFF28ADF668D571D6BBC22BE7E00E82CFB16564C64C053244BCEA1
199853342C683967237235BC6A0CF4C6F0C526C21A4C36A863659F2A6C6654340F260DC77B55CE
34A65B395DE52B48CE042E610065FB874C5852FB57C58C7C114755D69BC2E2AD4D602577AFF409
A86785F82D4806A86CAAE5BA45A83A606CAAB4CF101C9DA11ADB51595DEDA882E96D0787421858
927E794E8572BBE59FA4D18BAC205CF69F0C8865AC901AEC27858612ECAF38F42424808316BECF
AE2148D1732D7CC9D38E59A8877D6C38474D44148FA9D95FBCB891412726E011112506BC6475EC
91D784C30AD8E79C4BCD39B0BB4D6257B25278B03826AFB8A34B0F4BFFB32DEBB91CF2DA7AF658
7F73B26F84533B819F6440E461267CFD0A404E86538C6BD253D03834885BEAC3DD2BE4D46799EC
D73C29C2A28579A4735F67951973B964BF5606B54A4ED45D0A7B58256175600829D6AFA39C6072
C040337BD64B4FD00B8FFF4E123AED2831F897C937CAF1CFB8CADF1FEA7A3ABD803A50CA0BAD9E
BE9120365BE8C67F4E861168B2B1B4EBEE000240091D75492273E5186156725BFF1BA9E25F9D43
```

Limited English Proficient Students and the Reauthorization of ESEA

Improving education for limited English proficient (LEP) students through reauthorization requires changes to several programs within ESEA. While Title VII has been the section of ESEA most closely identified with services for LEP students, most LEP students are served through Title I. Other programs under ESEA, including those addressing literacy, technology, and extended learning opportunities, are important sources of support for LEP students.

Given this reality, the Department of Education has undertaken a coherent approach to ensuring that LEP students needs are addressed in the reauthorization process. The strategies that make up this approach are framed by four guiding principles:

Principle 1: Ensure teachers are well trained to teach LEP students.

Principle 2: Focus on student performance. Provide flexibility for local school districts to design their own programs contingent on their being accountable for improving student achievement.

Principle 3: Increase accountability for all programs serving LEP students with the goal that LEP students reach English proficiency after three years.

Principle 4: Work toward the goal of having every child fluent in at least two languages

Improving the Training of All Teachers to Teach LEP students:

Background

- The majority of LEP students have a primary teacher who is not well qualified to provide services to LEP students. The 1995 National Education Goals Report indicates that 40% of all teachers reported they had LEP students in their classrooms, but only 29% had received any training to teach LEP students.
- Funding for professional development programs in bilingual education was doubled from \$25 million to \$50 million in FY99 and the President is proposing another \$25 million increase in FY2000 to meet the increasing demand for fully certified bilingual teachers and English-as-second-language teachers.

Recommendations for Reauthorization

- Create an authority for a national demonstration project to recruit bilingual professionals into the teaching profession on a large-scale (Similar to Troops for Teachers).
- Improve and expand professional development for all teachers of LEP students. Because

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

FY99 is the first year that Training for All Teachers (Title VII, subpart 3) has been funded, there are not yet any indicators of its success; it would be premature to alter it in any significant way. However, the reauthorization proposal will include priorities within the competition to focus on innovative pre- and in-service programs that use Title VII to leverage support and build partnerships to develop large-scale efforts to reach large numbers of teachers within a school district.

- Support significant institutionalized changes throughout all (not just bilingual and ESL) teacher education programs. Require that IHEs applying for Title VII grants provide evidence of a broader plan to improve teacher education programs to include preparation for all teachers serving LEP students. This effort would be aligned to/included in any teacher quality proposal introduced in ESEA.

Provide Flexibility for Local School Districts:

Background

Due to demographic shifts, schools are serving students from many different backgrounds. Districts may offer different instructional approaches depending on availability of resources, values of a particular language community, and current research.

Recommendations

- Require parent approval for participation in Title VII programs
- Increase capacity of small districts by providing a separate competition to support districts with small but growing LEP populations and those that have not been funded before.
- Remove 25% cap on special alternative English programs in Title VII

Increased Accountability for LEP Student Achievement:

Background

Current Accountability Provisions:

- Program evaluation every 2 years in Title VII
- No requirement for annual assessment of English language proficiency
- Title I requires inclusion in State assessment, "to the extent practicable, in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what students know and can do." Title I requires that assessment data be disaggregated by English language proficiency status when final assessments are in place.

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Recommendations

ESEA will have a focus on institutional accountability by requiring:

- Annual Assessment of English Language Proficiency
Both Title I and Title VII will require annual assessments of English language proficiency for LEP students.
 - Progress on assessments of English language proficiency will be reported--on an individual basis--to parents, and results used by administrators and teachers to inform instruction.
- Assessment of Achievement to the Reading/Language Arts Standard
 - After three years of education in U.S. schools, LEP students would participate in reading/Language arts assessments in English, without accommodations.
 - Title VII will require annual reporting of progress in improving student performance, including LEP redesignation (rates of transitioning to mainstream classroom). Grant continuation will be contingent on results.

All Students Learning a Second Language:

Background

- Many other countries encourage or require foreign language education in elementary grades. Italy, Spain, Germany, Denmark, Ireland, Egypt require study of a second language by ages 8-9. France, some Canadian provinces, Great Britain, Mexico, South Africa, People=’s Republic of China, India, Russia, Israel, Switzerland, Brazil, Japan require study of a second language by ages 12-13.
- Title VII Foreign Language grants currently serve over 60,000 students nationally, addressing approximately 10 languages at all grade levels (Pre-K Bđ 12). Approximately 20 recipients have implemented two-way bilingual education programs with these funds. There are over 200 two-way bilingual education programs in this country. These programs, in essence, provide equal status to both languages of instruction, and provide instruction that allows all students to truly develop proficiency in two languages.

Recommendations

- Give priority to Title VII programs that develop proficiency in more than one language
- Strengthen capacity-building aspect of foreign language programs by requiring applicants to provide plan of how program will be supported after the funding period

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

ACCOUNTABILITY PROPOSAL FOR LEP STUDENTS IN ESEA
SUMMARY

The proposal differentiates between institutional accountability and student accountability.

- ⇒ A focus on accountability for results must address: 1) improving training for all teachers to better serve LEP students; 2) ongoing assessment of progress in developing English language proficiency; 3) assessment of student progress in meeting academic standards; and 4) institutional accountability for student progress in achieving English language proficiency and in meeting the academic standards.

- ⇒ The goal is that all LEP students will reach English proficiency within three years of education in the US.
 - Under both Title VII and Title I, LEP students would be assessed for English proficiency every year. Those results should be used for modifying instruction, and to report to parents their child's progress in learning English. In Title VII, such results will also be used to determine grant continuation.

 - LEP students who have been in a US school for less than three years will be included in the Title I assessment system to the extent practicable, in the language and form most likely to yield information about what these students know and can do.

 - LEP students who have been in a US school for three years or more will be tested for academic achievement in Title I required State performance assessments in reading and language arts in English, without accommodations, as part of the institutional accountability requirement.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Carolyn T. Wu (CN=Carolyn T. Wu/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 12:44:04.00

SUBJECT: Pls. call k. tramontano 61906

TO: ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN (ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 13:12:45.00

SUBJECT: nea conf call

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP on 02/03/99 01:12
PM -----

Carolyn T. Wu

02/03/99 12:46:08 PM

Record Type: Non-Record

To: Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP, Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP

cc: Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP

Subject: nea conf call

any word on this yet?

----- Forwarded by Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP on 02/03/99
12:46 PM -----

Karen Tramontano

02/01/99 09:34:11 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP

cc: Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP, Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP

Subject: nea conf call

bob chase met w/ john podesta. two issues that came up that i also spoke
w/ elena about were 1. our strategy re: ed flex and 2. the ia
regulations at doe--timing and substance. i am open to handling this
anyway that bruce and elena think will work -- they could call ME
Teasley, I could put a conference call together -- I'd like something to
happen sooner rather than later -- would you speak w/ laura and cathy and
see how they think their principals would like to handle these issues.
thanks, kt

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 14:25:18.00

SUBJECT: Ed Flex

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I spoke to Mary Elizabeth Teasley this afternoon about Ed-Flex. They're not planning to oppose it this year -- they share our view that it doesn't really amount to much one way or another. I told her the Dems' strategy of using it for amendments on class size and accountability. I asked her not to put the NEA out front in public in favor of the issue, because that would play into the Republicans' hands. She agreed -- but Karen, you may want to reinforce with Bob the next time you talk to him that while we don't have substantive problems with Ed-Flex, we want to slow this down, not speed it up.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Marilyn L. Scott-Perez (CN=Marilyn L. Scott-Perez/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 14:49:49.00

SUBJECT: Meeting on Education Theme of G-8 Summit

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Mr. Steinberg will be chairing a meeting on Tuesday, February 9 at 4:15-5:15 in the Situation Room on the Education Theme of the G-8 Summit and would like your participation at this meeting. We have also invited Mike Smith (Deputy Secretary of Education, Terry Peterson, Counselor Dept of Education. Please let me know if you will be able to attend. Thanks!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan Orszag (CN=Jonathan Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 15:36:00.00

SUBJECT: Memo to POTUS on Better America Bonds

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Comments? We would like to get this in as soon as possible.===== ATT

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D52]MAIL40761073W.036 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

```
FF5750439F0D0000010A02010000000205000000114B000000020000051E5540E6E1E43D1674DCE
5D6F9B2E1837A825B050F080024CAC5A4E00402AEB8A26E895AD3A212DFF66C9FD3D70ED88C955
843218BF99C90ED3DF6D921038B864237ABD2FB1E582D85E0B9676BFBE9598F977EA3FA3182628
A6584724852C066E509C2786153C66EB3ECBB5B0341C4D729F8F2D193D7DF24B986A82B052A053
```

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

February 3, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

CC: THE VICE PRESIDENT

**FROM: GENE SPERLING
BRUCE REED
PAUL WEINSTEIN
JON ORSZAG**

SUBJECT: "Better America Bonds"

During last Friday's briefing for the Mayor's event, you expressed interest in the details of your tax credit proposal to help states and local communities preserve open space, clean-up abandoned industrial sites, create or restore parks, and improve water quality. The purpose of this memo is to provide you more information on this initiative.

Since the Vice President announced the "Better America Bonds" (BABs) proposal, you and the Vice President have received widespread praise. Senator Daschle's staff has indicated a desire in making its passage a priority, and a bipartisan caucus of ten Senators focusing on smart growth issues has signified interest in the legislation. Over the past two weeks, we have briefed House and Senate staff on BABs and we are planning -- in conjunction with White House Legislative Affairs, OVP, and Treasury -- targeted briefings with staff from Senate Finance and House Ways and Means. We have also received significant interest in BABs from the press and other elected officials. (See attached document for specific comments of support for BABs and the livability agenda.)

As you know, communities are increasingly concerned about the loss of open space and farmland, as well as declines in water quality, attributable to unchecked development and sprawl. BABs are modeled on your school construction proposal, allowing state and local governments to issue zero-interest bonds to lenders who could claim a tax credit for the life of the bond in lieu of interest. Under your proposal, the issuer -- either the state or locality -- would make no payments on the bond until maturity (15 years in the future).

Over the next five years, Better America Bonds will provide states and local communities \$673 million in tax credits to pay interest on approximately \$9.5 billion of bonds issued for the following activities:

- ***Preserve and Enhance Green Space.*** State, local and tribal governments, working together or in partnership with land trusts and other nonprofit organizations, can create or restore urban parks, preserve suburban green spaces, and protect threatened farmland and wetlands. Land can be protected either by acquiring title or purchasing permanent easements. Proceeds can also be used for reforestation, replanting and other types of environmental restoration or enhancement.

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

- ***Protect Water Quality.*** Rivers, lakes, coastal waters, and wetlands -- and drinking water sources -- can be restored or protected through measures to reduce pollution runoff and land acquisition to reduce polluted runoff. Eligible projects include “passive” controls, such as settling ponds, or the creation of planted or forested buffer strips along waterways that filter contaminants from runoff.
- ***Clean Up Brownfields.*** Pressure to develop green space can be eased by remediating brownfields -- abandoned industrial sites -- for new economic uses. Better America Bonds will supplement your existing Brownfields initiatives by providing new resources to assess and clean-up brownfields for use as open spaces or for development under limited circumstances.

The allocation of BABs would be made through an open competition, with state and local governments submitting plans to the EPA for initial review. EPA would consult with a subgroup of agencies on the Vice President’s Community Empowerment Board that have programs and expertise in the relevant communities. This approach is analogous to the way HUD and Agriculture make decisions about Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities designations. Preferences will be given to regional proposals reflecting partnerships and comprehensive planning among local governments, particularly where cities partner with suburbs and rural areas on a coordinated strategy. This will ensure that the bond proceeds support the long-term economic and environmental goals of a broad range of communities.

Administrator Browner has made passage of BABs a top priority. The Administrator has done extensive outreach to the Mayors, environmental and land trust organizations, the National Realty Committee, and the National Association of Home Builders. So far, the response has been positive. The Mayors are particularly excited about this program because they can apply for the authority to issue the bonds directly.

You should know that some people have raised concerns that Better America Bonds and school modernization bonds are overly complex and will not provide true interest-free borrowing to the communities that have used them because issuers will have to offer the bonds at a discount in order to attract buyers.

Your economic advisors believe that if we provide the private sector a large enough incentive, they will create a relatively efficient market for this type of debt. That is why the financing mechanism for BABs is very similar to the mechanism for your school modernization proposal. Since these two initiatives will provide tax credits on about \$35 billion in bonds, we believe that the private sector will develop the expertise necessary to make this financing mechanism an effective means to help state and local communities build more schools, preserve green spaces, clean-up brownfields, and provide clean and safe drinking water.

**WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON AND VICE
PRESIDENT GORE'S PROPOSAL FOR BETTER AMERICA BONDS**

- **Jim Marshall, Mayor of Macon, Georgia (D):** "This is a great idea and if this doesn't sail through Congress, we've got a bunch of fools up there."
- **Dave Armstrong, Mayor of Louisville, Kentucky:** "If the Administration proposal gets through Congress, Louisville undoubtedly would seek the zero-interest financing through the bonds to fund anti-sprawl programs as they are developed. It's a good start. It's an opportunity over the next decade for cities like Louisville and other cities across America to build on things to bring people to the cities, and to keep people in the cities...."
- **The Denver Post, January 20, 1999:** "Congress should support a pair of Clinton administration proposals, outlined in President Clinton's State of the Union speech, that would help Colorado and other fast-growing states conserve parkland, open space and wildlife habitat.... Better America Bonds might provide a mechanism for cash-strapped communities to do so. In addition, cities such as Denver could use the funds to supplement money they are already investing to transform abandoned or vacant properties into municipal parks and urban trails."
- **The Tampa Tribune, January 18, 1999:** "Vice President Al Gore is correct to believe there are votes to be won by combating urban sprawl... A major part of the White House plan is a five-year, \$700 million program in which state and local governments would be allowed to issue no-interest 'Better America Bonds' to lenders, who would claim a tax credit for the life of the bond rather than receive interest.... we hope members of Congress ultimately support this conservation initiative."
- **Roanoke Times & World News, January 17, 1999:** "The White House proposes offering 'Better America Bonds' that might help to mitigate the damage.... The bonds would give communities another resource to save treasures that are threatened -- but this would be a small downpayment on what is due."
- **Capital Times (Madison, WI), January 14, 1999:** "[T]he new Clinton-Gore program can help our community in several ways. One of the program's centerpieces is a five-year, \$700 million tax credit program to support 'Better America Bonds,' aimed at preserving greenspace, cleaning up contaminated urban sites called 'brownfields,' creating or restoring urban parks and protecting water quality. These funds can augment the county's \$30 million Stewardship Fund, a 10-year program that the county executive proposes to protect Dane County's rivers, streams, lakes, wetlands, woods and prairies."
- **The Atlanta Journal, January 13, 1999:** "If ever a Clinton administration program had metro Atlanta's name written all over it, it's the one Vice President Al Gore announced this week to promote 'smart growth' for America's cities... [T]he program has one other element, 'Better America Bonds,' which would not require federal expenditures but still could have an enormous impact on U.S. cityscapes."

- ***San Antonio Express-News, January 18, 1999:*** “The new ‘Better America Bonds’ -- \$700 million in federal tax credits to generate \$9.5 billion in state and local bonds -- could be used to restore urban parks, preserve suburban green spaces or protect threatened farmlands or wetlands. Or to clean up urban brownfields. Or for water quality by creating planted or forested buffer strips along waterways to filter contaminants from runoff.... Such incentives could catalyze a culture change in how communities act -- giving more credibility to conservationists and advocates of ‘smart growth’ and strengthening the hand of local officials who want to form constructive collaborations.”
- ***The Bond Buyer, January 12, 1999:*** “A California public finance banker familiar with the school bond program praised the Administration’s plan, because expanding the uses of tax-credit bonds will enhance the market for such debt. Heather Ruth, president of The Bond Market Association, called the proposal ‘fascinating,’ noting that her organization was not consulted about it. ‘The purposes for which the bonds would be authorized are purposes which can currently be financed by tax-exempt bonds,’ Ruth said. ‘Obviously the goal here is to make it more attractive than traditional bonds ... I am sure many state and local governments regard this as an opportunity.’”
- ***Chicago Daily Herald, January 12, 1999:*** “Gore’s plan also calls for the government to encourage preservation of green space by backing zero-interest bonds for states or cities. Investors buy these 15-year ‘Better America’ bonds and receive a share of \$700 million in tax credits, rather than interest. We support this initiative. In suburban Chicago, open fields and forests are quickly being bulldozed to make room for fast-food restaurants, strip malls and crowded housing developments. Creating open space for recreation, wildlife and aesthetic deviation from asphalt should be a priority.”
- ***The Spokesman-Review (Spokane, WA), January 12, 1999:*** “What’s lacking is financing for a better style of growth and redevelopment. Gore’s proposal, therefore, is a welcome act of leadership.”
- ***E.J. Dionne, Washington Post, January 15, 1999:*** “The core of the administration’s plan is ‘Better America Bonds’... The sprawl issue would seem a winner, in part because of the success of so many smart growth and anti-growth initiatives in November’s elections.”
- ***Jeffrey Baratta, Vice President at Union Bank of California, January 12, 1999:*** Making the Better America Bonds available to individual investors is “a great move.... It will probably help in liquidity and create a greater secondary market.”

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 16:18:26.00

SUBJECT: higher education

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 Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP on 02/03/99 04:18 PM -----

Elizabeth R. Newman

02/03/99 03:13:42 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP

cc: Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP

Subject: higher education

Mike - Joe Lockhart is making remarks on Friday to the NATIONAL Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. They are interested in particular in what this admintsration is proposing for the coming year - ie: SOTU/budget issues - to better higher education. Do you have any fact sheets/materials that you could send to me so i can prepare his remarks? Are there any items in particular that you feel he should highlight/emphasize? Thanks

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 16:20:52.00

SUBJECT: archer plan on school construction

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

USA Today is emailing me the plan he is going to outline tomorrow. they'd like WH react. I will send you his plan when I get it.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 16:23:10.00

SUBJECT: school construction

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

what's the answer beyond react?

----- Forwarded by Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP on 02/03/99 04:22 PM

"Henry, Tamara"

02/03/99 04:26:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Amy Weiss/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: school construction

Amy,

Also need to know how different this is - other than the fact the proposal applies to all school districts and extends the amount of time school districts have to spend the money.

Tamara

Chairman Archer's proposal would relax the so-called "arbitrage rebate" rules for bonds issued to finance the construction of public schools. As a result, the State and local governments issuing the bonds would face lower costs and greater flexibility regarding construction of public schools. Accordingly, school districts would have more funds to use

for new schools, new equipment, and new teachers. Chairman Archer's proposal means

More money for school districts

Less paperwork for State and local governments

Greater flexibility to school districts regarding issuing bonds and constructing public schools

According to the most recent revenue projections, the proposal's revenue cost is \$1.4 billion over five years.

CHAIRMAN ARCHER'S SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROPOSAL

Arbitrage Rebate

State and local governments may issue bonds to finance school construction (and for other governmental purposes), the interest on which is exempt from Federal income tax. Because the bonds are tax-exempt, the issuer (the State or local government) pays a lower interest rate to the bondholders. The result is lower borrowing costs for State and local governments.

The Internal Revenue Code imposes several restrictions on tax-exempt bonds. One significant restriction is arbitrage rebate: the issuer of a tax-exempt bond is required to rebate to the Federal government any profit that the issuer earns from investing tax-exempt bond proceeds in higher yielding securities (i.e., "arbitrage"). Of course, as in other areas of the tax law, a variety of exceptions and special rules may apply. Small issuers (i.e., governmental units with general taxing powers that issue no more than \$5 million of bonds) are not subject to arbitrage rebate. For State and local governments issuing public school construction bonds, the small issuer exemption may be increased to \$10 million (this provision was added by the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997). In addition, tax-exempt bonds issued to finance the construction of governmental buildings (such as schools) are subject to a relaxed rebate rule, generally giving the issuer two years to spend the bond proceeds on construction before becoming subject to rebate.

Conceptually, the arbitrage rebate rules make sense. Absent arbitrage rebate restrictions, issuers of tax-exempt bonds would have an incentive to issue more bonds than needed and earlier than needed. The issuer would simply invest the bond proceeds in higher yielding taxable securities until the funds were needed. Still, the actual arbitrage rebate rules are complex and expensive to comply with.

Chairman Archer's Proposal

Chairman Archer's proposal would make it easier for State and local governments issuing public school construction bonds to comply with the arbitrage rebate rules. Generally, the proposal would provide issuers with four years to spend the bond proceeds on construction of public schools (rather than being subject to the current two year rule generally applicable to construction of governmental buildings). Since the issuer would have less rebate to pay to the Federal government, school districts would have more funds to use for new schools, new equipment, and new teachers.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 16:42:30.00

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: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/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: Rhonda Melton (CN=Rhonda Melton/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

We will be having the weekly Health Care Strategy Meeting tomorrow,
February 4, at 4:00 p.m. in Bruce Reed's office, 2 Floor, West Wing.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 16:52:13.00

SUBJECT: Weekly Education Strategy Meeting

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

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

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

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

TO: Vicky_Stroud (Vicky_Stroud @ ed.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David L. Stevenson (CN=David L. Stevenson/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:

We will be having the weekly Education Strategy meeting tomorrow, February 4, at 5:15 p.m. in Bruce Reed's office, 2 Floor, West Wing.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 17:49:24.00

SUBJECT: from amy:any idea of how long until answer? And, do you want to talk w.rep

TO: ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN (ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MICHAEL (Pager) #COHEN (MICHAEL (Pager) #COHEN [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 17:55:31.00

SUBJECT: prescription drugs

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy Weiss (CN=Amy Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

By ALICE ANN LOVE Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Dr. Scott Baumgartner has good news and bad news for his elderly patients with rheumatoid arthritis: A revolutionary new drug can treat their disease, but it costs up to \$1,000 a month and Medicare won't pay for it -- or any prescription drug.

'It's a shame to have to say, 'Well, here's this medicine' -- they've all read about it, they know it might help them -- 'but you can't do it,''' Baumgartner said.

Some patients in his Spokane, Wash., practice are taking the drug, Enbrel, for a few weeks at a time as they can afford it. Others simply stay with inferior treatments.

Medicare, the government health insurance program for 39 million elderly and disabled Americans, has never paid for prescriptions.

President Clinton as well as many Republicans would like to change that. But the costs could be daunting for a program

advances in recent
and even slowing
prescription
medicines they need, it's
increased medical care,"
department

older drugs also
avoid blood clots in
a common heart
prescription drugs on

to Medicare --
ensure the
promises.

expected federal
is expected to
generation retires,

president and

we can find a way

senior citizens
retiree health
through supplemental
their own.

already facing a shaky financial future.

New drugs are among the greatest medical
years, reducing heart attacks and cancer deaths
the progress of AIDS. As a result, the lack of
coverage is becoming a bigger problem.

"If elderly Americans are not getting the
costing the nation a lot of dollars for
said
Dr. Raymond Woosley, who heads the pharmacology
at Georgetown University Medical Center.

Enbrel is an extreme example. But the costs of
can add up: one common blood thinner used to
heart and stroke patients costs \$60 a month and
drug \$180. Older Americans take five or six
average.

Clinton has said he wants to add drug coverage
assuming he and lawmakers can find a way to
program can provide the benefits it already

The president has suggested using some of the
budget surplus for Medicare. Even so, Medicare
run short of cash as the huge baby boom
entering the program in waves around 2010.

That has members of a commission advising the
Congress on Medicare searching for options.

"People would like to have a drug program if
to pay for it," said Sen. John Breaux, D-La.

The government estimates about two-thirds of
have some drug coverage. Most get it through
benefits offered by former employers, or
policies known as Medigap that they buy on

Medicare
the poor.

health benefits to
1990s. And a
es have gone

cost-cutting are
attract the
older brand-name

they're
trying to return

Medicare will
elderly cannot get the

rash of broken hips to
are cheaper but can
ziness, Woosley said.
affect blood

than a

for the elderly is
adding even a
example, 75 percent
billion a year.

having an adequate

Others get coverage through the small number of
HMOs, or through Medicaid public assistance for

But the percentage of large companies offering
their retirees has dropped by 20 percent in the
recent Consumer Reports study found Medigap pric
up as much as a third.

Meanwhile, HMOs squeezed by Medicare's
curbing drug reimbursements offered as perks to
elderly, or limiting them to cheaper generic or
drugs.

The result: The newest drugs, expensive because
developed at tremendous cost to companies
profits to investors, are out of reach for many.
Nevertheless, there is mounting evidence that
actually lose money in the long run if the
best medicine.

One recent study, for example, attributed a
retirees taking older antidepressants, which
cause a drop in blood pressure and thus diz
Newer but more expensive antidepressants don't
pressure as much.

''A prescription drug costs an awful lot less
hospitalization,'' Woosley said.

But the upfront expense of paying drug costs
daunting. One government estimate found that
modest benefit -- having Medicare pay, for
of their drug bills -- would cost at least \$20

Still, senior citizens are pressing hard.

''I don't think you can have the pretense of

having drug coverage, ''
ation of older

if the
corporate retirement

Requiring private
to seniors. Then,
get private
limited to those who

health care program in the future without
said John Rother of AARP, the largest organiz
adults.

Some Medicare commission members also fear that
government starts paying for retirees' drugs,
benefits might dry up.

Therefore, they are considering another option:
insurers to offer better, cheaper drug benefits
new Medicare subsidies could help the poorest
coverage, so government spending would be
need it most.

□#AP-NY-02-03-99 1610EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-1999 22:27:42.00

SUBJECT: Revised comments to Edley draft

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

EK:

I've tried my best to incorporate Bruce's points here, though only in the summary points. You may not want to spend too much time on my line-by-line comments. In most instances, they don't add much more anyway.

jc3

Clara:

Forgive the tardiness, but here are my comments on the initial draft of the race/crime chapter circulated last week. Since they're extensive, a bit repetitive, and not limited to line edits, allow me to summarize my major concerns:

1. Contradiction on whether the system is fair or unfair. Most importantly, the draft suffers from a series of contradictions about whether we believe the justice system is fundamentally fair or unfair to minorities. We believe that the facts show that, if you control for criminal offending, the system is essentially fair, but that it doesn't do enough to protect minorities in high-crime neighborhoods. There are several things we need to do to convey this. First, the opening of the crime chapter should include a key set of facts that makes clear the rates of minority victimization and offending. Without such facts, it is almost impossible to engage in a broader discussion of race and crime -- and it is difficult to distinguish whether issues should be dealt with as matters of policy or perception. Second, given these facts, the draft should characterize America's race/crime problem as both a lack of opportunity and responsibility...too little opportunity for minority youth to avoid crime, stay out of jail, and get ahead...and too little responsibility in the form of high crime, public disorder, and broken communities. Beginning the race/crime discussion as such, we can begin to understand why minority communities mistrust a justice system that -- while not fundamentally unfair or intentionally discriminatory -- doesn't meet their public safety needs, despite incarcerating so many persons. And we begin to lay the groundwork for solutions that address these issues (i.e., more opportunity for youth, improved public safety) and build trust (i.e., engaging the community).

2. More focus on the need to build stronger communities. The draft should focus more on the importance of building strong communities. That means more than simply picking up garbage, rehabbing housing, and targeting resources. Although these things matter, they are not the biggest predictors of violent crime. Falling crime rates in some of our worst neighborhoods have proved this. So, too, has the Earls/Sampson study on Chicago neighborhoods, which found that communities with a strong sense of shared values and people willing to reinforce those values -- whether black or white, rich or poor, uptown or downtown, etc. -- had 40 percent less violent crime. This is a powerful study that should be more prominently and positively featured in the draft. It shows that community members who act responsibly and in the interest of their neighbors have a huge impact on crime and violence. It shows that even the best law enforcement is no substitute for strong communities. And, as is the case with the Boston Gun Project, it shows that one entire communities -- police, prosecutors, parents, and priests -- organize to reinforce certain behaviors, they can literally bring murder and gun violence to a standstill.

3. Concept of community justice not clear. I don't think the discussion of community justice makes clear exactly what policies the Administration is calling for. We are probably better served by discussing how community policing has revolutionized policing and public safety in America, and how its two component parts -- solving crime problems and engaging the community -- can help revolutionize our entire criminal justice system. More importantly, these two concepts -- more than the term "community justice" -- capture what it will take to address the paradox of America's race/crime problem: that, with respect to the criminal justice system, minorities are both fundamentally underserved and overrepresented.

4. Wrong tone for discussion of "hot button" issues. While I recognize the desire to touch on the difficult issues of racial profiling and police brutality. I think the draft's language will be viewed by our friends in law enforcement as inflammatory. Not only are the vast majority of law enforcement officers decent, hard-working public servants who put their lives on the line every day, but -- as a result of community policing -- they have become the harbingers of change in the criminal justice system. In many cities, police-led efforts to work w/the community have made the justice system more responsive, resulted in new prevention programs, and increased the flow of information to the public. Condemning them and their practices with a broad brushstroke strays from the known facts, and doesn't contribute to our goal of building trust. Equally important, I don't believe our own federal law enforcement bureaus -- who I'm sure don't think they engage in racial profiling -- are prepared to live under the executive order on racial profiling proposed in the draft. In many ways, dealing with this issue at the federal level (i.e., INS and Customs enforcement at the nation's borders) is even more difficult than locally (traffic stops and drug enforcement).

Also, with respect to the section on racial disparities in the rates of incarceration, I think this entire discussion is inconsistent with point #1. It ignores the disparities in criminal offending and suggests we excuse away behavior. We simply shouldn't.

5. More emphasis on President's record and its impact on minorities. Finally, the draft should include discussion and examples of falling crime rates in minority communities. It should mention the dramatic drop in youth gun homicides, mostly among minority youth, and it should include anecdotes with specific and well-known minority neighborhoods (e.g.,

Washington Heights in New York City, where the number of murders has dropped from a peak of 100+ per year to about 10 now). Also, we should take credit for major policy shifts that have benefited minorities -- such as taking on the gun lobby at a time when more teenagers were being killed by guns than by any natural cause; and transforming the nature of policing across the nation. Finally, the President's leadership in appointing an unprecedented number of high-caliber, minority law enforcement professionals (Holder, Noble, Johnson, Gonzales, etc.) is worth highlighting, too.

Here are some additional, specific comments:

1. Page 1, paragraph 4, 3rd sentence: Replace with, "Since 1993, the violent crime rate has dropped by more than 20 percent nationwide, including a 28 percent drop in the homicide rate, which is at its lowest level in 30 years." (1997 National Crime Victimization Survey, Bureau of Justice Statistics).
2. Page 2, paragraph 2, between 3rd and 4th sentence: We should think about adding a sentence along the lines of, "Although African Americans represent 12 percent (?) of the overall population, they have represented approximately half of all murder victims for the past 30 years." (BJS crime stats...Scott should have this chart)
3. Page 2, paragraph 3. This is an important point that needs to be clearer and perhaps expanded. We need to make clear from the outset what we know -- what the facts are -- about rates of victimization and offending by race. I recall that Chris Stone's paper to the Advisory Board has a good discussion on this topic; perhaps it should be incorporated. And the recent BJS homicide study (12/98) including factoids showing that African Americans were 7 times more likely than whites to be murdered, as well as 8 times more likely than whites to commit murder. Perhaps we should come to agreement on the 5-10 most important facts here and break them out as bullets. And perhaps we should also include the findings from the GAO and DOJ studies, mentioned at the end of page 26, showing that -- if we control for the type of criminal offense committed -- rates of arrest, prosecution and conviction do not differ significantly by race. Again, the point being that we should make the facts of minority rates of victimization and offending very clear up front
4. Page 3, paragraph 1, last line: I believe this number is include in the DOJ/Interior report on crime in Indian Country, and that it might be that violent crime is up by more than 80%. (Scott should have this in his copy of the final report on crime in Indian Country.)
5. Page 3, last paragraph, last 2 sentences: I'm not sure this is right...or what we want to emphasize here. Don't we want to emphasize the cutting edge findings from Earls/Sampson Chicago Study that a strong, shared sense of community (collective efficacy) is a better predictor of violent crime than the usual demographic data -- by 40 percent, in fact.
6. Pages 4 and 5, the first full paragraph and the two following it: I would drop this discussion of perceived unfairness and high rates of incarceration from this section on criminal victimization and law enforcement need, and look to incorporate it into the section on Building Fairness (starting at page 20).

7. Page 5, final paragraph and sentence: A couple of comments on this sentence...(1 if the GAO study shows that, if we control for criminal offending, the rates of arrest, prosecution and conviction don't differ greatly by race, than what are the assumed "racial disparities" that are even greater in the juvenile system...or do disparities only really exist in the juvenile system? If we're trying to make a point about the juvenile system, let's cite the facts and make it. If not, let's drop the inconsistent rhetoric....We can't say throughout this chapter that the system is both fairer than people think...yet unfair...and (2) with respect to the following sentence, the sad truth is that we've already lost a generation of minority youth -- victims and offenders -- to the mix of crack/gangs/guns (discussed on pages 10 and 11), and this sad chapter accounts for many of the difficult issues surrounding crime and race. Perhaps this is a story that should be told more explicitly here.

8. Page 6, first full paragraph, drop everything after the 4th sentence: Again, either we believe the system is fundamentally fair or unfair, but it can't be both. I would argue that we want to say the system is fundamentally fair, but that it can be improved...that the relationship between law enforcement and some minority communities is not as strong as it could or should be...and that law enforcement and the community both lose when this is the case. Consistent with this point, I wouldn't generalize that unfair policies, racial biases and police brutality undermine the criminal justice system. Instead, I would point out that in some communities racial tensions, past riots, incidents of police brutality, police shootings, etc., have led to historically strained relationship between police department and some minority communities, and that these strained relationships can and must be overcome. Perhaps a specific example of a community that overcame racial unrest/tension would help make the point.

9. Page 6, 2nd and 3rd full paragraph: Do we really want to introduce/coin the term "community justice" here? I'm not sure the term "community justice," without further explanation, is clear. Instead, I would suggest that, in the last sentence of the 2nd paragraph, we replace "community justice" with "community policing," and then drop the opening sentence of the third paragraph. Later in the workplan we can talk about applying what we've learned from community policing to other components of the criminal justice system -- neighborhood DAs, community corrections, special youth/gun/drug courts, etc.

10. Starting w/the last line on page 6 and over to page 7: I'd replace this w/a paragraph along the lines of:

"Before I ran for President, I traveled across the country and visited different cities where local officials were leading the way in solving some of the nation's most difficult domestic problems. One of the places I visited was Charleston, SC, where Police Chief Reuben Greenberg was at the forefront of the community policing movement. Through community policing, Chief Greenberg was both driving down the crime rate in public housing and strengthening the relationship between local police and community residents...(add more specifics here on what Charleston has done...and we can add more here on Charleston overcoming a difficult history of police mistrust)."

I would then add a paragraph on our policing initiative...something like:

"That is why when I became President one of my top priorities was to help our cities hire more police and expand the community policing philosophy. I was proud to work with an unprecedented coalition of law enforcement,

teachers, clergy, local officials and other community leaders to pass our initiative to put 100,000 more community police on the street. Today, we have nearly reached our goal of funding 100,000 more police officers and helped expand community policing to thousands of police departments across the country. Our efforts are making a difference. Crime and the fear of crime have dropped to their lowest level in a quarter century..."

11. Page 7, 2nd paragraph, last sentence: Strike everything after "community policing," and replace with -- "applying the lessons learned from community policing to other areas of the criminal justice system, such as local prosecutors' officers, our courts, local jails, etc."
12. Page 7, "Community Justice" subheading and subsequent paragraph: Replace "Community Justice 'Hot Spots'" w/ "Targeting Crime 'Hot Spots.'"
13. Pages 7 and 8, bullets describing "Hot Spots" initiative: I would expand the first bullet on our 21st Century Policing Initiative to include more details on this initiative, and add bullets with other programs that would be specifically targeted. I would drop the 2 bullets on comprehensive community plans; they are meaningless in terms of message and substance...perhaps something like this:
 - * The federal government will target funds from its 21st Century Policing Initiative to help communities with high-crime neighborhoods to hire and redeploy up to 50,000 additional police officers, acquire the latest crime-fighting technologies, and engage their entire community in the fight against crime.
 - * The federal government will target key prevention programs, including afterschool programs and programs for at-risk youth...
 - * What else? (i.e., gun enforcement...drug testing...?)
14. Page 8, 1st full paragraph: Rewrite this paragraph to be focused on how targeting resources will allow high-crime, minority neighborhoods to develop comprehensive anti-crime strategies, and to engage their entire community -- schools, prosecutors, clergy, etc. Drop all references to economic development.
15. Page 8, penultimate paragraph: Drop entirely.
16. Page 12, first paragraph: We should quote David Kennedy's article from the NIJ journal; it's very powerful and persuasive.
17. Page 12, 2nd paragraph, 3rd and 4th sentences: I don't think this rhetoric on the drug war works; we should drop it here and elsewhere. The truth is that much of the perceived unfairness and/or disparate impact in the drug war is tied to government's response to the crack cocaine epidemic. If we wanted to be brutally honest we'd point out that the crack epidemic did in fact cost us a generation of minority youth -- both as victims and perpetrators -- and that well meaning legislators/government officials of all races supported the drug war. The more important point to make, I believe, is that drugs and related crime have devastated minority communities, and that we can never let what happened with crack happen again. Instead, we must support a balanced drug strategy that supports tough enforcement, more treatment, better prevention...etc.
18. Page 14, bullet at top of page: Change to "Building stronger communities."

19. Page 16, 1st paragraph, last sentence: Drop entirely (economic development reference).
20. Page 17, 1st paragraph...question: What do these numbers mean? How do they comport w/our earlier findings by GAO and DOJ that, if we control for criminal offending, there are no substantial differences between the races?
21. Page 19, bullet/subheading: Replace with, "Reinforce right from wrong by promoting appropriate punishments when kids first get into trouble."
22. Page 19, bottom paragraph, 4th sentence: After "including alcohol," add, "or to get money to buy drugs."
23. Page 20, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence: We shouldn't use this reference to only 12 percent of prisoners receiving treatment; Justice has disclaimed it and believes its inaccurate. I think the more important point to make here is that numerous studies show -- convincingly so -- that most persons on probation, parole or in prison have a drug history/habit, but that we don't do everything we can...we don't use the full power of the justice system...to reduce their drug use and criminality. Also, this section provides an opportunity to laud the President's record on promoting drug testing/treatment, drug courts, etc.
24. Page 20, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs: I'd drop these entirely; I'm not sure they add anything.
25. Page 21, first full paragraph: I can't believe we want to get into a discussion of OJ and jury nullification. What would we say? Also, as I mentioned before, I wouldn't generalize that police "experiences, incidents, and policies" lead "law abiding persons of color to believe that they are targeted or threatened by law enforcement. I think that's inflammatory and inaccurate. As I mentioned before, I believe it's more accurate to point out that in some communities the police have a historically strained relationship with minorities. If we want to explain why this is the case, than we should take the time to do it right. It's not simply because of recent police policies or racial profiling; recent police policies, in fact, have done much to improve relations with minority communities. Rather, I believe it has much more to do with 30-years of changes in some of our minority communities (population moving out, concentration of poverty and related social ills), tensions from riots during the civil rights era, the professionalization of urban police forces and the resulting gap between the police and the policed, the nature of the crack epidemic, the relatively rapid diffusion of guns in minority communities...etc .
26. Page 22, 2nd paragraph, penultimate sentence...through the end of the chapter: I think these four sections on racial profiling, police brutality, incarceration, and diversity in law enforcement are fundamentally problematic for a variety of reasons. First and foremost, in one fell swoop, we say that these are difficult issues that need to be addressed, but we haven't made a convincing case for them. Again, either we need to make the case that the system is fundamentally fair or unfair, and go from there. If the justice system is fundamentally fair, as I believe we should be saying, than we should say these are isolated problems that are important because of their disproportionate impact on perceptions and attitudes of the system's overall fairness -- not because they're implicitly widespread.

More specifically, I have the following concerns w/each of the sections...

Racial profiling: As I understand it, we are not in a position to propose the executive order recommended in the chapter. DOJ has, for some time, been reviewing their own policies, but they have concerns, especially with respect to INS (I believe, for instance, that some courts have held that the use of ethnicity is sometimes okay for law enforcement purposes). Secondly, Treasury -- especially with respect to the Customs Service -- is sure to have concerns as well. With respect to data collection, I'm not sure if there's any point in supporting the Conyer's bill. It was killed by the police groups last year and will easily be killed again this year. Thus, if we really want to do something on improved data collection, let's just direct the AG to work with law enforcement to do it now; we don't really need a legislative language.

Police Brutality: I would reverse the emphasis of the current section by leading with the fact that there are very few case of police brutality (less than 1 percent of police encounters), and laud the Administration's record on bringing federal civil rights and pattern or practice suits when necessary. Then I would go into the fact that we must have zero tolerance for police brutality...that it undermines the work of most honest, hardworking officers...poisons the trust between them and the people they're sworn to protect...etc.

Disparities in Sentencing/Incarceration: I would reverse the emphasis in this section, too. I would open with the GAO and DOJ studies showing that, if we control for criminal offending, rates of arrest, prosecution and conviction do not differ greatly by race. Perhaps we could also include Eric Holder's report from several years ago that comes to the same conclusion for federal crack and gun sentencing. I would then talk about how, over the long term, we can't be satisfied with a system that incarcerates so many Americans, especially so many minorities...that destroys so many families...disenfranchises whole communities...makes so many people unemployable. We can't simply be satisfied with high rates of incarceration; we must actually work to reduce criminality and recidivism. One way to do this is by using the power of the criminal justice system to get offenders to kick their drug habits. We can do this by making an unprecedented commitment to drug test, treat, and appropriately punish the millions of probationers, parolees and prisoners w ith drug habbits....etc.

Finally, I'm not sure what if anything I would include on the disproportionate minority confinement of juveniles or the death penalty. The draft seems to indicate we'll have more to say on these topics.

Diversity in Law Enforcement: Two quick points...we really should be able to tell a more positive story here. I'm sure our policing initiative has done much more to promote diverse police forces than we're acknowledging. Also, the President has a strong record of appoint minority law enforcement professionals; perhaps they're worth mentioning (Ron Noble, Jim Johnson, Eric Holder, Eduardo Gonzales...?).