To: Kim Tilley 202-456-5340

Lissa Muscatine 202-456-6244

From: Patti Solis

Date: 9/26/00

Pages: 2

Notes: Please respond with your thoughts on this as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Mickie & Patti

LEIBOVITZ STUDIO, INC. before Oct. 7

Path –
what do you
think?

To Lissa
+ Kim Tilly

To: David Rosen, *HRC 2000*

From: Karen Mulligan, *Annie Leibovitz Studio*

Date: September 12, 2000

Re: Photo shoot request

via facsimile (212) 967 1392

Dear David,

It was great to talk to you today. As you asked, here is the request in writing.

Annually, Vanity Fair publishes their Hall of Fame portfolio in December. The Hall of Fame portfolio celebrates noteworthy people and events of the previous year. As we discussed on the phone, Vanity Fair is very interested in including Mrs. Clinton in their portfolio. And of course Vanity Fair wants Annie to take the portrait.

Annie wants to travel with Mrs. Clinton for two days while she is campaigning. During this time, Annie also wants to take a portrait of Mrs. Clinton and Chelsea together.

We want to schedule this shoot within the next few weeks. The deadline for the Vanity Fair portfolio is October 7.

I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you so much for your time.

Best,

Karen Mulligan

Karen Mulligan
Annie Leibovitz Studio

DONE

10/00 Annie Leibovitz

547 WEST 26TH STREET NEW YORK NY 10001 TEL (212) 594 8400 FAX (212) 594 8989

NEWHOUSE NEWS SERVICE

1101 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Suite 300 Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 383-7800

DONE

FAX

Date September 21, 2000

Number of pages including cover sheet 2

TO: LISSA MUSCATINE
Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of Communications to the First Lady/The White House

Phone

Fax Phone 202-456-7805

FROM: DELIA M. RIOS
National Correspondent
American History Issues

Phone 202 383-7849

Fax Phone 202 296-9537

CC:

REMARKS: ☐ *Urgent* ☐ *For your review* ☐ *Reply ASAP* ☐ *Please Comment*

NEWSPAPER INTERVIEW REQUEST FOR THE OFFICE OF THE CURATOR

10/19/00 Newhouse News

NEWHOUSE NEWS SERVICE

1101 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Suite 300 Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 383-7800

September 21, 2000

Lissa Muscatine
Deputy Assistant to the President
and Director of Communications to
the First Lady
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ms. Muscatine,

I write about American history issues for Newhouse News Service.

With the 200th anniversary of the White House fast approaching, I'm hoping to mark that event by doing a story that focuses on what it takes to maintain the historical integrity of the president's home. I'd like to do that by profiling the job of the Office of the Curator and, of course, the curator herself. I'm interested in the history of the curator's office -- when an institutional effort began toward preservation -- and how that job has evolved. I'm interested, too, in the philosophical underpinnings of the preservation effort as well as the mundane details of ensuring that the White House endures into the next century.

Betty Monkman and I have exchanged voicemails. She knows of my interest and asked that I speak with your office first. I'd be happy to discuss my thoughts in more detail and can be reached directly at 202-383-7849 or by email at delia.rios@newhouse.com. Our hope is to have a story as early as possible so that we can give our newspapers plenty of time to use it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Delia M. Rios

Delia M. Rios
National Correspondent

914-238-9021

file w/ DONE

9/22/00 Joe Klein

Following are the quotes Joe Klein has used from his interview with Mrs. Clinton.

"He knew that deficit reduction was the predicate, that we couldn't have a credible activist government unless we could get the budget under control," Hillary Clinton told me in a recent interview. "I compare it to the importance of education in Arkansas. We couldn't get the economy moving there unless more people had the skills necessary for better jobs. In 1993, our most important job was dealing with 'Stockman's Revenge'—which I think was Daniel Patrick Moynihan's term for the massive deficits that the Reagan tax cuts and defense buildup had created. Unless we dealt with the deficits first," Mrs. Clinton concluded, "we'd never be able to do any of the other things we wanted to do."

"In law school, Bill did a typical Bill thing in his Corporate Finance class," Hillary Clinton recalled. "He never went to lectures, but then he spent a week or two cramming, and he got the highest grade in the class. The professor called him, a bit miffed I believe, and asked how it was possible that he was able to do so well. 'It's just like politics,' Bill said. 'All you have to figure out is who's screwing who.'"

Spoke to Joe K
9/22 3:30 pm.

8/1/00 Interview with Elizabeth Bumiller

TO: HRC
FROM: Lissa
DATE: August 1, 2000
RE: Interview with Elizabeth Bumiller

In addition to the story line we outlined for the Newsday interview, the focus of the New York Times interview will likely be your work on the foster care and adoption bills. It's very important that you re-aquaint yourself with these issues (details and chronologies were in your briefing materials yesterday). You may find a need to "educate" Elizabeth about what goes into a piece of legislation. She is only now grapsing that every successful bill involves a great deal of conceptualizing, negotiating, and promoting. And she is beginning to see that you and your staff played a critical role on these two bills.

On a larger scale, Melanne and I have tried to get her to measure you by a reasonable standard – e.g. it's not fair to compare your "legislative" record to that of someone in elected office because you had no power to legislate. At the same time, we want her look at your record and understand that your impact on legislation has been quite remarkable, especially given that you've had no direct legislative authority as First Lady.

We've also tried to underscore the following points: that most bills don't pass; that the technical question of who actually writes or introduces the bill is often less important than who is shaping its contours and figuring out its substance; that your staff people were representing you and the White House in meetings with agencies, the Hill, etc.

Finally, we don't want her to think that all you had to do was snap your fingers and things suddenly got done. Rather, we want her to appreciate that immense amounts of thought and work went into these issues.

Any anecdotes you can think of would be good. She knows about your phone call with Sen. Chafee before he died. Other stories would be helpful.

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON
WORKING TO BRING THE TOOLS OF PROSPERITY TO ALL

Hillary Rodham Clinton has long believed that equipping people with the tools of opportunity, will enable them to gain a stake in the mainstream economy and develop the means to strengthen their families and build up their communities. One important way to unlock the potential of impoverished communities is by making available small loans – with microloans or microcredit – thereby extending access to capital and training to non-traditional, underserved borrowers, especially women, who lack the collateral for traditional small business loans. That is why for over 15 years, Mrs. Clinton has worked to develop community lending institutions and the innovative policies to support them in the U.S. and abroad. Microcredit is such a powerful concept because it is a pragmatic approach to poverty alleviation that gives its beneficiaries the tools to improve their lives by building their own microenterprises; or as Mrs. Clinton had said, a helping hand, as opposed to a handout.

Mrs. Clinton first heard about microcredit over 15 years ago when she and then Governor Clinton were looking for ways to create economic opportunity in the poorest sections of what was then one of the poorer states in the U.S. **[did she see anything in particular through travels around the state??]** Mrs. Clinton had heard about the groundbreaking work of both the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh and the Shore Bank in Chicago, and reached out to representatives of both to learn about the impressive impacts small loans could make on communities.

In 1986, Mohammed Yunus, an economist who received his Ph.D. in the Unites States and later founded the Grameen Bank, met with the Clintons to offer advice on how such loan funds operate. By 1988, Mrs. Clinton helped create, and served on the board of, the Southern Development Corporation and its non-profit affiliate, the Good Faith Fund – one of the first rural microenterprise funds in the United States. Modeled after the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, the Good Faith Fund provides small loans, training and technical assistance to low- and moderate-income entrepreneurs in rural communities in Arkansas. Several U.S. foundations have partnered with the Good Faith Fund.
[add effects of good faith in ar]

Mrs. Clinton's successful implementation of a microenterprise fund in Arkansas inspired one of the key platforms of the 1992 Clinton campaign – to establish a nationwide network of small community development banks. In 1994, the President proposed and signed into law the Community Development Financial Institutions fund (CDFI fund), which, through grants, loans, and equity investments, is helping to create a network of community development institutions in distressed areas across the United States. Microcredit became a major element of the Administration's community empowerment and development agenda, and served as a catalyst for the Administration's subsequent domestic and international microcredit initiatives including the Administration's New

Markets Initiative. In addition to her work behind the scenes to promote the microcredit agenda within the White House, Mrs. Clinton also visited a number of microcredit programs throughout the country and made several public announcements of the Administration's microcredit agenda, including the unveiling of the Administration's microcredit legislation on Capitol Hill.

As a lead Administration proponent for domestic microcredit programs, Mrs. Clinton additionally sought to promote the concept of microcredit throughout the world. In her travels to impoverished communities in South and Central America, Africa, Southeast Asia, and newly independent states in Eastern Europe, Russia and central Asia, Mrs. Clinton met with small lending groups and their beneficiaries, as well as government officials to promote the efficacy of microloans, announce grants to many of these programs, and to encourage the governments of these countries to develop an infrastructure that would support these programs.

INTERNATIONAL MICROCREDIT

Mrs. Clinton has long recognized and promoted microcredit as an effective means towards empowering women. This is especially true in developing nations where women have not traditionally enjoyed the same rights as men, or worse, have been doubly oppressed by a political system that does not support them, and an economy that does not enable them to support themselves. Microcredit gives women world-over the tools they need to be self sufficient, self respecting and able to build futures for themselves and their families. Throughout her travels, Mrs. Clinton made an effort to meet with women who had benefited from microcredit programs in their countries and to then to bring their stories and concerns to the international stage as well as to government officials. Whether in small, undeveloped villages in developing nations, or at renown venues including the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland and the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, Mrs. Clinton always impressed upon her listeners that the economic well-being of women in developing nations was an essential priority to ensuring the social and economic health of emerging democracies.

Mrs. Clinton repeatedly met with women microentrepreneurs and loan agents worldwide, heard their stories, and then shared those stories with others. Some highlights include the following:

- In March 1995, Mrs. Clinton visited the Self Employed Women's Association (SEWA) in India and the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh to highlight these important microcredit programs enabling poor women to become self-sufficient. In India she met women who had gained a stake in their economies, as well as political force in their communities, because microcredit programs had given them the economic means to band together and have an impact. In Bangladesh, she only had time in her schedule to visit one site, a Hindu women's bank, however, Muslim women also wanted to have the opportunity to meet with her. Rather than remain divided because

of their historic cultural animosity, the Muslim women joined the Hindu women for the session, and each woman there learned that despite their cultural differences, they shared much in common in their quest to improve the lives of their families and communities.

- In September 1995, Mrs. Clinton spoke in Beijing, China, at the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) panel discussion on "Women's Economic Empowerment."
- In October 1995, Mrs. Clinton visited a FINCA bank, "Mothers United," in Nicaragua (which was subsequently re-named "Mothers United *with Hillary*"), and an Accion microenterprise project, "PenaSol," in Santiago, Chile. Both projects serve very poor women and have been successful in providing economic opportunity. The women she met in Nicaragua told her that they had seen pictures of her microcredit events in India, and asked her for tips they could learn from the Indian women. In Chile, she met a seamstress who told her that the small loan she received enabled her to buy a sewing machine, and that she felt like a caged bird set free.
- In December 1996, Mrs. Clinton visited BancoSol in La Paz, Bolivia -- Bolivia's largest commercial bank and the world's only commercial bank dedicated solely to micro lending. (The BancoSol borrowing group that Mrs. Clinton met with re-named itself the "Hillary" group in honor of her.)
- In March 1997, Mrs. Clinton met with borrowers from the Zambuko Trust Microfinance Program, a microenterprise institution supporting 4,000 Zimbabwean businesses -- 75% of them owned by women. There she announced a USAID grant to the Zambuko Trust. Also in March 1997, Mrs. Clinton visited a FINCA microenterprise borrowing group outside Kampala, Uganda.
- In May 1997, Mrs. Clinton visited with indigenous and peasant women involved in various microenterprises in Mexico, who displayed their products and discussed their work. Mrs. Clinton also participated in a roundtable in Costa Rica with microcredit entrepreneurs and Mrs. Figueres, the First Lady of Costa Rica. Eight microentrepreneurs from throughout Costa Rica spoke with the First Lady and displayed their merchandise. Mrs. Clinton spoke to the Regional Consultative Forum on Microenterprise Development in San Jose, Costa Rica. The Forum brought together 70 entrepreneurs from Central America to exchange ideas, share best practices, and ask for support from the region's political leadership. Mrs. Clinton participated in the Caribbean Regional Microenterprise Forum in Bridgetown, Barbados. The event was sponsored by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Caribbean Development Bank. Mrs. Clinton announced $500,000 in assistance for microenterprise assistance to the four Windward Islands of St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Grenada, and Dominica.
- February 2, 1998 Mrs. Clinton made remarks at the Annual Meeting of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, where she discussed the need for corporate responsibility and her support for microcredit as a development tool.
- In March 1998, Mrs. Clinton and the President traveled to a FINCA program in Uganda with Yoweri Museveni, the President of Uganda. Mr. Museveni noted that he had not even heard of the program in his own country until Mrs. Clinton drew his attention to

it.

- In October 1998, Mrs. Clinton attended the Central and Eastern Europe Regional Forum on Women in the 21st Century in Sofia, Bulgaria, where she encouraged the cultivation of women as business leaders.
- In December 1998, Mrs. Clinton announced USAID grant recipients at the Women's Empowerment Center in Beach Camp, Gaza. In March 1999, Mrs. Clinton toured the Enda Inter-Arabe Urban Development Center in Tunisia. In November 1999, Mrs. Clinton and Her Majesty Queen Rania of Jordan presented the first annual Jordan Microenterprise Awards in Amman, Jordan.

DOMESTIC MICROCREDIT

At the fourth United Nations Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995, where Mrs. Clinton delivered a groundbreaking address on the rights of women worldwide and held a summit on microcredit, the First Lady highlighted the international and domestic community development commitments the United States was undertaking. Mrs. Clinton announced that through the CDFI Fund, the Administration would establish a new Presidential awards program to honor outstanding microlending organizations. These awards provide challenging benchmarks for microenterprise programs throughout the nation, they raise public awareness of the importance of such programs, and enable many in the private financial marketplace to see markets in places they never looked for them.

Mrs. Clinton also promoted microcredit as a means of lifting people out of the welfare system and giving them an opportunity to contribute to the economy. In her remarks at the first Presidential Awards Ceremony, Mrs. Clinton talked about the importance of microcredit: "These micro-lending networks and the small businesses they create can be important tools in our efforts to move Americans off welfare and to give working but poor Americans more of a chance to realize their own potential. The loans represent not only an infusion of cash into a business but also an infusion of confidence in a recipient's ability to succeed. Whether it is a beauty salon in Albuquerque or a child care center in San Diego or a small restaurant right here in the District of Columbia, small neighborhood businesses created with micro-loans can bring much-needed jobs, goods, services, and opportunities to low-income areas." [1/30/97]

The Administration has demonstrated a solid record of creating new initiatives and expanding existing initiatives to promote community and economic development by working with the private sector, states, and localities to help revitalize America's communities by bringing capital, jobs, and opportunity to distressed areas and cleaning up the urban environment. Mrs. Clinton and her staff have been particularly involved in the development of the domestic microcredit agenda **[staff work included serving on an interagency council and advocating for funding increases – is this necessary?]** which includes: developing and announcing the microenterprise awards; introducing the PRIME Act, under which the CDFI Fund will provide microenterprise technical assistance through competitive grants to microenterprise development organizations that focus on

low-income entrepreneurs; a doubling of support for technical assistance in SBA's Microloan Program and a doubling of support for SBA lending to leverage new microlending; and new funding for Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) and for SBA's One-Stop Capital Shops.

The First Lady and her staff were deeply involved in the development of the Administration's domestic microcredit policies and Mrs. Clinton made several public announcements of the Administration's proposal in this area. In May 1996, Mrs. Clinton and Secretary Rubin announced the details of the Presidential Awards for Excellence in Microenterprise Development via video to the Association for Enterprise Opportunity Conference in Rhode Island. In January 1997, Mrs. Clinton, Secretary Rubin and USAID Administrator Brian Atwood held a press conference on the microenterprise awards, which was followed by a ceremony in which the President, First Lady and Secretary Rubin presided over the Inaugural Presidential Awards for Excellence in Microenterprise Development at the White House. In July 1997, Mrs. Clinton made remarks at the launching of a new Microenterprise Development Initiative on Capitol Hill and in June 1998 Mrs. Clinton joined Senators Kennedy and Domenici on Capitol Hill to announce the PRIME Act of 1998. The "Program for Investment in Micro-Entrepreneurs Act" provides grants to organizations that aid microentrepreneurs. In February 1999, Mrs. Clinton and the President presented the 1998 Microenterprise Awards at the White House.

Mrs. Clinton visited a variety of microcredit lending institutions throughout the United States. In July 1995, Mrs. Clinton visited Mi Casa, a program in Denver, Colorado, promoting microenterprise development, which has received support from the Small Business Administration. She also spoke to the Women's Foundation of Colorado Conference on microenterprise as a tool of opportunity. In December 1996, the First Lady addressed the Community First Bank in Washington, D.C. where she applauded the efforts of HUD, HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros, and the Bank for all their efforts for community empowerment. In February 1997, Mrs. Clinton visited a Foundation for International Community Assistance (FINCA) borrowing group in Washington, D.C.

FIRST LADY HILLARY CLINTON'S COMMITMENT TO CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS

Hillary Clinton has fought hard to make children's health a top Administration priority. For years, she served on the board of the Arkansas Children's Hospital, and as First Lady she has made more than 20 visits to children's hospitals around the country to underscore the vital role they play in our nation's health care delivery system. She also knows the essential role independent children's hospitals play in the education of future pediatricians. Independent children's hospitals educate nearly 30% of all pediatricians and nearly half of all pediatric specialists. Unlike other teaching hospitals, however, and despite the critical role they play in educating pediatricians, independent children's hospitals received virtually no Federal funds for physician training. (In 1999, teaching hospitals received an average of $76,000 in federal graduate medical education (GME) funding per resident, while children's hospitals received an average of $400 per resident. This inequity exacerbated an already difficult financial situation for children's hospitals, which often serve the poorest, sickest and most vulnerable children).

The First Lady recognized the inequity in the gap in GME funding for independent children's hospitals, and fought within the Administration to have it addressed. Working with White House staff and the Office of Management and Budget, she developed a much-needed proposal for federal support of GME at children's hospitals. Due to her strong leadership and efforts, the President's FY 2000 budget included $40 million for GME at independent children's hospitals.

In January 1999, the First lady convened a White House meeting with HHS Secretary Donna Shalala and senior executives from almost 30 children's hospitals, to discuss GME at children's hospitals and to announce the Administration's new commitment. Understanding that inclusion of this new program in the President's budget by no means ensured its enactment, the First Lady continued to work to underscore its importance and monitored the appropriations process. When the Senate Labor-Health and Human Services-Education bill did not include this critical funding, she made sure that the Administration's policy statement to Congress on the bill expressed the Administration's concern over the lack of funding and urged the Senate to fully fund the $40 million request. In the end, Congress fully funded the $40 million commitment.

In December 1999, along with representatives from children's hospitals, the First Lady participated in the Oval Office signing ceremony for the Healthcare Research and Quality Act of 1999, which authorized federal funding for graduate medical education at children's hospitals. At the signing, the President praised her for her leadership in championing GME at children's hospitals.

The First Lady has continued her work for graduate medical training at children's hospitals, working to increase the funding in this year's budget (FY 2001). She continues to monitor the appropriations process to see that the vital funding is enacted by Congress and that we continue to invest in our children's health.

Eliz. Bucciller

Add to done folder w/ Bucciller stuff

- Barbara Kennelly
  Bea Cardin
  Nicki Littlefield
  Transcript - Bill signs adoption act
  → Kennelly >
  → Camp (Rep - N.) > } transcript
  Chafee →

*) Piece / US News & Report 9/2/96
  Columns -

  press notices >
  press briefings >

* hots of '99 clips
  98 - clip from
  97 - " from Wash Times
  (
  ——— KC Star clip abt Decoma
  Columbus Dispatch -

- Adoption Bill Signing '97 - where HRC spoke

-

Children's Hosp - grad. educ. funds
in kind i WH to get into budget
(memorandum -
had to fight to keep it in)
Dir. of children's affairs

School
Work Force Investment Act Press paper
School to Work - descript -
injured $72 m into NY
draft press advisory

} recent

Mark Tucker document -
can we show that?

631 843 2775

TO: HRC
FROM: Lissa
DATE: July 31, 2000
RE: Interview with Liz Moore

From what I can piece together, Liz Moore is trying to answer the campaign question posed by Rick Lazio: What will Hillary Clinton do for New York? She is looking intently at your record – what you have worked on and how "effective" you've been at getting things done. She is a prodigious researcher and has looked back at everything from your legal writings to the "High Skills, High Wages" report to your work on education in Arkansas. She is very smart and interested in nuance; however, she has a hard time seeing connections and grasping the process of how things work around here.

Perhaps most important, she seems to be struggling for a signature -- or metaphor – that encapsulates your work and your political philosophy.

Melanne and I have spent a lot of time trying to convey several ideas:

1) That although your job has no portfolio you have used the position in unique and unprecedented ways to effect and affect policies that were important to you.

2) That the "untold story"of this Administration is the role you played after health care reform in championing domestic policy issues. That is, you didn't disappear and retreat into the woodwork (or into "traditional" First Ladydom), but were in fact very strategic in your efforts to continue work on health care reform and other issues of importance. We have given her examples, including the piecemeal steps taken on health care, as well as foster care and adoption, economic matters (such as microenterprise), Gulf War syndrome, the arts, and early childhood issues.

3) The importance of your domestic policy staff internally in the White House as well as in interactions with agencies, the Hill and interest groups. We think she's beginning to grasp that your staff, at your behest, has been the lead White House operation conceptualizing legislation, pushing for regulatory or budget items, negotiating and discussing with relevant agency and congressional staff. You can fill in the blanks with whatever stories you remember about your own interactions with members of congress, the Cabinet, etc.

4) Your work on these issues is evolutionary, not episodic – and that it is motivated by a spirit of social action that dates back to your experiences in high school and college.

5) The scope of your work internationally – your almost iconic status on issues relating to human rights, women, and democracy – and how it has involved

immense amounts of substantive work behind-the-scenes as well as public advocacy.

6) We have tried to give her some anecdotes that illustrate how things usually get done, to wit:

You go out around the country (or state, in the case of NY) and listen to people. You come back loaded down with notes and clippings and ideas of things that need to be worked on. (She seems particularly taken by the image of you coming back from a trip and showing up at staff meetings with your big crate, the sight of which causes all of us to take a deep breath because we can anticipate how much work will be involved.) Mammograms/Medicare, Gulf War, and aging out of foster care are good examples of this.

She still needs an umbrella theme for all of your issues. Obviously "empowering people" is one way to do it, although that's a bit cliched. I think it may be summed up best as: an effort to affirm our individual and collective potential by creating opportunities, respecting people's rights and enhancing their ability to take responsibility for their own futures.

Please call if you want to discuss this more.

MON 7/10

1) Call Jean Louis Atlan

Esther Cooperswith

2) Hermine Warren - friend of Esther 212-988-6973
- Nat'l Assoc. of Science - NY Acad. of Sciences >
- haven't heard from Hillary's staff re: media coverage
- bio >

Should she have Mrs. Bhtr come?
Ack. Hermine's efforts to call her attn to science issues —

→ Tell Melanee - Turkish Relief - HRC = honorary chair
Brooke Shtr

3) Fed Ex photos
Libby Hilkind
268 Warwick Ave (put in mail slot)
Staten Is - 10314

will be harder for Hill to be helpful - if it's printed like this in the public record
behind the scenes

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

Art Kaminsky

1) Has Lazio ever bought an option before this one? How come you bought options that day?

2) Janice Taylor – deaf lawyer who works for Elliot Spitzer – has dog trained to read sign language who goes after her everywhere
- went on subway – conductor kicks her off + arrests her a few days later – same thing (bc of the dog)
- could go to visit her
- Melissa Russo – channel 4 reporter

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION



Clay Eals <ceals@fhcrc.org>
07/13/2000 05:43:55 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Lissa Muscatine/WHO/EOP

cc: Clay Eals at home <ceals@home.com>
Subject: Interview re: Goodman

Lissa:

First, please, no need for apology. I'm just glad an interview with Hillary is possible. And if next week is too crammed as well, that's fine. Just sometime this summer would be great.

When you reply to this message, please "reply all," to get my home e-mail address as well. Right now, I'm at work today at my half-time job at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center.

It seems it may help you to have a handy list of where and when I'll be available and at what phone numbers. Here's that info through the rest of this month. (I don't have a cell phone, but I trust that I have enough time available at specific phone numbers to make a connection possible.) If we don't connect this month, I'll e-mail you a similar list for August as this month winds down.

Thanks again, Lissa. My availabilities for the rest of this month are below.

Clay

=========

Friday, July 14, through Sunday, July 16
I'm in Chicago at the 35th reunion of the Maine Township High School class of 1965. I'll be staying at a relative's apartment, where you could leave a message for me or reach me late nights or early mornings, 773-871-2174. Late Sunday night, I fly back to Seattle.

Monday, July 17
Available 2 p.m. to 8 p.m. Eastern, 206-667-2753 (Hutch)
Available 9 p.m. to midnight Eastern, 206-935-7515 (home)

Tuesday, July 18
Available 11 a.m. to 8 p.m. Eastern, 206-667-2753 (Hutch)
(I have a phone interview with someone else set for 9-11 p.m. Eastern this night.)
Available 11 p.m. to midnight Eastern, 206-935-7515 (home)

Wednesday, July 19

Available 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. Eastern, 206-667-2753 (Hutch)
Available 9 p.m. to 11 p.m. Eastern, 206-935-7515 (home)
Late this night, I fly overnight to Florida for five days of book-related interviews.

Thursday, July 20, through Tuesday, July 25
I'm in Tampa and Palm Beach, Florida, for interviews. With a day's notice, I could give you a phone number for Hillary to call during these days.

Wednesday, July 26
I'm in Louisville, Kentucky, for book interviews. With a day's notice, I could give you a phone number for Hillary to call that day. For about two hours of this day (I don't know what time yet), I'll be interviewing Arlo Guthrie in person. Late this night, I fly back to Seattle.

Thursday, July 27
Available 11 a.m. to 8 p.m. Eastern, 206-667-2753 (Hutch)
Available 9 p.m. to midnight Eastern, 206-935-7515 (home)

Friday, July 28
Available 11 a.m. to 8 p.m. Eastern, 206-667-2753 (Hutch)

Saturday, July 29, through Sunday, July 30
Available anytime, 206-935-7515 (home)

==========

Subject:
Re: Interview this week re: Goodman?
Date:
Thu, 13 Jul 2000 16:22:05 -0400
From:
Lissa_Muscatine@who.eop.gov
To:
Clay Eals <ceals@home.com>

Clay,
I'm so sorry to have taken so long to get back to you. It's been unusually hectic. I don't think Mrs. C will be able to talk to you before the reunion weekend. I wish she could but her schedule is completely crammed at the moment. Our best bet is for me to have her call you next week -- possibly on Monday. Where can she reach you? I won't be able to give you much notice because she'll probably just call when she's in the car with a moment to spare.....Sorry we can't be more specific....

Thanks,
Lissa

Clay Eals
Internal Publications Editor

Mailing address:
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
1100 Fairview Ave. N. LA-205
P.O. Box 19024
Seattle, WA 98109-1024

Street address:
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
820 Yale Ave. N. LA-205
Seattle, WA 98109-1024

Phone: (206) 667-2753
Fax: (206) 667-7005
E-mail: ceals@fhcrc.org (Software: Eudora Pro 3.0)

August 4, 2000

Dear Elizabeth:

Here's more information than you probably want, but I figured that more was better than not enough. I've included the following:

1) Remarks by members of Congress at the signing of the adoption bill (two of the three are Republicans).

2) A story in U.S. News and World Report that may help explain HRC's lower profile post health-care reform.

3) A zillion columns she has written on foster care and adoption

4) Press advisories related to foster care/adoption events that she was involved in

5) A handful of stories about the adoption bill (there are many more that I didn't send because they're fairly repetitive)

6) More information on HRC's role in securing funding for graduate medical education at children's hospitals, including an overview of her involvement.

Let me know if you have questions or need anything else.

Thanks.

FAX FOR KELLY CRAIGHEAD

FROM: MELANNE VERVEER

MATERIAL FOR HRC, PER REQUEST

144
145 PAGES INCLUDING COVER

Fax: 631-232-3079

Prepared in case the President does something on this — nothing planned at this time

DRAFT
WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT PRESS PAPER
DRAFTDRAFT AS OF 7/31/00**

Today, the President will celebrate the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). This historic bipartisan legislation reformed our national job training system to streamline the array of publicly funded employment and training programs and create a network of customer-focused local "one stop" service delivery centers to increase the earnings and skills of the nation's workforce. Since the signing of the Workforce Investment Act two years ago, all 50 states have developed plans that passed the Department of Labor's approval, and the number of One-Stop Centers in communities across the United States has grown from zero in 1993 to 1200 today. The realization of the President and Vice-President's vision for an accountable streamlined national job training system will not only help ensure that the nation's workforce has the skills to support continued economic growth in today's rapidly changing economy, but also assure that all Americans can participate in our economic prosperity. The President will call on Congress to invest in workforce development by fully funding WIA and other key training and employment activities such as the Administration's Fathers' Work/Families Win initiative rather then reversing course with irresponsible tax cuts that risk our fiscal discipline and jeopardize our continued economic strength .

ACHIEVING FULL IMPLEMENTATION. The President will announce the publication of the final rule providing guidance and preserving flexibility for states and communities as they implement key provisions of WIA. The publication of this rule marks the nation's progress in both consolidating numerous employment services at the street level through One-Stop Career Centers, and in reforming the system for customer-accountability through Individual Training Accounts (ITA's). These ITA's expand consumer choice by allowing individuals to select the training and provider that best suits their needs.

The principles of coordination, partnership, and customer service underlying WIA are reflected in the process and format of the rule. Developed with the leadership and participation of stakeholders such as business, labor, community groups, veterans service organizations, states, local entities and the disability community, the rule itself is written in a plain English Question and Answer format. Finally, the Administration has launched a website, **http://usworkforce.org**, to serve as a central user-friendly information resource for employers, employees, states, communities, and others with questions concerning any aspect of WIA.

RETOOLING FOR THE NEW ECONOMY. The implementation of WIA will help prepare workers and our nation's youth for the 21st century and respond to the growing need for skilled workers in today's rapidly changing economy. The pace of economic change calls for ready access to lifelong learning that meets individual needs and interests; an objective that WIA promotes through accessible One-Stops in every community and ITA's that empower eligible individuals to choose the training programs they prefer. By providing universal access to electronic tools such as the Internet based Career Kit and including access to electronic databases such as America's Job Bank, America's Talent Bank, and Career Info Net, One-Stop Centers recognize the increasing importance of technological access for full participation in America's economic, political and social life. By investing in skill development, WIA also helps

businesses--many of which have been clamoring for more skilled workers from any source--stay competitive. In recognition of the stake employers' have in job training, WIA includes business among the key partners in the state and local workforce investment boards and One-Stops. A skilled workforce is necessary to propel economic growth and to assure that all Americans participate in the resulting prosperity.

INVESTING IN A SYSTEM WE BUILT TOGETHER. Today the President will call on Congress to properly fund workforce development activities in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. The House bill provides none of the $154 million requested for the One-Stop Career Center system, proposes a $93 million cut from the 2001 requested and 2000 enacted levels for adult training, underfunds youth opportunity grants by $200 million, and eliminates $21 million in job training and education opportunities for 13,000 disadvantaged youth under the Youth Activities program. The Senate bill also underfunds youth opportunity grants by $125 million, cuts youth Activities by $21 million, fails to fund $44 million in enhancements for One-Stops, and cuts dislocated worker assistance by $181 million. Promoting involvement of fathers in the workforce carries particular importance, since responsible fathers are critical to the well-being of their children. Today the President will also call on Congress to fully fund the Administration's $255 million Fathers Work/Families Win initiative which would help approximately 80,000 low-income fathers and working families obtain the support and skills necessary to support their families. By failing to fund employment and training activities, Congress undermines the foundation of the new workforce investment system, and abandons the spirit of cooperation that marked the passage of WIA.

CLINTON-GORE ADMINISTRATION'S CONTINUING COMMITMENT TO LIFELONG LEARNING AND THE AMERICAN WORKER. This program represents the successful realization of a vision to retrain America's workers that Bill Clinton and Al Gore first outlined in their 1992 book Putting People First. For the next 6 years, President Clinton and Vice-President Al Gore pressed for their employment and training services reform proposal as a G.I. Bill for American Workers. Finally signed August 7, 1998, the Workforce Investment Act was described as "one of the best but most underreported, bipartisan achievements of the Clinton Era." With WIA now up and running, the Clinton-Gore Administration crowns its many achievements to assure that the American worker can participate in both lifelong learning and in our nation's economic prosperity.

Among other accomplishments, the President and Vice-President have helped make community college universally available through the Hope Scholarship and lifetime learning tax credits, employed 857,000 former welfare recipients through the Welfare To Work initiative, allowed penalty-free IRA-withdrawals for undergraduate, graduate, and post-secondary vocational education, and increased funding for Job Corps by over $400 million (or 48%) and increased the number of slots available to disadvantaged youth by over 3,000 slots (or 8%) since 1992.

Clinton Administration School-to-Work Accomplishments -

- According to a report written by Jobs for the Future, as a result of School-to-Work "education will be richer in technology, less classroom-bound, and more focused on what young people will do when faced with new demands or real problems."

- Since 1994, the federal government has made over $1.6 billion available to states and local partnerships as seed funding for school-to-career experimentation and implementation, with annual appropriations cresting at $400 million in both FY 1997 and 1998. States are investing the funds in: developing new working relationships among education, workforce training, and economic development; statewide outreach; professional development; new curricula; and other activities. Local partnerships have significant leeway in their use of funds, provided they demonstrate support for the local investments from employers, schools, and other partners. While no new grants will be made after FY 2000, some states will have until 2005 to fully spend their funding.

- STW has led to improvement in student attendance, student motivation and satisfaction, the rigor of course selection, employer engagement, the quality of adult relationships, dropout prevention, college attendance rates, wages in first jobs.

- Evidence from Philadelphia, Boston, New York State, and elsewhere indicate, some of the most encouraging gains have been in urban schools with high concentrations of minority students.

What has STW done for New York?

- Infused over $72 million into the State to help young people make the transition for school to work by providing them with education that is based on high standards, is reliable, usable, and leads to multiple future careers and lifelong learning.

What's Next?

STW sunsets in FY 2001. What can we do to continue to help young people with transitions to work, build effective partnerships between schools and business, and ensure that all of our students have access to economic opportunity now and in the future?

- Support major effort to reform high schools into smaller learning environments that include opportunities for young people to learn in small, thematic, personalized environments. Career academies set in high schools, for example, can focus on careers in technology and include effective school-to-work strategies that combine high academic standards with workplace training. (Administration has proposed $120 million for high school reform in FY 2001, VP has proposed $1 billion for smaller classes and smaller schools). [Charter Schools or alternative schools that focus on school-to-work or career academies are also another alternative.]

- Provide funding for regional intermediaries that scope out the skill needs of the business communities and then work to connect business, organized labor, and schools to improve in-school achievement and out-of-school learning opportunities.

- Help prepare our students for careers in technology: Support the Administration's $300 million Tech-Prep Initiative that works to promote training in high-tech by promoting curriculum realignment between high schools and postsecondary institutions provides students with a two-year experience in a high-tech field aligned to the curriculum.

- Continue to Support and Build School-Business Partnerships: Advocate for $100 million to award grants to workforce investment boards to continue to support effective school to work practices, such as externships for teachers, structured workplace for kids, employer involvement, and educational course work that includes high-tech curriculum.

STW Home
What's New
What is STW?
States
Resources
Communications
Grants
Evaluation
TA Providers

School-to-Work

Search | Site Map | Calendar | Links | Listserv | Contact Us | Comments | Top 5

NEW YORK School-To-Work Opportunities - 1999 Profile

State Development (1 Years): $620,000 State Implementation (5 Years): $60,300,000	Federally Funded Local: $ 958,608 Urban-Rural High Poverty: $10,110,043 Out-of-School Youth: $ 139,424
Total Federal Investments (as of 9/30/99): $72,128,075	

Governance & Leadership for the NYS STW system is provided by a 33-member NYS STW Advisory Council representing, in addition to the required partners, the legislature, governmental departments and agencies, service delivery organizations & associations, and students from across the State. The Council is co-chaired by the State Education Department and The Business Council of NYS.

Sub-state roll-out. The NYS STW system infrastructure consists of 47 regional STW Partnerships, each governed by an advisory council composed of all of the statutory partners. Each partnership supports a broad array of programs, activities and services that continues to reach 85 percent of all public schools in the state.

Roll of Key Partners. At the State Advisory Council level partners support the initiative through a variety of ways. They serve the Council by bringing each organization's unique perspective, policy initiatives and program information that shapes statewide STW policy decision-making. They are the conduit of information flowing to each agency and raise awareness of STW by ongoing information dissemination to their constituency groups. Examples of STW initiatives undertaken by policy members include:

* **The Department of Labor** supports activities related to career majors research and implementation, provides information on labor market statistics and child labor law, and has designed and continually improves the Occupational Information Network, now know as CareerZone, which is an on-line service available through the world wide web.

* **The NYS Congress of Parents and Teachers** provides awareness and training for parents through it regional networks and develops and disseminates brochures for parents on STW.

* **The Business Council of NYS, Inc.**, in partnership with local chambers of commerce, provides leadership and direction to over 4,000 businesses in the State of New York around involvement with education, including STW activities and programs.

* **NY Association for Training and Employment Professionals** - conducts an annual STW institute. This partner also developed a resource guide on "Sustaining and Building School-to-Work."

* **Legislative Partners** - In each of the past four years New York's legislative partners have drafted, in collaboration with the STW office, legislation for a statewide STW program. The legislation has failed each time to get past committee.

School-to-Work Models

System building initiatives include:

- Statewide regional conferences provide professional development and technical assistance around the integration of SCANS, workplace readiness skills and career development activities into all subject areas.
- Development of scope and sequence grids for each of the 6 career majors.
- Development and dissemination of a resource guide, *Sustaining and Building School-to-Work* that describes all the products created for STW.
- Continuation of the STW Advisory Council as a permanent advisory council in the proposed "New York's Workforce Development System" governance structure. STW Advisory Council has designed strategies for the possible transition of council membership on to Workforce Investment Boards.
- Maintenance of the NYC STW Alliance, a not-for-profit intermediary agency which provides coordination and collaboration between the employer community, NYC Board of Education and local partnerships.
- The state Education Department's Basic Education Data System (BEDS) collects data about teachers and administrators with respect to career development integration in curriculum and the alignment of all curricula areas with the all learning standards including CDOS.
- Maintenance of the NYS STW Web-Page which permits the exchange of local effective practices.
- The Regents have charged a panel of experts to study and make recommendations concerning the feasibility of a career and technical education diploma.
- New state assessments contextualize constructs around CDOS.
- Creation of the Office of School-to-Career at the New York City Board of Education.
- Development and implementation of the statewide Career Plan Pilot that involves 17 school districts which will expand to 200 districts next year.

Key STW Partners:
* **Business** - All partnerships have multiple employer/business partners including the following: Fleet Bank, American Express, Goldman-Sachs, Siemens Corporation, Travelers Insurance, Corning Incorporated, Eastman Kodak, Consoildaed Edison, NYNEX, Citibank, Solomon Smith Barney, Oppenhiemer & Co., Lehman Brothers, Coopers & Lybrand, MicroTrek, American International Group, the Wall Street Journal, Careers and Colleges Magazine, Novartis Pharmaceuticals, First Union National Bank, Ciba Specialty Chemicals, Paine Webber, Inc., East Harlem Cobs

---

NEW YORK STATE DIRECTOR: Jean C. Stevens, (518) 474-8892, email: jstevens@mail.nysed.gov

NCEE
National Center On
EDUCATION
And The Economy
™

700 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 750
Washington, DC 20001
(phone) 202 783 3668
(fax) 202 783 3672
(email) info@ncee.org

Fax Cover Sheet

1 August 2000

Date *No. of Pages (Including Cover Sheet)*

Betsy Brown Ruzzi

From

Shirley Milan

To

(202) 456-6244

Company *Fax Number*

O Urgent O For Review O Please Reply O FYI

- article on America's Choice
- review of legislation coming from it
- update on NSSB

Call if you need more + I'll look for photos.

B

If you do not receive all pages transmitted, please call Donna Weaver at (202) 783-3668 extension 123

an article to remember America's Choice

America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages! The Report of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce

By Ira Magaziner and Hillary Rodham Clinton

We have watched as Singapore, Taiwan and Korea grew from run-down Third World outposts to world premier exporters; as Germany, with one quarter of our population, almost equaled us in exports; as Japan became the world's economic juggernaut, and as America became the world's biggest borrower.

We have heard the excuses: The countries we beat in the Second World War are simply regaining their former places in the world. The Europeans and the Japanese are exploiting their low wages. Our competitors are class-ridden countries.

The truth is otherwise: Our former adversaries are doing far better in relation to us than they did before the war. A dozen nations now pay wages above ours. Our distribution of income is more skewed than any of our major competitors and our poverty rate is much higher.

Our education statistics are as disappointing as our trade statistics. Our children rank at the bottom on most international tests—behind children in Europe and East Asia. Again, we've heard the excuses: They have elite systems, but we educate everyone. They compare a small number of their best to our much larger average. The facts are otherwise: Many of the countries with the highest test scores have more of their students in school than we do.

We are not facing the facts about our future. What we are facing is an economic cliff—the front-line working people of America are about to fall off it.

From the 1950s to the 1970s, America's productivity grew at a healthy pace. The nation was get-

Ira C. Magaziner is president of SJS, Inc., a consulting firm that provides assistance to groups addressing current economic and social issues facing America. Previously, he was founder and president of Telesis, an international consulting firm for corporate strategy and economic policy development.

Mr. Magaziner co-authored the study on which this story is based.

He is a graduate of Brown University and attended Balliol College Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar.

Hillary Rodham Clinton, an attorney in Little Rock, Arkansas, is a national leader in education and community affairs. She chaired the Arkansas Education Standards Committee which recommended substantial changes in standards for the State's public schools.

Ms. Clinton serves as co-chairperson of the Implementation Committee for the Commission. She graduated from Wellesley College and earned her law degree from Yale.

06/01/2000 17:30 FAX 202 783 3672 NCEE 003

ting richer, and workers lived better on what they earned. Since then, the rate of increase in productivity has dropped dramatically. The distribution of income in the United States has been worsening. Those with college degrees are prospering, but front-line workers have seen the buying power of their paychecks shrink year after year. Since 1969, real average weekly earnings in the United States have fallen by more than 12 percent. And, during the past two decades, our productivity growth has slowed to a crawl. It now takes nearly three years to achieve the same productivity improvement we used to achieve in one year.

If we are to avert potential catastrophe, we must make drastic improvements in our rate of productivity growth.

If productivity continues to falter, we can expect one of two futures. Either the top 30 percent of our population will grow wealthier while the bottom 70 percent becomes progressively poorer, or we all will slide into relative poverty together. If we are to avert potential catastrophe, we must make drastic improvements in our rate of productivity growth. But we cannot grow simply by putting more people to work, as we have done for 30 years. Fewer people are entering the workforce, and fewer still will enter in the years ahead. We must grow by having every American worker produce more. If we do not, our incomes will go into a free fall with no end in sight.

We must work more productively and be more competitive. We cannot do this simply by using better machinery, because low wage countries can now use the same machines and still sell their products more cheaply than we can. Nor can we continue to organize work by breaking complex jobs into a myriad of simple rote tasks, because the world's best companies now use new high performance work organizations, unleashing major advances in productivity, quality, variety and speed of new product introductions.

The key to productivity improvement for a high wage nation lies in the third industrial revolution now taking place in the world. The steam engine and the electric motor drove the first two industrial revolutions, causing profound changes in work organization. This boosted productivity, quality and living standards dramatically. The creation of the

modern factory in the 1800s and mass production in the 1900s followed these technology breakthroughs.

The advent of the computer, high speed communication and universal education are heralding a third industrial revolution, a revolution keyed to the high performance work organization.

The new high performance forms of work organization operate very differently from most American workplaces where simple tasks are managed by a small group of educated planners and supervisors. Rather than increasing bureaucracy, the high performance work organization reduces it by giving front-line workers more responsibility. Workers are asked to use judgment and make decisions. Management layers disappear as front-line workers assume responsibility for many of the tasks—from quality control to production scheduling—that others used to do.

Workers are asked to use judgment and make decisions.

Because most American employers organize work in a way that does not require high skills, they report no shortage of people who have such skills and foresee no shortage. With some exceptions, the education and skill levels of American workers roughly match the demands of their jobs. If we want to compete more effectively in the global economy, we will have to move to high performance work organizations.

To do this we must mobilize our most vital asset, the skills of our people—not just the 30 percent who will graduate with baccalaureate degrees from college, but the front-line workers, the bank tellers, farm workers, truck drivers, retail clerks, data entry operators, laborers and factory workers. We can move toward high performance organizations only by reorganizing the way we work in our stores and factories, in our warehouses and insurance offices, and in our government agencies and hospitals. We can give much more responsibility to our front-line workers, educate them well and train them to do more highly skilled jobs.

By doing this, we streamline work. Fewer supervisors, fewer quality checkers, fewer production schedulers and fewer maintenance people are needed, so organizations become more efficient. Because they are more efficient, they can lower prices

and sell more. Because they can sell more, they can expand. Because they can expand, they can employ more people. Although each operation requires fewer people, society as a whole can increase employment and wages can go up.

Our most formidable international competitors are doing just this. For the most part, we are not.

We still have a robust economy. Some of our firms are among the best run in the world. They learned how to organize for high productivity. If many more do so, and we make the required investment in skills for our front-line workers, this country will have a bright future. If not, our incomes will decline at an accelerated pace. This is our choice: high skills or low wages.

The Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce

The Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce was brought together in June 1989 to analyze the interplay between economic trends and population dynamics, with hopes of steering a new course for the U.S. before we face a crisis. The Commission's study was carried out by a research team of 23 loaned executives from companies, unions, industry associations and the United States Department of Labor. The team probed into several industries both in the United States and abroad and concentrated in major labor markets of several states. In total, the team interviewed over 2,000 people at more than 550 firms and agencies and analyzed many government and private reports relevant to the project.

The Commission's findings on American industry, labor policy, and education pointed in one direction: Americans are unwittingly making a choice. It is a choice that most of us would not make were we aware of its consequences. It is a choice that will lead to an America where 30 percent of our people may do well—at least for a while—but the other 70 percent will see their dreams slip away.

The choice America faces is a choice between high skills and low wages.

The choice is being made by companies that cut

wages to remain competitive. It is being made by public officials who fail to prepare our children to be productive workers. Ultimately, we are all making the choice by silently accepting this course. We still have time to make the other choice—one that will lead us to a more prosperous future—a choice for high skills, not low wages. To make this choice we must fundamentally change our approach to work and education.

To make this choice we must fundamentally change our approach to work and education.

Problems and Solutions

The Commission did not seek in its research merely to draw conclusions about the problems America faces. Rather, the Commissioners set out to both identify the problems and recommend feasible solutions. Based on its research, the Commission made several key recommendations for an education and training system to address the economic challenges confronting our nation.

1. Problem: Two factors stand in the way of producing a highly educated workforce: We lack a clear standard of achievement and few students are motivated to work hard in school. One reason that students going right to work after school have little motivation to study hard is that they see little or no relationship between how well they do in school and what kind of job they can get after school.

Recommendation: A new educational performance standard should be set for all students, to be met by age 16. This standard should be established nationally and benchmarked to the highest in the world.

Students passing a series of performance based assessments that incorporate this new standard would be awarded a Certificate of Initial Mastery. Possession of the Certificate would qualify the student to choose among going to work, entering a college preparatory program or studying for a Technical and Professional Certificate as described below.

2. Problem: More than 20 percent of our students drop out of high school—almost 50 percent in many of our inner cities. These dropouts go on to make up more than a third of our front-line workforce. Turning our backs on those dropouts, as we

To make this choice we must fundamentally change our approach to work and education.

do now, is tantamount to turning our backs on our future workforce.

Recommendation: The states should take responsibility for assuring that virtually all students achieve the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Through new local Employment and Training Boards, states, with federal assistance, should create and fund alternative learning environments for those who cannot attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery in regular schools.

All students should be guaranteed the educational attention necessary to attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery by age 16, or as soon as possible thereafter. Youth Centers should be established to enroll school dropouts and help them reach that standard.

3. **Problem:** Other industrial nations have multi-year career-oriented educational programs that prepare students to operate at a professional level in the workplace. America prepares only a tiny fraction of its non-college bound students for work. As a result, most flounder in the labor market, moving from low paying job to low paying job until their mid-twenties, never being seriously trained.

Recommendation: A comprehensive system of Technical and Professional Certificates and associate's degrees should be created for the majority of our students and adult workers who do not pursue a baccalaureate degree.

A sequence of advanced certificates would be available and could be obtained throughout one's career.

Technical and Professional Certificates would be offered across the entire range of service and manufacturing occupations. A student could earn the entry-level occupation certificate after completing a two- to four-year program of combined work and study. A sequence of advanced certificates would be available and could be obtained throughout one's career.

National committees of business, labor, education and public representatives should be convened to define certification standards for two- to four-year programs of professional preparation in a broad range of occupations. These programs should combine general education with specific occupational skills and should include a significant work component.

4. Problem: The vast majority of American employers are not moving to high performance work organizations, nor are they investing to train their non-managerial employees for these new work organizations. The movement to high performance work organizations is more widespread in other nations, and training of front-line workers is commonplace.

Recommendation: All employers should be given incentives and assistance to invest in the further education and training of their workers and to pursue high performance forms of work organization.

We propose a system whereby all employers will invest at least one percent of their payroll for the education and training of their workers. We further recommend that public technical assistance be provided to companies, particularly small businesses, to assist them in moving to higher performance work organizations.

We propose a system whereby all employers will invest at least one percent of their payroll for the education and training of their workers.

5. Problem: The United States is not well organized to provide the highly skilled workers needed to support the emerging high performance work organizations. Public policy on worker training has been largely passive. The training system is fragmented with respect to policies, administration and service delivery.

Recommendation: A system of Employment and Training Boards should be established by federal and state governments, together with communities' local leadership, to organize and oversee the new school-to-work transition programs and training systems we propose.

We envision a new, more comprehensive system where skills development and upgrading for the majority of our workers becomes a central aim of public policy. The key to accomplishing these goals is finding a way to enable the leaders of our communities to take responsibility for building a comprehensive system that meets their needs. The local Employment and Training Boards would serve as the vehicles for oversight and management of training and transition programs, Youth Centers, and job information services.

08/01/2000 17:32 FAX 202 783 3672 NCEE 009

...pose a system ...by all employers will ...at least one percent ...payroll for the ...tion and training of ...orkers.

Implementing America's Choice

Since the release of the report in June 1990, the Commission has been busy promoting awareness of the report's recommendations through speeches and briefing sessions with educators, business and labor leaders, government officials and advocacy groups throughout the United States. As the report's findings have been disseminated, interest in implementing its recommendations has become widespread.

On the national level, key members of Congress have asked for a legislative program to implement the recommendations made by the Commission and have offered to hold hearings on it. Over 20 states have expressed an interest to work with the Commission on implementation strategies; three states, Oregon, Washington and New York, have already created legislative initiatives to implement key proposals from the report. Other activities to implement specific recommendations are described below.

Over 20 states have expressed interest to work with the Commission on implementation strategies.

New Standards for the Schools

Efforts are underway to implement the Commission's first recommendation, the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Since the release of the report, key national groups including the President's Advisory Committee on Education, the governing board of the National Assessment on Educational Progress and the National Education Goals Panel began to advocate the development of an examination system consistent with the Commission's recommendation.

More recently, President Bush, in his education initiative, "America 2000", announced the development of a national examination system for the nation's K-12 school system, with standards benchmarked to the highest in the world. Numerous groups, including the New Standards Project, a partnership of the National Center on Education and the Economy and the Learning Research and Development Center of the University of Pittsburgh, have begun to develop a new student perfor-

mance assessment system, putting into place the first steps to making this new system a reality.

Recovering our Dropouts

It will do no good to raise academic standards for school leavers if large numbers of high school students cannot meet them. The idea of Youth Centers, the Commission's strategy for recovering school dropouts and bringing them up to a high academic standard, is an essential component to the whole strategy for national human resource development.

The Commission is working closely with the William T. Grant Foundation's Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship and others to develop a national network of Youth Centers. A bill has been submitted to the New York State legislature to create Youth Centers in that state.

A bill has been submitted to the New York State legislature to create Youth Centers in that state.

The Commission is working to make information available to other states on the characteristics of alternative education programs that have been successful for dropouts.

Technical and Professional Preparation for Front-Line Workers

The vast majority of employers in this country have never been seriously involved in setting industry standards for entry level employment, and have no established mechanisms for doing so. Instead of blaming schools for not providing the type of workers employers want, business and industry leaders must share responsibility for defining standards of professional competence and take the lead in helping students cross the bridge from school to work. There is also no tradition among employers in this country of offering formal, multi-year, on-the-job training programs to high school graduates.

Efforts are currently underway to change American employer attitudes and practices toward workforce education. The U.S. Departments of Labor and Education are focusing on workforce training and vocational education. Ira Magaziner, the chair of the Commission, serves on the Department of Labor's Commission on Work-Based Learning, an

advisory commission on workplace training and high performance work organization.

The Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce plans to work with industry associations and key national business organizations to convene industry groups to develop certification standards for their industries. This summer, the Commission plans to participate with the National Governors' Association (NGA) and the National Council on Vocational Educational in an NGA-sponsored conference on new forms of technical and professional preparation programs.

been submitted
York State
to create Youth
that state.

Work Reorganization and Industry Incentives

Setting skill standards must go hand-in-glove with a strategy to reorganize work.

Setting skill standards must go hand-in-glove with a strategy to reorganize work. Under current forms of work organization, employers do not demand high skilled workers. It is highly unlikely that this country will do what must be done about workers' skills unless there is a strong demand from business and industry for people with those skills. That will not happen until employers see the need to embrace high performance forms of work organization.

The Commission has met with national business groups to begin a concerted campaign to promote an understanding of high performance work organization. Plans are underway to begin to develop an industry-led technical assistance network to help companies make the transition. Activities would range from disseminating information to visiting successful high performance work sites to helping companies reorganize to make the most effective use of new technologies. In terms of matching employees' skills to the new organization, some companies will have the internal resources to develop the necessary training programs to upgrade worker skills, while others will need outside consultation.

Employment and Training Boards

Without a cohesive labor market system that embraces national, state and local government, the Commission's other recommendations will be less effective.

The Commission has put forth a legislative proposal that we believe is a first step toward bringing together disparate pieces of the nation's existing labor market programs. In addition, we plan to publish papers on the elements of the system we believe should be put in place—from post-secondary data systems to a reborn employment service. Then, we hope to convene a working group of state, federal and national government leaders with business, labor and education leaders to begin discussions on implementation.

Conclusion

Taken together, the Commission's recommendations provide the framework for developing a high quality American education and training system, closely linked to high performance work organizations. The system we propose provides a uniquely American solution. Boldly executed, it has the potential not simply to put us on an equal footing with our competitors, but to allow us to leap ahead, to build the world's premier workforce. In doing so, we will create a formidable competitive advantage.

The status quo is not an option.

The status quo is not an option. The choice we have is to become a nation of high skills or one of low wages. The choice is ours. It should be clear. It must be made. ■

See pg 3-4 re: legislation

The Problem

As we move closer to the year 2000, the United States economy continues to demonstrate surprising growth and strength. Unemployment has dipped to levels not seen in decades and inflation has remained subdued. These extraordinary economic conditions, however, should not blind us to the plight of many Americans, particularly the less educated and disadvantaged, who face three major threats in the current labor market: a wide wage and employment gap between more and less educated workers, rising skill requirements for many jobs and heightened job insecurity.

As many analysts have observed, the wage-gap between educated and less educated workers has grown rapidly since 1979 and is still wide in the late-1990s. Between 1979 and 1995, the real hourly earnings of college-educated males grew by 0.6 percent. However, earnings for high-school educated males dropped by 16.7 percent during the same period. (Economic Policy Institute, 1997) In addition, more educated workers have much brighter employment prospects than less educated workers. In 1995 only 2.6 percent of college graduates were unemployed, while 5.8 percent of high school graduates and 12.8 percent of individuals with less than a high school education were unemployed. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, unpublished tabulations)

The large wage and employment gap between workers reflects another major economic trend: rising skill requirements for many jobs. In recent decades, the U.S. economy has been generating an increasing number of high skill jobs and shedding many jobs that require minimal skills. Between 1983 and 1994 almost half of all new jobs were in managerial and professional occupations that require high-level cognitive skills. (The Manufacturing Institution, 1998) This trend is likely to continue into the net century. According to the latest projections, over a third of new jobs created before 2005 will require a bachelor's degree or more. (Bureau of Labor Statistics) The major force behind this change in the nature of work has been rapid technological progress, notably the introduction and widespread use of the computer. In the past, for example, workers in automobile manufacturing plants tended to be semi-skilled or unskilled employees. Today, however, manufacturing workers must have the advanced technical skills required to operate robots, computers and other sophisticated machines.

A third trend affecting many Americans is the threat of permanent job loss. Technological change, corporate restructuring and downsizing and intensified global competition have reshaped the American economy. Between 1991 and 1995 about 3 million workers each year were permanently displaced from their jobs. (Sum, 1997) Some displaced workers have encountered serious labor market problems, such as extended periods of

joblessness and real wage losses upon reemployment. In the early 1980s displacement was primarily a phenomenon affecting blue-collar, manufacturing workers. But in recent years the pace of white-collar job loss has quickened as layoffs increasingly affected upper and middle management. Between 1993 and 1995, for example, over half of all displaced workers were white-collar employees. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1996)

Although these labor market trends have affected the entire workforce, they have been particularly pronounced for minorities and the disadvantaged. Minorities tend to be much more likely than whites to have low-paying jobs. By 1995, 39 percent of African American workers and 48 percent of Hispanic workers held jobs paying less than poverty-level wages, compared to only 26 percent of Caucasian workers. (Economic Policy Institute, 1997) Minorities have also faced a greater likelihood of unemployment, even in what has been a generally robust economy. In 1996, unemployment rates for African American and Hispanic women were nearly twice the national level with the unemployment rate for African American males reaching 11.2 percent and 8.1 percent for Hispanic males. (Economic Policy Institute, 1996) Most importantly, minority youth face serious challenges in getting the high-quality education and training they desperately need to be successful in today's labor market. High school dropout rates in some urban areas and among some minority groups have climbed to well over 50 percent.

These facts pose major challenges for states and local areas. For too long, workforce programs have been fragmented, poorly aligned and difficult to access. States now face the challenge of reforming the delivery of workforce services to meet the increasing skill needs of a changed labor market. They must create integrated workforce development systems that provide universal access to a wide range of education, employment and training services. In particular, states must design systems for:

- moving young people from education to work;
- assisting welfare recipients to move into the workforce and upgrade their skills;
- guiding unemployed and experienced workers from one job to the next; and
- helping all workers advance in an economy characterized by rising skill requirements and swiftly changing patterns of occupational demand.

In addition, states and local areas must reform alternative education options for young people who have left the traditional system but still need to develop the skills that will lead to good jobs and decent earnings. Most of the alternative education programs in the United States suffer from a lack of resources, high staff turnover rates and unstable funding. (National Center on Education and the Economy, 1997) And most alternative education programs are not part of any system of alternative education with agreed

upon and common goals for participant achievement and objective measures which determine whether participants are prepared for the new world of work. Those alternative programs which do have agreed upon goals and standards offer either a GED program, which provides a strong incentive for those young people working to pass it, or, in some cases, a local high school diploma. However, even though participants who have attained the GED fare better than those who do not, reports indicate that the GED still carries a stigma. Tied to performance of the average high school graduating class, states are free to move the "pass" rate often well below the national goal of 40 percent.

As school systems across the country implement new, high academic and applied learning standards, young people in alternative programs working toward a standard designed just for them and perceived as a lower standard may fall further and further behind their peers in traditional schools unless new standards are introduced into these programs as well. The consequences of not addressing an increasing disparity in standards between those in public schools and those in alternative programs are unacceptable. Employers will be even less likely to hire young people who have not met new higher standards. And the pathway to further education will be made even more difficult. Higher education institutions will admit fewer young people from alternative education programs as the admission standards are ratcheted up, and those who do enter may be less able to compete with their peers from the public schools. The research shows that long-term earnings of those who enter but never complete post-secondary education are no better than those who never entered.

In 1990, the National Center's Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce tackled the issue of how American public policy needs to change to respond to the changing labor market and the increasing skill needs in the economy. The Commission's report, *America's Choice: high skills or low wages!*, made five core recommendations. The report recommended that the United States create:

- A national qualifications system, with a foundation-level qualification for basic education and a set of technical/professional qualifications for advanced skills training;
- A school-to-work transition system to help move young people from basic education to training to rewarding careers;
- New alternative learning environments to recover virtually all school dropouts and take responsibility for helping them meet the new basic education standards;
- A labor market system that serves everyone, offers opportunities for upgrading skills, and provides the information workers need to find good jobs and employers need to find good workers; and

- Policies and programs to promote high performance work organizations in the workplace.

Since the release of *America's Choice*, the United States has made much progress toward implementing these recommendations, in large part due to the strong commitment to these ideas by the Clinton Administration. In 1994, the Congress passed the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* which focused on raising education standards in our schools. The President has since championed this cause across the country. The Congress also established the National Skill Standards Board to work with the business and labor communities to set voluntary skill standards for front-line through first-line supervisory work. At the President's urging, the Congress also moved to create a system for helping young people make a smooth transition from school to work, passing the *School to Work Opportunities Act* which has given states substantial funds to design and begin implementation of School-to-Work systems.

This Administration has made significant progress in improving our public labor market institutions to better help all citizens prepare for, search for and secure good jobs. The President's G.I. Bill proposal recognized the need for fundamental reform of our labor market system and echoed the recommendations of the *America's Choice* report. Although this proposal was not enacted in legislation, the Administration has moved ahead with many of the ideas through a number of U.S. Department of Labor initiatives. The Department of Labor has invested in efforts in over forty states to put in place one-stop career center systems to provide a comprehensive range of job training information and services to all citizens. In addition, the Department has begun an initiative to provide employment information and services to the welfare population through the same system that currently serves unemployed and dislocated workers. Efforts are also being made to give disadvantaged young people better opportunities to connect to the labor market. Through the Youth Opportunities Areas Program, the Department is supporting intensive and targeted efforts in low-income communities to place disadvantaged young people in career path jobs.

Still, it is at the state level that these changes will need to be put in place and integrated into a system that can truly serve all workers. The first piece of our proposed project is an effort to help advance this broad new workforce agenda at the state level. Clearly, no state should have to face the challenge of building new systems to move young people, unemployed workers, dislocated workers and those on welfare into work alone; collaborative solutions will be more innovative, more cost-effective and yield faster progress.

The High Skills State Consortium — a small set of diverse states committed to building comprehensive education, employment and training systems for

→ Since writing this Congress passed, + the President signed, the Workforce Investment Act which helps states build one-Stop Career Center systems as described here.

MORE ON NSSB

The National Center has continued to play a leading role on the National Skill Standards Board whose goals include boosting the competitiveness of American firms and increasing the skills of the workforce, connecting skilled workers to better jobs, opening opportunities for all workers and reducing training and retraining costs for business. Marc Tucker, as chair of the Board's Standards, Assessment, Certification and Policy Committee, leads the development of the Board's framework for the skill standards system. The framework defines the economic sectors in which standards will be set, the levels of jobs that standards will be developed for, the method for setting standards, the type(s) of assessments that will be produced which show that individuals meet the standards and other key components of a quality assurance system to insure that the NSSB endorses skill standards and certificates that meet or exceed the highest standards used in the United States and other countries.

Having helped to produce consensus on that framework, the National Center has focused on the design of the certification and assessment system, civil rights and access policies and the development of a common format and language for skill standards. The Center has also helped identify the broad clusters of jobs by industry, for which skill standards will be developed and helped define the composition and operating procedures of the Voluntary Partnerships which will set the standards. These Voluntary Partnerships include employer, union, worker, community, government and education and training representatives in fifteen economic sectors including:

- Manufacturing, Installation and Repair;
- Retail Trade, Wholesale Trade, Real Estate and Personal Services;
- Finance and Insurance;
- Construction;
- Telecommunications, Computers, Arts and Entertinment and Information;
- Restaurants, Lodging, Hospitality and Tourism;
- Education and Training;
- Business and Administrative Services;
- Mining;
- Public Administration, Legal and Protective Services;
- Scientific and Technical Services;
- Transportation and
- Utilities and Environmental and Waste Management

Skill standards in Manufacturing and Retailing will be released in the Fall 2000. Education and Training and Hospitality skill standards will follow next year. Work is underway as well in the Utility and Information technology sectors.

Hillary -

(1) I reached Barbara Kennelly.
She's happy to talk to Elizabeth.
202 861-1500

Ditto fr
(2) Ben Cardin -
either thru his D.C. office
cos David Koshgarian 202 225 4016
or in Baltimore 410 433 8886.

(2) Nick Littlefield is prepared
to explain legislative process
617/832-1000

(3) I'm still trying to reach Jay

Copyright 1999 The Houston Chronicle Publishing Company
The Houston Chronicle

View Related Topics

September 25, 1999, Saturday 3 STAR EDITION

SECTION: A; Pg. 1

LENGTH: 572 words

HEADLINE: Enemies in high places find an issue to agree on;
Clinton, DeLay encourage more **adoptions**

SOURCE: Staff

BYLINE: NANCY MATHIS, Houston Chronicle Washington Bureau

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

WASHINGTON - Over the years, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay has leveled many charges of high crimes and misdemeanors at President Clinton - lying, adultery, perjury, even cheating at golf.

But Friday the two sworn enemies set aside their differences, if only temporarily, and DeLay appeared at the White House to champion efforts by President Clinton and first lady **Hillary** Rodham **Clinton** to increase the rates of **adoption** and foster care.

The sight of DeLay heading down White House corridors brought administration aides to a shocked, mouth-gaping stare.

"It was like an alien dropped into the White House and decided to walk through," said DeLay spokeswoman Emily Miller.

Clinton said at the event, attended by a group of adopted children and their parents, that he recently had read a newspaper profile about DeLay, R-Sugar Land, and began to get steamed because DeLay "started grinding on my golf game," accusing the president of not counting all his strokes.

"And then I get to the next part of the story, and it talks about all his experience and his commitment to **adoption** and to foster children, and the personal experience that he and his wife had. And my heart just melted. And all of a sudden I didn't care what he said about my golf game," Clinton said.

DeLay, through a spokeswoman, was equally magnanimous, despite spending a full year leading the effort to oust Clinton from the White House and to impeach him.

"One of Tom's most personal issues in the Congress is to encourage **adoption** and to make foster care a better system and to make **adoption** through foster care easier, so he's thrilled that the president and first lady are as focused on this as he is and have the same goal. That's why he accepted their invitation to go to the event," Miller said.

Miller added that it was a "rare occurrence in their relationship," but it was an issue on which they agreed. DeLay only smiled and nodded as Clinton took notice of his presence.

Before the event, DeLay presented Clinton a foster care business card and suggested the president was going to have a lot of spare time after January 2001, so he might consider foster care. Still, DeLay was unsure whether Clinton understood that he was urging him to take in foster children personally rather than talk about it as a policy goal, Miller said.

DeLay and his wife, Christine, raised two foster children, a girl now 18 and a boy now 17. Christine DeLay works with Court Appointed Special Advocates, a national organization of volunteers who submit recommendations to judges on foster care placement.

Miller, however, said the truce between Clinton and DeLay applied only to this issue.

"This does not mean the budget negotiations are going to have any kind of breakthrough today," she said.

Clinton used the event to announce $ 20 million in bonus awards to 35 states that increased their **adoption** rates. He also announced $ 5.5 million in **adoption** opportunity grants to organizations in 16 states to devise ways to increase **adoptions** between states and the **adoptions** of minority children.

The president also endorsed a DeLay-backed bill pending in the Senate to extend federal support, such as Medicaid and job training, to foster children after they reach age 18. Currently, all support for foster children ends when they turn 18, leaving many without health care or job skills.

"Together, we can help our foster children," Clinton said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: September 27, 1999

FOCUSTM
Search: General News;adoption and hillary w/2 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1999 Associated Press
AP Online

January 29, 1999; Friday 18:03 Eastern Time

SECTION: Washington - general news

LENGTH: 447 words

HEADLINE: First Lady Pushes **Foster Care** Funds

BYLINE: KEVIN GALVIN

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Hoping to ease the transition to independence for the 20,000 children who move out of **foster care** each year, **Hillary** Rodham **Clinton** announced $280 million in proposed programs to help them obtain insurance, get jobs, and finish their high school diplomas.

"When a child goes into **foster care,** in a very real sense, we are all that child's family," Mrs. Clinton said Friday. "And we haven't been as loving and concerned a family for our children in **foster care** as we should be."

Mrs. Clinton, accompanied by Tipper Gore and Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, made the announcement before a group of former foster children and advocates.

The goal of the proposals, which will be included in the fiscal 2000 budget the president sends to Congress on Monday, is to make sure foster children don't find themselves without a safety net just because they turn 18.

"This is one of those problems that can be solved," Mrs. Clinton said.

The proposals would increase by 50 percent the federal Independent Living Program, which helps older foster children earn high school diplomas and learn such daily living skills as planning a budget and securing housing. Its budget has been frozen at $70 million since 1992.

It also would provide health insurance to foster children, who often lose coverage when they move out of the system.

"For too many people, **foster care** means insurance, and when they leave they lose their Medicare coverage, " Mrs. Clinton said.

Also Friday, President Clinton said he would seek a $2.5 billion spending increase for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

"The present prosperity is an opportunity and a responsibility to make sure that opportunity and prosperity reaches every person, into every corner of this country, into every neighborhood in every city of this country," Clinton told a gathering of the nation's mayors at the White House.

"If we cannot do this now with what some people believe is the strongest overall economy in our history, believe me, we will never get around to doing the job," he said.

His proposal would include money to increase affordable housing, housing vouchers for needy residents in distressed areas and $150 million for newly designated economic empowerment zones. Another highlight was the initiative he announced earlier this month to encourage Wall Street to invest in

underserved inner-city and rural communities.

That plan includes a $1 billion tax credit designed to spur $6 billion in new equity capital for investment in the targeted markets and the creation of private investment partnerships, patterned after the Overseas Private Investment Corp.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: January 29, 1999

FOCUS™
Search: General News;foster care and hillary w/2 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1998 M2 Communications Ltd.
M2 PRESSWIRE

November 26, 1998

LENGTH: 922 words

HEADLINE: THE WHITE HOUSE
President Clinton announces expansion of the **Internet** to increase **adoptions**

BODY:

Today, the President will issue a new directive to the Department of Health and Human Services to expand the use of the **Internet** as a tool to find homes for children waiting to be adopted from foster care. The President will make the announcement with the First Lady at a White House ceremony marking National **Adoption** Month and celebrating new **adoptions** in the District of Columbia.

Creating an **Internet** Registry to Meet the President's Goals for **Adoption.** In 1996, **President Clinton** set a goal of doubling, by the year 2002, **adoptions** and other permanent placements from the public child welfare system. Since then, **adoptions** have increased; from 1996 to 1997 alone, **adoptions** increased by over 10 percent, from 28,000 to 31,000. Today, the President is directing the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to develop a plan to expand **internet** use to share information about children who are legally free for **adoption** in order to shorten the time needed to find them adoptive families. HHS estimates that approximately 100,000 children in our nation's foster care system cannot return to their birth families and need families to adopt them. An effective national registry will help break down geographic barriers to **adoption** and assist in meeting the President's **adoption** goal. HHS Secretary Donna Shalala will report to the President within 60 days on a plan to work with the states and other leaders to carry out this effort.

Building on a Strong Record. Today's announcement builds on a deep commitment by the President, the First Lady, and the Administration to facilitate **adoptions** and improve the child welfare system. Since taking office, **President Clinton** has championed efforts to make foster care work better for the children it serves, to find and assist adoptive families, and to break down barriers, including high **adoption** costs and complex regulations:

- Achieving Landmark Legislative Reform. On November 19, 1997, the President signed the **Adoption** and Safe Families Act, reforming our nation's child welfare system and making it clear that the health and safety of children must be the paramount concerns of state child welfare services. This landmark legislation was based in large part on the recommendations of the Clinton Administration's **Adoption** 2002 report, which the President requested by executive memorandum on December 14, 1996, to meet his goals of doubling **adoptions** and permanent placements by the year 2002 and moving children more quickly from foster care to permanent homes. The Act tightened time frames for making permanent placement decisions for children and ensured health insurance coverage for all special needs children in subsidized **adoptions.** Also, it created new financial incentives for states to increase **adoptions,** and continued funding for services to keep families together when it is appropriate and safe.

- Making **Adoption** Affordable for Families. In 1996, **President Clinton** signed into law the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, which provides a $5,000 tax credit to families adopting children, and a $6,000 tax credit for families adopting children with special needs. This provision has alleviated a significant barrier to **adoption,** helping middle class families for whom **adoption** may be prohibitively expensive and making it easier for families to adopt children with special needs. Since **President Clinton** took office, the number of children with special needs who were adopted with federal **adoption** assistance has risen by over 60 percent. In the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, **President Clinton** ensured more support for families who adopt children with the $500 per-child tax credit.

- Giving States Flexibility and Support. To test innovative strategies to improve state child welfare

systems, the Clinton Administration has granted waivers to 18 states, giving them more flexibility in tailoring services to meet the needs of children and families. In addition, the Administration has provided states with enhanced technical support and helped improve court operations. The President secured $10 million in FY 1999 in new funds to support state efforts to implement the new **adoption** law, and has, through the **Adoption** Opportunities program, supported state and local innovative demonstration projects to promote **adoption,** provide post-adoptive services, and build new public-private partnerships. To prevent children from entering foster care in the first place, in 1993 the Clinton Administration enacted and secured federal funding for the Family Preservation and Support Program to help states, local governments, and service providers develop effective programs to serve children and families at risk.

- Breaking Down Racial and Ethnic Barriers to **Adoption.** New inter-ethnic **adoption** provisions, passed as a part of the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, ensure that the **adoption** process is free from discrimination and delays on the basis of race, culture and ethnicity by strengthening the Multi-Ethnic Placement Act which the President signed in 1994.

- Providing Supports for Child Protection and **Adoption.** In 1993, **President Clinton** signed into law the Family and Medical Leave Act, enabling parents to take time off to adopt a child without losing their jobs or health insurance. In addition, the welfare reform legislation signed by the President maintained the guarantee of child protection and **adoption,** and did not reduce funds for child welfare, child abuse, and foster care and **adoption** services.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: November 27, 1998

FOCUS™
Search: General News;internet and adoption and president w/3 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1997 News World Communications, Inc.
The Washington Times

View Related Topics

February 14, 1997, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: Part A; NATION; Pg. A10

LENGTH: 520 words

HEADLINE: House committee report finds states' welfare funding ample;
Shrinking caseloads leave more for hard-core jobless

BYLINE: Cheryl Wetzstein; THE WASHINGTON TIMES

BODY:

Faced with shrinking welfare caseloads and federal mandates to spend welfare funds on welfare recipients, states should have ample funds to move longtime welfare recipients into work, a House committee report said yesterday.

The report was released before top Clinton administration officials came to testify about why $21 billion in new welfare spending was needed in the 1998 budget.

Yesterday's hearing touched also on the need to encourage adoption of children in foster care. Today, a Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) report, "**Adoption 2002,**" is scheduled to be presented to President Clinton and first lady **Hillary** Rodham **Clinton.**

Prior to the hearing before the House Ways and Means subcommittee on human resources, a one-year analysis of Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) caseloads was released.

The analysis showed that between September 1995 and September 1996, AFDC caseloads dropped in 48 states. Twenty states saw double-digit declines.

With 400,000 fewer families on welfare, states will have more money to spend on the remaining families because states get fixed welfare grants regardless of the size of their caseloads, said Rep. E. Clay Shaw Jr., Florida Republican and subcommittee chairman.

"Because of the savings . . . [states] will have much more money to spend in job training to get the hard-core unemployed into the job market," he said.

If states misuse welfare funds by building bridges or schools, "they'll get caught . . . and they'll have to repay the money and a penalty," a GOP aide asserted privately.

Welfare rolls have dropped from 4.6 million families to 4.2 million families. The House committee report projected that the caseload would fall to 3.7 million families by 1998.

The Clinton administration has proposed adding $21 billion in new welfare spending over the next five years.

Roughly $14 billion of that is to sustain benefits to low-income elderly legal immigrants who became disabled after they came to the United States, and Medicaid for low-income disabled immigrant children.

Under the welfare law, about 500,000 of the 800,000 legal immigrants enrolled in the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) cash welfare program are expected to lose their SSI and food stamp benefits beginning this year.

The Clinton proposal would continue SSI for about 320,000 of the 500,000 legal immigrants who are expected to lose benefits.

States have the option to deny legal immigrants Medicaid, but only four states have decided to do that, officials said yesterday.

The administration proposals are to remedy "problems in the welfare reform legislation that are harmful to immigrants and that have nothing to do with promoting the welfare reform goals of moving people from welfare to work," said Olivia A. Golden, a top HHS official.

But subcommittee members offered little hope for expansive change in the welfare law.

"It's going to be really hard to get people to pay for noncitizens' benefits when they are going to be taking away from citizens' programs," said Rep. Robert T. Matsui, California Democrat.

GRAPHIC: Chart, DECLINING WELFARE, By The Washington Times

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 14, 1997

FOCUS™
Search: General News;adoption 2002 and hillary w/2 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

The Associated Press

View Related Topics

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

February 14, 1997, Friday, AM cycle

SECTION: Washington Dateline

LENGTH: 353 words

HEADLINE: Clintons announce effort to increase adoptions

BYLINE: By RON FOURNIER, Associated Press Writer

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Fretting for children who "languish forever in foster care," President Clinton proposed bonus payments for states that increase their adoption rates.

The proposal was part of his "**Adoption 2002**" campaign designed to double the rate of adoptions in five years.

Surrounded by adopted children, their parents and strings of valentine hearts, the president said Friday, "Putting this plan into action today will mean that we are ensuring that no child will languish forever in foster care when loving families are out there - ready, willing and able to open their hearts and their homes."

"No child should grow up in foster care," added **Hillary** Rodham **Clinton,** who has supported the cause of foster children for years.

The White House said 450,000 children were in foster care in 1995 and only 20,000 of them have been adopted.

The Clintons accepted the Department of Health and Human Services' goal of placing 54,000 children into new homes by 2002 by reducing bureaucratic barriers to adoption. Department recommendations include:

- Legislation to give states federal dollars for every child that is adopted over a state's prior-year totals. Larger bonuses would be awarded when children with special needs find homes. The White House did not provide further details, though Clinton said savings from foster care costs would pay for the bonuses.

- $ 10 million for technical assistance and grants for state agencies, courts and communities to help find ways to recruit parents and place children. Specific numerical goals would be set.

- Legislation requiring a court hearing no later than 12 months after a child enters the foster care system. Current law allows 18 months before a hearing.

A bipartisan plan to be introduced in the House would take a similar approach to speeding up adoption hearings.

Earlier this year, a law took effect allowing families with incomes below $ 115,000 to receive a tax credit of up to $ 5,000 if they adopt a child. People who adopt hard-to-place youngsters, such as those

who are minorities, older, disabled or have siblings, are eligible for a $ 6,000 credit.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 14, 1997

FOCUS™
Search: General News;adoption 2002 and hillary w/2 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1997 States News Service
States News Service

View Related Topics

November 13, 1997, Thursday

LENGTH: 1267 words

HEADLINE: ADOPTION BILL SAILS TO THE WHITE HOUSE

BYLINE: By Elias Wolfberg, States News Service

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

A bill sponsored by Sen. Larry Craig, R-Idaho, to move abused and neglected children from foster care into permanent homes resoundingly passed both houses of Congress on Thursday.

The bill, which has been pushed by Craig for more than a year, uses a mixture of cash incentives and new safety guidelines to make it easier for parents to adopt foster children.

"This is legislation to make our child welfare system work foremost for children," said Craig. "Top among all our priorities is the safety and wellbeing of the child. No one else's interest should come first."

The legislation will end the uncertainty of most foster home arrangements by limiting the time a child can spend in foster care. The bill's supporters hope that forcing states either to put up children for adoption or return them to relatives will lead to quicker permanent homes.

Most children end up in foster care because their parents are either in jail or unable to take to care of them, and foster homes are supposed to provide a temporary home for dislocated children.

The legislation also rewards states with grants of between $3,000 and $6,000 for every child they successfully put up for adoption, and pumps an additional $65 million into a federal foster care program.

Critics of the current system say that foster homes have increasingly become a semipermanent situation, where children often are shuttled around from one home to another or returned to their abusive natural parents.

"I don't want to condemn anybody that has worked in the foster care system . . . but the bias in the past has been to the parents," Craig said. "That bias was so overpowering that it ignored the backgrounds of the parents, even when those parents might have been abusive."

While laws governing foster care differ in every state, the new measure will make sure that all states use a child's welfare as the litmus test when deciding whether to place that child back with its natural parents or up for adoption.

For the first time, states will not be required to try to keep together families with a history of physical or sexual abuse. Instead, the new law will require that a judge take away the "parental rights" of abusive parents.

"The practice has generally been not to return a child to a family where such abuse has occurred," said Karabelle Pizzigata of the Child Welfare League of America. But "this is the first time in federal law where it says that a reasonable effort by the state (to reunite all families) does not have to be made."

For a state like Idaho, the new law will codify a practice that is already underway.

"For every child that is going to be adopted, we do a comprehensive home study to make sure that all families are up to par," said Bill Walker, spokesman for the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare. "But the majority of children leave foster care within six months and go back to living with their families of relatives."

The bill has received a broad range of support across the political spectrum. In the House, it passed by a resounding 407-7, and won unanimous approval in the Senate. First Lady **Hillary** Rodham **Clinton** even called Craig -- often an opponent of causes favored by the First Lady -- to congratulate him when the bill first passed the Senate.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 13, 1997

FOCUS™
Search: General News;adoption bill and hillary w/2 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1997 News World Communications, Inc.
The Washington Times

View Related Topics

February 15, 1997, Saturday, Final Edition

SECTION: Part A; NATION; Pg. A2

LENGTH: 521 words

HEADLINE: Clintons propose national effort to help foster-care kids

BYLINE: Cheryl Wetzstein; THE WASHINGTON TIMES

BODY:

Surrounded by smiling families and several children who hope to be adopted, President Clinton and first lady **Hillary** Rodham **Clinton** proposed a national effort to promote the adoption of children in foster care.

The administration's budget proposes to spend $149 million on adoption reform over the next three years, according to a Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) report released yesterday.

Some of that money would be recouped by savings in foster-care spending.

"The public child-welfare system was created to provide a temporary haven for those children, but not to let them languish forever in foster care," Mr. Clinton said in an Oval Office ceremony after receiving the HHS report called "**Adoption 2002.**"

"Now we have to move quickly to put this plan into action so that no child is deprived of a safe and permanent home for even one day longer than necessary."

The HHS report "makes it clear that foster care should never be a permanent solution. No child should grow up in foster care," Mrs. Clinton said.

The administration's goal is to double the number of foster-care children adopted or placed in permanent homes by 2002. In 1995, only 27,000 out of about 100,000 children in foster care who were free for adoption found such homes.

The HHS estimates there are about 450,000 children in the foster-care system.

The administration's 1998 budget proposes to:

* Spend $10 million a year for three years on "technical assistance" to states to speed up adoptions.

* Make $108 million available for "per-child bonuses" to states for adoptions. Much of this would be recouped by reduced foster-care spending.

* Spend $10 million in 1998 for competitive grants for states to develop model strategies to reform their systems.

* Spend $1 million on a public awareness campaign.

The White House also would like to see "permanency planning hearings" for children within one year after they enter foster care and clarifying how long caseworkers must work to reunite families.

"Don't be afraid to adopt teen-agers, because it's very rewarding," said Dennis Krauss of Cleveland,

Ohio, who attended the White House ceremony with wife Debra and 14-year-old adopted daughter Danielle.

"God provided Deanna and God provided us," said Bob Collins as wife Sherada and 15-year-old Deanna stood nearby.

Yesterday was Deanna's second visit to the White House. In 1995 she attended a White House adoption event and read a poem she had written about life in foster care. Mrs. Clinton was so moved by it that she included the poem in her book, "It Takes A Village."

The Collinses read about Deanna and asked to adopt her.

Life has "been great" since, Deanna said yesterday.

But spending a decade in foster care was hard. "Waiting is very difficult," she said.

Rep. Dave Camp, Michigan Republican, yesterday saluted the Clintons' efforts to make adoption a national priority but said streamlining the process is a better priority than making new funding proposals.

Mr. Camp is preparing legislation on adoption with Rep. Barbara B. Kennelly, Connecticut Democrat.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 15, 1997

FOCUS™
Search: General News;adoption 2002 and hillary w/2 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1996 Associated Press
AP Worldstream

November 14, 1996; Thursday 14:32 Eastern Time

SECTION: International news

LENGTH: 548 words

HEADLINE: Mrs. Clinton Looking to Work on Children's Issues Quietly

BYLINE: SONYA ROSS

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Look for first lady **Hillary** Rodham **Clinton** to spend the next four years working on behalf of children and families very quietly.

"I know that I will continue to work on the issues that I have worked on for more than 25 years," Mrs. Clinton said during a recent appearance in Nevada.

Those include, she said, health care for children, easier **adoptions,** better foster care and welfare reform an issue President Clinton has said he'd like for her to take on.

"Her mantra for the second term should be, 'No more controversies,'" said Larry Sabato, a University of Virginia political science professor. "She would be much better off working on smaller projects outside the glare of the spotlight. My guess is she fully realizes that."

One motivation for keeping a low profile is the continuing Whitewater investigation.

The lawyer first lady has come under increasing scrutiny for her legal work a decade ago on Castle Grande, a failed land development in Arkansas when her husband was governor, that has cost taxpayers dlrs 4 million.

Castle Grande was run by the Clintons' Whitewater business partners, James and Susan McDougal. Mrs. Clinton says she recalls nothing about her work on the project.

She helped draft a real estate document that priced a parcel of property at dlrs 400,000 more than 10 times what the federal government was able to sell it for six years later after the development collapsed.

Besides legal matters, Mrs. Clinton was criticized as well as praised for her close involvement in the administration's first-term efforts to overhaul health care insurance rules.

Her work resulted in no law, although a modified health care bill was passed this year.

Still, the president recently suggested that he would like to put his wife to work on possible changes to the new welfare law.

"I think the real advocates of children, including the first lady, have to weigh in here," Clinton said in a TV interview. He added that the job would not be "a formal role."

Mrs. Clinton later said she was surprised at his comment, but she didn't rule out such a role.

During the re-election campaign, through numerous tours of hospitals, community centers and schools, Mrs. Clinton expressed concern for the needs of working women and their children, from family leave

and longer hospital stays after giving birth to improved child support collection and day care for mothers who leave welfare for work.

There are plenty of other options for Mrs. Clinton in a second term as well, either as an advocate for education, a champion of global women's issues or an Eleanor Roosevelt-like ambassador of goodwill.

James Blumstein, a Vanderbilt University law professor who attended Yale law school with Mrs. Clinton, said to get away from the glare of investigation, the first lady could become "a major player in the international sphere."

For example, she could tie her child advocacy work to international human rights issues such as female circumcision, he said.

"It would reflect some intellectual and personal growth for her," Blumstein said. "There's going to be a lot of stuff falling down around her head. These investigations are getting awfully close. She's going to have to play defense as well as offense."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 14, 1996

FOCUS™
Search: General News;adoption and hillary w/2 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

The Associated Press

View Related Topics

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

May 10, 1996, Friday, AM cycle

SECTION: Washington Dateline

LENGTH: 550 words

HEADLINE: House Approves Tax Credit In **Adoptions**

BYLINE: By CASSANDRA BURRELL, Associated Press Writer

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

The House voted overwhelmingly Friday to encourage more **adoptions,** promising parents tax incentives and banning racial hurdles. Supporters said the measure would decrease the number of youngsters - particularly black children - languishing in foster care.

The bill would offer families a $ 5,000 tax credit to adopt children and would ban "race matching," a policy that allows social workers to reject or put potential interracial **adoptions** on hold until adoptive parents can be found matching a child's race.

There is controversy in the field on that issue. For example, the National Association of Black Social Workers has said interracial **adoptions** should be approved only after exhaustive attempts to find a relative or black adoptive parents have failed.

The House voted 393-15 to approve the plan, which would provide the tax credit to families earning up to $ 75,000 a year to help pay for **adoption** expenses. Smaller credits would be given to families earning up to $ 115,000, with none above that level.

Complicated **adoptions,** particularly those involving foreign children, can cost $ 15,000 or more.

A similar bill is making its way through the Senate.

After the vote, House Republicans involved in bringing the bill to a vote celebrated with three families that have adopted children.

"Thank you for passing this bill so more kids like me can be adopted," said Reid McKenney, 9, the Korea-born adopted son of William McKenney of Arlington, Va. Reid spoke before television news cameras while standing on a chair.

"We're happy that we were able to get this done, and we're happy to get it done by **Mother's Day,**" Rep. Jim Bunning, R-Ky., said.

At the White House, **Hillary** Rodham **Clinton** met with mothers and their adopted children, praising them for accepting the challenges as well as the joys of **adoption.**

She applauded the tax and racial provisions in the House bill but said, "we need to do more. We should redouble our efforts. We should make it possible for thousands more children to be adopted by **Mother's Day** next year."

About 450,000 American children live in foster care at any given moment, according to the bill, and as many as 600,000 live in foster care during a year. About half are minorities, and 41 percent of black children in foster care wait more than four years to be adopted.

President Clinton endorsed both the tax credit and the elimination of race matching, but opposed another provision that would make it easier for anyone to adopt American Indian children.

Some white parents have complained that the 1978 Indian Child Welfare Act has kept them from adopting children with as little as 1/64 Indian ancestry.

Some Indians have angrily denounced the bill's provision, saying it would weaken a law enacted to preserve their cultures by placing Indian children in Indian homes. The new measure also would allow courts to decide who is Indian and who is not, they said.

The tax credit was part of the GOP's "Contract With America" and was included in a massive budget proposal that Clinton vetoed last year.

To offset a $ 1.7 billion loss in tax revenue, the bill would change tax rules for foreign trusts with U.S. beneficiaries and eliminate an income exclusion for energy conservation items businesses buy and use.

The bill is HR3286

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 10, 1996

FOCUS™
Search: General News;mother's day and adoption and hillary w/2 clinton

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: **House of Representatives**

About LEXIS-NEXIS | Terms and Conditions | What's New
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

MAP ROOM BRIEFINGS

...scripts and selec... overag... ...'s Map
...gs with reporters ...briefings included re...

02/11/98	Millennium Project
10/22/97	Child Care (no transcript available)
04/14/97	Early Childhood Development
03/12/97	Education
01/30/97	Microcredit

We didn't do a map room briefing on adoption. Attached is one transcript.

PRESS BREIFING ON WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING
APRIL 14, 1997

HRC: We are, this week, going to have a conference about the latest on brain development in young children and implications of that for every sector of society; starting with parents and family members, including educators, community leaders, political and businesss leaders, and the like. This is an issue that we believe has absolutley profound implications for how we view and treat our youngest children. And it certainly has such implications for how families perceive [inaudible] of their babies, and what it must mean, we hope, forthem in terms of the parenting that goes on. But it also has implications, for the larger society, in terms of public policy grounds.

At the conference on Thursday, you'll be hearing from only a few of the experts and leaders in this field as well as people from various organizations that are attempting to implement what this research means for young children. We are fortunate to have two experts withh us today, who have been involved in this research and the policy implications of it for many years, and will be speaking to that.

Dr. Alexander is the Director of the National Institute of Child Health, it is, I think fair to say, Dr. Alexander, the premier institution in the world for research into child development. It is a federal government agency, funded by the federal government, without which it would not exist, could not have done the ground-breaking work that has flowed from the years of investment in this kind of work. And Dr. Alexander is one of the members of a broad committee thathas put together a report that you're getting an advance copy of, in the material in front of you, called 'Rethinking the Brain'. There's just an enormous amount of information in here that you'll get a chance, at least to review, later.

Dr. David Hamburg is the current President of the Carnegie Foundation, he's a psycholgist [?], he started his career at the National Institute of Child Health and Development. He has served on the faculties of premier universities in ournation. He has been a leader in the effort to try to take what medicine and scientific research tells us, and put it into practice. Most recently, through his leadership at the Carnegie Corporation, he has been sounding the alarm, if you will, but also providing the data, about what we need to do for our youngest children. In your material also, you'll have a copy of the Carnegie Corporation's report called 'Starting Points', which I believe is one of the best explanations of this material for lay people, like me, that there is anywhere in the country.

Dr. Hamburg: Thank you very much. From my background in biomedical research and education and patient care over many decades, with a boost coming from NIH in the 1950's, and stints on the faculties of Stanford and Harvard, I increasingly came to feel that it's very, very important, in a democracy, for people to understand very broadly, what is the latest, up to date, scientific information with respect to any important issue that affects peoples lives, as far as healthy child and adolescent development, education, getting a good start on life.

So, when I came to be President of the Carnegie Foundation, technically called the Carnegie Corporation in New York, because Andrew Carnegie ran out of names by the time he got to the Foundation, but anyway, I felt that one of the main things we could do, would be to prepare from time to time, an intelligible, credible census on our knowledge of each phase of child and adolescent development. That is to look at the emerging scientific and professional consensus. What do we know about the essential requirements for healthy development in early childhood, middle childhood and early adolescence and later adolescence? So, I hoped, in my time, that we could cover the first two decades of life, in a reasonably systematic way. These [inaudible] were meant to be credible because they were based on the scientific research to the maximum extent possible. And also on community innovations that tried to put the knowledge to use for the benefit of children on a wide scale. And that they would be intelligible, because we would try and translate them from technical language to the language that would be meaningful to educated readers.

That's what we've tried to do with a series of reports, each of which is prepared by a distinguished body that's composed in the following way: About half are experts on the subject matter, albeit in different disciplines and backgrounds, and the remainder are from powerful sectors of the society that had a stake in the problem, or a reason to be concerned about it, even though they are not technically experts on the subject matter. People from business and from media, and from various other sectors of the society, the military and what not. They're carefully vetted and reviewed, these reports are, before they come out. There have been a series which we're trying to oppose now, they wanted to take it chronologically, the one on 0-3 is called Starting Points, and what we claim for it is that it has the most attractive picture of a baby on the cover as any of these. There's a little competition going between Time and Newsweek and Carnegie and the brain research report about who has the best picture of a baby on the cover. Aside from that, our Foundation has been very actively cooperating with all of these efforts to build public understanding of what the research says. The kind of thing coming out of Dr. Alexander's institute and other institutes around the world.

First of all, you get the facts straight, and then to try and consider what it might mean for parents and for community organizations. The way of structuring the problem in this developmental strategy, from conception through adolescence, is to ask what it is that people need to understand, to get the facts straight, and then to say, well, who could do something about that. Who could put that knowledge to use? And so we come to look at a set of pivotal institutions, sort of front line institutions, who everyday, have an impact, for better or for worse, on child development. That starts with the centers on strengthening families, but it also has to include the schools, in this case, early childhood education, pre-school schools, and it includes community organizations, including religious ones, it includes the media, whose impact, everyday, on parents and children, is very significant. Of course, it includes the health care system.

Surrounding that set of front-line institutions, are other, powerful institutions in society, that can make their job easier or harder. I mean by that, government at all levels, business, scientific community, various relevant professions. So, we're saying that it takes a village and then some, really the whole society, as a set of institutions that bear on child development, whether we like it or not, they do have that bearing. We've tried to ask, how can each institution strengthen it's

contribution to health child development? That is the framework we used on the case of Starting Points. First we looked at, which came out just three years ago this month by the way, that report looks at brain development, but it looks at the development of the whole child. The brain is a very important part of the child, and it looks at it from conception on up. It's a very dramatic time from development from just two cells, to a zillion cells in utero, and the transition from being in utero, to being outside and then the first human attachments which are the underpinnings for decent human relationships throughout the life span. And that fantastic exploratory curiosity which needs to be nurtured if you're going to look toward life long learning. So, it's a very dramatic period, perhaps the most dramatic period, that 0-3.

We try to lay out what science has to say in an intelligible fashion, and then, we took four thrusts to try to make use of the knowledge for the benefit of children everywhere. One thrust has to do with preparation for responsible parenting. That is not only after pregnancy, but before pregnancy, we lay out a whole array of possibilities, ways in which people can be ready for responsible parenting. The second thrust is in health care, and primarily comprehensive prenatal care, and comprehensive primary care. We try to spell out how preparation for responsible parenting can be done, how comprehensive prenatal and primary health care can be done. The third thrust is on child care, early childhood education. What constitutes quality child care? How do you recognize it when you see it? How can quality be strengthened, and quality care made available throughout the country. It certainly is not at the present time. There is a new study on this from the NICHE released just last week. The fourth thrust of Starting Points is on community mobilization. That is the community, the village, how do you get the resources of decent, well meaning people, parents and community organizations, media and business in a community, coming together to assess what our needs are with respect to young children. And, how can we mobilize in this community to meet those needs? There are a lot of different ways of doing it all across the country. My last point would be that although these four thrusts of making use of the knowledge are subject to evaluative research so we can tell what works from whom under what conditions, that's not always the case, evaluative research lags behind. You have to make the best judgement you can about what's the best set of measures to take. The thrust of it is to pool our strengths and share the burdens in communities to provide the necessary conditions for healthy childhood development to stimulate brain and other development in the most constructive ways.

There are working models around the country. We tried to evaluate the working models as best we can. We tried not to just stick with hypothetical ideals. Wouldn't it be nice if you could do so and so. That can be useful but we tried to say, here are communities in which working models exist. For example, in which community organizations are reaching out to their families and young children in ways that get poor children taken care of better than we've done in the past. The many, many examples scattered all through Starting Points, we tend to put in boxes. It's all about taking the research, as it evolves, and trying to understand it, have it largely understood, and putting it to use for the larger benefit of children everywhere.

Dr. Alexander: Thank you. I'm going to talk primarily about research, and I do this from the perspective of a developmental pediatrician whose entire career has been at the National Institute of Child Health and Development at the National Institutes of Health. It's been my good fortune for the last ten years to serve as Director of that institute. Research is really the underpinning for

this conference. It's in recognition of the importance of research, of what it's contributing, and what it's telling us, that has really been the impetus for this White House conference. The Carnegie Corporation has done an enormous service by bringing together this research and pointing out how important it is for public policy. What we're trying to do with this conference is give increased visibility and enhanced attention to the importance of what that research is telling us.

That research has largely been funded by the federal government, mainly through the National Institutes of Health. Research in other areas, such as transportation or the environment, is funded more by the private sector than by the government. Even research on adult health is funded 50/50 by the government and the private sector. When you get to research on children, the government is almost the only game in town. Probably 95% of the research on children, child health, their development, their education, justice issues, and so forth, is funded by the federal government, and the importance of that work to the Clinton Administration is evident by the increase in funding that research has received in the last four years. Most of the research that you're going to be hearing about at this conference on Thursday has been funded by various institutes of the NIH. Lots of it will be reporting on discoveries from the last 20 years, during which time we have learned more about the brain and it's development than all previous time put together.

Much of this research has policy implications. Some of it, unfortunately, is ignored by policy makers at the government level, but it's also often unknown by parents, by educators and others. It's important for us to be reaching all of those audiences with that information. The conference really focuses on the convergence of two areas of science. First is basic studies of the anatomy and physiology of brain development, and second is basic behavioral studies of child development. If we look at these behavioral studies, it's amazing what we've had to learn, and sometimes unlearn in what we thought was the case. For example, we thought that newborn babies couldn't see, and we have discovered that in fact they do see, and they see quite well. And in fact, within a few weeks, they're able to differentiate between their mothers face and a strangers face. We thought they couldn't hear very well, and we've found that is also incorrect. Within a very short time, babies are able to discriminate their mothers voice from the voice of someone else. We though that they were not able to feel pain, but in fact they do feel pain. They are able to experience emotion and show that in ways other than just crying. They learn very quickly, especially in the first three years.

Their positive or negative experience in the environment that provides stimulation to them is extremely important, and, in fact, their may be critical periods for particular stimuli to have occurred or they do not make particular gains in development. We've [inaudible] a critical period from animal research, it's not so clear in human studies, it may be more like prime times rather than critical periods, but it is an important concept for us to understand. We have also learned that stimulation children receive in their first three years is so important, that children that receive that stimulation do better in the long term than those who do not.

Now, what have we learned from brain studies that relates to this. What really gets people excited in this area is not only what we've learned, but what we've been able to see from our studies of brain development. We can actually see the difference that environmental stimulation

makes in brain development, physiologically and anatomically. The human is unique in the amount of brain development that occurs after birth. If you consider animals, I don't know how many of you have ever witnessed the birth of an animal like the horse, the birth process is pretty incredible. But what is absolutely mind boggling is that within 15-30 minutes, that horse is standing up, walking around, and within an hour or so it's trotting. It takes humans 5 months to sit up and 6-8 months to crawl, and 12 months to be able to walk. So, we're so different from the rest of the animal kingdom in the amount of development that occurs after birth.

It's an extremely important time. Much of this development occurs in the first three years of life. By age 3, the brain has reached 80% of it's adult weight, compared to 20% or 25% of the child's overall weight being the portion of the adult. WE have also learned that we are not born with all the nerve cells we will ever have. Some multiplication of nerve cells continues after birth, but the most important process is that of pruning of nerve cells, that is a selective loss, or selective dying off of nerve cells, and the ones that are stimulated are the ones that are maintained. The process after birth more than the process that involves nerve growth, is the process of proliferation of connections between the different nerve cells. These connections are what's so important for our physical mobility, for our learning, for our memory, for emotional function, for basic bodily function. It is this proliferation of connections that you can actually see. And, you can tell the difference between an animal that's been placed in a stimulating environment, and one that has not, by the number of connections that develop, and the ways in which they are developed and maintained.

What we have learned from these studies is that this proliferation occurs in response to stimulation. The unstimulated animal, whether it's an intact animal or whether we use human tissue nerve cells in culture, develops far less of these connections that are so important, than the stimulated animal does. We have also learned that these connections are maintained in response to stimulation. It's important that not all of these connections are maintained. Like an apple tree that has too many branches for it's healthy production of apples, the brain cells develop far more connections than they actually need. So there is a very active pruning process, much of which occurs in the first three years of life, that eliminates, selectively, some of these connections. The ones that are maintained, again, are the ones that tend to be stimulated. These connections then become the basis for facilitated action. Motor skills, speech, language and communication skills, emotional responses, memory skills, sensory skills, whatever. It's also important to understand that 0-3 is time of the most rapid pruning that occurs at any time throughout life. We can develop, and do develop, more of these connections during a lifetime, and this is probably the basis of further physical training, memory development, and so forth. But, it's less easy to develop these after the first three years of life. That's the basic message I think you're going to hear from the neuroscientists that will be speaking at the conference on Thursday.

This information does, obviously, have some policy implications. First of all, it tells us that the ages of 0-3 are critical in child development, with life long implications. Now, this isn't the only important time,so parents can't sit back after they've made it to age three and relax from there on. Nor should they feel that if there wasn't maximum stimulation during this time, that the game's over. The game goes on. Obviously middle childhood, adolescence, are times of important developmental processes as well. But there is never again a time that this learning is as rapid and

there is as great an opportunity as there is in those first three years of life.

The primary policy implications here are for parents. We often don't think that parents are policy makers or implementers but they are. And the implication is that their interactions with and stimulation with their child is extremely important during this period of time. So most of their activities that relate to this children and much of the thrust of the conference is to get this message to parents. That their interaction with the child in the first three years of life is extremely important, the twig is bent early.

This also holds for care givers other than parents. It holds for grandparents, for baby sitters, for day care providers or whoever else is interacting with the child during that time. Now, just one word about day care. Mrs. Clinton made reference to the study of day care that was released just over a week ago by the National Child and Human Development, here at the Society for Research and Child Development meeting in Washington. Lots of press attention was paid to that story at the time, and I think it reflected the enormous interest and impact on American families that information has.

What that study showed was that the greatest influence by far, in a child's cognitive and language development, is the family and the home environment. There is no substitute for that. Day care did play a significant role, but it was a smaller role. Good quality day care had a positive impact, not a negative impact, and it was an add-on impact, if anything. Now, the policy here, is that increased emphasis on the quality of the home environment is extremely important. Day care, even when good, is not a substitute, but it may well add on to the impact of the home environment. The time that is sufficient for child development and stimulation in home in the evening is at least equal and greater in importance than the day care environment during the day outside the home.

It also emphasizes the need for that day care to be good quality. There's an opportunity for it to play an enriching and supplementary impact in child development above and beyond what is provided at home. And this holds whatever level of functioning the mother and family have. It also suggest the need for quality standards for day care and the importance of early Head Start types of programs in child development. I think these are the kinds of messages that you are going to get from the scientists who make presentations at the conference on Thursday. And I think that you'll enjoy attending that and the messages that they have provided in far greater detail and amplication than I've done in this short time.

HRC: Thank you Dr. Alexander. Well, one of the best examples we have recently of early stimulation is Tiger Woods' father putting a putty in his crib. He apparently didn't need neuroscience to do that but the results speak for themselves. And I hope that we are able through a concerted effort certainly using the media and every other means of communication to get these messages out to parents, because as I point out in chapter of the book that I wrote, I've often in the past, and still do today run into parents who have not yet learned what Dr. Alexander was saying about what babies actually know and are capable of doing. So they will say to me when I say I bet you are having a good time talking to that baby in a quizzical voice the parent might

respond "Why would I talk to her, she can't talk back?" And so we are not yet at a point where we have even conveyed this information to a critical majority of the parents in the United States and certainly around the world, I'd think you'd find it even at a smaller percentage.

So as both Dr. Alexander and Dr. Hamburg said our primary audience for this conference happens to be parents both because we think that what parents will do and can do is the most significant form of early stimulation. And also because we believe that educated parents, informed parents will be more likely to demand the kind of policy changes that influence quality child care, adequate pre-school education and all of the other issues that will help to supplement their efforts in their own homes. So with that, we'd love to throw it open.

Q: . . . assume that the earliest childhood development conference, you know within this to age period, maybe up to 5?

MAN: I think that we've often believe that was an extremely important period of life. What we have now is reinforcement of that concept both from the behavioral sciences area and then the neural sciences area. We can document anatomically the importance for brain development of what happens to the child during those years.

Q: What do you see, do you see an enhanced government role in this issue? and if so what are some of the things that . .

HRC: Well Rita, I think that's the really challenging question for those of us who believe there is a reason for bringing the entire community to awareness to support parents and family. Let me just mention a few things that I think should be looked at more closely.

If we believe that the home environment is the most important influence in this early stimulation and as the research shows and as common sense would suggest. Then what does that say for something like Family Leave? Don't we want there to be an opportunity for mothers and so far as possible fathers to have the time to really spend in those early months connecting with that new baby. One of the interesting findings from the research on child care that came out a little over a week ago is how when children are put into care at a very age, there does seem to be some weakening of the bond between the mother and the child. So that if you're a working mother, and you are told you have to go back to work at two weeks as so many women in our country are, how do you emotionally prepare yourself for that kind of separation? Well one of the things I think, and this is not from the research, this is my personal observation and opinion. I think you have to in a sense emotionally distance yourself from that baby in order to deal with the feelings that are created as you drop that child off at whatever substitute care setting is available to you. We now know that leads to a weakening of the interaction between the mother and the child. I mean, if you have to steal yourself day after day to drop your baby off as you go back to punch the clock or work at the computer or whatever your allowable leave has been. Then, you may be creating a situation, albeit unknowingly in our society where we have large numbers of parents who are less engaged because they don't get to spend the time with their children, than is best for the child, and is best, I would argue, for society, by creating more engaged, stimulated, effective youngsters. So, that's just one area that I think this research, perhaps, is going to cause us to

review, the relationship between family leave and the impact on children in those early years. The President, on Saturday, in his radio address, extended the definition of family leave to federal employees to try to keep creating opportunities for more stimulation and attachment.

Q: Are you saying that women shouldn't work?

HRC: No, that's not what we're saying. Let me ask Dr. Hamburg if he wanted to say something, then we'll respond.

Dr. Hamburg: The Starting Points panel looked at this question about family leave and basically expressed a view similar to what Mrs. Clinton has just expressed and said that 3 months, which has become sort of the norm, is useful, that probably double that would be much better, as is done in most European countries. They recognize that there are a lot of questions about that, economic questions, management questions, as well as interpersonal relationships. They lay out in that report, some options for handling how you would get from here to there. They also, in the child care piece of the report, basically talk about the complimentarity of care outside the home and inside the home. Care by the parents, and care by others, it is the same essential properties of what goes into good child care, whether it's the biological mother or not the biological mother, an initial stranger, whoever it is, on the basic problems of responsive care so you're really trying to get around the adequate contours of adequate care during the full span of time. Some of that at home, and some of it outside the home, typically today. We have to bear in mind as a practical matter, that over half of mothers are working, even with infants and toddlers, it's a revolutionary change, it's a very recent change historically. And I think we, as a nation, are still groping with how to deal with that kind of transformation. But, one of the things we have to consider is, can we work out a more time for one or both parents to be at home early on and be a better conjunction of what they do at home with what happens in child care settings outside the home.

Q: The question that I was going to ask originally was not so much directed at the middle class, but we know that most of the children in our country now are being born into poverty, we know that we have this explosion of teenage births and we know that most of these people have almost no resources to help them with anything. And I wondered whether that've been a cause of doing this research sort of suggests that there is a need for the government to offer some kind of help in terms of education, some kind of help in terms of care, I mean, or do you just say, well we are going to hope these media messages are getting to the 16 year old girls having the babies. The same medium that was sending out the messages to them not having the babies in the first place when they were 16?

Dr. Hamburg: Yeah, well I think that is a very fundamental question. Let's put it this way. It is certainly a national problem, not a federal government problem alone. Although the federal government just can't cop out . As I was saying before, the home approach of the Carnegie developmental strategy has been through these various panelists to find ways in which different institutions can play a part. The federal government is certainly a part of that. But I think we as a society have got to consider that. And I do believe your immediate coverage is essential to getting a serious thoughtful discussion about how we can meet these fundamental needs. The fact is that these young babies have to have a great deal of nurtureance, protection, the right kind of

stimulation. The nature of the scope of the stimulation is very important. They have to begin to get the skills of language and even the skills of coping with adversity. All that comes in the first few years of life. Not finished, but it comes very importantly there and it is a big demand. It's a big care taking demand. And some how or other some set of people will have to meet those demands, otherwise we're going to be turning out larger and larger numbers of people with shattered and empty lives and no prospects. That is a fact. I mean, it's just an empirical fact. And somehow or other we've got to meet those needs.

What that says about what the federal government should do and what other institutions should do is wide open for public discussion and obviously the configuration of response is different in this country than it is in Western Europe.

HRC: Let me just follow up on that, and then Dr. Alexander wants to as well. There are lots of things that we know work, as effective interventions. One of the frustrating aspects of being involved in this field for many years is that we don't take what we know works and adequately implement it on a broader scale. Now one of the things that this whole research on the brain will demonstrate, throughout the next several weeks over a variety of settings, there will also be congressional hearings, there will also be a big tv special we have already had the Newsweek and the Time publications. And in each of those there will be examples about what works... and the examples are not all uniformly cut from one mold. I think the television show that rob Reiner is producing

young parents...to try and get the message across Rita that you are referring to. So they have a variety of strategies... other communities have adopted other ways of intervening such as home visitors...something I believe in strongly...you know one of the main reasons I was so supportive of the maternity stays in hospitals wasn't just for physical reasons... but to try to encourage more hospitals,..HMO's, community groups to take that time when you've got a new mother - whether she's 16 or 40 and get somebody in there to talk to her and try to make a connection...and then sending people out...home visitors...visiting nurses... a concept used widely in western Europe... and we just have to acknowledge that there are certain kinds of investments that will save us money. If we invested on the front end in some of these early intervention strategies..I honestly believe we would not be spending so much money on prisons on mental health and drug abuse treatment and some of the other symptoms of the breakdown of this development that we are trying to maximize. So what are trying to say is there is not one over-arching federal government solution -- that is not what any of us is advocating... but this is a national problem as Dr. Hamburg said, and there are potential national solutions that can be implemented at the local level, the private sector, not for profit, business, -- there are a lot of things that can be done that would work.

RON.... Given the political and fiscal constraints CLINTON Administration has ... what can the CLINTON Administration do other than making it easy for people to take time off without pay.

HRC: Well I think that there are a number of things that the president and the administration are

trying to do that can make a difference and let me just mention a couple cause I believe they are important

- The early Head Start that was program that was passed in the first term and is now being implemented is really a very significant change -- you know we started Head Start in the 1960's when the best research we had was that ...we could really make a difference working with four and five year olds... well we know that if we could find a way to work with 0 to 3 year olds, we could make an even BIGGER impact... so starting in the first term we started putting resources in the early Head Start and we now have some model programs out there working. So that will give us, I hope, some information about how to intervene in this very important early stage. We've been working to increase the child care money available particularly to those coming off welfare and for those who are the working poor coming off of subsidies, and we will have to look very closely about what is the quality of that child care and how we use those federal funds to leverage good child care.

When I was in Florida with Governor Lawton Chiles speaking at an advocacy week program that was put on for children issues - both of us made that point that the states now have this huge responsibility for child care -- so how can the federal government through the research of people like Dr. Alexander who accumulates it - get that information out to the states so the states and the federal government can be partners in creating better quality child care.

So those are two things that are already ongoing that I hope this research can make a convincing case to members of Congress and others that we need to be working on.

Q: So far, we've been talking about applying the research to solve existing problems [inaudible]. Given the explosion of information about the brain that you've been talking about, and the rapid pace, knowing more in the last 20 years than in all previous times, if we continue to learn about the brain at that pace and find effective ways to turn the research into policy, we are talking about a future generation of children that are like no other, because we will have learned ways to stimulate, and ways to get through to the, and ways to nurture them that could potentially be a huge break with the past. Or, are we really only learning things that our great grandmothers knew, and we'd forgotten some of that?

Dr. Alexander: I think we have the capability,as we learn more about how people learn and how early we are capable of learning, of having a greater proportion of the population more capable than it has ever been before. If we take advantage of the knowledge that we are acquiring. We are also probably going to learn how to provide that stimulation in a more effective way than we ever have done it before. But the basic things that we're talking about, learning, nurturing, caring, are probably nothing that different from what we thought from our grandmothers, and experienced from our grandmothers. What we're probably going to be capable of, is greater intellectual growth and stimulation that we've had in the past.

HRC: You know, I think that's a really interesting question because a lot of what science is now proven many parents and grandparents going on back kind of instinctively knew, but many others didn't. What makes that division? Why do some people, and even people who two generations

ago were in impoverished conditions somehow the magic happens, and through stimulation and encouragement of learning or whatever the combination of factors might be, they grow up to be parents who stimulate their own child. You know, my mother as I write in my book, had no stimulation to speak up from her own parents. I mean, she was born to a 15 year old mother and a 17 year old father who were totally neglectful. Now, she had some other adults around her always through her life who did whatever one does to create the conditions for somebody to love learning and to love language and then to be able to pass it on to her own children. But if you had looked at her profile, of when she was born, you would have said, "well you know, destined to be kind of not very affective, not very successful". You don't want to get to the point where we say that there's only one way of doing this because we know too much about human nature, and we know too much about examples that defy our expectations to do that. But what we want to do is sort of increase the odds so that no matter who that child is, and who the parents of that child may be, anywhere in America, we are going to try to increase the odds of that child's God-given potential will be stimulated so that he or she can develop. And that is really what we are talking about. You know, a lot of people will just continue to do what their grandparents did and other adults will intervene where necessary to help out and to provide support for a child who might not get it from the parents. But we want to increase the odds to even more children will have that opportunity.

Q: Mrs. Clinton could you talk about how this conference fits in with your own attempt to define an agenda in a vision for what you're going to be doing in the second Clinton term?

HRC: It's just the same thing I've done for 25 years and that I am going to keep doing because I think these issues that we're talking about here today, and that I've tried to talk about concerning children and families, need to be on the forefront of the political agenda. They are not marginal issues, they are not issues that should be left to science or educators, or people who already have an existing interest in them. They ought to be in the forefront of our national debate because they, more than so much of what is talked about here in Washington, will determine the quality of life we have in our country. I think that there is a growing awareness of that. I've made a speech that some of you have heard on several occasions, where I put it in context of the '96 presidential election, because a lot of what the President talked about, leading up to that election, and during the campaign, was the stuff of how we live our life. And, it was part of his vision how together we can really change how we perceive our own possibilities, how we treat each other, how we live with one another, and most importantly, how we raise our children. I think, initially, there were some who thought, "What on earth does family leave or uniforms in schools or curfews or brain research have to do with a presidential campaign?" That's not what we should be talking about. And, I've tried to say, repeatedly, is that there is an element of politics that has always been there and in some ways is more determinative as to how people feel about themselves and their country than the big macro issues that dominate political discourse. And if you want to think about it in those terms, think about how those of us who have followed politics, who have been students of political science, we have talked often about realpolitik.You know, the relationships between nations and those are essential, I mean it's critical. You know we have a strong defense and an engaged foreign policy and that the big issues are dealt with. But, there's also what I call real life politic, "how do we live our lives?"How do we maximize the opportunity for each child born in the United States to be successful in school, be an effective, functioning citizen. That's

what I hear a lot about as I travel around the country, these sort of "kitchen table" issues. And that's what I've been concerned about ever since I became interested in these issues many, many years ago. So this is a continuation of my own personal concern, but also of the President's understanding of what it's going to take to create our political life. And to keep our democracy going. David Hamburg has done as much work on this issue as he has on these others. Maybe, before we go on, you'd like too add something David.

DH: I do think it's absolutely fundamental in the future of a democracy, that these issues be awfully well understood. There's been some tradition in the scientific community, of not talking to the public. To some degree, one of the worst charges you could make against a scientist 30 or 40 years ago, was that he was a "popularizer". I think Carl Sagan is a case in point. That was considered to be a bad thing to do. It just seems to me, if we're really serious about democracy, that it's just terribly important to have increasingly reliable methods for translating all this archaic stuff that goes on under Dr. Alexander's auspices, into language that everybody can understand.

Q: Inaudible. . . paid maternity leave. Dr. Hamburg has said that the average is 6 months, and that's because they get subsidized maternity leave, I mean is it because it's not really realistic, or because it really wouldn't make a difference?

HRC: Well, speaking just personally, not for the Administration, I think it's because people believe that in our current political climate, and given the characteristics that mark the American political character, that it's not realistic. We fought for 8 years to get unpaid leave for people who worked in employment settings of 50 or more, and that left out a huge number of people who are not even eligible for unpaid family leave, But, I think that, it was huge step forward for our country to adopt family leave legislation at all. And, what I'm hoping, is that over time, more and more business and political leaders will understand how it is in our long term, and I would argue, medium and short term, interest to support family leave and eventually paid family leave for as many workers as that's economically feasible. I think it's a kind of horse and cart issue, we have to make the case and part of what this brain research is doing, I believe, is making the case of the importance of those years because then over time, we could make the case that if we're hoping to produce effective citizens and employees, we need to start where it starts, which is in those early years. And we need to make sure that parents have the supports they need to be as fully engaged with their children as possible. [inaudible] Of course I'd be for it if it were feasible. If it were economically and politically feasible, though I don't know what the terms or the specific, or the contours of it would be, but I think it's the kind of policy that would make it possible for many more parents to take time to become attached to their child early on and to do some of the work in stimulation in child care that they know their child needs.

Q: Mrs. Clinton, what would HRC's five tips for stimulation be?

HRC: Besides reading and singing and talking, well, those are really important. I'll just tell you what I believe, and then I'll let the expert, Dr. Alexander chime in. The time spent, verbally, in a positive tone of voice, interacting with a baby, is time spent building those nerve cell connections called synapses, and that can be done in a lot of different ways. Some of the easiest ways are singing to a child, even if you have a terrible voice, sing until they know any better, I mean,

Chelsea stopped me singing when she realized I couldn't sing. I can remember that day like it was yesterday. . . . I used to sing to her every single night, and when she was about 18 months old, she reached up, put her hand on my mouth and said "no sing mommy". Now, her father kept singing because he wasn't tone deaf.

Reading to a child, even if your not a good reader. I've visited lots of GED programs, welfare reform employment training programs, and I've urged the parents there, predominantly mothers, to read to their children, often times, they'll say, well I'm not a good reader, and I'll say, before the age of three, your child doesn't know if you are a good reader. Hold the book, and tell a story. Just make sure it's the same story you tell, every time, holding the book, because the child will remember what the story is. I think that making up stories for a child is very stimulating.

Doing all those old fashioned games that again, parents and grandparents did, peek-a-boo games, the itsy bitsy spider game, all of that is not just some way to be engaged with your child, it really does stimulate brain growth. I think exposing your child to the out-of-doors, I mean taking your child outside and just pointing out the things that you see. Putting the child in the basket in the supermarket, and talking as you go down, pointing out what you see, I mean, there's so many opportunities that don't cost anything, that don't require you to go very far from home, that you can do, just within your own environment that will make the difference.

It is something to stress again, that it doesn't break down if you are a person who works outside the home, or inside the home, to get back to Helen's point, because as Dr. Alexander says, as a report that I write about in my book called Meaningful Differences says, you can be a terrifically engaged, stimulating parent staying home all day, or going to work, and coming home. And you can be an unstimulating, depressed, uninvolved parent staying home all day, or going out to work all day. That is not the determinative criterion. It is what you do, and how you engage with that child, our attentiveness, and awareness of what your child needs, picking up the messages and signals that your own child sends you, that really determine the quality of your parenting. Let Dr. Alexander respond, too.

Dr. Alexander: Those sound like 5 pretty good ones to me. Just a couple things I might add, we have also learned from research, the importance of physical movement kinds of stimulation. Whether it's swinging or tossing or interacting with a toy, whatever, so the physical movement kinds of stimulation are important. And any other just, close body contact. You never outgrow your need for hugs. And, the more, the better, and that kind of physical contact, is certainly importan, from mother, father, anyone.

Q: Could somebody look at this data and say, 'gosh, I really should stay home for the first three years.' I've always thought my thing would be to go out in the work world, but now I've changed my mind because of this data, would that be a reasonable conclusion?

HRC: Yes, I think that a person could draw that conclusion. And a person could also draw the conclusion that I don't need to stay home for the first three years of life an attentive involved parent, and that requires that I do the following things with my child. I think that we have to be careful not to send any sort of uniform, cookie - cutter, one size fits all message because parents

come in all sizes, shapes, and experiences, so do babies. And I started out in my work years and years ago when I was in law school. And I saw so many different settings of parent - child interaction.

Let me just give you just two quick examples. I can remember working with Doctor Sally Province who was one of the early pioneers in the work of infant behavior. And she could look at a little infant interacting with her mother or her father and tell you so much about how those two people spend time together. And then she could help the parent understand what they were doing either right or wrong, because usually the only kids she saw were kids who were being under stimulated with some kind of presenting problem. And so often, you know, you hear from the mother this anguished voice: "I'm with her all day. I do everything I think I'm supposed to do. But it just isn't working." So that mother needed some help. She thought she was doing the right thing. She was home all day. Maybe that wasn't the right thing for that parent and that child. That there were some other strategies that were going to be workable.

On the other hand, you've got a lot of parents who need to work. They should not be made to feel any more guilt about their need to work and their child-rearing, than the society already puts on them. What they need to be given is some useful tips about how they can make sure they're the best parent they can be. And that includes looking for what makes good child care, because a lot of parents still don't know what it is that they want to find when they go into that child care center. Knowing what they can do with their child when they are at home, understanding this research. And so there's just a lot of different elements to this and I don't think that what would be a reasonable conclusion for one parent to draw, should then be generalized so that every parent should do this. I think we have to be much more thoughtful I how we approach this. David, were you going to say something?

DH: Basically, the Starting Points panel looked at this in terms of options, and it is certainly an option that ought to be preserved. It should in no way be discouraged for the mother, or by the way, the father. One of the things the Starting Points panel looked at to some extent was the issue of cooperation and the extent to which fathers are compensating for time now not being spent at home by mothers. The answer is not much so far, but maybe there's a little trend in that direction, with both parents involved as care givers. But in any case, that option of doing it yourself at home to the extent you possibly can, is an option that ought to be preserved. Although realistically, the panel had to face the fact that in over half the cases, both parents are out working, and therefore, you simply have to come to terms with that reality as best you can, and, as Mrs. Clinton said, adopt an array of strategies that will meet different kinds of situations.

Q: We're not saying that women should necessarily stay at home, or not stay home or whatever, probably the other one biggest policy other than family leave that's affected a lot of young mothers, is the welfare bill that was signed last year which had the effect of making a lot of women who don't necessarily want to leave their homes, [inaudible], put them into child care. How is that consistent?

HRC: I've thought a lot about this Peter. I mean, I think this is a very fair question, and if I can just sort of relate how I've thought about it. First of all, as Dr. Hamburg said, most women are

now in the work force, even mothers of infants and toddlers. So there are a lot of women in minimum wage jobs, low paying jobs, working as hard as they can to either help supplement their husbands salaries, or as a single parent, being the sole support of their children. They are now coping with all of these challenges in how they raise their children. I have never understood or thought it was fair that those women would get themselves into the work world, do the best they can, while we would support other women to stay at home when the women in the work world didn't have that choice.

I think everybody who has to work to support themselves should be on the same playing field in the sense that everybody should have to be responsible and do their part for themselves. But, that doesn't answer what we're going to do with these millions of women coming off of welfare an into the work world. And I think there are a number of strategies that the states are developing, and the federal government is encouraging. One is to train some of these women to be child care workers. There is a shortage of quality child care, I would like to see a significant effort undertaken so that we could create more effective child care settings using the money that's in the welfare reform bill and the child care appropriations to help fund that kind of training and to find subsidies so that families can afford those subsidies. There are a lot of job opportunities in this field if it is seen as a priority. Also, I think that all parents of any kind of economic background right now can use this information to be better parents. And so, the fact that welfare mothers are being encouraged, and then will be eventually required to seek work, should not be the determining factor in the quality of their parenting. Just like women who have worked have had to make the trade-offs and understand how to be the best parent possible while you work in the home and outside the home. These women will also have to face up to that, and it has been my experience in many years of working with and talking with women on welfare that there is a sense of pride and accomplishment which accompanies moving off of welfare, becoming self-sufficient--- which is a very good message to send to children. I mean, one of the results, and I'd like Dr. Alexander just to sat a word about this, one of the results of the child care study which reinforces everything we know about child development is that a depressed, lethargic, uninvolved mother, whether she is living in a housing project or in a palace, has a detrimental effect on the quality of parenting and interaction with her child. And so we have to be more, we have to be more thoughtful about this. There have been many women on welfare who have done a terrific job raising their children against unbelievable odds. And there are those who have not. Just like in any zip code with the highest income in America, you can find mothers who have done a terrific job and those who have had problems. So what we are trying to do is to look at strategies and solutions and not point fingers and say, well, if you stay home, you're this, and if you go to work, you're that, and if you're poor, you're this, and if you're rich, you're that. Because so many of those characteristics in individual cases don't explain what's going on. Dr. Alexander, [inaudible]

Dr. Alexander: Yeah, the day care study looked particularly at the maternal-child relationship and mother-child interaction. The former at fifteen months of age and the latter at twenty-four and thirty-six months of age. In relation to the day care experience as well as to the home environment. As direct observations of the interactions between mother and child at home and in a laboratory setting as well as the day care environment. The study at fifteen months show that the day care environment had not, did not have a negative impact on [inaudible], the day care experience did not have a negative impact on the mother-child, uh, relationship, uh, as long as the

mother-child relationship was good at home. And the governing factor really was the kind of interaction that the mother and the child had at home, not whether the child was in day care or not. Similarly, at twenty-four and thirty-six months, we looked at interactions with the mother and the child. And again the key factor was, as long as the day care quality was satisfactory, the governing factor was the interaction between the mother and the child at home. And whether the mother was passive, depressed, whatever. This is what had a negative impact on that interaction, not the day care situation.

Q: Two questions. One is for Dr. Alexander and one is for Mrs. Clinton. I can't remember whether you discussed this in your book but what did you do when Chelsea was born. Were you working? Did you take a lot of time off? Was it a hard and fast decision? And the other question is just, we've been talking a lot about mothers and children, I'm wondering if in all of the research it shows that, is that bond between a mother and a child more important than a father if the father is the primary care giver, does it have the same effect?

Dr. Alexander: Okay, we unfortunately don't have the answer to the father question yet. That's data that has been collected but not yet analyzed. So I wish I could answer that but I can't based on the data from the study. Sorry, we will have that.

HRC: Uh, I took a four month leave and because I was a partner in a law firm, my compensation wasn't effected because at the end of the year, I mean I got my salary and then I got whatever of my percentage of the income I was due was. So I didn't have the same issues. And one thing I have worked hard for was to make sure that leave was available, not only for lawyers, but for staff people and the like. And it is a very tough case to make in any kind of employment setting. Unpaid leave or paid leave, there are just so many economic considerations that people felt are controlling. And then there are also some sort of cultural considerations as well. My personal experience was that nobody that I worked with would talk to me about the fact that I was pregnant. This was seventeen years ago and I just kept on getting bigger and bigger and bigger. And they kept averting their eyes and not dealing with it. And so there was never any discussion and there was no policy. And so therefore after I had Chelsea, I just said well I'm going to take some time off. And they didn't know how to deal with it. And so they said, well alright. You know. And it was just kind of the way we backed into those decisions those days. And it has gotten better in many settings because at least there are policies and there is a sense of predictability and people can plan. But there is still this cultural resistence to the idea of leave in our society. And there is still is, I think, this very strong sense that pregnant women and women with small babies shouldn't be at work anyway. So maybe if we don't deal with it, we don't confront it, we'll kind of, by attrition, change the demographics. And of course, that overlooks all the single women who are supporting themselves and small children. And it overlooks women who have to work otherwise out of economic necessity. And it overlooks women who choose to work for the vast number of reasons that women like us around this table have chosen to work. So I think that we're kind of in one of those cultural limbos. And whenever Dr. Hamburg raises the point about how Western Europe or Canada or Japan and other countries that have leave and including paid leave deal with these issues, the response always comes back, oh, but they have ten percent unemployment, twelve percent unemployment. Their growth rate is down and all of that. But if you look at economic indicators solely and you don't look at costs associated with the

economic choices that a society makes, you get a distorted picture. And that's one of my arguments, about how we should start thinking about a much broader definition about what our investments of our country should be and what the costs that we are paying should be. I refer to a book in my book that a conservative, kind of economist observer named Edward Litwack (sp?), I think is his name, has written about turbo-charged capitalism. And he said you know, we in America seem to only look at the bottom line and we don't fully define the bottom line. And he gives an example. He said, you know, you can go to some countries and they have leave and they have this and they have that. And American business and American political leaders say, "oh my gosh, that's such a drag on the economy. That's so expensive. They have smaller, cheaper prisons. They have smaller, cheaper mental health and drug abuse loads." You know, you just kind of go down the list. And if we were honest with ourselves and if we really tally up what we spend for social costs that are preventable. There will always be people that will have to go to prison. There will always be people who are socially and personally destructive. Human nature being what it is. But cutting the numbers of people who end up causing trouble for themselves or others, is a smart way to be thinking about where we, as a society, would like to end up, both socially and economically. I think that part of what I hope this research is going to cause people to be stimulated to discuss is different ways of evaluating our success as a nation. And if we do that, then I think we can be sensible in coming up with some solutions. You looked poise to say something, David?

DH: The prevention, if you're talking about if you either pay now or you pay later, there are a number of studies. There is a new one, which I haven't seen but I've heard about, from Rann (sp?) which you may associate with defense studies, correct me but they have now taken on domestic problems as well, that looks at what you get from this dollar invested in these zero to three interventions down the road. And there have been a variety of studies on that. And it always runs somewhere in the neighborhood of five or ten dollars saved down the road. We have defined these things in terms of the health care system, the education system, the prison system, whatever name you apply to it, there are a whole bunch of rotten outcomes that to a considerable extent can be prevented, even in the light of present knowledge and will be much more so with the research in the next ten, twenty years. So we have to really think much harder about the whole approach of prevention, identifying major risk factors and how you can deal with those risk factors. In a way now, I guess that we've changed our behavior with respect to smoking. Nobody in medicine, hardly anybody thought that would happen when I was a medical student, but it's happened big time. It happened more in this country than in most other countries. So, I think that kind of thinking in terms of prevention and early investment for good outcomes is an important thing to do across the board.

HRC: I just want to end by saying that one of the responses to that, whenever I make the argument, is that, you know, it's too expensive, it's too interventionist, and it won't work. And that what we need to do is get back to a time when each individual was responsible for him or herself and each family was an island onto itself. And nobody needs any help from anybody else. And certainly not from the federal government.

And part of the reason I wrote my book was to make what I think is a common sense argument, which is that we are all in this together. Whether we like it or not. And when we think about

ways of being helpful to each other, we don't have to think only in one way. You know, we have moved considerably from the idea that top-down, one size fits all, solutions are the way we should go. But we have not yet really accepted, I think, the evidence that is around us. That there are many strategies that do work. That if we spend a little money and a little time implementing would have big pay-offs. And that certainly focusing on the individual and particularly on the individual parent and thinking what could we do as a society that would help maximize good parenting and better child outcomes. And if we thought like that, then, yes, there might be some government programs.

But there would also be some things business would do and that there would be some things that the media would do on a regular basis, not a one shot deal, continuing, and there would be different ways schools would be organized and community groups would take a different look and have a different responsibility, certainly the health care system, starting with prenatal care but moving through the child's development would be thinking differently and organizing differently, and it wouldn't necessarily be more expensive. But, it would be different, and I guess that's part of what we hope this research will stimulate. That people will start to say to themselves, "Is what we are doing, more likely than not, to increase the chances that parents and children will have more of a chance to be successful together."

August 2, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON

FROM: HEATHER HOWARD

SUBJECT: GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION AT CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS

Attached for your review are the following materials on your work to secure federal financing for graduate medical education (GME) at independent children's hospitals:

1) Memo describing your efforts.

2) Statement by the President on the signing of the Healthcare Research and Quality Act of 1999, which authorized funding for GME at children's hospitals. The statement credits you for advocating for the budget initiative. (12/6/99)

3) Two pages from the newsletter of the National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions. One is a picture of the bill signing in which you participated. The other shows your visit to Children's National Medical Center in Washington; the caption recognizes your support for GME at children's hospitals.

4) Your column on GME at children's hospitals. (12/1/99)

5) Speech by the President to the American Academy of Pediatrics. On page five, he credits you with "strongly push[ing]" for the GME proposal. (10/12/99)

6) Administration SAP on the Senate Labor-HHS-Education (FY 2000) bill. On page four, it expresses concern over the Senate's failure to fund GME at children's hospitals, and urges the Senate to fully fund the Administration's request. (9/29/99)

7) Letter from the National Association of Children's Hospitals to the President thanking him and you for support of GME at children's hospitals. (2/28/00)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release October 12, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS

Washington Convention Center
Washington. D.C.

11:37 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, President Alpert -- (laughter) -- President-elect Cook. Seems like just yesterday I had that title for a while. (Laughter.) To the executive board and the members of the American Academy of Pediatrics, thank you for welcoming me here. I am told that I'm the first President ever to address your convention, but I know -- (applause) -- I know that Hillary spoke to you in 1993, and I was -- (applause) -- I was thinking of, given the difference in our respective political prospects for the future, we should have reversed the order. (Laughter.)

But we just got back this morning from Camp David where we celebrated our 24th anniversary and she asked me to give you her regards, so I do so today. (Applause.)

I'm delighted to be here. I think pediatricians have a special place in the hearts of every person who has ever been privileged to either be treated by one or have his or her children treated by one. Just a few weeks ago, the man who was my doctor in Hot Springs, Arkansas when I was a little boy, Dr. Joe Rosenzweig, came to see me with his wife and his grandchildren. I regularly stay in touch with Dr. Betty Lowe, who once headed this distinguished group and took care of Chelsea when she was a little girl. And so I feel a great personal bond to the work that you do.

And you should feel a great personal bond to the work that I do. I mean, Washington is the only place outside of a pediatrician's office where you can hear so much screaming and crying on a daily basis. (Laughter and applause.) And we all -- all the politicians here have a lot in common with doctors. We all want to prescribe medicine, and no one wants to take it. (Laughter.) But screaming and crying are part of the process of getting better, in medicine and in politics.

Let me echo some of the things that Dr. Alpert has said. I am profoundly grateful for the things that we have done together, and the leadership that you have taken to make America better. The gains that our administration has made for children have come with your organization fighting by our side: passing the Family and Medical Leave law, which now over 15 million people have taken advantage of; immunizing more than 90 percent of our children against major childhood diseases for the first time in our history; passing the Brady Bill and other measures to stem gun violence; making aggressive initiatives in the area of school safety, including zero tolerance for guns in schools; and -- (applause) -- thank you. The V-chip, the TV rating systems, and now similar systems for the Internet and for video games that we're working on. Increasing child support enforcement and collection; dramatically expanding opportunities for adoption and for moving foster care kids into permanent adoptive homes. I thank you for all those things. The First Lady's Prescription for Reading program, and many, many other issues I could mention.

One I want to talk about more later today in my remarks is your role in creating the $24-billion Children's Health Insurance Program, which is designed to address that problem of more than 10 million uninsured children.

Because of all these efforts, America is a better place for children; they're healthier and safer than they were seven years ago. Infant mortality is down, drug abuse is down, teen pregnancy is down, juvenile crime is down. America, itself, is stronger, more prosperous, more confident.

Today, we enjoy the longest peacetime expansion in our history, the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 30 years, the lowest poverty rate in 20 years, the lowest crime rate in 26 years, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years. Thank you for your contribution to all of these things. (Applause.)

But like your work with children, our work here is always about tomorrow. So the question we face is, what are we going to do with this phenomenal burst of good fortune that we have had, by dint of effort and the grace of God? What are we going to do with it?

I have been arguing very strenuously now, for some time, that we have turned the country around and we are heading in the right direction. And now we have, as a people, the chance -- literally, the chance of a lifetime, that a nation gets maybe once every 30, 40, 50 years, to deal with its long-term challenges, to seize its long-term opportunities, to forge the future that our children and our grandchildren will have. And that is what I earnestly hope we will do. I believe that we have to use this moment to meet the great challenges we know, without a doubt, 21st century America will face. What are they?

First, the aging of America. The number of people over 65 will double by the year 2030. I hope I'll still be one of them. There will be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security.

Second, the health and education of the largest and most diverse group of children in our nation's history.

Third, sustaining our economic prosperity over the long term, and expanding its reach to people and places that have not been touched by this marvelous economic recovery.

Fourth, making America the safest big country in the world. Yes, the crime rate's at a 26-year-low, but no one believes it's low enough. The accidental death rates by guns of children is nine times higher than that of the next 25 big industrial countries combined. So, yes, we have a 26-year-low in crime rates. But if we're the strongest economy in the world, and we have a free society, why don't we say we're going to not stop until America is the safest big country in the entire world? (Applause.)

The fifth big challenge we have, which will bear directly on your efforts and those that succeed you in the years ahead is dealing with the environmental challenges we face, especially the challenge of climate change and global warming. (Applause.) I feel very, very strongly about that. One of the problems I have in dealing with it is that the applause is still scattered when I talk about it.

And, sixth, building one America out of all the diverse threads of our citizenship and doing it in a world that we help to make ever more inter-dependent, peaceful and prosperous.

The answers to those questions, whether we will do that, will be affected by the decisions we make here in Washington in the coming days and weeks. Ever since I gave my State of the Union address I have been working with Congress, or trying to, on a budget that will move us ahead in meeting all these challenges; that will leave this country in good shape for the new millennium, while maintaining our budget discipline that has been responsible for so much of the good things that have happened in this country in the last six and a half years.

To meet the challenge of the aging of America I have proposed to extend the life of Social Security to 2050, to get it out beyond the life of the baby boom generation, to lift the earnings limit, to give more help to older women who are disproportionately poor. I have also proposed to extend the life of Medicare to 2027, that's the longest existence of the Medicare trust fund in a long time; to add a voluntary prescription drug benefit; to allow uninsured Americans between the ages of 55 and 65 to buy into the Medicare program; and to provide a long-term care tax credit for families that are dealing with that challenge.

To meet the challenge of our children's education, I have proposed to continue with our program of putting 100,000 more teachers in the classroom, to lower class sizes in the early grades -- (applause) -- to build or modernize 6,000 schools; to complete our efforts to hook all of our classrooms up to the Internet by the year 2000; and to raise standards and accountability.

I know Secretary Riley spoke here earlier, and perhaps he dealt with this at greater length, but we propose as we give out our federal money and reauthorize that law every five years -- this is the year we do it -- to say every state must have high standards, every state must have accountability -- accountability for teachers, for schools, for students. We shouldn't have social promotion, but we shouldn't blame kids for the failure of the system. So we proposed to triple the number of our children served by after-school and summer school programs. We proposed to give funds to schools that are failing, to turn them around or require them to be shut down. We proposed to expand the number of charter schools within our public school system so we'll get up to 3,000 by the end of next year.

These are very important things that I hope all Americans will support. Unless we can educate all our children -- and increasingly, they come from families whose first language is not English -- we will not have the country we want in 30 years.

To meet the challenge of expanding and continuing our economic prosperity and bringing it to people who haven't felt it yet, I have asked the Congress to adopt a new markets initiative to give Americans with funds to invest the same incentives to invest in poor areas in America we now give them to invest in poor areas in Latin America or Asia or Africa. (Applause.)

I have proposed to increase the immensely successful community empowerment program that the Vice President has run for us over the last six and a half years, to increase enterprise zones, empowerment communities, to increase our community development banks that make loans to people and places where capital is not available. And to keep this expansion going perhaps for another generation, through ups and downs in the global economy, I have asked the Congress to do this within a framework that would enable us to continue to pay down our national debt which we quadrupled in the 12 years before I took office, so that in 15 years, America could be debt-free for the first time since 1835 when Andrew Jackson was the President of the United States. (Applause.)

Let me say to all of you -- this is a pretty progressive

group, and you always want government to invest in money -- why should progressives want America to be out of debt? I want to make this argument just very briefly. All of us who are over 40, at least, who went to college and took an economics class were told that every country needs a certain amount of debt, that it's healthy. And that was true when every country controlled its own economic destiny independent of every other. And it was true when people were borrowing money to invest in things like roads and bridges and parks and universities and long-term capital investments.

But over the last 20 years, governments, the United States being the worst offender, got to borrowing money just to pay the bills every week. And in a global economy where money can move across national borders instantaneously, if a government is debt-free, it means the people in that country -- whether they're businesses, trying to start or expand; or families trying to pay for homes, cars, college loans and credit card bills -- can all borrow money more cheaply. It means that if rich countries like America get out of debt, and other countries get in trouble, like our Asian partners did over the last couple of years, they can get money to get help more quickly, rebound more quickly, and buy our products more rapidly.

So I feel very strongly that this is an important idea, that I hope the American people will insist upon. And I hope that they will say to the Congress, don't let tax cuts or spending increases get in the way of getting us out of debt. If you want to spend the money, raise it. Do whatever's necessary, but get America out of debt over the next 15 years so that we can continue to grow for the next 50 years. It's very, very important to our future. (Applause.)

Now, here's what's going on here. I know you see all this food fight in Washington and you wonder, what is really going on? Here's what's going on. We passed a balanced budget bill in 1997. It had very tough spending caps. The spending caps were too tough -- if you work in a teaching hospital, or at other hospitals that have been handicapped by the Medicare cutbacks, you know they're too tough. I'll say more about that in a minute. But what we said was, we're going to balance this budget, and then we're going to keep it balanced by staying within these caps -- which means we have to spend money according to a certain plan over the next five years; or, if we want to spend more money, we have to raise more money -- either by cutting some other spending, closing some tax loopholes, raising some fees, or raising some tax. So that's why we're having this fight.

Then it turns out we have a bigger surplus than we thought we would, thanks to the prosperity and the hard work and the productivity of the American people. Then the Congress said, we want to separate the Social Security fund from the other funds. That's something they never could have done before, because the only surplus we've had for the last 17 years was in Social Security. All the others -- the deficit -- every year, you saw those deficit numbers, it was always a lot bigger than that. It's just -- we're paying more in Social Security taxes than we were paying out in Social Security payments. And the difference under the government's unified accounting -- lowered the deficit.

So, they said, let's separate them; now that we have a non-Social Security surplus, let's separate them. And we really want to do this. So I said, fine by me, I'll do that. Because under my plan, we would keep the Social Security taxes separate, then use the interest savings we get on paying down the debt and put it back into Social Security, and run Social Security out to 2050 beyond the life of almost all but the most fortunate baby boomers, and get us through this big population problem we've got.

But when the Congress looks at the books -- and the majority

party, the Republican Party, which normally says they're more conservative than we are on spending -- it depends on what it is -- found out that they couldn't spend all the money they wanted to spend with just the non-Social Security surplus. And they didn't want to raise the cigarette tax, or raise fees on people that have to help us clean up the toxic waste dumps, or close any of the corporate loopholes that I tried to close. And so that's why you see all these problems up here.

They're having a very difficult time, even with this big surplus, because they promised they wouldn't touch the Social Security part of the surplus, crafting a budget that both protects that surplus, invests in important things like education and health care, does what both parties wanted to do in transportation, meets their defense targets and stays within the spending cap. So that's why you hear about all these gimmicks and why they wanted to start giving poor people their tax returns under the Earned Income Tax Credit every month, instead of in a lump sum, like the rest of us get ours -- and why they wanted to put a 13th month into the year and all that.

All that sort of hand-wringing -- it must strike you as crazy, since you know we've got a surplus. The reason is they committed -- both parties did, back at the first of the year -- to take the Social Security surplus and put it over here and only spend the non-Social Security surplus. It never existed before, the non-Social Security surplus. And it's going to get bigger and bigger. And this problem won't be here next year or the year after next, but right now it's real small, and what they want to spend is real big, and they don't want to raise the money to raise the difference. That's what's going on.

How many of you knew that before I explained it? (Laughter.) About 10 hands. That's what's going on. If we were under the old accounting system, this would be like falling off a log. It would have no, sort of, larger economic impact in the short run, but it could be a very bad habit to get into over the long run.

So if we can stop now, we ought to stop now. But in order to stop now, with no gimmicks, we have to work together. If we don't, you wind up with the problems that the House of Representatives is confronting now. Just let me give you some examples.

Already in health care, they want to cut $85 million from my request for childhood immunizations. That's 170,000 kids who won't get the vaccines they need to ward off major childhood diseases like measles and mumps. There's no money in this proposal, which was strongly pushed by the First Lady, to support graduate medical education at children's hospitals -- where many of our pediatricians receive their training, and over half of the specialists in many areas receive their training.

It doesn't offer even a modest down payment on my $1 billion effort to support our nation's health care safety net of public hospitals and clinics, which -- you remember back in '94, when we got whacked around on health care, and everybody accused Hillary and me of wanting to have the government take over the health care system, which was not true -- they said that if our proposal passed, it wouldn't work. We said, if something didn't pass, the number of uninsured would go up. And sure enough, we were right, and you see the numbers, now.

Well, one of the things we can do in the short run is to dramatically beef up the public health care network. In my home state, for example, over 85 percent of all the immunizations are now done in the public health clinic, the county health clinic. Even upper-class people get their kids immunized in the health clinic. Solves all those liability problems and other things, and it's just something we did when I was there. But we need to do this. But it can't be done with this

bind they're in.

And let me tell you this: If something is not done, they're going to go back and cut everything 3 percent across the board. If they exempt defense, they'll have to cut everything 6 percent across the board. And that is a huge amount of money.

So I'd like to respectfully suggest that Congress go back and look at the budget I sent them seven months ago. It makes all the investments that they want to make, and the investments that I believe in. It stays within the spending caps by providing offsets, including a 55-cent-a-pack excise tax on tobacco. (Applause.)

Now, I believe -- I think it's good fiscal policy and you know it's good health policy. You know more than 400,000 Americans die every year from smoking-related diseases; almost 90 percent of our people start smoking as teenagers, and one of the most effective ways to get the attention of teenagers is to raise the price. (Applause.)

So Congress now faces this, for them, biblical choice: Cut investments in areas like health care and education and the environment; spend from the Social Security trust fund at least one more year; or maintain our fiscal discipline and save children's lives by raising the price of smoking, closing some corporate loopholes and doing a few other things to raise some money here.

I know what I believe the right choice is. I think most Americans would agree with me. I will work with Congress to put politics aside and do the right thing. Congress is clearly capable of working with me. We did it in 1996, with the welfare reform bill, which has cut welfare rolls almost in half, and, after I vetoed two earlier attempts, provided billions of dollars in child care and kept the guarantee of Medicaid and food stamps for poor families and work. We did it in the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. And last week, the House of Representatives did it again when they finally passed a strong, enforceable patients' bill of rights, thanks to you and others. (Applause.)

We are one step closer to seeing all Americans, including those in HMOs, have the right to the nearest emergency room care, the right to a specialist, the right to know you can't be forced to switch doctors in the middle of a treatment; the right to hold a health care plan accountable if it causes grave harm. (Applause.) But let me remind you, this is not the law of the land yet. This is a bill which has passed the House of Representatives. A much, much weaker bill passed the Senate.

So if you look at the vote in the House -- thanks to the solid support of the members of our party and some very, very brave people in the Republican Party who stuck their necks out, took a lot of heat from their leadership and from the health insurance companies, led by Congressman Norwood and others -- we got a big victory in the House. It wasn't close; it was a big victory -- won it by over 100 votes.

Now, the Senate should listen to that, and see the will of the American people, and give us a bill that is not loaded down with special interest poison pills. That was their original strategy. We'll pass this bill really strong, but we'll have so much other stuff on it that the President will not be able to sign it, or if he does, he'll be sick for four days. (Laughter.)

And so I say to you, thank you for your efforts. I want to ask you to do two things. Number one, write every one of those members of Congress that voted right on that bill, and recognize that, especially for the Republicans, it was a tough vote, and give them a pat

on the back. And number two, don't stop until it comes to my desk in the right form. We are a long way from home, but we have a good chance to win.

Now, I want to say there are some other opportunities for victory. Congress can put progress ahead of partisanship by making it possible for the millions of Americans with disabilities who want to work but are afraid to because they would lose their Medicare or Medicaid, to do that -- to go to work and keep their government health care coverage.

The Senate has already passed, by a 99-0 vote, the Work Incentives Improvement Act, to ensure that Americans with disabilities can gain the dignity of a job without fear of losing their health insurance. A bipartisan majority in the House has co-sponsored the same measure. I will sign it.

There is a modest cost associated with this bill for the government. I have offered them offsets for that. And so far, they don't want to take that, either. But it would be a pity, when virtually everybody in the Congress knows this is the right thing to do, to nickel-and-dime this to death. We're talking about thousands and thousands and thousands of people's lives.

I don't know if you know anybody like this. I've had the privilege of meeting a substantial number of people who are disabled, who got to go into the work force because somebody made provisions for health insurance, or because they were in an income category where they could keep their Medicaid for a while. And I've met even more who would go in a New York minute if they knew they could keep their Medicaid or their Medicare. And I've met a lot of employers who would hire them, but who know they cannot afford their health insurance.

So I implore you, do what you can to help us pass this. This is a bill that everybody's for, and the process is still fooling around with it because of a modest cost that can easily be offset. That is very important.

The third thing I ask for your help on doesn't require any more legislation, and it's consistent with a commitment you have already made. And that is to get children enrolled in the Children's Health Insurance Program. (Applause.)

Since the CHIP program went into effect, it has provided health coverage to over a million children whose families can't afford health coverage, and who make too much to be eligible for Medicaid. I am grateful to you for helping us to create it, and for helping us put it into effect. But as your President said, somewhere between 10 million and 11 million children in America still lack health insurance. That's way over 15 percent. The majority could be covered under either CHIP or Medicaid.

We've still got 2 or 3 million kids out there who are Medicaid-eligible who aren't covered -- if we can get word out to their families and sign them up. We know that children who lack health insurance have higher rates of treatable conditions like asthma, ear infections, vision problems. We know when a child can't see a blackboard clearly or hear the teacher precisely or pay attention to anything other than his or her own pained breathing, the kids aren't going to be able to learn.

CHIP and Medicaid can change all that for millions of people. And when we passed the CHIP program we thought it would ensure 5 million people, if we could also get the Medicaid insurance rates up and solve at least half the problem. Now, two years later, we've only insured a

million. But it was only this year, to be fair, that all 50 states had their programs in place. So we're now at the take-off point; and we will be judged -- you and I and all of us -- on how well we do from here on out.

This year -- or last year, I established an inner-agency task force to come up with some innovative strategies to get the word out to parents about CHIP and Medicaid. Today, I'm releasing their first annual report, which details a lot of promising outreach efforts. Just for example, the Department of Agriculture, which administers the school lunch program, has added information on CHIP and Medicaid to applications it sends to every school district in America. Millions of parents who fill out their school lunch forms now will have a chance to learn about these health programs.

Other promising innovations are also in the works. Thousands of AmeriCorps and Vista volunteers who deal directly with low-income families every day will soon have information in their training manuals on how to enroll children in CHIP and Medicaid. Tens of millions of elderly Americans who may have grandchildren eligible for CHIP and Medicaid will soon be able to read about these programs in the annual letters they receive from Social Security and Medicare.

But as the Vice President has been saying for months and months and months, if we're going to bring health care coverage to poor children, we have to start with where the children are in the schools. That's why today, I am issuing an executive order to the Secretaries of Education, Agriculture and Health and Human Services, directing them to find the most innovative school-based strategies now being pursued at the state and local level, to report back to me in six months on how we can replicate them in every community in the country.

I'm also sending a letter to states clarifying that they can use the CHIP fund for school-based outreach efforts. (Applause.) And we're going to dedicate over $9 million in new research grants to find out what outreach methods in schools or elsewhere work best. I believe these things will go a long way toward bringing health coverage to our children. But we need help from the churches, from the YMCAs and the YWCAs, from all the community organizations. And we need help from all the physicians and the public health units throughout our country.

It is simply inexcusable that we're sitting here, and have been, with the money for two years to provide health insurance to 5 million kids and 80 percent of them are still uninsured. And it is conceivable that we could do better than 5 million children with the money appropriated if we had effective enough outreach.

And to those of you who see a lot of people whose parents' first language is not English, I know we have trouble there. But I would implore you, do what you can, when you go back home, with your local groups, and your local medical societies, and your local health clinics, and your local schools, to get them to do this. There is no stigma associated with this; most people will walk through a wall to get their kids decent health care coverage -- if they know it is available.

This is simply a question -- the average person who's not covered by this doesn't know CHIP from block. (Laughter.) Or Medicaid from Lego, or whatever. You know, we've got to deal with people that -- you know, most normal people worry about their lives, not government acronyms. And we're dealing with -- a lot of these folks don't know anything about this. And you can help to make sure, in your community, that the schools and the community groups, and the religious organizations, and everybody, is doing their outreach on this. It is profoundly important. (Applause.)

Now, let me just say this last point. If every child eligible for CHIP and Medicaid were enrolled, there would still be millions who lacked coverage. You know it, and I do, too. You know that I and Hillary and the Vice President, we have always believed it is wrong for any American, much less any child, not to have affordable, quality health care. I know that the American Academy of Pediatrics believes that. I will keep working to change that as long as I am President. I will keep looking for ways to end this unconscionable and growing gap of uninsured care. (Applause.)

Our hospitals will continue to have problems -- and again, I would say, this has nothing to do -- and you can help us with this -- this has nothing to do with the government taking over health care. The government's not taking over health care in the CHIP program, or Medicare, or Medicaid.

If we'd let these people -- next to the kids, the fastest-growing group of uninsured people are 55 to 65 years old, who retire and can't get employment-based health insurance anymore. We ought to let them buy into Medicare. You know, I get into all these fights with the insurance companies -- and I hate to fight with them all the time -- but the truth is, America has a system of financing health care that dictates high levels of uninsured, which dictates enormous burdens on the health care system of the country, and burdens on everybody that buys insurance. (Applause.)

And they can deny otherwise as long as they want to, but all you have to do is look around at other examples, and you know it's simply not true. There is no other conceivable explanation. It is the system by which we finance our care, which has got us in the fix we're in now. (Applause.)

And so we are trying to do this, and we are trying to do the bill for the disabled, and there are lots of other things we can do. But if you look at everything we do that's going to make a difference, it's because we have changed the financing. And those are facts and you can get them out there.

For the last six and a half years, I have had the great honor to serve as President of this country. I have about a year and four months left, maybe a little more. I've worked hard to turn this country around and then to keep the American people always thinking about tomorrow, about the challenges and the opportunities of the new century and the new millennium.

Well, now we have turned America around. And the great test is whether we are going to take this moment and shape our tomorrows. That's what you do every day, every time you take some preventive measure, every

time you do something to help a child -- there may be some screaming and crying, but you know they're all going to be better off tomorrow.

I just would like to see all of us here in Washington take the same attitude toward the future of all our children's tomorrows that you take toward each child's tomorrow. If we do, America's best days lie in the new millennium.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 12:13 P.M. EDT

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN COORDINATED BY OMB WITH THE CONCERNED AGENCIES.)

September 29, 1999
(Senate)

S. 1650 - DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2000

(Sponsors: Stevens (R), Alaska; Specter (R), Pennsylvania)

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on S. 1650, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2000, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

As the President indicated in his statement yesterday, while the funding levels in the Senate Committee bill are better than those in the House bill, he would veto the bill in its current form for the reasons discussed below.

The President's FY 2000 Budget provides levels of discretionary spending for FY 2000 that conform to the Bipartisan Budget Agreement by making savings through user fees and certain mandatory programs to help finance this spending. The Administration wants to work with the Congress on mutually-agreeable mandatory and other offsets that could be used to increase funding for high-priority discretionary programs, including those funded by this bill.

Department of Education

The Administration strongly opposes the Senate Committee bill's undermining of our national commitment to improve our schools by not guaranteeing funds specifically for Class Size Reduction. The President's Budget includes the second installment of his goal to hire 100,000 new teachers in order to reduce class size in the early years. Unfortunately, the Senate bill reneges on the bipartisan commitment last year to reduce class sizes to an average of 18 in the primary grades by providing no funds specifically for Class Size Reduction. As a result, it does not guarantee funding for the 29,000 teachers hired last year or the additional 8,000 teachers that would be hired under the President's proposal. This program has been extremely popular -- every State applied for and received funding in FY 1999, and preliminary State reports show that 1.7 million children will benefit from last year's funds alone. We would support efforts to restore funding to this critical initiative as the bill moves through the legislative process.

The Senate Committee-reported bill also provides unacceptably low funding for the following education priorities:

- GEAR UP. The President's budget requests $240 million for GEAR UP, which helps students in high poverty areas stay in school, succeed in their classes, and prepare for college. The Committee bill provides $180 million, denying college preparation services to more than 130,000 fewer low-income middle school students.

- After School. The President's budget request focuses on raising student achievement and improving accountability in our Nation's schools. A cornerstone of this effort is the President's $600 million request for After School programs, which would support State efforts to end social promotion by providing extra learning time for 1.8 million students to help them master academic material. The Senate bill provides only $400 million for After School, denying services to nearly 600,000 students. The Administration strongly opposes the reduction in a top Presidential priority.

- Hispanic Education Agenda. The President's budget requested over a $400 million increase to support programs targeted to improve the educational outcomes of Hispanic Americans. Unfortunately, the Senate bill cuts $236 million from the request which will deny many of these indispensable services to this underserved population, seriously hampering the progress of Hispanic Americans in reaching the high academic standards expected of all students.

- Adult Education ESL/Civics Initiative. The Senate bill provides no funding for the President's Adult Education ESL/Civics Initiative (part of the Hispanic Education Agenda), which would provide $70 million to help adult English language learners acquire the skills necessary to become successful participants in American society.

- Reading Excellence. The Committee bill reduces the President's $286 million request for Reading Excellence to help over one million children learn to read by the end of the third grade. The bill provides $260 million for this program, denying 100,000 students the help they need to read independently, the cornerstone for all learning.

- Education Technology. The Committee's $94 million reduction from the request would make it increasingly difficult for States to meet school children's education technology needs, especially in training teachers to integrate educational technology into their curriculum effectively. These technological investments are critical in order to prepare the next generation for the 21st Century.

- Community Based Technology Centers. The Committee's $55 million reduction from the Budget would prevent low-income communities from gaining access to the technology that they need to prepare for the 21st Century. Recent studies have shown that not only do children and adults in low-income communities have much less access to computers than in high-income communities, this "digital divide" is also growing. The President's request would have helped to shrink this gap by funding nearly 300 additional community-based technology centers.

- Charter Schools. The Committee bill cuts $30 million from the request, which would leave over 500 charter schools without funds to assist in the planning and development of innovative programs that enhance public school choice.

- Research. The Committee has cut by over $50 million the President's request for

research and dissemination, eliminating funding for large-scale, joint research with the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health on early learning in reading and mathematics, teacher preparation, and technology applications. These cuts would occur at a time when teachers and policy-makers are demanding reforms proven by sound research.

In addition to the funding issues identified above, the Administration strongly urges the Senate to include a key language provision that would support stronger accountability under the Title I program by requiring States to reserve 2.5 percent of their LEA Grant allocations to help turn around the lowest-performing schools.

Furthermore, the Administration objects to the language limitation that would bring a halt to the President's efforts to help States and parents raise academic standards through a voluntary national test. The Committee bill's language would prohibit the pilot testing, field testing, implementation, administration, and distribution of the tests unless explicitly authorized. The language prohibition should be deleted. Congress should be promoting high standards for all students, not undermining them.

Department of Health and Human Services

The Senate Committee bill underfunds public health priorities, including preventive health, mental health services, and health care access for the poor. The Administration is very concerned about the following cuts to key health and social service programs:

- Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). The Administration is strongly opposed to the $1.3 billion reduction in the Social Services Block Grant. The Committee funding level is less than half the level requested and 45 percent below the FY1999 level. This cut would have a direct and severe impact on States, local governments and nonprofits that provide such critical programs as child care, child welfare, and services for individuals with disabilities.

- National Family Caregiver Support Program. The Administration urges the Senate to provide the $125 million requested to establish a new program to assist approximately 250,000 families caring for an older relative. The need for this program is indicated by the fact that there are seven million informal caregivers providing primary assistance to the 95 percent of older persons who need help with their daily activities.

- Head Start. The Administration commends the Committee for fully funding the President's request for Head Start. The $507 million increase above the House mark will enable this important program to deliver comprehensive education and developmental services to 44,000 additional low-income children. This increase also supports critical investments in quality improvement activities included in the President's budget and agreed upon in the bipartisan reauthorization of the Head Start Act last year. The Administration raises concern, however, over the possible impact of an advance appropriation at the level included in the Committee's mark.

- Mental Health Block Grant. The Administration objects to the $49 million reduction to the request for the Mental Health Block Grant. This funding is important for assisting States in supporting comprehensive community systems of care for adults with a serious mental illness and children with severe emotional disturbances, given that

approximately 10.2 million people, or over five percent of the population, suffer from a serious mental illness over the course of any given year.

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The Administration is concerned that the Senate bill would reduce requested funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention by $53 million, impairing CDC's ability to carry out key public health activities such as childhood immunizations, chronic and environmental disease prevention, domestic HIV/AIDS prevention, and surveillance and investigations of outbreaks. Research done in CDC laboratories is used by community disease prevention programs around the country to address illnesses such as AIDS, cancer, diabetes, and influenza. The Administration urges the Senate to fund the requested increases for CDC, including funding for research, laboratory work, and technical assistance.

- Health Care Access. The Administration strongly opposes the Senate bill's failure to fund adequately programs that will improve health care access for many Americans, including a portion of the 43 million uninsured. No funding is provided for the Health Care Access for the Uninsured initiative, which would provide funds to enable the development of integrated systems of care and to address service gaps within these systems. In addition, the bill does not include the full $25 million increase requested for Family Planning services. The President's full request would provide family planning services to an additional 500,000 clients who are neither Medicaid eligible nor have insurance.

- Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education. The Administration is concerned about the Senate bill's lack of funding for Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education (GME). Teaching hospitals that do not treat many Medicare patients, such as the Nation's free-standing children's hospitals, receive a very small share of Medicare GME dollars. The Administration urges the Senate to fully fund this request.



- Bioterrorism. The Senate bill does not include in the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund the requested $13 million for critical FDA expedited regulatory review and approval of new vaccines and drugs to combat biological and chemical agents used for terrorist purposes.

- Minority AIDS Initiative. The Senate Committee reduces funding by $15 million (-30 percent) for minority AIDS prevention and treatment from the FY 1999 enacted and FY 2000 requested level. These important resources allow HHS to direct the necessary funds to the most critical areas of need to address this epidemic in minority communities and should be restored.

- HCFA Program Management. The Administration appreciates the Senate Committee's action to fund the request for HCFA Program Management. However, we encourage the Senate to enact the full amount of already-authorized Medicare+Choice user fees, as well as the President's requested increase in Medicare+Choice user fees. We also encourage the Senate to enact the President's proposed program management user fees totaling $194.5 million, which could free up resources under the discretionary caps for education and other priorities.

- Medicare+Choice Competitive Pricing Demonstrations. The Senate bill includes language that would prevent funds from being used to administer the Medicare+Choice

Competitive Pricing Demonstration Project. These demonstrations were passed by the Congress as part of the Balanced Budget Act in order to provide valuable information regarding the use of competitive pricing methodologies in Medicare. The information that we could learn from these demonstrations is particularly relevant as we consider the important task of reforming Medicare. The Administration urges the Senate to remove this provision and to allow HCFA to implement the demonstrations.

- Abortion. The Administration urges the Senate to strike sections 508 and 509 of the Committee bill, which would prohibit the use of funds for abortion. The President believes that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. These provisions would continue to limit the range of conditions under which a woman's health would permit access to abortion services. Furthermore, section 509 requires a physician to make a legal determination that these conditions have been met. The Administration proposes to work with the Congress to address the issue of abortion funding.

- Delayed Obligations for NIH. In providing the National Institutes of Health an increase of $2 billion, the Senate bill would delay the obligation of $3 billion to the end of the fiscal year. The Administration is concerned that the size of this restriction could hamper the efficient management of NIH's grant portfolio and potentially delay the funding of high-quality research on cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's, and other diseases.

Department of Labor

The Administration appreciates the Senate Committee's mark for the Department of Labor's employment and training programs and programs protecting working Americans at their jobs. This supports our initiatives to help dislocated workers, youth, and others in need of skills or skill upgrading to prepare for, find, and retain jobs in today's workplace. In addition, the Committee's mark will help ensure that worker safety and health and other rights are protected on the job at home as well as help developing economies establish core labor standards. However, the Administration urges the Senate to provide the full request for the Department to work with other agencies to address youth violence among out-of-school youth and the request for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to ensure that our statistical programs are maintained and improved.

National Labor Relations Board

The Administration appreciates the Senate Committee's full funding of the request for the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). Among other things, this will enable the NLRB to work down its case backlog and improve its information technology so it can better serve labor and employers in resolving the charges brought before it for resolution.

Read our Privacy Policy

Pls Add to DONE binder

6/23/00: Lifetime Albright + White House

DEAR ERICA:

AS MENTIONED, IF AT ALL POSSIBLE, FOLLOWING THE INTERVIEW REGARDING MADELINE ALBRIGHT, IF THE FIRST LADY HAS TIME FOR A FEW QUESTIONS FOR OUR PROGRAM ON THE HISTORY OF THE WHITE HOUSE, IT WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED. (MRS. CARTER HAS ALREADY BEEN INTERVIEWED AND WE ARE INTERVIEWING MRS. BUSH AND MRS. FORD NEXT MONTH).

ENCLOSED ARE QUESTIONS FOR MRS. CLINTON AND IN ADDITION, THE AREAS WE WOULD LIKE TO SHOOT (PENDING APPROVAL—ANY AREA WOULD BE APPRECIATED)

Gary Ponticello
Actuality - has done several intimate portraits - end of October will air

THE WHITE HOUSE -- A Living History

Interview questions for First Lady Hillary Clinton:

1) Do the constant reminders inside the White House of previous first families and the challenges they faced provide comfort for you during difficult times?

2) Is there any one room or historical furnishing in the White House that you find especially inspiring?

3) Do you treasure the White House family quarters as virtually the only place where you and your family can have real privacy, without secret service agents nearby?

4) Please talk about how the Truman balcony still shows burn marks from the British attack during the war of 1812, and what you think about when you see those reminders of the building's history.

5) What does the White House mean to you?

White House B-roll:

The rooms we would like to shot in, listed in order of preference:

1) The Oval Office; emphasizing wide shots and moves in towards the desk

2) The Lincoln Bedroom; emphasizing wide shots and moves to the bed
3) The Treaty Room; emphasizing wide shots of room and moves into medium close shots of the various treaties displayed
4) The East Room
5) The Yellow Oval Room

6-22-2000 12:23PM FROM ACTUALITY PRODS INC 818 379 7050 P.3

MEMORANDUM

TO: **HRC**
FROM: **Erika Batcheller**
RE: **Interview for Lifetime's *Intimate Portrait* of Madeline Albright**
DATE: **June 22, 2000**

You are scheduled for a 20-minute interview Friday afternoon with Lifetime TV for their upcoming program "An Intimate Portrait of Madeline Albright." The program is a biographical feature of Albright, covering both her personal story as well as her career. They're primarily interested in talking to you about your relationship with her, her influence in the U.S. and abroad and any other insights or anecdotes you have from your long friendship.

The interviewer will be Gary Ponticello. He's done a number of interviews for Lifetime's *Intimate Portrait* series. The program on Madeline will air the end of October.

A biography of Sec. Albright follows.

Thanks

Biography

Madeleine Korbel Albright
U.S. Secretary of State



Madeleine Korbel Albright was nominated by President Clinton on December 5, 1996 as Secretary of State. After being unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate, she was sworn in as the 64th Secretary of State on January 23, 1997. Secretary Albright is the first female secretary of state and the highest ranking woman in the history of the U.S. government.

Prior to her appointment, Secretary Albright served as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations (presenting her credentials at the UN on February 6, 1993) and as a member of President Clinton's Cabinet and National Security Council.

Secretary Albright formerly was the President of the Center for National Policy. The Center is a non-profit research organization formed in 1981 by representatives from government, industry, labor and education. Its mandate is to promote the study and discussion of domestic and international issues.

As a Research Professor of International Affairs and Director of Women in Foreign Service Program at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service, she taught undergraduate and graduate courses in international affairs, U.S. foreign policy, Russian foreign policy, and Central and Eastern European politics, and was responsible for developing and implementing programs designed to enhance women's professional opportunities in international affairs.

From 1981 to 1982, Secretary Albright was awarded a fellowship at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars at the Smithsonian following an international competition in which she wrote about the role of the press in political changes in Poland during the early 1980's.

She also served as a Senior Fellow in Soviet and Eastern European Affairs at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, conducting research in developments and trends in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

From 1978-1981, Secretary Albright was a staff member on the National Security Council, as well as a White House staff member, where she was responsible for foreign policy legislation. From 1976-1978, she served as Chief Legislative Assistant to Senator Edmund S. Muskie.

Awarded a B.A. from Wellesley College with honors in Political Science, she studied at the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, received a Certificate from the Russian Institute at Columbia University, and her Masters and Doctorate from Columbia University's Department of Public Law and Government.

Secretary Albright is fluent in French and Czech, with good speaking and reading abilities

in Russian and Polish.

Selected writings include *Poland, the Role of the Press in Political Change* (New York: Praeger with the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, Washington D.C. 1983); *The Role of the Press in Political Change: Czechoslovakia 1968* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University 1976); and *The Soviet Diplomatic Service: Profile of an Elite* (Master's Thesis, Columbia University 1968).

Secretary Albright has three daughters.

(###)

Secretary of State | Department of State
This is an official U.S. Government source for information on the WWW. Inclusion of non-U.S. Government links does not imply endorsement of contents.

cc: Lisbon

5/30

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

HRC said she'd like to do this. All the suggested quotes are fine. Missy

TO: **HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON**

FROM: **MARGARET M. WHILLOCK** MW

66306

DATE: **Friday, May 26, 2000**

RE: **Bronson van Wyck**

Bronson van Wyck called me and asked me to deliver this fax to you. *Women's Wear Daily* is writing an article about Bronson, his mother and their event business. Louise Farr, west coast editor, would like to have a quote from you. Bronson and Mary Lynn have sent a few talking points for your review.

cell: 323-791-8872

h: 310-288-0020

870: 55229

6/13/00 WOMEN'S WEAR DAILY

VAN WYCK & VAN WYCK

May 20, 2000

Done 6/13/00
Louise Farr
WWear Daily

Mrs. Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC

Dear Mrs. Clinton,

Years ago you offered help, advice, and a good recommendation when I told you I wanted to go to Yale. I'm writing to ask you for a similar favor. For several months, *Women's Wear Daily* has been trying to do a profile on the event company that Mom and I started last year. Since we get new business through word of mouth, an article like this could really help us. We've agreed to do the profile and have recently been interviewed by *WWD*'s West Coast Editor, Louise Farr.

Louise would also like to quote some of the people who have attended our parties. Over the course of the past year, we've been able to volunteer our time, expertise, and staff to help with several events for the President and the Vice President. We also handled the production and decoration of the East Hampton Airport for your fundraiser last summer. It has been a pleasure and an honor to contribute in this way to the cause of people whom we admire so much, but particularly for you, since my first political jobs were as your photographer and then as a member of your correspondence staff.

Since you also know Mom and me outside of work, I wonder if you could share a few thoughts about us for quotation in Ms. Farr's article. I would appreciate it so much. I've attached a few talking points for your review.

Mom and I have been thinking a lot lately about ways we can help with your campaign. Your name comes up all the time because we're helping Susan and Alan Patricof with their son's wedding. We may just have to hop on your bus and travel door to door with you guys, spreading the word to all our friends who we've known over the years in New York. Everyone in my family keeps a copy of your speech about politics being the art of the possible; we are all committed to making sure that there's no turning back from where we've come over the past eight years.

I hope that you'll be able to help me with this article, and I look forward to seeing you in June in LA.

Sincerely,

Bronson

Bronson van Wyck Jr.

P.S. I think we're doing the flowers for one of your LA events!

BvW

Talking Points for quotation in *Women's Wear Daily* article on Mary Lynn van Wyck and Bronson van Wyck Jr.

Personal:

I've known Mary Lynn for twenty years, and Bill and I have watched Bronson grow up. He's one of the most exciting, intelligent, and responsible people I know.

~~On a professional level,~~ my experience with the parties they throw is that they're always unforgettable.

Mary Lynn and Bronson have excellent taste, work incredibly hard, and do whatever it takes to get the job done right.

The upcoming convention in LA:

The DNC has chosen Van Wyck & Van Wyck to handle all its convention-related events because of their proven track record, their unfailing attention to detail, their uncompromising commitment to quality, and their fantastic sense of what it takes to throw a great party. They're perfectionists who come in under budget.

A few anecdotes:

They came in at the last minute a day before a big event that Bill and I spoke at in New York. We had Wycliff Jean playing and we didn't have a stage. Bronson spent six hours on the phone tracking one down, and finally found one large enough in Springfield, Massachusetts. Bronson and Mary Lynn had it taken apart that night, loaded on a truck, and set up and ready to go for a sound check with the band the next afternoon. Forty-five minutes after our event ended, the stage was back on its way to Massachusetts and was used for a summer concert there the next afternoon.

For a political event in Los Angeles, they turned a hotel ballroom into what I imagine the old Cotton Club must have looked like. They brought in fifty or sixty palm trees, and there were birds of paradise everywhere. Mary Lynn was up on a crane hanging paper lanterns, which they filled with lightbulbs that they hand-dyed to all the colors you'd find in a beautiful beach sunset --- shades of rose, lavender, orange, and goldenrod. Bronson had a crew outside on a loading dock treating the lanterns with some sort of flame retardent foam so they'd pass the fire code before they were hung. You came into a room that had been completely transformed. Bill thought it was absolutely gorgeous.

To: Jan
From: Margaret
Call 6-6306 with questions. Thanks

VAN WYCK & VAN

May 20, 2000

Mrs. Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC

Dear Mrs. Clinton,

Years ago you offered help, advice, and a good recommendation when I told you I wanted to go to Yale. I'm writing to ask you for a similar favor. For several months, *Women's Wear Daily* has been trying to do a profile on the event company that Mom and I started last year. Since we get new business through word of mouth, an article like this could really help us. We've agreed to do the profile and have recently been interviewed by *WWD*'s West Coast Editor, Louise Farr.

Louise would also like to quote some of the people who have attended our parties. Over the course of the past year, we've been able to volunteer our time, expertise, and staff to help with several events for the President and the Vice President. We also handled the production and decoration of the East Hampton Airport for your fundraiser last summer. It has been a pleasure and an honor to contribute in this way to the cause of people whom we admire so much, but particularly for you, since my first political jobs were as your photographer and then as a member of your correspondence staff.

Since you also know Mom and me outside of work, I wonder if you could share a few thoughts about us for quotation in Ms. Farr's article. I would appreciate it so much. I've attached a few talking points for your review.

Mom and I have been thinking a lot lately about ways we can help with your campaign. Your name comes up all the time because we're helping Susan and Alan Patricof with their son's wedding. We may just have to hop on your bus and travel door to door with you guys, spreading the word to all our friends who we've known over the years in New York. Everyone in my family keeps a copy of your speech about politics being the art of the possible; we are all committed to making sure that there's no turning back from where we've come over the past eight years.

I hope that you'll be able to help me with this article, and I look forward to seeing you in June in LA.

Sincerely,

Bronson

Bronson van Wyck Jr.

P.S. I think we're doing the flowers for one of your LA events!

BvW

Retransmit 3/29/00 - 1.40 PM

Due 6/12/00

ORPHAN FOUNDATION OF AMERICA

Fax

To:	Melanne Verveer	**From:**	Eileen McCaffrey
Fax:	202 456-6244	**Pages:**	2pg ltr., PARADE Mag article & fact sheet, & cover - 6 total
Phone:		**Date:**	3/22/00
Re:		**CC:**	

The Orphan Foundation of America (OFA) was established in 1981 to assist foster youth.

To date OFA has awarded $1 million to students in 46 states. Funds come from caring individuals, civic organizations and a growing list of corporate supporters.

OFA's scholarship program is the only one of its kind in the United States.

Dear Ms. Verveer

Thank you for your attention to this matter. As per your conversation with Mame Riley, we are considering asking Congressman Tom DeLay to also be an honoree at the June dinner, but we take your direction in this matter.

Best regards

Eileen McCaffrey

P.S. Jason Fiorillo the young man featured in PARADE graduated from Stanford Law School last year and is an associate at Skaden Arps in Palo Alto, specializing in Mergers & Acquisitions.

6/12/00 ORPHAN FOUNDATION of America

128-C Church Street, NW Vienna, VA 22180-4507 • **E-Mail:** help@orphan.org
Voice: 703-281-4226 • **Fax:** 703-281-0116 • **Internet:** www.orphan.org

America's Charities Member CFC # 0472

ORPHAN FOUNDATION OF AMERICA

March 29, 2000

Dear Mrs. Clinton,

We at the Orphan Foundation of America (OFA) would like to honor you as the recipient of OFA's *Year 2000 Humanitarian Award*. This award is the highlight of our annual Awards Gala Dinner that celebrates the great potential of every young American in foster care. This year's dinner will be held in Washington on **Tuesday, June 13**, and it is a tradition that the recipient of the award be present at the gala.

We are thrilled to have you as an ally as we work to enlist the support of the American people in helping thousands of young people who have spent much of their lives in foster care make the difficult transition to adulthood and independence. These young people would be delighted to see you publicly acknowledged for all you have done on their behalf.

Many teens in foster care are now college-bound. Their focus is necessarily on the day-to-day struggles of survival, but they realize they are better off today because you have embraced them and championed their potential.

Twelve of the best and brightest teenagers in foster care are coming to Washington, DC in June as part of OFA's annual youth leadership program – the ***OLIVER Project***. They are among hundreds of outstanding foster youth who will be awarded $500,000 in scholarship money by OFA this year. During their 10-day stay in the nation's capital, these 12 youngsters will speak with Members of Congress and the media, and they will be trained as advocates and role models for younger foster children.

Their stay in Washington culminates with the Awards Gala Dinner. This year the event is being co-chaired by Congressman Jim Moran (D-VA) and Congressman Tom Davis (R-VA). Past keynote speakers at the dinner have included Attorney General Reno and Kerry Kennedy Cuomo.

We know how busy you are and that you have a myriad of commitments and responsibilities, but we would be truly honored if you could attend the dinner on June 13 to send a message of hope and support to the 20,000 young people aging out of foster care this year. We would be willing, if necessary, to change the date to June 12 or 14 to accommodate your busy schedule.

One of this year's participants is Lisa Piccolo, a junior at Hofstra University in New York, majoring in elementary education. Lisa will be a wonderful OLIVER, she was recently on the Maury Povich show discussing adoption and aging out of foster care. One of last year's OLIVER winners, David Ambroz of Vassar College, has been volunteering in your New York City campaign office and is the Dutchess County Democratic Committee's student coordinator. Another past winner, Terri Yaden, had the honor of meeting you

128-C Church Street, NW Vienna, VA 22180-4507 • **E-Mail:** help@orphan.org
Voice: 703-281-4226 • **Fax:** 703-281-0116 • **Internet:** www.orphan.org

America's Charities Member CFC # 0472

3-29-2000 9:45AM FROM ORPHAN FOUNDATION 7032810116 P.2

and Mrs. Gore at the White House when you announced that the President's budget included increased funding for Independently Living Programs. These dynamic young people, who like many of the foster youth we work with, always mention you when asked about their role models.

We would very much appreciate hearing from your office as soon as possible to let us know if you might indeed be joining us and our guests at the annual ***OLIVER Project*** Awards Dinner in June to receive OFA's Humanitarian of the Year Award.

Thank you very much for your consideration and of course for all the wonderful work you have done on behalf of American youth in foster care.

Sincerely,

Eileen McCaffrey

Eileen McCaffrey
Executive Director

ORPHAN FOUNDATION OF AMERICA

The **Orphan Foundation of America** (OFA), was founded in 1981 by an unadopted orphan. It is the only national entity solely dedicated to helping older foster youth achieve successful adulthood. **OFA's mission is to provide scholarships, teen leadership training, mentoring support, and independent living skills training to older foster youth that will enable them to become productive, self-reliant adults.**

OFA at a Glance

- Tax status: 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, all donations are tax-deductible
- *Receives no state or federal funding*
- Sources of funding are the Combined Federal Campaign and donations by private individuals, with increasing involvement from the corporate community

Scholarship Program Facts

- Started in 1986, to help local foster youth, the scholarship was offered on a national basis beginning in 1991. It is **the only program of its kind in the United States**
- ***100% of funds donated to the scholarship program go directly to youth***
- ***$1,000,000*** has been given to foster youth in 46 states since the program's inception
- Scholarships are awarded for **academic studies or technical training. Funds are unrestricted,** and may be used for books, transportation, food, housing, etc.
- The number of eligible and deserving applicants requesting funds nearly doubles each year. There is every indication the need and demand will continue to grow. OFA's goal for ***year 2000*** is to award ***$500,000***.

Initiatives

- Scholarship Sponsor Program offers donors the opportunity help a youth attend college or vocational school, and hear directly from the student how their support is making a difference
- **e-Mentors** – a national program matching volunteer mentors with OFA scholarship recipients, this rewarding one-on-one volunteer experience is designed for busy professionals who want to make a lasting difference in a young person's life.
- The ***OLIVER Project*** -- An annual summer teen leadership program in Washington, DC that trains participants to be advocates of others in foster care with Congressional leaders and elected officials
- Burtrez Morrow Low-Interest Loans for parentless girls (Jr & Sr of college only)
- Independent Living Skills Video Loan Library
- Public Information & Education source

Corporate Sponsors include:
American Airlines, American Home Products, American Renewal PAC, American Society of Assn. Professionals, AT&T, BGE, Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., Fannie Mae, Gateway, General Dynamics, Kerr-McGee Corp., Kraft Foods, Lucent Technologies, Northrop Grumman, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Telos Corporation, The Limited, The Wexler Group, UPS

February 2000 *info sheet*

128-C Church Street, NW Vienna, VA 22180-4507 • **E-Mail:** help@orphan.org
Voice: 703-281-4226 • **Fax:** 703-281-0116 • **Internet:** www.orphan.org

America's Charities Member CFC # 0472

3-29-200 9:47AM FROM ORPHAN FOUNDATION 7032810116 P.4

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1997

The Washington Post

PARADE

What happens to a foster child who becomes too old to remain in the system? Often, big problems–but there is help out there.

Nineteen—And Alone In The World



A foster child and now a success story
After "aging out" of the foster care system, Jason Fiorillo received a scholarship to attend MIT. Jason, 23, currently is a student at Stanford Law School.

TO BEGIN WITH, NO ONE SHOULD ever have to go through the system," said Calvin Russell. "All a foster child wants to is to be loved and cared for— just like a normal child." At 7, Calvin was placed in foster care and remained there until he graduated from high school, "aging out" of the system at the same time. "I was very scared," he continued, "because I knew as soon as graduation was over, I was on my own. I had nowhere to go, and that made me very angry."



Eileen McCaffrey, executive director of the Orphan Foundation of America.

"Our goal is to make sure our founder's vision lives on. He knew the world could be a kinder place to America's foster youth."

Acccording to one federal agency, about 15,000 of the 500,000 children in foster care "age out" of the system annually, like Calvin. Other foster children usually age out after their high school graduation or at 18. No longer the responsibility of the state, these young people are on their own, often without the skills they need to succeed or a support system to catch them if they fall. One study reported that 40 percent to 60 percent of these young people join the ranks of the homeless for at least a portion of their lives.

Feelings of loneliness and abandonment are common among older foster children who graduate from the system. It was just such feelings experienced by one unadopted orphan, Joseph Rivers, that prompted him to act. In 1981–17 years after he had aged out of the system–Rivers organized the Orphan Foundation of America (OFA) in Washington, D.C., to improve the quality of life of young people who, like himself, had

BY JAMES G. ZUMWALT

3-29-200 9:48AM FROM ORPHAN FOUNDATION 7032810116 P.5

- **There are 500,000 foster children in America.**
- **According to a federal agency, about [redacted]5,000 of them "age out" of the foster care system annually.**
- **One study reported that up to 40% of these young people join the ranks of the homeless for some portion of their lives.**

been in foster care. He envisioned the term "orphan" in the collective sense to include "any child who has lost the love of natural parents through death, abandonment, abuse or neglect." Rivers wanted to help them to become productive, self-reliant adults by assisting them with academic scholarships, providing workshops on independent living skills and, most important, providing recognition for their achievements. Later ordained in the Liberal Catholic Church, Rivers struggled to build OFA into a national organization for eight years, getting private funds and gathering volunteers nationwide. Sadly, he never saw his dr[redacted]finished. Father Joseph Rivers died in 1989.

R[redacted]ers' foster sister, Eileen McCaffrey, was determined to keep the organization alive. Saddened by the death of a man who had been so committed to giving to others, she assembled a group of other OFA volunteers who wished to continue Father Joseph's legacy. "Our ultimate goal," she said, "is to make sure Joseph's vision lives on. He knew the world could be a kinder place to America's foster youth."

Today OFA is going strong. From its small headquarters in Vienna, Va., OFA comprises a full-time staff of two–that includes Eileen McCaffrey, who is the executive director–and several hundred volunteers. The foundation awards undergraduate scholarships (85 of the 196 who applied last year received financial aid), has a mentor program and operates a toll-free information line. It gets no government support and must rely solely on private contributions.

Jason Fiorillo, 23, is one on the foundation's success stories. A graduate of MIT and currently a student at S[redacted]rd Law School, Jason received an OFA scholarship each of his four years at MIT. He is now a junior member of the Orphan Foundation of America's board of directors.

"If given opportunities and a little help, any foster child can blossom into a happy, healthy, successful adult," Jason Fiorillo said. "But the crucial ingredient is the willingness of individuals and organizations to reach out and support them. The lack of a blood bond does not reduce the quality or necessity of these relationships. The Orphan Foundation and its scholarships have provided a vote of confidence to me and many others."

Annually, the Orphan Foundation of America recognizes several of its scholarship recipients in a program aptly titled OLIVER, after the orphan in Charles Dickens' novel *Oliver Twist*. OLIVER is also an acronym for Orphan Leadership Initiative: Values, Education, Resources. During this week-long leadership program, outstanding young recipients are brought to Washington to meet public officials, participate in career and personal growth workshops, spend time with business and government leaders, and attend a Congressional reception and awards dinner. Eileen McCaffrey said such recognition is necessary to "create a future generation of Father Josephs," so that the students leave "with a sense of service toward others."

Today, the memory of Father Joseph Rivers and the organization he founded serve as an inspiration for these young people who are on their own for the first time in their lives:

"The OLIVER project offered me the highest degree of confidence and direction in taking control of my situation and taught me to share that confidence with other teens without parents," said Sean Jacobs, 20, a project participant in 1996 and 1997.

"Knowing there are people who believe in me and my potential helped me on my long journey," said Sherry Gonet, 22, a three-time scholarship recipient. "My will is strong and my goals just a reach away."

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
write to: Orphan Foundation of America, 380 Maple Ave.West, Sulte LL5, Dept. P, Vienna, Va. 22180
or call: 1-800-950-4673
or visit: www.orphan.org

PARADE MAGAZINE IS READ IN OVER 14 MILLION HOMES THROUGHOUT THE NATION

3-29-2009 9:50AM FROM ORPHAN FOUNDATION 7032810116 P.6

Done 6/8/00

RE: Michael Jackson's show in LA

Michael Jackson's show runs from 9 am -12 pm. The producer said HRC should call anytime within that period that works with her schedule. He can be reached through either one of the following hotline numbers: 213-389-3074 or 213-389-3186. Norma will answer the phone. She's expecting the call and will immediately connect HRC to the studio.

In case you run into any problems, the producer's name is Bonnie Gethner. Her number is 213/637-5269. The main number is 213-383-4222.

USSA — HERE'S THE INFO ON HIS SHOW. HE WAS GONE FOR THE DAY — I TALKED TO HIS PRODUCER & THEY ARE THRILLED SHE MIGHT CALL.

ERIKA

6/8/00 Michael Jackson Show

5/24/00 LifetimeTV: Intimate Portrait

ACTUALITY
Productions

05/24/00

mid July deadline
could do - hold
LA

TO: LISSA MUSCATINE

FROM: BOB PETRELLA

Dear Lissa:

Per our conversation, we produce a program for Lifetime Television, "Intimate Portrait." Our latest project is on the remarkable life of our Secretary of State Madeline Albright.

We are working on arranging several interviews to tell the story of Secretary Albright. This includes Assistant Secretary of Southeast Asian Affairs Rick Inderfurth; , her former spokesperson Jamie Rubin; and several family members. We are also working through Karen Kirchgasser of the State Department for an interview with the President.

We will be interviewing the Secretary of State.

We would be honored to include among that distinguished list, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton. The interview would be about 15 minutes, and we would do everything possible to accommodate Mrs. Clinton's schedule. Our deadline for the interview is mid-July. By the way, the show is scheduled to air in late September or early October.

I can be reached at 818-377-7200, x273, fax: 818-377-6200, or email: bobp@actualprod.com. Thank you, Lissa.

Regards,

BOB PETRELLA
ASSOCIATE PRODUCER

4730 Woodman Avenue • Suite 300 • Sherman Oaks, California 91423-2406
(818) 377-7200 • (818) 377-6200 fax

5-24-2000 10:59AM FROM ACTUALITY PRODS INC 818 379 7050 P.2

ACTUALITY
Productions

TO: NINA BLACKWELL

FROM: BOB PETRELLA

Dear Nina:

Per our conversation, we produce a program for Lifetime Television, "Intimate Portrait." Our latest project is on the remarkable life of our Secretary of State Madeline Albright.

We are working on arranging several interviews to tell the story of Secretary Albright. This includes Assistant Secretary of Southeast Asian Affairs, Actor Anthony Hopkins, Vice President Gore and several family members. We are also working through Karen Kirchgasser of the State Department for an interview with the President.

We would be honored to include among that distinguished list, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton. The interview would be about 15 minutes, and we would do everything possible to accommodate Mrs. Clinton's schedule. Our deadline for the interview is mid-July. By the way, the show is scheduled to air in late September or early October.

I can be reached at 818 377 7200, x273, fax; 818-377-6200, or email: bobp@actualprod.com. Nina, thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

BOB PETRELLA
ASSOCIATE PRODUCER

4730 Woodman Avenue • Suite 300 • Sherman Oaks, California 91423-2406
(818) 377-7200 • (818) 377-6200 fax

05/25/00

TO: LISSA MUSCATINE

FROM: BOB PETRELLA

Dear Lissa:

The reason for my writing is three-fold. One is to follow-up on the request to interview Hillary Clinton for Lifetime Television's "Intimate Portrait" on Secretary of State Madeline Albright. (I spoke with you last week and sent a request in writing the same day). Concurrently we are also producing a one-hour documentary for The History Channel on "The History of the White House," to air in late October or early November. This will coincide not only with the 2000 election, but also with the 200th anniversary of the official opening of the White House (November 1, 1800).

The show will examine the White House from an architectural, personal and historical perspective. Original footage will be mixed with archival material and interviews with distinguished experts and those who have lived and worked in the White House. The program is part of the "Save our History" series on The History Channel.

We would be honored to have Hillary Rodham Clinton included in our program, and were hoping to possibly speak to her at the same time as the Madeline Albright interview. We would do everything possible to accommodate her schedule. Together, the interview(s) would take about 15-20 minutes and we will also submit each and every question that will be asked well in advance of the interviews.

By the way, George Bush, Gerald and Betty Ford, and Jimmy and Rosalyn Carter have already agreed to an interview. The History Channel is dedicated to creating a program worthy of its subject, and feel that the Clintons are an integral part of The White House's magnificent history.

We were told that any permission to film inside the White House goes through your office. We put an initial request to White House Curator Betty Monkman in March, but have not heard back from anyone yet. We would need at least one day of taping.

I understand your and Mrs. Clinton's busy schedule, but any participation by your office would be truly appreciated—by two networks!

I can be reached at 818-377-7200, x273, fax: 818-377-6200, or e-mail: bobp@actualprod.com. Lissa, thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

BOB PETRELLA
ASSOCIATE PRODUCER

62 Schedule Cover

Press

5/12/00 Clay Eals/Seattle Interviewer

From: Clay Eals <ceals@home.com> on 05/12/2000 05:41 AM GMT

Please respond to Clay Eals <ceals@home.com>

To: first.lady@Whitehouse.GOV
cc:
Subject: Interview request for Steve Goodman biography

Done

[Connection Information]

CLIENT: 24.4.254.129[24.4.254.129]
BROWSER: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 4.5; Mac_PowerPC)
URL:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/Mail/html/Mail_First_Lady.html

[Sender Information]

PERSONAL-NAME: Clay Eals
EMAIL-ADDRESS: ceals@home.com
ORGANIZATION:
RELATIONSHIP:
STREET-ADDRESS: 1728 California Ave. S.W. #301
CITY: Seattle
STATE-PROVINCE: WA
ZIP-CODE: 98116-1958
COUNTRY: USA

- Her avatar of his music
- which of his songs are favorite
(Clay & Steve dated)
High school days -
memories of Steve G.

[Message Information]

PURPOSE: Other
TOPIC: Other
AFFILIATION: Professional
SUBJECT: Interview request for Steve Goodman biography

[Message]

Ms. Clinton:

I am a Seattle writer who, for the past year and a half, has been researching and writing a book about singer/songwriter Steve Goodman, who died of leukemia in 1984 at age 36. As you know, the two of you were classmates at Maine Township High School. I am writing to request a 20-minute interview with you about Steve.

I already have interviewed more than 160 people for the book, including such prominent performers as Jackson Browne, Randy Newman, Steve Martin, Tom Paxton, Pete Seeger, Maria Muldaur, Studs Terkel, Mimi Fariña, Tom Rush, Martin Mull, Janis Ian, Samantha Eggar, Doc Watson and Loudon Wainwright III. I would be happy to e-mail you a full list of interviewees and an 18-page overview of the project, if you wish.

I have made seven interviewing trips to various U.S. cities

in the past year and a half. This summer -- probably June 15-28 -- I plan a return trip to the New York City/Philadelphia/Washington D.C. area. Of course, I would appreciate the opportunity for an in-person interview, but I also understand that your schedule is quite busy and that a phone interview may have to suffice.

Steve Goodman was a wonderful musician and performer who is long overdue for a comprehensive biography that brings alive the man and his music. I trust that you would agree, and I will look forward to your reply. Thanks in advance for your help!

Clay Eals
Phone: 206-935-7515
E-mail: ceals@home.com

cc: PSD 3/30



3/30 - 5/10/00 Rosie O'Donnell

March 30, 2000

To: Lissa Muscatine

Hello Lissa! I am looking forward to meeting you and seeing Mrs. Clinton again on the Rosie O'Donnell Show on Monday May 8th. We will tape the show at 10am and we should be finished by 11am. The entire show will be about Foster Care, and Mrs. Clinton will stay out the entire hour with Rosie. We would love to have you at our studio by 9:30am so we can brief everyone and answer any questions. This show will air on Wed. May 10th.

Please don't hesitate to call if you need anything, and I look forward to seeing everyone on May 8th.

Sincerely,

Jeffry Culbreth
212-506-3208

30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA SUITE 800E NEWYORK, NY 10112 PH 212.506.3200 FAX 212.506.3261

March 20, 2000

Ms. Lissa Muscatine
Press Secretary for the First Lady
FAX: 202 456 7805

RE: Request for interview with Hillary Rodham Clinton

Dear Ms. Muscatine,

I am writing on behalf of Fox News correspondent Rita Cosby to request an interview with the First Lady on the topic of her event today, improving the diagnosis and treatment of children with emotional and behavioral disorders. Rita will be packaging this evening for Fox Newschannel's Special Report with Brit Hume. Segments of the interview would also likely appear on Fox's programming throughout the evening and following day, and would be distributed nationally to Fox affiliates.

Please let me know at your earliest convenience if the First Lady will be available. Rita and I can be reached at the Fox White House booth at 202 628 1742. Or you may page me at 1800 skypage, pin 189 0392. Thanks very much,

Very truly yours,

Ellen Uchimiya
Producer

campaign →
3/20/00

BBC

Erika 4/4/00

Facsimile

To:	Erica Batcheller	**Phone:**	202-456-2960
		Fax No:	202-456-7805
From:	Liz Kennedy	**Phone:**	011-44-1232-338321
	Producer "Just Jones"	**Fax No:**	011-44-1232-338341
	BBC Belfast	**E-mail:**	liz.kennedy@bbc.co.uk
Date:	4 April 2000	**No.of Pages (including this one):**	1

☐ **Urgent** ☑ **Please Reply** ☐ **Private and Confidential**

Message: Erica, re our telephone conversation this afternoon, I'd like to request that our pre-recorded interview with the First Lady, which was granted for March 17th, St Patrick's Day, but was too late for us to record on that occasion, be re-scheduled for a radio broadcast on April 14th. "Just Jones" is an afternoon phone-in and fun music programme, (top-ratings)daily on BBC Radio Ulster. On April 14th, we shall be trailing our television documentary which we made in New York and running parts of our interviews on that afternoon's radio programme. It would be fabulous to include Mrs Clinton, because of her strong community links in Belfast. Our programme includes all age-groups from children to senior citizens.

I do hope that it would be possible to pre-record something into one of our studios at the First Lady's convenience. I was previously in communication with Lissa and Jennifer about this, whilst we were in New York. Thank you for your help. Irish Ambassador Mike Sullivan is also a good friend of the programme.

Liz Kennedy.

BBC April 2000

CONFIDENTIALITY: This is a private facsimile transmission intended for the named recipient only, and its contents may be confidential. If you are not the named recipient, you must not read, copy or use the contents, or disclose them to any other person. Please notify the sender immediately by telephone that you have received the transmission in error.

To Lissa

Vox - gonna try to get him time w/ the POTUS - she should do it & she's comfortable

THE NEW YORKER

296-5840
212-[illegible]-286 5917

29 March, 2000

Dear Mrs. Clinton—

Done

I am writing a substantive and, I hope, readable evaluation of the Clinton administration for The New Yorker. The piece—pieces, perhaps—will be published in June, soon after the Third Way conference in Germany, which I plan to attend. My intent is to judge this presidency as I believe history will: according to how it helped prepare the American people—economically, socially, culturally, spiritually—for the transition from the industrial to the information age.

I know you have other business to attend to these days, but I'd hope that you would sit down with me and talk about the last eight years. You can set the ground rules. The conversation can be totally off the record. I am not, repeat NOT, interested in reviewing the so-called scandals; I don't believe historians will be very interested in them, either (except, perhaps, to wonder what all the fuss was about). I'd like to have the sort of informal conversation about ideas and policies that you and I have had in the past—perhaps we could do it in our common home county of Westchester.

Want to come over for dinner some night? (We live in Pelham.) Done properly, this might even be fun.

Best Wishes,

Joe Klein

3/29/00 The New Yorker

1156 15TH STREET, SUITE 1016 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

THE WHITE HOUSE

Patti -

F47 -

See CNN request.

Alice

TO Lissa
- Patti

Mar. 18

cc: Melanne Patti Lisa



Molly Melching <melching@telecomplus.sn>
02/04/2000 07:25:16 AM

yes - Patti

Record Type: Record

To: Alice J. Pushkar/WHO/EOP

cc:
Subject: It's been so long!!!

Dearest Alice,

Done - file

I can not believe that all this time has gone by and I have not even sent you holiday greetings! This is unlike me but I hope that you will understand that I was totally caught up in efforts to get the Sudanese and Malians here to Senegal to do our program and have been totally, totally overwhelmed with all the preparation! But hurray!! the training is now taking place in Thies! The logistics of getting everyone here (exit visas from the Sudan involved getting four women's departure approved by the courts!), entrance visas to Senegal were so difficult, etc. But it seems the gods were on our side and everything has worked out. The participants all love the program and feel that there is real hope for the same results of ending Female Genital Cutting in the Sudan and Mali. They are not only doing the training for the sessions, but are also visiting communities in Senegal to learn from the villagers' experiences.

There is often electricity in the air as we train - a feeling that it is the beginning of an historic movement for human rights at the grassroots level which will have as one result the end of FGC in these communities. But we know there will be much positive impact in other areas also. I feel so lucky to be a part of this whole process - and to witness the joy of all involved.

The Sudanese Embassy here in Dakar closely studied our program and decided to give their full support to Tostan's efforts to register in the Sudan. They have already written two letters of recommendation! They came to the airport to greet the participants upon their arrival and invited us to eat at the Embassy yesterday. Everyone there said that they feel this will help to promote better relations between the US and the Sudan and I was so thrilled when they said this as you can imagine. The Ambassador said how much he appreciated an American organization making all this effort to reach the people at the grassroots level, especially such a small organization like Tostan. They very much hope that after the initial five communities, the program will be extended throughout the country. Obviously, we emphasized the health content of the sessions and not the human rights!!!!

Alice, CNN has decided to do a program on Tostan and our efforts to end FGC in Africa. I told them that Mrs. Clinton had been very supportive of the village men and women who are spearheading this movement. I will be in the States to do fundraising from March 4 to March 22 and in Washington

3-18-00 CNN

around March 18 and was hoping to see Mrs. Clinton to bring her the yearend report for the credit program she funded (it is wonderful!!! - we are just translating it into English now) and a beautiful thank you card that all the participating village women prepared for her (with all of their signatures if you can imagine!) CNN was thrilled at the idea of filming a meeting between her and myself, so I wanted to write and see what you (Melanne and Hillary of course too) think about this possibility. At present, the issue of FGC is no longer as controversial as it was before so I think the American public would be happy to see her supporting this issue. It would help us tremendously to have her support especially at a time when so many other African countries are asking for our program and we are seeking funds to help them. It would also show how appreciative the women at the grassroots level are for her concern and support over the years. This is for the CNN program PEOPLE COUNT produced by Barbara Pyle. Should I write a more official letter to Mrs. Clinton or Melanne? Or should CNN write this letter? I would really appreciate your help in this.

Also there will be an article soon on Tostan in the Baltimore Sun - Sunday feature magazine. I will let you know the exact date. The journalist has been calling and talking for hours. I would hate to get her telephone bill!

Let me wish you a very very HAPPY NEW YEAR, late though it is!! I received a beautiful card from the Clintons and was so happy to hear from them. They are incredible people!

I hope you are doing well - hello to everyone in your office, to Melanne, Katie and of course Mrs. Clinton.

Love from Senegal!! MOLLY



Austin American-Statesman

FAX TRANSMITTAL

305 S. Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas 78704

P.O. Box 670
Austin, Texas 78767

No. of Pages ____
(including this cover sheet)

Date 2-21-00

To: Pam Ciccetti

Phone: 202-456-2369

Fax No.: 202-456-9412

From: Janet Wilson

Phone: 512-445-3668

Fax No.: 512-445-3968 512-452-5559

If you experience any problems with this fax transmittal, please contact Janet at 512-445-3668

Comments:

Liz Carpenter said you might be able to help me with this!

Thanks-

Austin American-Statesman

JANET WILSON
FEATURES REPORTER

305 S. Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas 78704

P.O. Box 670
Austin, Texas 78767

Voice: 512-445-3668
Fax: 512-445-3968

jwilson@statesman.com

Done
File

Feb. 21, 2000

First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington D.C.

RE: Lady Bird Johnson project

Dear Mrs. Clinton,

In my capacity as features and projects writer for the Austin American-Statesman, I have been asked to write an advance obituary for Lady Bird Johnson. This will include not only the news story, but a special eight-page section. While we do not anticipate publishing this material for many years, we want to be prepared for that day.

In addition to gathering quotes and favorite memories and anecdotes about Mrs. Johnson from her friends and associates, we also are asking five people important in her life to write a 500-750 word tribute. This will be published in the special commemorative section. As her hometown newspaper, we want this section to be worthy of a former first lady who has always been first in Texans' hearts.

Your unique perspective as First Lady and long-time friend will provide the depth and insight we want for this section. Would you consider writing one of the memorial tributes?

I will be working on this project in February and March. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (512) 445-3668 or through my email address: jwilson@statesman.com.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Janet Wilson

2/29/00

Yes - due end of March.

2-29-00 Austin-American Statesman



Austin American-Statesman

JANET WILSON
FEATURES REPORTER

305 S. Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas 78704

P.O. Box 670
Austin, Texas 78767

Voice: 512-445-3668
Fax: 512-445-3968

jwilson@statesman.com

Feb. 21, 2000

First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington D.C.

RE: Lady Bird Johnson project

Dear Mrs. Clinton,

In my capacity as features and projects writer for the Austin American-Statesman, I have been asked to write an advance obituary for Lady Bird Johnson. This will include not only the news story, but a special eight-page section. While we do not anticipate publishing this material for many years, we want to be prepared for that day.

In addition to gathering quotes and favorite memories and anecdotes about Mrs. Johnson from her friends and associates, we also are asking five people important in her life to write a 500-750 word tribute. This will be published in the special commemorative section. As her hometown newspaper, we want this section to be worthy of a former first lady who has always been first in Texans' hearts.

Your unique perspective as First Lady and long-time friend will provide the depth and insight we want for this section. Would you consider writing one of the memorial tributes?

I will be working on this project in February and March. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (512) 445-3668 or through my email address: jwilson@statesman.com.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Janet Wilson

ABC February, 2000

ABCNEWS PRODUCTIONS

yes done

facsimile transmittal

2/29/00 yes → cayton

To: Lissa Muscatine Fax: 202-456-7805

From: Dana Reeve Date: Feb. 29, 2000

Re: Mrs. Clinton Request Pages: 6

cc: for "LIFETIME LIVE"

☐ Urgent ☒ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☒ Please Reply ☐ Please Recycle

As requested . . .

If you have any questions at all . . . please call Dana or myself,

Marilyn Kaskel
Senior Broadcast Producer
(718) 706-3656

Thank you -

LIFETIME VIEWERSHIP OVERVIEW

(December 6, 1999)

Lifetime is currently available in over 75 million households, making it one of the most widely distributed cable networks.

Lifetime ranks 2nd among cable networks in terms of total day household rating (1.0).

Year-to-date 1999, Lifetime has attracted the largest number of women 18-49 viewers in its 15-year history, breaking records set last year.

Lifetime ranks #1 among cable networks in terms of women 18+ total day audience.

Lifetime ranks #1 among cable networks in terms of women 18-34 total day audience.

Lifetime ranks #1 among cable networks in terms of women 18-49 total day audience.

Lifetime ranks #1 among cable networks in terms of women 25-54 total day audience.

Lifetime ranks #1 among cable networks in terms of working women total day audience

Source: Nielsen, 12/28/98-11/28/99

November 1999, the third full month of Lifetime's new season, has been particularly strong:

Lifetime attracted the largest prime time and total day audiences of any November in its history.
Lifetime ranked 3rd among cable networks in terms of total day household rating (1.0).
Lifetime's prime time household viewership increased 12% over November 1998 (1,145,000 vs. 1,022,000), and total day household viewership increased 16% over November 1998 (746,000 vs. 641,000). Lifetime's women 18-49 audience grew 12% in prime time (463,000 vs. 414,000) and 22% in total day (346,000 vs. 283,000) over November 1998.

Lifetime's new season continues to increase target audience viewership. Compared to the same weeks last year:

Any Day Now (Su 10-11p) has increased the time period women 18-49 audience by 72% (854,000 vs. 497,000).
Beyond Chance (Mon 8-9p) has increased the time period women 18-49 audience by 13% (359,000 vs. 317,000).
Oh Baby (Sa 10-1030p) has increased the women 18-49 time period audience by 39% (478,000 vs. 345,000). The women 18-34 audience has increased by 53% (198,000 vs. 129,000).
Lifetime's new season-to-date vs. last year has shown a 17% increase in women 18-49 audience in prime time (524,000 vs. 449,000), and a 17% increase on a total day basis (353,000 vs. 302,000).
Once and Again (Fri 11p-12a) has increased the time period women 18-49 audience by 73%

Lifetime
Television for Women

DANA REEVE NAMED CO-HOST OF "LIFETIME LIVE"

Reeve Joins Deborah Roberts as Co-Host

ABC News - Produced Program Premieres Monday, March 6

NEW YORK, NY – February 11, 2000 – Dana Reeve has been named Co-Host of "LIFETIME LIVE," it was announced today by Dawn Tarnofsky-Ostroff, Executive Vice President, Entertainment, LIFETIME Entertainment Services.

Reeve, an accomplished actress, singer, advocate and author, joins previously announced Co-Host Deborah Roberts ("20/20"). "LIFETIME LIVE," a live, daily information show for women is produced by ABC News and will air Monday through Friday, premiering Monday, March 6 from 12 noon - 1pm, ET/PT.

"We are so thrilled to welcome Dana to 'LIFETIME LIVE,'" said Tarnofsky-Ostroff. "She has natural curiosity, a luminous personality and a genuine interest in people. These are the qualities that make her an excellent choice to co-host with Deborah."

Reeve, an actress and singer, has appeared on Broadway, Off-Broadway and regionally in a number of acclaimed productions.

On television, she has guest starred on "Law and Order," "All My Children" and "Loving." She had a recurring role on the CBS drama "Feds," and starring roles in the HBO films "Above Suspicion" and "Somebody Had to Be Benny." As a singer, she has performed on national television and at various New York venues, as well as the title song on the soundtrack of the Cable Ace award-winning HBO drama, "In the Gloaming," directed by her husband Christopher Reeve. She attended the California Institute of the Arts. MFA Program for Acting after graduating cum laude from Middlebury College.

(more)

Most know Reeve for the grace and courage she demonstrated after her husband sustained a physically disabling spinal chord injury in a riding accident in May of 1995. She was cited by "CBS This Morning" as one of America's Outstanding Women of 1995. She is also the recipient of the Visiting Nurses Association's Caregiver's Courage Award, which has since been named in her honor.

With her husband Christopher, she is actively involved in the fight for increases in medical research funding, volunteering for organizations such as The American Paralysis Foundation and the Reeve - Irvine Center for Spinal Chord Research. She is an advocate for disability rights and serves on the Board for The Christopher Reeve Paralysis Foundation, Word T.E.A.M. Sports and The National Family Caregivers Association. She also serves on the Board of the New Jersey Shakespeare Festival and is involved with the environmental organization, Renew America. She is an active public speaker and volunteer for many local and global causes.

She is a mother to three children: Will, age 7 and stepchildren Matthew, 19 and Alexandra, 15. Her book, CAREPACKAGES: Letters to Christopher Reeve From Strangers and Other Friends was published by Random House in November 1999

"LIFETIME LIVE" will be presented live from the LIFETIME Television Studios in New York City. Shelley Lewis (former executive producer, "Good Morning America") is executive producer of "LIFETIME LIVE." Chuck O'Neil is the director.

LIFETIME Television is dedicated to providing the highest quality entertainment and informational programming for women. LIFETIME is available on more than 11,000 cable systems and alternative delivery systems nationwide, serving over 75 million households. The Lifetime Movie Network is a 24 hour service launched in July 1998. Learn more about both networks on the Lifetime Online site at http://www.lifetimetv.com. LIFETIME Television and Lifetime Movie Network are part of LIFETIME entertainment Services, a 50/50 joint venture of The Hearst Corporation and The Walt Disney Company.

####

CONTACT: Paul Reader, LIFETIME Television (212) 424-7489, reader@lifetimetv.com

Lifetime
Television for Women

**LIFETIME TELEVISION ANNOUNCES "LIFETIME LIVE"
A LIVE, DAILY INFORMATION SHOW FOR WOMEN
TO PREMIERE MONDAY, MARCH 6**

**Deborah Roberts to Host from LIFETIME Studios in New York City
Program Produced by ABC News**

PASADENA, CA -- January 19, 2000 -- LIFETIME Television will premiere "LIFETIME LIVE," a live, one-hour, daily information program for women produced by ABC News, it was announced today by Carole Black, President and CEO, LIFETIME Entertainment Services.

Award-winning ABC News Correspondent Deborah Roberts ("20/20"), will host, along with an additional host, to be named at a later date. The program will be produced by ABC News and will air Monday through Friday beginning Monday, March 6 from 12Noon-1pm, ET/PT.

"Women want and need information to make their lives work better. Our intention is to have our viewers learn something from every show, something that makes their lives -- and the lives of their families -- better," said Black.

"LIFETIME LIVE" will be a dynamic, one-hour program that will present news headlines; stories of the day that will spark discussion; women's inspirational stories; the latest advice from experts on careers, childcare, finance, and family; and "New Attitudes" segments that will explore women's choices in personal and home styles.

To enhance the show's content, LIFETIME's web site (www.lifetimetv.com) will also provide ways for viewers to submit issues, nominate subjects, quiz guests or offer comments on the program, making the telecast truly interactive.

"LIFETIME LIVE" is produced by ABC News and presented live Monday through Friday from 12Noon-1pm, ET/PT from the LIFETIME Television Studios in New York City. Shelley Lewis (executive producer, "Good Morning America") is executive producer of "LIFETIME LIVE." Chuck O'Neil is the director.

-more-

LIFETIME Television is dedicated to providing the highest quality entertainment and informational programming for women. LIFETIME is available on more than 11,000 cable systems and alternative delivery systems nationwide, serving over 75 million households. The Lifetime Movie Network is a 24 hour service launched in July 1998. Learn more about both networks on the Lifetime Online site at http://www.lifetimetv.com. LIFETIME Television and Lifetime Movie Network are part of LIFETIME Entertainment Services, a 50/50 join venture of The Hearst Corporation and The Walt Disney Company.

# # #

CONTACT: Winnie Atterbury, LIFETIME (212) 424 –7396, atterbury@lifetimetv.com