

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 094 - FOLDER -005

[04/28/1999-04/30/1999]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 10:00:58.00

SUBJECT: DRAFT POTUS statement & Q&A

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I just picked up a voice mail from Matt saying they postponed their press conference until tomorrow -- I'm trying to reach him now to find out more=====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D6]ARMS25140433J.136 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043A4040000010A020100000002050000002008000000020000008DA3E8497023B9F5B0C50
F3E9D176C59FDE2C8A4E6A41A9D5C82F4ACED91882688914123DAB2AD28198E3E6E025F5DDD1B0
317D5546BE4399348303575409549E2C1F247A8747C1BBE19B5560213C55B94E06B049560FCFFB
310D170C31640A8560AE3EA286DB3AA726312332527D84FA78037F13EA592A74048732FE9BB6B3
3FF2779410865BDE7D6636F023DA266B08CD3E81C0914F1171C3B06FDA37847D1BD968903183B5

Statement by the President on Tobacco

April 28, 1999
9:45 am DRAFT

This new report from the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids underscores why I strongly oppose any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. Without such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion to reduce youth smoking. **We must act now:** Every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1000 will have their lives cut short as result.

Tobacco Q&A
April 28, 1998 -- DRAFT

Q: What do you think about the new report from the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids showing states are not spending tobacco settlement funds to reduce youth smoking?

A: This new report underscores why the President strongly opposes any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. Without such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion to reduce youth smoking. Every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1000 will have their lives cut short as result.

The report done by the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, to be released on Thursday, is compelling:

- There are 25 states in which there is no proposal being seriously considered to guarantee the use of a substantial portion of the settlement funds for programs to reduce tobacco use among children.
- In recent months, only 4 states have decided to use settlement funds to reduce youth smoking, and unless Congress and the states act, only 9 states will have comprehensive efforts to reduce youth smoking.

An average of 57 percent of the state recoveries is reimbursement for costs borne to the federal government, and the President believes that there should be a commitment by the states to use a portion of the monies from the settlement to prevent youth smoking, protect farmers, improve public health, and assist children. The Administration will work with the states and Congress to enact tobacco legislation that resolves the federal claim to tobacco settlement funds in exchange for a commitment by the States to use the federal share to support these shared state and national priorities.

Q: Would the President veto the Supplemental Appropriations bill if it allows states to keep the entire \$246 billion tobacco settlement?

A: The President's senior advisors have recommended that he veto the Senate Supplemental bill, if it is sent to him with the current objectionable riders like this tobacco provision.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 10:17:08.00

SUBJECT: REVISED DRAFT POTUS statement & Q&A

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Campaign is now planning to release its report tomorrow.

Here's what I recommend

We release a statement tomorrow -- here's a draft

We use these Q&As today.

Cynthia A. Rice

04/28/99 10:00:50 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, Laura
Emmett/WHO/EOP

cc: J. Eric Gould/OPD/EOP

Subject: DRAFT POTUS statement & Q&A

I just picked up a voice mail from Matt saying they postponed their press conference until tomorrow -- I'm trying to reach him now to find out more

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D18]ARMS22612433Z.136 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

```
FF575043A4040000010A020100000002050000002008000000020000008DA3E8497023B9F5B0C50
F3E9D176C59FDE2C8A4E6A41A9D5C82F4ACED91882688914123DAB2AD28198E3E6E025F5DDD1B0
317D5546BE4399348303575409549E2C1F247A8747C1BBE19B5560213C55B94E06B049560FCFFB
```

Statement by the President on Tobacco

April 28, 1999
9:45 am DRAFT

This new report from the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids underscores why I strongly oppose any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. Without such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion to reduce youth smoking. **We must act now:** Every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1000 will have their lives cut short as result.

Tobacco Q&A
April 28, 1998 -- DRAFT

Q: What do you think about the new report from the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids showing states are not spending tobacco settlement funds to reduce youth smoking?

A: This new report underscores why the President strongly opposes any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. Without such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion to reduce youth smoking. Every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1000 will have their lives cut short as result.

The report done by the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, to be released on Thursday, is compelling:

- There are 25 states in which there is no proposal being seriously considered to guarantee the use of a substantial portion of the settlement funds for programs to reduce tobacco use among children.
- In recent months, only 4 states have decided to use settlement funds to reduce youth smoking, and unless Congress and the states act, only 9 states will have comprehensive efforts to reduce youth smoking.

An average of 57 percent of the state recoveries is reimbursement for costs borne to the federal government, and the President believes that there should be a commitment by the states to use a portion of the monies from the settlement to prevent youth smoking, protect farmers, improve public health, and assist children. The Administration will work with the states and Congress to enact tobacco legislation that resolves the federal claim to tobacco settlement funds in exchange for a commitment by the States to use the federal share to support these shared state and national priorities.

Q: Would the President veto the Supplemental Appropriations bill if it allows states to keep the entire \$246 billion tobacco settlement?

A: The President's senior advisors have recommended that he veto the Senate Supplemental bill, if it is sent to him with the current objectionable riders like this tobacco provision.

Tobacco Q&A
April 28, 1998 -- DRAFT

Q: What do you think about the information in the Washington Post that states are not spending tobacco settlement funds to reduce youth smoking?

A: This new information underscores why the President strongly opposes any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. Without such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion to reduce youth smoking. Every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1000 will have their lives cut short as result.

The information, based on a report by the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids and the American Heart Association to be released on Thursday, is compelling:

- There are 25 states in which there is no proposal being seriously considered to guarantee the use of a substantial portion of the settlement funds for programs to reduce tobacco use among children.
- In recent months, only 4 states have decided to use settlement funds to reduce youth smoking, and unless Congress and the states act, only 9 states will have comprehensive efforts to reduce youth smoking.

An average of 57 percent of the state recoveries is reimbursement for costs borne to the federal government, and the President believes that there should be a commitment by the states to use a portion of the monies from the settlement to prevent youth smoking, protect farmers, improve public health, and assist children. The Administration will work with the states and Congress to enact tobacco legislation that resolves the federal claim to tobacco settlement funds in exchange for a commitment by the States to use the federal share to support these shared state and national priorities.

Q: Would the President veto the Supplemental Appropriations bill if it allows states to keep the entire \$246 billion tobacco settlement?

A: The President's senior advisors have recommended that he veto the Senate Supplemental bill, if it is sent to him with the current objectionable riders like this tobacco provision.

Statement by the President on Tobacco

April 29, 1999

10:10 am DRAFT

This new report from the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids and the American Heart Association underscores why I strongly oppose any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. Without such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion to reduce youth smoking. **We must act now:** Every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1000 will have their lives cut short as result.

Note: this report will be released Thursday 4/29.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 11:15:20.00

SUBJECT: Teen Birth Trends

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

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: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/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:

Here's a chart summarizing key trends related to teen births, teen pregnancy, and out-of-wedlock births. Should come in handy for briefing/background for the First Lady's drop-by at the reception for National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy honorees this afternoon and the VP's roundtable tomorrow.

Bruce, this should also clarify question you had about AGI data (teen births, pregnancies, and abortions are all down). HHS Q&A says:

Q5: Is this [reduction in teen births] an improvement because there are more abortions?

A5: No. Birth and abortion rates among teenagers have both declined, reflecting the overall decline in the teen pregnancy rate. In fact, the abortion rate has dropped more than the birth rate. From 1991 to 1996, the abortion rate for teenagers dropped 22 percent, while the teen birth rate fell 12 percent.

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D71]ARMS25739433W.136 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

```
FF5750432A0D0000010A02010000000205000000F629000000020000575772BDB43CCDD408D9B6
9FDCB5A2817026A891024FE2EAE533B6F66C7AD42B8163438D7407A0B0740DBD1406A6E894A0AD
7607051E5D1011A5D3D76DA84272A230FB211F62BC0B289CF566246427422ECF0BE04C9BB75C6F
```

Birth Rate Trends 4/28/99 (for internal use)

	1991	1996	1997	% change 1991 - 1997	% change 1996-1997
Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 women 15 - 19)	62.1	54.4	52.3	- 16%	- 4%
Number of teen births	519,577	491,577	483,220	- 7%	- 2%
Birth rate to unmarried women (births per 1,000 unmarried women 15 - 44)	45.2 ^{1/}	44.8	44.0	- 3 %	- 2%
Birth rate to unmarried teens (births per 1,000 unmarried women 15 - 19)	44.8 ^{2/}	42.9	42.2	- 6%	- 2%

1/ Birth rate for unmarried women 15- 44 peaked at 46.9 in 1994 and fell 6% from 1994 to 1997.

2/ Birth rate for unmarried teens 15 - 19 peaked at 46.4 in 1994 and fell 9% from 1994 to 1997.

- Births to teens (19 and under) accounted for 13 percent of all births in 1997.
- The percent of all births that were to unmarried women stabilized at 32.4% in 1997-- unchanged from 1996. The percent of all teen births that were out-of-wedlock continued to rise, reaching 78% in 1997.

Teen Pregnancy Trends

	1991	1995	1996	% change 1991 - 1995	% change 1995-1996
HHS/NCHS teen pregnancy rates ^{3/}	116.5	102.7	98.7 (<i>not released</i>)	- 12%	- 4% (<i>not released</i>)
AGI teen pregnancy rates ^{3/}	115.8	101.1	97.3	- 13%	- 4%

3/ NCHS estimates are based on NCHS teen birth figures and fetal loss estimates and the private Alan Guttmacher Institute's (AGI) abortion data. The AGI's estimates are based on NCHS's teen birth figures and AGI's own estimate of abortions and fetal losses.

Teen Abortion Trends

	1991	1995	1996	% change 1991 - 1995	% change 1995-1996
AGI teen abortion rate (per 1,000 women 15 -	37.6	30.0	29.2	- 22%	- 3 %

19)					
-----	--	--	--	--	--

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 12:31:22.00

SUBJECT: Proposition 187 Q &A

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

During a California Working Group meeting I attended yesterday, I was asked to draft a Q&A on Proposition 187 for meetings that the President, Vice-President, and other Administration officials are having in DC with a number of California officials beginning May 3rd (CA Legislative Delegation, 5/6 LA County Supervisors) including Governor Davis on May 6th. Also, the President will be in CA from 5/14-5/16.

I would appreciate your comments on my draft (see below).

PROPOSITION 187

Q: What is the Administration's view of California Governor Gray Davis' decision to seek mediation to resolve the legal challenge to Proposition 187?

A: When the California voters considered Proposition 187 in 1994, the Administration strongly opposed this proposition because it was unfair to children. Since Proposition 187 is currently pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals and the Administration is not a party in this case, it is not appropriate for the Administration to comment on pending litigation. However, the Administration hopes that the important and complicated issues raised in this case will be resolved soon.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 12:52:04.00

SUBJECT: Race book

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

CC: edley (edley @ law.harvard.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

Folks: the book team is nearing the end of its authorized assignment. That is Terry and Liz will be leaving the project on 5/15. Because of this, Todd and I want to finish as much as we can in the next two weeks--our plan is to press forward to complete the agreed upon edits, have one or more drafting sessions on the disputed edits (which are not the big substantive issues), distill the substantive issues for presentation to president by 5/7. Accordingly, here's what we still need from you all:

1. With respect to the education portion of the workplan chapter---I suspect that the most recent revisions will still not address the fundamental gap between what we have been saying re changes to ESEA and the book's focus on the "compact." So as to move things along, Todd and I discussed that it would be very helpful if DPC would draft that section of the chapter--this would help highlight the problem and shed some light on resolution. For example, Bruce had expressed view that the esea discussion in last draft was a throwaway, short shrift reference--how can we make it more consistent. We need by Friday, 4/30 because we are winnowing down issues by next week.

2. With respect to criminal justice and racial profiling: where is the options memo we discussed three weeks ago? We have the draft exec order received from doj and I know Elena had comments from Edley on policy question of an exec order on data collection or a different one--so can we

get this by Friday, so issue can resolved?

3. Economic development--we have never received comments from Gene/nec on this or other parts of the latest version of the book. However, the book team has been working closely with treasury and sarah rosen (to some extent) on comments. Todd has sent sarah and treasury the 4/2 draft of this section and we need your comments by end of week to determine whether here too is a policy dispute. Both Todd and I believe that we can resolve these issues after this last round.

4. On civil rights enforcement, especially resource comparability, Chuck has expressed concern re whether there has in fact been a policy decision on how far to push Title vi--we need to see the latest version of this section before deciding if there is a substantive decision.

5. One or more of you have argued that the book really does not say anything bold or new on race--Todd and I wonder whether it would be useful for a small group of you to meet with writing team to amplify those comments--or whether it would be better just to communicate the views in the cover memo to the president--we stand ready to listen to your suggestion. As for the comment that the book does not really have the President's voice, that it's either too social scientist or not in keeping with the way he has spoken before such as macomb cty; Todd and i think this is one where we really need the President's feedback, including his red pen.

6. The book team is making changes per mtgs with Todd--we need chapters to todd and me before we can sit down and work through the disputed language issues. We are willing to schedule drafting session for weekend, provided that we have in our hands chapters--we also think it is necessary to have redlined draft--it'll make the job easier--Clara will follow up with Terry and Christopher but our goal is to have a new version to the President with explanatory memo on substantive disputes and other comments by 5/7.

WE NEED YOUR HELP----NOW!!!! THANKS TO ALL BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO FINISH THIS PROJECT.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 13:08:30.00

SUBJECT: Matt Myers put in a call to you Bruce

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

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

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

TEXT:

probably while we were discussing tobacco in your office, Bruce. He wanted to relay that his GOP consultant says GOP governors are getting a bit nervous, but still think it's too early to compromise. The GOP governors are hearing from the GOP House appropriators that while we're raising objections to the Hutchison provision they aren't sure we'll veto over it. Matt's wondering if we can have some tougher sounding quiet conversations. I didn't give him any hope.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 14:04:36.00

SUBJECT: EPIC

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

have you had a chance to speak with Chris?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 14:43:57.00

SUBJECT: Rept w/Teen Birth data incl tobacco use during pregnancy

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI: The report that contains the teen birth data being announced by the VP also includes all sorts of other data on births (prenatal care, c-sections, multiple births, etc) including tobacco use during pregnancy.

Like the report released a year ago, this report shows smoking during pregnancy is down overall but up among teens. We are not planning to highlight the trend is mentioned at the end of the HHS press release.

Andrea Kane

04/28/99 11:15:09 AM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Teen Birth Trends

Here's a chart summarizing key trends related to teen births, teen pregnancy, and out-of-wedlock births. Should come in handy for briefing/background for the First Lady's drop-by at the reception for National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy honorees this afternoon and the VP's roundtable tomorrow.

Bruce, this should also clarify question you had about AGI data (teen births, pregnancies, and abortions are all down). HHS Q&A says:

Q5: Is this [reduction in teen births] an improvement because there are more abortions?

A5: No. Birth and abortion rates among teenagers have both declined, reflecting the overall decline in the teen pregnancy rate. In fact, the

abortion rate has dropped more than the birth rate. From 1991 to 1996, the abortion rate for teenagers dropped 22 percent, while the teen birth rate fell 12 percent.

Message Sent

To: _____
Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP
Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP
Sarah A. Bianchi/OVP @ OVP

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D29]ARMS28115243K.136 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF5750432A0D0000010A02010000000205000000F6290000000200000575772BDB43CCDD408D9B6
9FDCB5A2817026A891024FE2EAE533B6F66C7AD42B8163438D7407A0B0740DBD1406A6E894A0AD
7607051E5D1011A5D3D76DA84272A230FB211F62BC0B289CF566246427422ECF0BE04C9BB75C6F
D8D476B4484D49D8C617617E704D893602F38C35696EF04EE777265BE906CA643E7BAC4C6D7309
E30970193A5A02623649FC6454C97176306D198D9EEBE941E82F6DBECD5C2826AC36AE8553ABB6

Birth Rate Trends 4/28/99 (for internal use)

	1991	1996	1997	% change 1991 - 1997	% change 1996-1997
Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 women 15 - 19)	62.1	54.4	52.3	- 16%	- 4%
Number of teen births	519,577	491,577	483,220	- 7%	- 2%
Birth rate to unmarried women (births per 1,000 unmarried women 15 - 44)	45.2 ^{1/}	44.8	44.0	- 3 %	- 2%
Birth rate to unmarried teens (births per 1,000 unmarried women 15 - 19)	44.8 ^{2/}	42.9	42.2	- 6%	- 2%

1/ Birth rate for unmarried women 15- 44 peaked at 46.9 in 1994 and fell 6% from 1994 to 1997.

2/ Birth rate for unmarried teens 15 - 19 peaked at 46.4 in 1994 and fell 9% from 1994 to 1997.

- Births to teens (19 and under) accounted for 13 percent of all births in 1997.
- The percent of all births that were to unmarried women stabilized at 32.4% in 1997-- unchanged from 1996. The percent of all teen births that were out-of-wedlock continued to rise, reaching 78% in 1997.

Teen Pregnancy Trends

	1991	1995	1996	% change 1991 - 1995	% change 1995-1996
HHS/NCHS teen pregnancy rates ^{3/}	116.5	102.7	98.7 (<i>not released</i>)	- 12%	- 4% (<i>not released</i>)
AGI teen pregnancy rates ^{3/}	115.8	101.1	97.3	- 13%	- 4%

3/ NCHS estimates are based on NCHS teen birth figures and fetal loss estimates and the private Alan Guttmacher Institute's (AGI) abortion data. The AGI's estimates are based on NCHS's teen birth figures and AGI's own estimate of abortions and fetal losses.

Teen Abortion Trends

	1991	1995	1996	% change 1991 - 1995	% change 1995-1996
AGI teen abortion rate (per 1,000 women 15 -	37.6	30.0	29.2	- 22%	- 3 %

19)					
-----	--	--	--	--	--

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 15:13:42.00

SUBJECT: Teen Birth Trends: Update

TO: Melissa B. Ratcliff (CN=Melissa B. Ratcliff/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Here's updated chart (for internal use)

HHS ended up sharing 1996 teen pregnancy rate on a "preliminary" basis --
it's the lowest level in 20 years and when they saw the press getting
interested in AGI's pregnancy numbers, they decided it would be good to
have the federal numbers part of the story. The VP's release didn't
change and it's my understanding he'll still focus on the teen birth data.=====

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D44]ARMS261333438.136 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF5750432A0D0000010A020100000002050000002B2D0000000200008BFE30697A2FFFAC318852
D6D0E8D38CE409BDDA8543F83CC62F90E63044CEFC8BFF7F23DCEB18E916690F7F8A9857C6DD80

Birth Rate Trends 4/28/99 (for internal use)

	1991	1996	1997	% change 1991 - 1997	% change 1996-1997
Teen birth rate (births per 1,000 women 15 - 19)	62.1	54.4	52.3	- 16%	- 4%
Number of teen births	519,577	491,577	483,220	- 7%	- 2%
Birth rate to unmarried women (births per 1,000 unmarried women 15 - 44)	45.2 ^{1/}	44.8	44.0	- 3 %	- 2%
Birth rate to unmarried teens (births per 1,000 unmarried women 15 - 19)	44.8 ^{2/}	42.9	42.2	- 6%	- 2%

1/ Birth rate for unmarried women 15- 44 peaked at 46.9 in 1994 and fell 6% from 1994 to 1997.

2/ Birth rate for unmarried teens 15 - 19 peaked at 46.4 in 1994 and fell 9% from 1994 to 1997.

- Births to teens (19 and under) accounted for 13 percent of all births in 1997.
- The percent of all births that were to unmarried women stabilized at 32.4% in 1997-- unchanged from 1996. The percent of all teen births that were out-of-wedlock continued to rise, reaching 78% in 1997.

Teen Pregnancy Trends

	1991	1995	1996	% change 1991 - 1995	% change 1995-1996
HHS/NCHS teen pregnancy rates ^{3/}	116.5	102.7	98.7 <i>(preliminary, not published)</i>	- 12%	- 4% <i>(preliminary, not published)</i>
AGI teen pregnancy rates ^{3/}	115.8	101.1	97.3	- 13%	- 4%

3/ NCHS estimates are based on NCHS teen birth figures and fetal loss estimates and the private Alan Guttmacher Institute's (AGI) abortion data. The AGI's estimates are based on NCHS's teen birth figures and AGI's own estimate of abortions and fetal losses.

Teen Abortion Trends

	1991	1995	1996	% change 1991 - 1995	% change 1995-1996
AGI teen abortion rate (per 1,000 women 15 - 19)	37.6	30.0	29.2	- 22%	- 3 %

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 16:06:04.00

SUBJECT: Rangel Bill Talking Points and Q&A

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CC: Dario J. Gomez (CN=Dario J. Gomez/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:

----- Forwarded by Shannon Mason/OPD/EOP on 04/28/99
04:00 PM -----

Brian V. Kennedy
04/28/99 03:29:57 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Shannon Mason/OPD/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Rangel Bill Talking Points and Q&A

Shannon, can you forward this around to everyone for comments?

THE RANGEL SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BILL ADDRESSES THE CRITICAL NEED FOR SCHOOL MODERNIZATION

THE RANGEL BILL PROVIDES SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES TO COMMUNITIES

The Rangel proposal would make nearly **\$25 billion** in bonds available to states and districts over the next two years to build and modernize up to 6,000 public school. The proposal provides:

\$11 billion in bonds available to states, to address priorities established by the state;

\$11 billion in bonds available to the 100 school districts serving the highest numbers of low-income children;

\$400 million in bonds available to schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

\$2.4 billion in bonds would be available to states for business-school partnerships in low-income communities.

THE NEED IS GREAT

2,400 new schools will be needed by 2003 to accommodate rising enrollments and to relieve overcrowding. [National Center for Education Statistics]

The average elementary school costs **\$8 million** to build, and the average high school costs **\$16 million**. [Council for Educational Facility Planners International]

\$112 billion is needed just to repair existing schools in poor condition across the nation. [National Center for Education Statistics, 1999]

The average public school in America is 42 years old, and school buildings begin rapid deterioration after 40 years. [National Center for Education Statistics]

INTEREST ON SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BONDS IS A BIG EXPENSE

Many states and school districts issue tax-exempt bonds to raise money for school construction. Bond buyers usually agree to loan money to the state or the school district, with the understanding that the money will be paid back with interest over a number of years. Interest payments take a big chunk out of the pocketbooks of local taxpayers.

The interest on a typical 30-year tax exempt bond almost equals the amount borrowed. Even on less typical 15-year tax-exempt bonds, the interest is still significant – totaling about 65% of the amount borrowed.

Questions And Answers on Rangel's School Construction Proposal
April 26, 1999

Q: *What is Representative Rangel's school construction proposal?*

A: Representative Rangel proposes to fund \$25 billion in desperately needed school construction and modernization activities through Federal tax subsidies. Under the proposal, eligible school districts will be authorized to issue bonds for construction activities. The Federal government will provide the bondholders with tax credits in lieu of interest. There will be two types of bonds: School Modernization Bonds (\$22.4 billion) and Qualified Zone Academy Bonds (\$2.4 billion).

\$22 billion in SMB authority will be divided equally between the States and the 100-125 urban school districts with the largest number of low income students. The Department of Interior will allocate an additional \$0.4 billion in SMB authority to Native American tribes for BIA schools repair and replacement. Finally, the QZAB program, created by the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, will receive \$2.4 billion in additional bond authority.

Q: *Does the Administration support Representative Rangel's school construction proposal?*

A: Yes. The Administration strongly supports Representative Rangel's bill.

Q: *How does this proposal differ from the arbitrage proposals of Representative Archer and others?*

A: The Rangel proposal provides deeper subsidies and funds greater levels of construction than the existing arbitrage (Representative Bill Archer - HR 4579, 105th Congress) proposals. The arbitrage proposals would extend the period, from two to four years, during which States and localities can earn income on investment of bond proceeds without providing rebates to the Federal government. As such, the arbitrage proposal may delay critical construction of school facilities while bond issuers attempt to earn investment income in the financial markets. Conversely, Rep. Rangel's proposal provides incentives to renovate and construct schools in a timely manner. Further, Rep. Rangel's proposal would enable school districts with limited fiscal capacity to issue bonds for school construction by providing Federal tax credits in lieu of bond issuer interest payments.

Q: *Does this proposal differ from Representative Rangel's proposal last year? If so, how?*

A: The current proposal is similar to the Rangel school construction bill in 1998. Changes include increasing total bonding authority by \$3 billion, adding a \$0.4 billion component for Native American schools, and adopting structural changes that improve the marketability of the tax credit bonds and strengthen the quality of school construction.

Q: *School construction has historically been the responsibility of States and local communities. What is the justification for using Federal funds for this local responsibility?*

A: The state of American schools has declined dramatically while enrollments continue to increase. According to a General Accounting Office report, a third of all schools across the country, with more than 14 million students, have one or more buildings that need extensive repair. School districts also face the cost of upgrading schools to accommodate computers and modern technology, and of constructing new classrooms and schools to meet the expected record enrollment levels over the next decade. As such, the Federal government needs to take a leadership role in improving the state of American schools. Rep. Rangel's program is a down payment on the \$112 billion school construction and modernization shortfall. We anticipate that this contribution will mobilize further investment in education by states and local communities.

Q: *Why does the Administration believe that the financial markets will embrace school modernization bonds when there has been limited utilization of a similar instrument, the Qualified Zone Academy Bonds (QZABs)?*

A: Utilization of QZABs has been slow for two reasons: the financial market's lack of familiarity with this new instrument and some of the financial features that limited usage or reduce the price of the bonds. QZABs are the first bonds that offer Federal tax credits in lieu of interest payments; we expect substantial market interest as awareness spreads. To address financial concerns regarding the bonds, the Administration is joining Rep. Rangel in proposing to enhance marketability of these instruments through four fundamental changes. Changes to the QZAB program are as follows:

- Allow bond-holders to carry forward unused tax credits;
- Base tax credit rates on prevailing market conditions at time of issuance;
- Expand qualified bond holders (currently limited to financial institutions) to include individuals and other businesses; and
- Allow borrowers to use the bond proceeds for school construction.

Q: *How can the Administration ensure that the proposal will complement, not supplant, existing construction funding?*

A: Under the proposal, the Secretary of Education is responsible for ensuring that bond issuer plans certify that bond allocations are used only to supplement, and not supplant, the amount of school construction, rehabilitation, and repair in the State or community would have otherwise undertaken in the absence of the allocation. All applicants for bonding authority will be required to submit documentation to the Secretary of Education that delineates need for public school facilities, including descriptions of health and safety problems at such facilities, the capacity of public schools in the State to house

projected enrollments, and the extent to which the public schools in the State offer the physical infrastructure needed to provide a high-quality education to all students. The application would demonstrate that a comprehensive survey has been undertaken of the construction and renovation needs in the jurisdiction and describe how the jurisdiction will ensure that the bond funds are used for the purposes intended by this proposal.

Q: Why does the Rangel proposal provide tax credits rather than direct support for schools?

A: Given the scope of the nation's school facilities infrastructure problem -- \$112 billion needed for facility repairs and replacement alone -- a limited grant program to cover the full cost of school construction projects could not begin to make an impact on the problem. By using Federal dollars in the form of tax credits to leverage increased state and local support, we can help states and local districts to do much more construction than they would be able to do on their own.

Q: Why does the Rangel proposal reserve half the money for 100 urban districts?

A: Urban, rural and high-growth suburban areas all face different and difficult school modernization needs, however many school facilities problems are concentrated in urban districts, and these districts often have limited financial resources to meet their needs. In 1996, the GAO reported that 38 percent of central city schools have at least one inadequate building, as compared to 29 percent of schools in suburbs and large towns and 30 percent of small town and rural schools. In addition, 67 percent of central city schools (compared to 57 percent of suburban/large town schools and 52 percent of small town/rural schools) had a least one building feature, such as a roof, plumbing, or heating and air conditioning, needing repair or replacement.

Q: Will this proposal help states and communities that have already passed school construction bonds?

A: Yes, states and communities that have already passed school construction bond referenda could take advantage of this proposal as long as they have not yet issued their school construction bonds.

Q: *Does the Administration support application of the Davis-Bacon Act to this school construction proposal?*

A: The Davis-Bacon Act is a part of Rep. Rangel's proposal and the Administration supports its inclusion. The Administration is a strong supporter of the Davis-Bacon Act (DBA). The statute ensures that workers are compensated at wage rates comparable to those paid in the local area. Good wages are important for working families in these communities. In addition, payment of locally prevailing wages attracts skilled and qualified craftsmen that will be able to build quality schools for our children.

Q: *How would the Davis-Bacon provision be administered and enforced?*

A: The Davis-Bacon provision would be administered and enforced in the same manner as it is currently administered and enforced on Federal contracts. Construction contractors would be required to pay prevailing wage rates. DOL would investigate complaints filed regarding the possible wage rate violations. Neither the Department of Education nor the Department of Treasury would have a role in administering or enforcing the Davis-Bacon Act.

Q: *Given the Davis-Bacon Act drives up construction costs, would application of the Davis-Bacon Act decrease the amount of construction that would be conducted absent this provision?*

A: The payment of prevailing wages does not necessarily inflate costs, but does prevent costs from being cut at the expense of employees wages. The Congressional Budget Office testified in 1993 that the costs of paying higher wages may be offset by the benefits of hiring more skilled and productive workers. In addition, 31 states currently have "little Davis-Bacon laws." Accordingly, it is likely that most school construction would fall under state Davis-Bacon laws.

Optional

Q: *Does the Administration support extending Davis-Bacon application to other similar tax credit initiatives? For example, the Better America Bonds.*

- A:** Today, we are discussing Rep. Rangel's school modernization bonds. We agree fully with Rep. Rangel's approach for ensuring that Davis-Bacon will be applied to construction work generated by these bonds. The Administration is a strong supporter of the Davis-Bacon Act (DBA). The statute ensures that workers are compensated at wage rates comparable to those paid in the local area. The Administration has not evaluated how the Davis-Bacon Act might apply to construction financed by other tax credits.
- Q:** *Senator Daschle's school construction bill does not include a method for ensuring Davis-Bacon applies to the construction his bill would support. Do you prefer the Rangel approach to the Daschle approach?*
- A:** Today, we are discussing Rep. Rangel's school construction proposal. We agree fully with Rep. Rangel's approach for ensuring that Davis-Bacon will be applied to construction work generated by these bonds. We applaud Sen. Daschle's efforts to put school construction on the Senate's agenda. We look forward to working with Congress to take action on this critical issue affecting our schools today.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 18:18:44.00

SUBJECT: Race book

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

CC: edley (edley @ law.harvard.edu @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

Folks---I just realized that there may be some confusion re paragraph 1 below--what I meant to convey was that because there's a dispute between the current draft on education and what we say on ESEA and what DPC and others believe we should be saying so we are consistent with what the President has said previously, , it would be helpful if DPC would put pen to paper--that way we could evaluate competing drafts, ultimately to hone in on the dispute for resolution, if necessary by the President.

Folks: the book team is nearing the end of its authorized assignment. That is Terry and Liz will be leaving the project on 5/15. Because of this, Todd and I want to finish as much as we can in the next two weeks--our plan is to press forward to complete the agreed upon edits, have one or more drafting sessions on the disputed edits (which are not the big substantive issues), distill the substantive issues for presentation to president by 5/7. Accordingly, here's what we still need from you all:

1. With respect to the education portion of the workplan chapter---I suspect that the most recent revisions will still not address the fundamental gap between what we have been saying re changes to ESEA and the book's focus on the "compact." So as to move things along, Todd and I discussed that it would be very helpful if DPC would draft that section of the chapter--this would help highlight the problem and shed some light on

resolution. For example, Bruce had expressed view that the esea discussion in last draft was a throwaway, short shrift reference--how can we make it more consistent. We need by Friday, 4/30 because we are winnowing down issues by next week.

2. With respect to criminal justice and racial profiling: where is the options memo we discussed three weeks ago? We have the draft exec order received from doj and I know Elena had comments from Edley on policy question of an exec order on data collection or a different one--so can we get this by Friday, so issue can resolved?

3. Economic development--we have never received comments from Gene/nec on this or other parts of the latest version of the book. However, the book team has been working closely with treasury and sarah rosen (to some extent) on comments. Todd has sent sarah and treasury the 4/2 draft of this section and we need your comments by end of week to determine whether here too is a policy dispute. Both Todd and I believe that we can resolve these issues after this last round.

4. On civil rights enforcement, especially resource comparability, Chuck has expressed concern re whether there has in fact been a policy decision on how far to push Title vi--we need to see the latest version of this section before deciding if there is a substantive decision.

5. One or more of you have argued that the book really does not say anything bold or new on race--Todd and I wonder whether it would be useful for a small group of you to meet with writing team to amplify those comments--or whether it would be better just to communicate the views in the cover memo to the president--we stand ready to listen to your suggestion. As for the comment that the book does not really have the President's voice, that it's either too social scientist or not in keeping with the way he has spoken before such as macomb cty; Todd and i think this is one where we really need the President's feedback, including his red pen.

6. The book team is making changes per mtgs with Todd--we need chapters to todd and me before we can sit down and work through the disputed language issues. We are willing to schedule drafting session for weekend, provided that we have in our hands chapters--we also think it is necessary to have redlined draft--it'll make the job easier--Clara will follow up with Terry and Christopher but our goal is to have a new version to the President with explanatory memo on substantive disputes and other comments by 5/7.

WE NEED YOUR HELP----NOW!!!! THANKS TO ALL BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO FINISH THIS PROJECT.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-APR-1999 18:34:26.00

SUBJECT: Draft Hyde letter

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

BR/EK:

Should I send this to anyone else...or do you guys want to review first.
jc3

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D41]ARMS229474638.136 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504356050000010A02010000000205000000AC140000000200001C71EBA19B3922AF7A3E46
DA760237DEC19DD4DB72869E91BC12E7DA15D2F6212DC89BA0FEF0D701DEF46C928F7DF695FA6F

April 28, 1999

The Hon. Henry Hyde
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As you know, yesterday I unveiled a comprehensive proposal to strengthen our federal firearms laws in four important ways: (1) by expanding the successful Brady Law; (2) by further restricting youth access to guns; (3) by cracking down on illegal gun traffickers; and (4) by strengthening the Ban on Assault Weapons. In the coming days, I will transmit this legislation to Congress. Frankly, there is nothing in this proposal that Congress should not be able to pass this year. Its provisions are common sense and build on efforts that have already proven to be effective in keeping guns out of the hands of criminals and youth. For instance, consider some of the specific provisions:

My legislation will extend Brady background checks to all gun show sales, as well as to the purchase of explosives. Justice Department studies show that Brady background checks have stopped hundreds of thousands of illegal handgun sales. Certainly they can do the same if applied to gun shows and explosives.

My legislation will raise the age of the current youth handgun ban from 18 to 21 years of age. **With ATF gun trace data showing that more crime guns are traced to 18 and 19 year-olds than all other age groups, how can we not make this change?**

My bill will also ban youth possession of existing semiautomatic assault rifles and large capacity ammunition clips with more than 10 rounds of ammunition. In 1994, you and other Republicans stood up to the gun lobby and supported the original Ban on Assault Weapons. Is it unreasonable to consider legislation to keep those same weapons out of the hands of all juveniles?

And my legislation will limit handgun sales to no more than one per month per person, so that gun runners -- hiding behind straw purchasers -- cannot buy handguns in bulk and divert them to the street. It will also help law enforcement to trace more crime guns to their source, and to crack down on gun dealers involved in illegal gun trafficking.

For more than six years now, we have made great progress in reducing gun-related crime and violence in America. In fact, the number of violent crimes committed with guns has dropped by more than 25 percent during that time. Gun violence, however, remain a serious problem in our nation, and much more needs to be done. Passing comprehensive firearms legislation is one thing we can and should do to address this important issue. In the coming weeks, I hope you will give my legislation every possible consideration.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 29-APR-1999 10:42:32.00

SUBJECT: Q&A On Gambling Study

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

READ: UNKNOWN

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

READ: UNKNOWN

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

READ: UNKNOWN

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

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Question: Does the Administration support the expected findings -- including a moratorium on gambling expansion and more regulation of Indian Gaming -- from the National Gambling Impact Study Commission?

Answer: Since the study has not yet been forwarded to the Administration it would be premature to comment. However, The Administration looks forward to receiving the study and giving it careful consideration. However, I would like to point out that this Administration recently issued important regulations on Indian Gaming designed to help facilitate the ability of states and tribes to permit gambling on Indian lands

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Iratha H. Waters (CN=Iratha H. Waters/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-APR-1999 11:06:45.00

SUBJECT: Meeting Notice/Reminder

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Meeting today in Barbara Chow's office (260) at 4:30 pm... re: Puerto Rico...

Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-APR-1999 11:55:04.00

SUBJECT: Final POTUS tobacco statement

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

The campaign will hand it out at their 2:00 press conference and we'll simultaneously release it here.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
April 29, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am disappointed that so few states are devoting tobacco settlement funds to reducing youth smoking, as shown by the new report from the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids and the American Heart Association. This new report underscores why I strongly oppose any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. In the absence of such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion tobacco settlement to reduce youth smoking. We must act now: every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1,000 will have their lives cut short as result.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

April 29, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am disappointed that so few states are devoting tobacco settlement funds to reducing youth smoking, as shown by the new report from the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids and the American Heart Association. This new report underscores why I strongly oppose any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. In the absence of such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion tobacco settlement to reduce youth smoking. We must act now: every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1,000 will have their lives cut short as result.

###

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-APR-1999 11:59:03.00

SUBJECT: bankruptcy and the choice groups

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As we discussed briefly in our somewhat recent meeting on choice, the choice groups, led by NARAL, are working to advance an amendment to the quickly-moving bankruptcy reform bill that would specifically disallow debtors in bankruptcy to discharge debts that they may owe from damages awarded to victims of clinic bombings, etc. Schumer is championing the amendment in the Senate (it lost in Committee by a narrow, largely party-line margin). As you will see below in an e-mail from WH leg. affairs, NARAL wants to meet with us soon to try to secure the Administration's support for the amendment.

As you know, the Administration has several large concerns with the bankruptcy bills moving forward (a similar bill that moved through the House last year garnered a veto threat), and our ability to influence the bill on these large issues (means test, balance, etc.) is questionable, as is our ability to sustain a veto, frankly.

The NEC-led bankruptcy working group will likely be looking to you both for guidance on the political and policy context of this amendment, but we should probably have a broader discussion soon to consider our position on the amendment vis-a-vis the rapid movement of the bill (e.g., if we want to kill the bill, maybe we should fight hard for the amendment).

----- Forwarded by Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP on 04/29/99

11:42 AM -----

Joel K. Wiginton

04/28/99 04:44:18 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mark.McClellan@do.treas.gov

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

Subject: The FACE Amendment

NARAL wants to meet with us on Monday to discuss the Schumer and Nadler FACE amendments. Allison Hurit (sp?) wants the meeting to be with Schumer and Nadler's staff, them, and us. I have a bit of a concern about this, because -- to the best of my knowledge -- we haven't discussed how helpful we're going to be on these amendments. As you know, generally we've remained silent except on the most significant of amendments. Moreover -- except for the possible political advantage (which if played well, could be significant) -- I think that most folks on the bankruptcy group probably think this amendment may not be the best bankruptcy policy. Indeed, even NARAL's own material's on the amendment note that given a

recent Supreme Court decision, FACE damages are likely covered under the "willful and malicious injury" exception (NARAL appears to be worried about state FACE amendments which use a lesser standard of intent and forcing FACE victims to litigate the issue). As a policy matter, I recognize the importance of protecting the constitutional right to an abortion, but I'm not sure damages under the FACE amendment should be protected more so than damages provided for under other statutes designed to guarantee other constitutional rights (e.g., voting rights, a Section 1983 action).

In short, I don't want to have to tell Schumer and Nadler (two guys who may carry a great deal of water for us on this issue) that we're not going to actively campaign for their amendments.

That being said, if you all want, we can certainly make this a pro-choice deal and possibly throw a wrench in the progress of this bill. I always like a good pro-choice fight. Any thoughts?

Message Copied

To: _____

lucy.huffman@do.treas.gov
frank.toohey@do.treas.gov
tom.mcgivern@do.treas.gov
Broderick Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
john.daugherty@usdoj.gov
mark.mcclellan@do.treas.gov
karen:l.wilson@intmail.usdoj.gov
kenneth.l.chernof@intmail.usdoj.gov
Sarah Rosen/OPD/EOP@EOP
Sonyia Matthews/OPD/EOP@EOP
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-APR-1999 13:05:57.00

SUBJECT: Need your advice on one DOJ Q&A on tobacco lawsuit

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As you recall Sen McConnell and others submitted written questions to the AG on the tobacco lawsuit. Since the AG is testifying next Wednesday, we'd like to get these to the Hill tomorrow. There's one tricky one I'd like your help with. Can you think of a better way to answer this question?

Current Version of Q&A

Q: The Administration directly connects its proposed 55-cent increase in the cigarette excise tax to health care expenditures in various Federal programs. See FY 2000 Budget of the United States Government, Table S-8 (listing Veterans, Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, Department of Defense, and Indian Health Service). Doesn't this suggest that the amount of previously collected Federal tobacco excise tax revenues should offset any claims for past Federal health care expenditures?

A: No. The Department believes that liability for Federal tobacco-related health care costs properly may be assessed against the parties responsible for these costs. The Department does not agree that excise taxes paid by smokers relieve or reduce the accountability of the tobacco companies for these costs.

Background

Table S-8 of our budget simply lists 1) the year-by-year revenue raised by the 55 cent excise and the accelerated 15 cent tax, 2) the year by year tobacco related health costs in Veterans, Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, Department of Defense, and Indian Health Service, and 3) the amount assumed from recoupment.

The text of our budget (p. 88), however, says in the section discussing the price increase: "The funds that result from this policy will offset tobacco-related Federal health care costs. Each year, the Federal Government spends billions of dollars treated tobacco-related diseases for our Armed Forces, veterans, and Federal employees. It is fitting that the tobacco industry reimburse U.S. taxpayers for these costs, just as it has already agreed to do for the States."

In the later section mentioning the lawsuit, the budget says "In addition

to these Medicaid costs, tobacco-related health problems have cost Medicare and other Federal programs billions of dollars each year. To recover these losses, the Department of Justice intends to bring suit against the tobacco industry, and the budget contains \$20 million to pay for necessary legal costs. The Administration will propose that recoveries will be used to enhance the security of Medicare for future generations."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Jason H. Schechter@EOP@LNWTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 29-APR-1999 16:02:00.00

SUBJECT: Statement by the President: Tobacco

TO: 1=US (1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955
READ:NOT READ

TO: BARBUSCHAK_K (BARBUSCHAK_K@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TO: INFOMGT (INFOMGT@A1@CD) (SYS)
READ:NOT READ

TO: JOHNSON_WC (JOHNSON_WC@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SUNTUM_M (SUNTUM_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:29-APR-1999 16:28:51.80

TO: WOZNIAK_N (WOZNIAK_N@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:29-APR-1999 19:26:58.35

TO: GRAY_W (GRAY_W@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: NAPLAN_S (NAPLAN_S@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WEINER_R (WEINER_R@A1@CD) (DON)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GRIBBEN_J (GRIBBEN_J@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: RILEY_R (RILEY_R@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TO: tnewell (tnewell@ostp.eop.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HEMMIG_M (HEMMIG_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: RUNDLET_P (RUNDLET_P@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: BUDIG_N (BUDIG_N@A1@CD) (NSC)
READ:NOT READ

TO: meglynn (meglynn@usia.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: RATCLIFF_M (RATCLIFF_M@A1@CD) (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christine A. Stanek (Christine A. Stanek@EOP@LNWTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Lori E. Abrams
READ:NOT READ

(Lori E. Abrams@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Anne M. Edwards
READ:NOT READ

(Anne M. Edwards@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: David E. Kalbaugh
READ:NOT READ

(David E. Kalbaugh@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Julie E. Mason
READ:NOT READ

(Julie E. Mason@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Cheryl D. Mills
READ:NOT READ

(Cheryl D. Mills@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: G. Timothy Saunders
READ:NOT READ

(G. Timothy Saunders@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Laura D. Schwartz
READ:NOT READ

(Laura D. Schwartz@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik
READ:NOT READ

(Douglas B. Sosnik@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Todd Stern
READ:NOT READ

(Todd Stern@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Barry J. Toiv
READ:NOT READ

(Barry J. Toiv@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Michael Waldman
READ:NOT READ

(Michael Waldman@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Dorian V. Weaver
READ:NOT READ

(Dorian V. Weaver@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen
READ:NOT READ

(Catherine T. Kitchen@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Brenda M. Anders
READ:NOT READ

(Brenda M. Anders@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Richard Socarides
READ:NOT READ

(Richard Socarides@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Dag Vega
READ:NOT READ

(Dag Vega@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Barbara D. Woolley
READ:NOT READ

(Barbara D. Woolley@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno
READ:NOT READ

(Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Sara M. Latham
READ:NOT READ

(Sara M. Latham@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Andrew J. Mayock

(Andrew J. Mayock@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Beverly J. Barnes
READ:NOT READ

(Beverly J. Barnes@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Megan C. Moloney
READ:NOT READ

(Megan C. Moloney@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Laura S. Marcus
READ:NOT READ

(Laura S. Marcus@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Virginia N. Rustique
READ:NOT READ

(Virginia N. Rustique@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Thomas D. Janenda
READ:NOT READ

(Thomas D. Janenda@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Brian D. Smith
READ:NOT READ

(Brian D. Smith@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro
READ:NOT READ

(Leanne A. Shimabukuro@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Kim B. Widdess
READ:NOT READ

(Kim B. Widdess@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: 62955104
READ:NOT READ

(62955104@eln.attmail.com@inet@LNKTWY@EOPM

TO: backup
READ:NOT READ

(backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu@inet@LNKTWY@EOPM

TO: newsdesk
READ:NOT READ

(newsdesk@usnewswire.com@inet@LNKTWY@EOPMR

TO: usia01
READ:NOT READ

(usia01@access.digex.com@inet@LNKTWY@EOPMR

TO: usnwire
READ:NOT READ

(usnwire@access.digex.com@inet@LNKTWY@EOPM

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman
READ:NOT READ

(Elizabeth R. Newman@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jordan Tamagni
READ:NOT READ

(Jordan Tamagni@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Ashley L. Raines
READ:NOT READ

(Ashley L. Raines@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Peter A. Weissman
READ:NOT READ

(Peter A. Weissman@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Douglas J. Band
READ:NOT READ

(Douglas J. Band@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Edwin R. Thomas III
READ:NOT READ

(Edwin R. Thomas III@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Sherman A. Williams

(Sherman A. Williams@EOP@LNKTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: William W. McCathran
READ:NOT READ

(William W. McCathran@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Julia M. Payne
READ:NOT READ

(Julia M. Payne@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Robin J. Bachman
READ:NOT READ

(Robin J. Bachman@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Nicole R. Rabner
READ:NOT READ

(Nicole R. Rabner@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: June Shih
READ:NOT READ

(June Shih@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Brooks E. Scoville
READ:NOT READ

(Brooks E. Scoville@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Neera Tanden
READ:NOT READ

(Neera Tanden@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Sarah S. Knight
READ:NOT READ

(Sarah S. Knight@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Tracy F. Sisser
READ:NOT READ

(Tracy F. Sisser@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen
READ:NOT READ

(Woyneab M. Wondwossen@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Judithanne V. Scourfield
READ:NOT READ

(Judithanne V. Scourfield@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMR)

TO: Patrick E. Briggs
READ:NOT READ

(Patrick E. Briggs@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Debra S. Wood
READ:NOT READ

(Debra S. Wood@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt
READ:NOT READ

(Daniel W. Burkhardt@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Maureen A. Hudson
READ:NOT READ

(Maureen A. Hudson@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Lana Dickey
READ:NOT READ

(Lana Dickey@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Carmen B. Fowler
READ:NOT READ

(Carmen B. Fowler@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Lynn G. Cutler
READ:NOT READ

(Lynn G. Cutler@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Julianne B. Corbett
READ:NOT READ

(Julianne B. Corbett@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Walker F. Bass

(Walker F. Bass@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Virginia Apuzzo
READ:NOT READ

(Virginia Apuzzo@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Michael V. Terrell
READ:NOT READ

(Michael V. Terrell@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Elliot J. Diringer
READ:NOT READ

(Elliot J. Diringer@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Nanda Chitre
READ:NOT READ

(Nanda Chitre@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Melissa M. Murray
READ:NOT READ

(Melissa M. Murray@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Lisa J. Levin
READ:NOT READ

(Lisa J. Levin@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Phillip Caplan
READ:NOT READ

(Phillip Caplan@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Katharine Button
READ:NOT READ

(Katharine Button@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Douglas R. Matties
READ:NOT READ

(Douglas R. Matties@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Eli G. Attie
READ:NOT READ

(Eli G. Attie@OVP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: wh-outbox-distr
READ:NOT READ

(wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@in

TO: Sean P. Maloney
READ:NOT READ

(Sean P. Maloney@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Marsha Scott
READ:NOT READ

(Marsha Scott@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jodi R. Sakol
READ:NOT READ

(Jodi R. Sakol@OVP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Linda Ricci
READ:NOT READ

(Linda Ricci@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Mark D. Neschis
READ:NOT READ

(Mark D. Neschis@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol
READ:NOT READ

(Jeffrey A. Shesol@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Heather M. Riley
READ:NOT READ

(Heather M. Riley@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: McGavock D. Reed
READ:NOT READ

(McGavock D. Reed@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Chandler G. Spaulding

(Chandler G. Spaulding@EOP@LNIGHTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Janelle E. Erickson (Janelle E. Erickson@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Delia A. Cohen (Delia A. Cohen@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Maureen T. Shea (Maureen T. Shea@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Fred DuVal (Fred DuVal@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Pubs_Backup (Pubs_Backup@VAXGTWY@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: William C. Haymes (William C. Haymes@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jason H. Schechter (Jason H. Schechter@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani (Sheyda Jahanbani@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Marty J. Hoffmann (Marty J. Hoffmann@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (Dorinda A. Salcido@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: dmilbank (dmilbank@tnr.com@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julie B. Goldberg (Julie B. Goldberg@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (Sarah E. Gegenheimer@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: kyle.mckinnon (kyle.mckinnon@kcrw.org@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (Thomas M. Rosshirt@OVP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Minyon Moore (Minyon Moore@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Charles M. Brain (Charles M. Brain@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dario J. Gomez (Dario J. Gomez@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Carolyn T. Wu (Carolyn T. Wu@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Edward F. Hughes (Edward F. Hughes@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody
READ:NOT READ

(Rajiv Y. Mody@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Robin Leeds
READ:NOT READ

(Robin Leeds@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Deborah B. Mohile
READ:NOT READ

(Deborah B. Mohile@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Sondra L. Seba
READ:NOT READ

(Sondra L. Seba@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Tania I. Lopez
READ:NOT READ

(Tania I. Lopez@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Maritza Rivera
READ:NOT READ

(Maritza Rivera@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Victoria A. Lynch
READ:NOT READ

(Victoria A. Lynch@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jena V. Roscoe
READ:NOT READ

(Jena V. Roscoe@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Cheryl M. Carter
READ:NOT READ

(Cheryl M. Carter@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jocelyn A. Bucaro
READ:NOT READ

(Jocelyn A. Bucaro@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Kelley L. O'Dell
READ:NOT READ

(Kelley L. O'Dell@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jonathan M. Young
READ:NOT READ

(Jonathan M. Young@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jackson T. Dunn
READ:NOT READ

(Jackson T. Dunn@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Robert B. Johnson
READ:NOT READ

(Robert B. Johnson@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Charles H. Cole
READ:NOT READ

(Charles H. Cole@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: drosen
READ:NOT READ

(drosen@newsweek.com@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jennifer Ferguson
READ:NOT READ

(Jennifer Ferguson@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer
READ:NOT READ

(Joshua S. Gottheimer@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Carrie A. Street
READ:NOT READ

(Carrie A. Street@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: mhall

(mhall@usatoday.com@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: spage (spage@usatoday.com@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: bnichols (bnichols@usatoday.com@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Paul D. Glastris (Paul D. Glastris@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Maria E. Soto (Maria E. Soto@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (Alejandro G. Cabrera@OVP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christopher K. Scully (Christopher K. Scully@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: JOHN.LONGBRAKE (JOHN.LONGBRAKE@MS01.DO.treas.sprint.com@L
READ:NOT READ

TO: kara.gerhardt (kara.gerhardt@ost.dot.gov@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mindy E. Myers (Mindy E. Myers@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Larry.mcquillan (Larry.mcquillan@reuters.com@LNGTWY@EOPMRX
READ:NOT READ

TO: Deborin (Deborin@aol.com@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (Jonathan A. Kaplan@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen Tramontano (Karen Tramontano@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Skye S. Philbrick (Skye S. Philbrick@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Toby C. Graff (Toby C. Graff@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Samuel O. Spencer (Samuel O. Spencer@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Caroline R. Fredrickson (Caroline R. Fredrickson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX
READ:NOT READ

TO: Matthew J. Bianco (Matthew J. Bianco@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nancy.mathis (Nancy.mathis@chron.com@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Matt Gobush (Matt Gobush@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: James.gerstenzang (James.gerstenzang@latimes.com@LNGETWY@EOPM
READ:NOT READ

TO: scott.barancik (scott.barancik@americanbanker.com@LNGETWY@
READ:NOT READ

TO: IGCP (IGCP@usia.gov@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Evan Ryan (Evan.Ryan@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: rsimoncol (rsimoncol@aol.com@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Brian S. Mason (Brian.S.Mason@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Stacie Spector (Stacie.Spector@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Matthew W. Pitcher (Matthew.W.Pitcher@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David R. Goodfriend (David.R.Goodfriend@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: photo (photo@upi.com@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: kenneth.prewitt (kenneth.prewitt@ccMail.census.gov@LNGETWY@
READ:NOT READ

TO: Eli P. Joseph (Eli.P.Joseph@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (Jeffrey.M.Smith@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David Y. Stevens (David.Y.Stevens@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Neal Sharma (Neal.Sharma@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: *@krwashington.com>@LNGETWY@EOPMRX
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeffrey L. Farrow (Jeffrey.L.Farrow@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: marhast (marhast@aol.com@inet@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: mpena (mpena@efeamerica.com@inet@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: mgarcia (mgarcia@pacific.org@inet@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: info (info@elsoldetexas.com@inet@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: durph (durph@aol.com@inet@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Linda L. Moore (Linda L. Moore@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Orson C. Porter (Orson C. Porter@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bridget T. Leininger (Bridget T. Leininger@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Craig Hughes (Craig Hughes@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Simeona F. Pasquil (Simeona F. Pasquil@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: bob.davis (bob.davis@news.wsj.com@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (Victoria L. Valentine@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elena Kagan (Elena Kagan@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: jeanne.cummings (jeanne.cummings@news.wsj.com@LN GTWY@EOPMR)
READ:NOT READ

TO: patricia.peart (patricia.peart@MSNBC.COM@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jordan D. Matyas (Jordan D. Matyas@OVP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lorrie McHugh (Lorrie McHugh@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (Sean P. O'Shea@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Abigail C. Smith (Abigail C. Smith@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Veronica DeLaGarza (Veronica DeLaGarza@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard L. Siewert (Richard L. Siewert@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jade L Riley (Jade L Riley@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: jorszag (jorszag@doc.gov@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Jennifer H. Smith
READ:NOT READ

(Jennifer H. Smith@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: mmacdonald1
READ:NOT READ

(mmacdonald1@doc.gov@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: aaron_cohen
READ:NOT READ

(aaron_cohen@metronetworks.com@LNGETWY@EOPM

TO: Shannon M. Hinderliter
READ:NOT READ

(Shannon M. Hinderliter@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX

TO: Michael J. Sullivan
READ:NOT READ

(Michael J. Sullivan@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: James E. Kennedy
READ:NOT READ

(James E. Kennedy@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Erica S. Lepping
READ:NOT READ

(Erica S. Lepping@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: ssaukas
READ:NOT READ

(ssaukas@nbc.com@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Mae E. Haney
READ:NOT READ

(Mae E. Haney@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Kristina L. Gordon
READ:NOT READ

(Kristina L. Gordon@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jeffrey H. Oakman
READ:NOT READ

(Jeffrey H. Oakman@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: edwin.chen
READ:NOT READ

(edwin.chen@latimes.com@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Mark A. Kitchens
READ:NOT READ

(Mark A. Kitchens@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy
READ:NOT READ

(Ann C. Hertelendy@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Deborah Akel
READ:NOT READ

(Deborah Akel@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Debra D. Alexander
READ:NOT READ

(Debra D. Alexander@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: philippe.debeusscher
READ:NOT READ

(philippe.debeusscher@afp.com@LNGETWY@EOPMR

TO: gretchen.cook
READ:NOT READ

(gretchen.cook@afp.com@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Lindsey E. Huff
READ:NOT READ

(Lindsey E. Huff@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

TO: David Vandivier

(David Vandivier@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: carolmast
READ:NOT READ

(carolmast@aol.com@LNQWTWY@EOPMRX)

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 29-APR-1999 16:00:00

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release April 29, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am disappointed that so few states are devoting tobacco settlement funds to reducing youth smoking, as shown by the new report from the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids and the American Heart Association. This new report underscores why I strongly oppose any legislation waiving the federal government's claim to tobacco settlement funds without a commitment from the states to fund youth tobacco prevention efforts. In the absence of such a commitment, states won't have to spend a single penny of the \$246 billion tobacco settlement to reduce youth smoking. We must act now: every day, 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1,000 will have their lives cut short as result.

###

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 18:57:04.00

SUBJECT: Re: Parity Legislative Proposal- State Dept. rationale

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Scott Busby (CN=Scott Busby/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Update - During the Immigration meeting today, we reminded DOJ that we are waiting to hear from them on their view of the State Dept. rationale and they should be prepared to discuss at the next IWG meeting so we can move forward on getting decision on the parity legislation. Needless to say, I don't think we need a separate meeting on this issue at this time.

JANET MURGUIA

04/21/99 07:32:15 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Irene Bueno/OPD/EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP

cc: Mindy E. Myers/WHO/EOP

Subject: Parity Legislative Proposal- State Dept. rationale

I'm happy to pull that group together but frankly, I'm more concerned that we get to them on public charge and/or INS naturalization before NACARA parity. Which issue do you all think is more urgent. I'm not sure we should load up our meeting too much and discuss all these issues. Please advise.

----- Forwarded by Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP on 04/21/99
07:13 PM -----

Irene Bueno
04/20/99 10:57:07 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Parity Legislative Proposal- State Dept. rationale

Scott Busby received a draft of the State Dept. rationale for a broad parity legislative proposal. We would like to pull a meeting together of the group that has been meeting on this issue that you have convened in the past to discuss the State Dept. paper and to prepare a deputy level meeting to decide this issue. Do you want to schedule or would like me to schedule the meeting?

Please advise.

Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 08:39:33.00

SUBJECT: Re: Weekly Reader

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The idea below -- many e-mails below (smile) is very good. Can someone provide Ben with some direction in terms of whether or not pursuing would be good. I do believe it would be an excellent way for the President to reach thousands of young people. He could certainly speak from the perspective of a Father and President. Thanks!

----- Forwarded by Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP on 04/30/99 08:37 AM -----

Robert B. Johnson

04/29/99 12:21:29 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP, Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP@EOP, Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP@EOP, Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Re: Weekly Reader

Why don't you raise it with Loretta and If she doesn't respond in a positive way, I'll raise it and get the team to raise it. I just think as the Weekly Reader folks do, that this is a golden opportunity to reach out to a large group of young people in the aftermath of littleton.

----- Forwarded by Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP on 04/29/99 11:20 AM -----

Robert B. Johnson

04/29/99 07:51:35 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP, Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Weekly Reader

What do you guys think of this? Can I get your input?

----- Forwarded by Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP on 04/29/99

06:54 AM -----

Beverly J. Barnes
04/28/99 05:56:08 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP
cc:
bcc:
Subject: Re: Weekly Reader

ben, my best guess is that this is a speechwriting assignment. they could probably take the text of some speech they've done, shorten it and rewrite it in appropriate language. the other possibility would be dpc doing a draft that speechwriting then approves. great idea! bb

Robert B. Johnson
04/28/99 04:43:57 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Bever

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 10:10:14.00

SUBJECT: Is there something we can do with that NYT report on guns being sold not s

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 10:52:28.00

SUBJECT: Eli's Respons on Chicago Event

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI, here's Eli's letter to the editor in response to the Chicago Tribune article about the Partnership's convention in August (also included below).

Copyright 1999 Chicago Tribune Company
Chicago Tribune April 28, 1999 Wednesday

WELFARE REFORM By: Eli Segal, President and CEO The Welfare to Work Partnership.

I was disappointed to read Cornelia Grumman's article "Glitzy salute for welfare reform" (Metro, April 8). The article unfortunately missed the focus of The Welfare to Work Partnership's three-day national conference in August. The conference aims to bring together key players in welfare reform--businesses, service providers, community-based organizations, former welfare recipients and government officials--to present innovative solutions to shared concerns, including retention, transportation, child care and other challenges that lie ahead.

Clearly it is too early to "celebrate" victory. Although welfare to work has had unprecedented success in its infancy, much remains to be done. We cannot possibly change a system with 60 years of history in just 30 months.

Will the conference be exciting and energize attendees from around the country? We hope so. Will the conference utilize high-profile personalities to draw public attention to this important issue? Again, we certainly hope so. But the partnership's ultimate goal is to provide conference attendees with the tools and resources needed to move people from lives of dependence to lives of independence.

Copyright 1999 Chicago Tribune Company
April 8, 1999 Thursday, CHICAGOLAND FINAL EDITION

GLITZY SALUTE FOR WELFARE REFORM; AUGUST EVENT'S COST, PROPRIETY QUESTIONED
BYLINE: By Cornelia Grumman, Tribune Staff Writer.

Chicago's Navy Pier will be the site of a 3-day national welfare reform conference in August, marking the third anniversary of President Clinton signing a historic measure ending guaranteed entitlements to low-income families.

The purpose of the event, according to organizers who still are planning it, is to highlight the successes of welfare reform and to provide a forum for different regions of the country to exchange ideas about what has worked and what has not.

But organizers also are counting on attendance at the Aug. 2-4 event by celebrities, athletes, politicians, business leaders, Cabinet secretaries and former welfare recipients to draw media attention and to create a pep rally-like buzz.

"It's going to be an opportunity to stand up and say what's been accomplished," said Eli Segal, director of the Washington, D.C.-based Welfare to Work Partnership, the non-profit group organizing the event. "So I think there will be some celebration, but in the context of we still have a long way to go."

Already, though, the conference--with roundtable discussions moderated by movie stars or television talk show hosts, a party at the House of Blues and possible visits by Clinton or Vice President Al Gore--is raising eyebrows among welfare advocates who fear the event will become a celebration of dramatic drops in public assistance rolls.

"What are they going to celebrate?" says a laughing Jenny Wittner, who heads a Humboldt Park-based job training program, Chicago Commons ETC. "It's too funny. Time limits are coming up, and the point is not just how many people have gotten off, the point is how many people remain on and what will happen to them. To have a celebration when we have people whose lives have the potential to be made miserable seems to me somewhat inappropriate."

Others are concerned about the projected \$1 million cost of the event. Organizers are hoping half will be covered by city, state and federal dollars. The rest will come from corporate sponsorships and other private support.

Organizers recently met with city officials to discuss how to shuttle the expected 2,000 participants between hotels and the pier, getting streetlight banners made and asking celebrities such as Whoopi Goldberg, Oprah Winfrey and Michael Jordan to help conduct roundtable discussions and highlight welfare-to-work success stories.

But not everyone is convinced that a celebrity-laden, \$1 million event is the best way to bring attention to the poverty issue.

"If you're going to try to get businesses on board, get more people hiring, get more focus on the job yet to be done, it could be OK," said

John

Bouman, director of the Chicago-based Poverty Law Center. "If it's purely celebratory, I don't think it's appropriate. It would be unrealistic to think, and maybe distracting in a bad way, to convey that the job is done."

But Michael Kharfen, spokesman for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, said such a high-profile event could keep the momentum of welfare reform going among businesses.

He said that is especially important when dwindling welfare rolls become increasingly concentrated with people who have the hardest time finding jobs--those with drug or alcohol problems, the lowest skills and poor educations.

"Many people think that welfare is over," Kharfen said. "So having an Oprah or a Whoopi or any celebrity who can lend their personality and their interest, as well as to be able to draw attention, is helpful."

Nationally, welfare rolls have declined 35 percent since Clinton signed the law in August 1996, according to the latest figures.

But in Illinois, for instance, nearly as many recipients get dropped from the caseloads every month for missing an appointment or not properly filling out a form as the number who leave welfare for jobs.

At least 20 percent of those who go to work are back on the rolls within 12 months because they either quit or got fired. And many who have found work are stuck in low-paying jobs with little room for advancement.

Almost nothing is known about families who are said to "fall through the cracks," those who leave the rolls but have no job.

Meanwhile, overwhelmed and undertrained caseworkers often give recipients erroneous information about child care and other benefits.

But Gerald Greenwald, chairman of the Welfare to Work Partnership, said the conference is a time to focus on successes, encourage businesses to keep hiring and exchange ideas about what works in different areas of the country.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 11:08:18.00

SUBJECT: Next Steps on Tobacco

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mickey Ibarra (CN=Mickey Ibarra/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Fred DuVal (CN=Fred DuVal/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Since it sounds like yesterday's meeting with Dem Govs staff on tobacco recoupment went no where, I suggest that we have POTUS make a call to Carper. Timing is good because we just signed Carper's Ed-Flex Bill, which the Governor has been crying about for a full year. President could (jokingly) give Carper a hard time for not attending the bill signing, tell Carper recoupment prevention legislation will die unless we reach a compromise 9or something to that effect), and ask Carper to reach out to R Govs and signal to the Hill that the NGA wants a deal now so that states get the their money this year.

Reactions?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 11:42:23.00

SUBJECT: ABC

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

ABC is looking for Hollywood types friendly to us, who will work with us, whatever, to interview today or on the weekend on this issue. Anybody we'd like to recommend?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 12:27:25.00

SUBJECT: Draft Q/A on media meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/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:

Please forward to press...I'm running to a meeting...jc3

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D76]ARMS27165653T.136 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043BA040000010A020100000002050000000D1400000002000075B454DC3D33014093E834

**Meeting with Entertainment Industry
April 30, 1999**

Q: Can you tell us more about the meeting announced by the President today?

A: Today, the President called for a White House meeting in May with representatives from the entertainment industry -- including everyone from video games to music to movies to television -- as well as with **parents, educators, religious leaders, and young people themselves. This will be a working meeting -- or as the President said, a strategy session -- to discuss what all of us can do to accept our shared responsibility to teach and protect our children from the violence that is all too pervasive in our society. Although many of the details will be worked out in the coming days, we expect all attendees to come prepared with constructive suggestions on how we can move forward on this important issue.**

Q: What specifically do you expect to come from this meeting?

A: Essentially, we expect two things: First, that everyone attending recognized that we all have a role in addressing the issue of children and violence -- and that no one group is to blame or exempt from the responsibility to act. Second, we expect this to be the first of a series of meetings with all interested groups that will help us find common ground on these issues and spur a grass-roots movement across the country to turn our children away from violence.

Q: Will the President challenge the entertainment industry to reduce the level of violence in its programming?

A: The President will include all of the entertainment industry in this meeting, and challenge them to live up to their responsibilities. They -- perhaps as much as anyone -- can be a very powerful force for good or ill. They must be at the table and part of our efforts to find solutions.

Q: What will the President say to the entertainment industry the next time he goes to Hollywood to raise money for the Democratic Party? Will he challenge them then?

A: You should remember that President Clinton was one of the first government leaders to challenge the entertainment industry. His first year in office he gave a pointed speech to the industry about its responsibilities. More importantly, his words were followed up with action. He and the Vice President have fought for the V-Chip (which will soon be available in most television sets), a TV ratings system, and new tools to allow parents to help monitor and control their children's access to the Internet and other on-line services.

Q: Who will be invited to this meetings?

A: The list of invitees will be determined in the coming days. But as the President mentioned, we will include representatives from all of the entertainment industry -- as well as parents, educators, religious leaders, and young people themselves. We will also consult with Members of Congress.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: MaryEllen C. McGuire (CN=MaryEllen C. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 13:13:51.00

SUBJECT: AmeriCorps Conf Call

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Twest@cns.gov (Twest@cns.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JGompert@cns.gov (JGompert@cns.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We will be holding our biweekly AmeriCorps Conference Call this coming Monday, May 3rd at 4:00pm Please call 757-2100 code 4129.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 14:38:27.00

SUBJECT: Dumb question

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

I'm being asked for planning purposes if May 10 will be an open press event. Obviously it could conceivably be closed to show how serious it is. But I assume part of it at least will be open. Does anybody have a sense yet of how I can answer this? Is the answer that at least part of it will be open with others besides the President speaking? Or we don't know that yet?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 14:59:10.00

SUBJECT: Meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CC: Aprill N. Springfield (CN=Aprill N. Springfield/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:

You are invited to a meeting on Monday, May 3, at 4:00 p.m. in Bruce Reed's office. This will be a strategy session for the May 10 Meeting on Children, Violence, and Responsibility.

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 15:06:10.00

SUBJECT: LRM MNB60 - - LABOR Report on Legislation to ease Fair Labor Standards Act

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah Rosen (CN=Sarah Rosen/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John E. Thompson (CN=John E. Thompson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stuart Shapiro (CN=Stuart Shapiro/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: cla (cla @ sba.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ: UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

NOTE TO EOP STAFF: You will NOT receive a hard copy of this LRM.

LRM ID: MNB60
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Washington, D.C. 20503-0001

Friday, April 30, 1999

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer - See Distribution
below
FROM: Janet R. Forsgren (for) Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference
OMB CONTACT: Melissa N. Benton
PHONE: (202)395-7887 FAX: (202)395-6148
SUBJECT: LABOR Report on Legislation to ease Fair Labor Standards
Act restrictions on the employment of certain youth in the wood processing
industry

DEADLINE: 11:00 a.m. Wednesday, May 5, 1999
In accordance with OMB Circular A-19, OMB requests the views of your
agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the
program of the President. Please advise us if this item will affect
direct spending or receipts for purposes of the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions
of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

COMMENTS:

DISTRIBUTION LIST

AGENCIES:
61-JUSTICE - Jon P. Jennings - (202) 514-2141
25-COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202) 482-3151
107-Small Business Administration - Mary Kristine Swedin - (202) 205-6700
52-HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES - Sondra S. Wallace - (202) 690-7760

EOP:

Barry White
Larry R. Matlack
Debra J. Bond
Sarah Rosen
Stuart Shapiro
Daniel J. Chenok
Karen Tramontano
Maureen T. Shea
Caroline R. Fredrickson
Peter Rundlet
Sandra Yamin
Robert G. Damus
John E. Thompson
Elena Kagan

The Honorable Arlen Specter
Chairman
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services,
and Education
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510-6025

Dear Chairman Specter:

Thank you for your letter regarding child labor restrictions on Amish youth working in sawmills, and urging an administrative approach to addressing this issue rather than legislation.

As you know from our conversations on this matter, we share deep respect for the cultural and religious traditions of the Amish and similar communities, and recognize the good intentions of efforts to accommodate these traditions.

However, we have equally serious concerns that the legislation which has been proposed, if enacted, could result in exposing young workers to extremely hazardous workplace conditions in sawmills and the wood processing industry. This industry has an occupational fatality rate nearly five times higher than the national private-industry average. In addition to the serious dangers posed by milling and wood working equipment, the Department's Occupational Safety and Health Administration has many examples of sawmill workers who were crushed by falling loads, or run over by front-end loaders or fork-lifts. These serious dangers are exacerbated for young workers. The Department of Justice also has serious concerns about the constitutionality of the House legislation as set forth in their September 1998 letter to the Subcommittee.

Since this issue first arose as a result of the Amish community entering new commercial business ventures in which they employ their children, the Department of Labor has repeatedly offered to work with the Old Order Amish to help them comply with the child labor laws and develop employment opportunities for their young that do not place them at risk. Many of those efforts were outlined in my July 1, 1998, letter to you. Among these efforts, we carefully examined two proposals to allow 16- and 17-year-olds to work in sawmills under certain conditions. Our review of these proposals, which included on-site visits to operating sawmills in Western Pennsylvania, determined that the proposals would not adequately protect young workers; their health and safety would still be at

great risk. In addition, as a practical matter, the proposals would not have afforded the Amish with the accommodations they seek to employ their youth.

I should emphasize that the proposals we considered addressed the potential employment of 16-and 17-year old youth in sawmills. These proposals did not encompass the potential employment of 14-and 15-year-olds – as the Old Order Amish community seeks – because the law specifically prohibits the employment of youth under 16 years of age in manufacturing, which includes sawmilling and furniture manufacturing.

Clearly, the Department shares your constituents' belief that work experience can be beneficial for young people. We remain most willing to work with the Old Order Amish, and you, to try and find a reasonable solution, but our principal obligation under the law is to ensure that the health and safety of young workers are not compromised.

Sincerely,

Alexis M. Herman

April 30, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed
Elena Kagan

SUBJECT: DPC Weekly Report

Health Care -- Bicameral Democrats Meeting on Medicare Reform: On Wednesday, Congressman Gephardt hosted a meeting between House Democrats (e.g., Dingell, Rangel, Stark, Waxman, Pomeroy) and Senate moderate Democrats (e.g., Breaux, Conrad, Graham, Lieberman) to discuss Medicare reform. The Democratic Leadership arranged this meeting in order for Members to understand the conflicting positions held by the Democrats in the Congress on Medicare reforms. Senator Daschle wanted to make certain the House Democrats understood the strongly held position in the Senate that a viable reform proposal needs to be crafted; Congressman Gephardt wanted Senate Democrats to understand what he and his Members feel are the political and policy implications of pursuing what they feel to be "flawed" Medicare policy. Although the meeting was a bit confrontational, it was viewed by most attendees as constructive. At the conclusion of the meeting and in response to a suggestion by Senator Lieberman, Congressman Gephardt proposed that key Democrats from both Houses start working together -- along with the White House -- on some alternative competitive models for the program to determine if a consensus around one approach could be achieved. While encouraged by this development, we are still analyzing how to be responsive to the request without constraining your options and/or risking problematic leaks.

Health Care -- New Older Women's League Report on Importance of Medicare to Women: On Monday, the Vice President will join the Older Women's League (OWL) in releasing a new report on the disproportionate dependence women have on the Medicare program. The report will document that three-fifths of the Medicare population at age 65 are women and, that by age 85, women outnumber men in the program by a two to one ratio. It will also highlight how much income older women spend on health care (27 percent of their income by age 85), the number of chronic illnesses older women face (three out of four have two or more chronic conditions), the degree to which they rely on prescription drugs (8 out of 10 are prescribed medications regularly and the majority of their costs are paid out-of-pocket.), and how much longer they live than men (79 versus 73). At the event, OWL will indicate its support for the approach the Administration is taking to address the challenges facing Medicare. In particular, they will commend you for your Medicare surplus dedication proposal, your commitment to expand access to affordable prescription drug coverage, and will strongly support your opposition to increasing the eligibility age without any policy that assures it does not lead to

more uninsured Americans. Along these lines, they will reiterate their support for your Medicare buy-in proposal.

Health Care -- First Lady Launches Asthma Screening Program at Local School:

On Tuesday, the First Lady will visit Draper Elementary School in Washington DC to participate in the launch of a new asthma screening program being conducted by the American College of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology. This new program will screen thousands of children nationwide throughout the year to identify children with asthma and educate their parents about the disease in order to ensure they receive treatment. The First Lady will also announce that the Administration will submit to Congress legislation for a new, \$68 million initiative to fight childhood asthma. This initiative includes new efforts to: (1) implement school based programs that teach children how to effectively manage their asthma; (2) invest in research to determine environmental causes of asthma and to develop new strategies to reduce children's exposure to asthma triggers; (3) provide funds to states and providers to help them implement effective disease management strategies that will insure we lower hospitalizations, emergency room visits and deaths from asthma; and (4) conduct a new public information campaign to reduce exposure to dust mites and other asthma triggers, such as tobacco smoke.

Health Care -- Senate Finance Committee Holds Hearing and Praises the CHIP

Program: On Thursday, the Senate Finance Committee held a hearing to discuss the progress that HCFA has made in implementing the new Children's Health Insurance Program. The feedback from members was extremely positive; Senator Roth opened the hearing by stating that the members were there to "focus on a success story". In her testimony, Nancy Ann Min DeParle stated that during the first year of implementation, the program has enrolled almost 1 million children and is on target to enroll 2.5 million children in CHIP by the year 2000, a strong first step towards our goal of covering an additional 5 million children through both Medicaid and CHIP. She also noted that the new toll free number for children's health outreach, 1877 KIDS NOW, which you and the First Lady launched in February, has already received over 40,000 calls from families interested in learning about available free or low cost health insurance options for their children. Witnesses from the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities and state Medicaid departments also praised the Administration for its implementation of the program and its interest in initiating and sustaining outreach efforts

Drugs -- Arrestee Drug Use: On Thursday, the Department of Justice's National Institute of Justice released its 1998 report on arrestee drug use patterns. Some of the key findings of the study include:

- (1) Cocaine. Cocaine use declined among adult male arrestees, but remains the most commonly found drug for female arrestees. Though cocaine use appears to be stabilizing, in 19 of the 35 ADAM sites, at least one-third of all adult males tested positive for cocaine.
- (2) Methamphetamine. High rates of methamphetamine use remained largely confined to Western cities. In San Diego, Las Vegas, Spokane, and Sacramento, and Salt Lake City, over 20 percent of both male and female arrestees tested positive for meth.

(3) Opiates. Opiate use remained stable and geographically widespread. Nearly 70 percent of confirmed heroin users also test positive for cocaine, indicating problem of abuse of multiple drugs.

(4) Marijuana. Marijuana is the most commonly found drug in test results among male arrestees and its use is concentrated among younger arrestees, particularly young males.

(5) Young offenders (ages 15-20). Marijuana is the primary drug used by juvenile arrestees. On average, more than half of juvenile males tested positive for marijuana. While opiate use remains very low among juvenile arrestees, significant increases in heroin use were found in New Orleans, Philadelphia, and St. Louis.

Civil Rights -- Asian American and Pacific Islander Executive Order: May is *Asian Pacific American Heritage Month*. An Executive Order has been proposed that seeks to increase the participation of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Federal Programs particularly health and human services programs. This Executive Order has been long-awaited and will be well received by the Asian Pacific American community and particularly the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus. A scheduling request for a signing ceremony is pending.

Tobacco -- FDA Rule: This week the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to hear the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) tobacco case. Arguments are expected to be heard this fall, with a decision likely sometime next spring. As you will recall, in 1997 the district court upheld the FDA's authority to regulate tobacco products, but found the statute did not permit the agency to regulate tobacco advertising. Last August, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals struck down the district court ruling, finding the FDA did not have authority to regulate tobacco products. The Solicitor General filed a petition seeking Supreme Court review, arguing that Congress clearly gave the FDA the authority to regulate drugs and devices and that based on scientific evidence presented in the rule, the FDA made a reasonable interpretation that tobacco products meet the statutory definition of a product "intended to affect the structure or any function of the body." Thirty-nine states filed an amicus brief supporting the Administration's position. On the day of the Supreme Court announcement, we issued a statement praising the court decision and reaffirming your commitment to the rule. While this matter is pending in the courts, only parts of the rule are in effect. Retailers must check photo identification of any tobacco purchaser who appears to be under the age of 27 or risk fines. Not in effect are the rule's provisions designed to limit minors' access to cigarettes sold in vending machines or the rules limits on advertising and marketing which appeal to minors. In an unrelated event this week, The New York Times announced it will no longer run advertisements for tobacco products, the first ban for a national newspaper.

Tobacco -- Recoupment Issue: On Thursday the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids and the American Heart Association issued a report we mentioned earlier highlighting how few states are investing the tobacco state settlement into meaningful youth tobacco prevention programs. The report found in recent months only four states have decided to use settlement funds to reduce youth smoking, for a total of nine -- California, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, Oregon, Virginia, Washington. There are 25 states in which there is no proposal being seriously considered to guarantee the use of a substantial portion of the settlement funds for programs to

reduce tobacco use among children. We issued a statement expressing disappointment that few states are devoting funds to youth tobacco prevention programs and citing the report as support for our recoupment position. Since the supplemental appropriations process has been delayed, governors seem to be increasingly nervous that the Hutchison-Bliley amendment won't be enacted, but have not yet been willing to support any alternatives. We are having quiet conversations with the states and on the Hill in an attempt to resolve this impasse.

Education – School Construction: On Tuesday, Congressman Rangel plans to introduce his school construction legislation. The measure currently has about 85 Democratic co-sponsors. Rep. Gephardt's office has indicated that they would like to do some type of White House event with you on Tuesday to mark the introduction of this bill, however you are apparently scheduled for foreign travel on that day. Rangel's proposal -- which reflects your school modernization initiative -- would make nearly \$25 billion in bonds available to states and districts over the next two years to build and modernize up to 6,000 public schools.

Education - Class-Size Study. On April 29 at the National Press Club, Secretary Riley, Senator Patty Murray, the NEA, and other leaders announced the most recent findings of Project STAR -- the Tennessee study that has tracked the performance of a control group of students against others who were in smaller classes in grades K-3. Preliminary findings show that students who were in smaller classes in the early grades had better high-school graduation rates, higher grade point averages, and are more likely to attend college.

Education -- Florida School Reform Bill. [Hold for report based on Senate vote scheduled for late Thursday]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1999 18:58:11.00

SUBJECT: Public Charge Listening Meeting

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

FYI - Just a reminder - this is a follow up meeting to an INS meeting with the groups.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Irene Bueno/OPD/EOP on 04/30/99 06:32 PM -----

Iratha H. Waters

04/30/99 04:56:44 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Stuart Shapiro/OMB/EOP, Irene Bueno/OPD/EOP, Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP, Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP
cc: Jeffrey A. Farkas/OMB/EOP, Jack A. Smalligan/OMB/EOP
Subject: Public Charge Listening Meeting

Per Jack Smalligan, I have scheduled a meeting on Barbara Chow's calendar for Thursday, May 6 at 4pm in room 260 OEOB.... This is a joint OMB/DPC meeting. Please notify others in your area of this meeting if you feel it necessary.

Thanks.