

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the William J. Clinton
Presidential Library Staff.**

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Speechwriting

Series/Staff Member: Terry Edmonds

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 10984

FolderID:

Folder Title:

2/6/96 Remarks @ NGA Winter Meeting

Stack:

S

Row:

0

Section:

0

Shelf:

0

Position:

0

NIGA ~~Winter~~
Mtg Feb 6/96

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINT
NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION WINTER MEETI
WASHINGTON, DC
FEBRUARY 6, 1996

[Acknowledgements....

Thank you for the invitation to address this most important meeting.

I think we should begin by reminding ourselves that even though we face some historic choices about the direction of our country, this is a time of great potential. Because of our strong partnership and the hard work of our citizens, American is strong and growing stronger. Our economy is the healthiest it's been in three decades. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. We've created nearly 8 million new jobs. And for the third year in a row, we have had a record number of new businesses started in this country.

And perhaps most important, we are seeing Americans coming together again around our fundamental values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate and the teen pregnancy rate are all down.

We truly live in an Age of Possibility. As we move into an age of technology, information and global competition, the American people are presented with vast new opportunities. But they are also facing some stiff challenges. While more of our citizens are living better, too many of them are working harder just to keep up, and they justifiably wonder if they will be winners in this new environment.

The central challenge we face as political leaders is to give the American people the tools to make the most of their lives while keeping the American Dream alive for themselves and their children.

We know what our challenges are. A few weeks ago, I outlined them in the State of the Union: honoring the obligation we owe our children and building strong families; renewing educational opportunity so we can compete and win in the 21st century; providing economic security for families who are willing to work for it; taking back our streets from drugs, crime and gangs; protecting our environment for today and for future generations; maintaining America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace throughout the world; and reinventing government to make our democracy work better for the American people.

The question before us today is not whether we will meet these challenges, but how. Now, there are some who believe that the national government has no role to play in the lives of our citizens other than guarding our shores. They think that the

REMARKS AT
NIGA ~~Winter~~
Mtg Feb 6/96

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINT
NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION WINTER MEETI
WASHINGTON, DC
FEBRUARY 6, 1996

[Acknowledgements....

Thank you for the invitation to address this most important meeting.

I think we should begin by reminding ourselves that even though we face some historic choices about the direction of our country, this is a time of great potential. Because of our strong partnership and the hard work of our citizens, American is strong and growing stronger. Our economy is the healthiest it's been in three decades. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. We've created nearly 8 million new jobs. And for the third year in a row, we have had a record number of new businesses started in this country.

And perhaps most important, we are seeing Americans coming together again around our fundamental values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate and the teen pregnancy rate are all down.

We truly live in an Age of Possibility. As we move into an age of technology, information and global competition, the American people are presented with vast new opportunities. But they are also facing some stiff challenges. While more of our citizens are living better, too many of them are working harder just to keep up, and they justifiably wonder if they will be winners in this new environment.

The central challenge we face as political leaders is to give the American people the tools to make the most of their lives while keeping the American Dream alive for themselves and their children.

We know what our challenges are. A few weeks ago, I outlined them in the State of the Union: honoring the obligation we owe our children and building strong families; renewing educational opportunity so we can compete and win in the 21st century; providing economic security for families who are willing to work for it; taking back our streets from drugs, crime and gangs; protecting our environment for today and for future generations; maintaining America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace throughout the world; and reinventing government to make our democracy work better for the American people.

The question before us today is not whether we will meet these challenges, but how. Now, there are some who believe that the national government has no role to play in the lives of our citizens other than guarding our shores. They think that the

market will take care of everything else in between. I disagree.
this is a time of great potential. I truly believe we are living
in an Age of Possibility.

**REMARKS BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION WINTER MEETING
WASHINGTON, DC
FEBRUARY 6, 1996**

[Acknowledgements....]

Thank you for the invitation to address this most important meeting.

I think we should begin by reminding ourselves that even though we face some historic choices about the direction of our country, this is a time of great potential. Because of our strong partnership and the hard work of our citizens, America is strong and growing stronger. Our economy is the healthiest it's been in three decades. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. We've created nearly 8 million new jobs. And for the third year in a row, we have had a record number of new businesses started in this country.

And perhaps most important, we are seeing Americans coming together again around our fundamental values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate and the teen pregnancy rate are all down.

We truly live in an Age of Possibility. As we move into an age of technology, information and global competition, the American people are presented with vast new opportunities. But they are also facing some stiff challenges. While more of our citizens are living better, too many of them are working harder just to keep up, and they justifiably wonder if they will be winners in this new environment.

The central challenge we face as political leaders is to give the American people the tools to make the most of their lives while keeping the American Dream alive for themselves and their children.

We know what our challenges are. A few weeks ago, I outlined them in the State of the Union: honoring the obligation we owe our children and building strong families; renewing educational opportunity so we can compete and win in the 21st century; providing economic security for families who are willing to work for it; taking back our streets from drugs, crime and gangs; protecting our environment for today and for future generations; maintaining America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace throughout the world; and reinventing government to make our democracy work better for the American people.

The question before us today is not whether we will meet these challenges, but how. Now, there are some who believe that the national government is the enemy and has no role to play in the lives of our citizens other than guarding our shores. They

think that the market will take care of everything else in between. I disagree. And today, I want to tell you why.

The era of big government is over. It is clear from the experience of the past 30 years that centralized, one-size-fits-all government -- with top-heavy bureaucracies dispensing services from Washington, does not work and will not meet the challenges of our time.

But, we cannot go back to a time of fend for yourself. The pace of economic change is so rapid and our social fabric is under such pressure that to tell people you're on your own, is to leave people behind the train to the future pulls out the station. We must give everyone who is willing take responsibility, the opportunity to make the most of their own lives.

We need to meet these new challenges in an old-fashioned way. It is through our state and local governments, through businesses, civic groups, block associations, boys and girls clubs, church groups and schools, and yes through the national government -- all working together as a team, that we will meet our challenges. Everyone must play their part.

We need a government that There are some, in the workplace, in our religious organizations, in charitable and civic associations -- must work together in a spirit of teamwork. for the greater good. and on them in the midst of a tornado with the storm door locked. Economic change is We owe an obligation to our people to help them, help themselves. -- , we must not

OUTLINE -- NGA SPEECH

* Acknowledgements

*INTRO -
SCENE-
SETTER*

* Age of possibility- time of great potential ... they see positive trends in economy, social, etc. But a time of great change as well. Many families wondering if they will be winners in this new era. Our central challenge is to give the people the ability to make the most of their own lives in this new era.

* We know what our challenges are: renewing education, giving families economic security, strengthening families, protecting the environment, etc. The question is not whether we will meet these challenges -- we will -- but how we will meet them.

*"PUBLIC
PHILOSOPHY"*

* There are some who believe the national government should get out of the way -- that the only thing our national government should do is guard our shores, and not worry about everything in between. I disagree. Today I want to spell out why.

* The era of big government is over. It is clear that centralized, one-size fits all approaches from Washington will not enable us to meet our challenges. But we cannot go back to the era of "fend for yourself." In an economy and society such as ours, we must give our people the ability to help themselves.

* The way we will meet our challenges is to work as a team -- individuals, & state and local government, businesses, community groups, churches, schools, and, yes, federal government. [WE SHOULD ELABORATE HERE] Everyone must play their part

BUDGET

[* What is the part of the federal government? Most important thing the national government can do right now is to finish yesterday's business -- balance the budget.

- Budget deficit was a bipartisan creation. During 12 years before I took office, it skyrocketed; national debt quadrupled. One of my proudest accomplishments was when we cut deficit nearly in half. Now we must finish the job. And just as creating the deficit was a bipartisan affair, eliminating it must also be a bipartisan affair.

- I am glad that the NGA is working to bridge the gap on Medicaid and welfare]

*HOW THINGS
THE "SHOULD"
WORK //*

* But that is not the only way that the federal government can help solve problems.

- There is no one who has done more than I have to favor giving states more responsibility and more flexibility.

- examples of Clinton administration devolution - Elaine Kamarck of National Performance Review will get eg.s

*1. goals
2. steps
COPS
set goals &
resources*

- But there are national goals -- goals that go to who we are as a people -- that must be set by the entire nation. In those cases of significant import, it should not be up to the whims of a local government -- no matter how benevolent -- to meet the goal.

||- e.g. - community policing. The federal government set a goal, set up training programs and funding programs, etc.

||- (~~other e.g.s???~~)
· Medicaid
· welfare

EDUCATION

- And I would like to focus on educ. - ~~national goals~~ ^{one of our nation's great challenges}
- No one would deny that quality of our ed is central to ^{our nation's} opportunity, values, civic order, & economy. ~~Yet no one would deny that~~
It is a national concern. ~~Yet no one would deny that it is~~
~~state~~, school boards, parents, teachers, state & local govt
that ~~know best~~ should make the decisions, know best
what works.
- We have made renewing ed. a national mission.
 - Goals 2000 → - Head Start
 - Pell ↑
 - direct lending
- Now we must do more.

~~- And this is the way we must do our~~

- standards

- all Bruce - fe: charter

for the good of America.

Thank you.

ROUTING SLIP

216
Terry

DATE: 1/30/96

FROM: Stephanie Streett and Anne Walley
Deputy Assistants to the President and Directors of Scheduling

SUBJECT: Address Closing Plenary of 1996 NGA Winter Meeting

Don Baer	<u>✓</u>	Mack McLarty	<u> </u>
Erschine Bowles	<u> </u>	Leon Panetta	<u> </u>
Peg Cusack	<u> </u>	Jack Quinn	<u> </u>
Rahm Emanuel	<u> </u>	Carol Rasco	<u> </u>
Jack Gibbons	<u> </u>	Paige Reffe	<u> </u>
Laura Graham	<u>✓</u>	Patti Solis	<u> </u>
Pat Griffin	<u> </u>	Doug Sosnik	<u> </u>
Marcia Hale	<u>✓</u>	Speechwriting	<u>✓</u>
Alexis Herman	<u> </u>	G. Stephanopoulos	<u> </u>
Nancy Hemreich	<u> </u>	Todd Stern	<u> </u>
Kitty Higgins	<u> </u>	Ann Stock	<u> </u>
Harold Ickes	<u> </u>	Kim Tilley	<u> </u>
Jennifer Jose	<u>✓</u>	Jodie Torkelson	<u> </u>
Ron Klain	<u> </u>	Laura Tyson	<u> </u>
Anthony Lake	<u> </u>	Melanne Verveer	<u> </u>
Bruce Lindsey	<u> </u>	Maggie Williams	<u> </u>
Mike McCurry	<u>✓</u>	John Emerson	<u>✓</u>

FILE: Accept

2/6/96

COMMENTS: Per SS and ALW on 1/30/96

ROUTING SLIP

DATE: 12, 6, 95

FROM: Stephanie Streett and Anne Walley
Deputy Assistants to the President and Directors of Scheduling

SUBJECT: Address Closing Plenary of 1996 NGA Winter Meeting

Don Baer	☒	Mack McLarty	☐
Erskine Bowles	☐	Leon Panetta	☐
Peg Cusack	☐	Jack Quinn	☐
Rahm Emanuel	☐	Carol Rasco	☐
Jack Gibbons	☐	Paige Reffe	☐
Laura Graham	☐	Patti Solis	☐
Pat Griffin	☐	Doug Sosnik	☐
Marcia Hale	☒	Speechwriting	☒
Alexis Herman	☐	G. Stephanopoulos	☐
Nancy Hernreich	☐	Todd Stern	☐
Kitty Higgins	☐	Ann Stock	☐
Harold Ickes	☐	Kim Tilley	☐
Jennifer Jose	☒	Jodie Torkelson	☐
Ron Klain	☐	Laura Tyson	☐
Anthony Lake	☐	Melanne Verveer	☐
Bruce Lindsey	☐	Maggie Williams	☐
Mike McCurry	☒	John Emerson	☒

FILE: PENDING

COMMENTS: Per SS and AW on 12/6/95 : SS & AW to talk to Marcia

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

TODAYS DATE 12/4/95

 ACCEPT

 REGRET

 PENDING

TO: Stephanie Streett & Anne Walley
Deputy Assistants to the President
and Directors of Scheduling

FROM: Marcia Hale 
Assistant to the President for
of Intergovernmental Affairs

REQUEST: For the President to address the closing plenary session of the National
Governors' Association 1996 Winter Meeting.

PURPOSE: To deliver a speech on a major policy issue(s) to the nation's governors.
The governors will be discussing a wide range of critical topics,
including the implementation of new federal legislation, tax reform,
education, agricultural and environmental issues. This speech, which
typically receives heavy media coverage, provides an excellent
opportunity for the President to announce a major initiative that would
be supported by the Governors.

BACKGROUND: It is traditional for the President to address the closing plenary session
at NGA meetings. Usually, a Republican leader will address the closing
plenary session before the President.

PREVIOUS: The President has addressed the closing plenary session at each NGA
PARTICIPATION meeting since he became President. The last such speech was at the
NGA Summer Meeting, held in Burlington, Vt. on July 31, 1995.

DATE & TIME: Tuesday, February 6, 1996

DURATION: 30 minute speech; optional Q & A

LOCATION: J.W. Marriott, Washington, D.C.

PARTICIPANTS: The President, the Governors attending 1995 NGA Winter Meeting

REMARKS: Provided by speechwriters

**MEDIA
COVERAGE:**

Open press

**RECOMMENDED
BY:**

Marcia Hale
John Emerson

CONTACT:

Lawton Jordan (6-7060)
Bill Daley (6-6581)

Talking Points
NGA Resolution on Welfare Reform
February 6, 1996

As the President said in his speech to the NGA this morning, real welfare reform must require work, promote family and responsibility, and protect children. The governors' resolution reinforces what the President has said all along -- that the conference report he vetoed fell short of real welfare reform, and must be improved.

The Administration is pleased with the NGA's recommendations in several areas of promoting work and protecting children -- substantial increase in child care funds, a better contingency fund, a substantial performance bonus, equal treatment for recipients, reductions in the overall level of savings, provisions on SSI children's disability programs, increasing the hardship exemption, improving the work requirements, and making the family cap a state option. The Administration continues to have serious concerns about other important issues - including child welfare, Food Stamps, school lunch, maintenance-of-effort, and benefits for legal immigrants.

The NGA resolution suggests valuable improvements over the conference report and the Senate bill in several key areas that are priorities for the President:

Child Care -- The NGA resolution calls for adding \$4 billion for child care to the conference report, which is \$5 billion more than the Senate bill. Senator Dole acknowledged the need for more child care money in his speech to the NGA this morning. The Administration believes, however, that states should match this additional child care funding, and maintain current quality standards.

Contingency Fund -- The NGA called for doubling the contingency fund to \$2 billion, and providing an additional trigger based on Food Stamps population. The Administration has made additional suggestions to strengthen the countercyclical mechanism of this provision.

Performance Bonus -- The NGA endorsed additional funding for a 5% performance bonus to reward states that meet the work requirements -- a key provision that the President has long championed and that was a centerpiece of the Daschle-Breaux-Mikulski bill. This is a significant improvement over both the conference report and the Senate bill.

Equal Treatment -- The NGA resolution includes an important requirement that was not in either the conference report or the Senate bill, to ensure that states set forth objective criteria for the delivery of benefits and fair and equitable treatment.

SSI Disabled Children -- The NGA resolution adopts the SSI children provisions of the Senate bill, but moves back the effective date a year, to 1998.

The NGA resolution recommends other important changes that are similar to the Senate bill:

Work Requirements -- The NGA resolution adopts work requirements and state flexibility similar to the Senate bill, which will somewhat reduce state costs of running work programs.

Hardship Exemption -- The NGA resolution endorses the 20% hardship exemption in the Senate bill for recipients who reach the five-year limit. The conference report had reduced this provision to 15%.

Family Cap -- The NGA resolution endorses the Administration policy that states should decide for themselves whether to limit benefits for additional children born to parents on welfare. Like the Senate bill, the NGA would make the family cap a state option -- rather than a mandatory provision with an opt-out, as the conference report included.

Overall Savings -- The NGA resolution cuts more deeply into Food Stamps than the Administration's balanced budget plan -- at levels deeper than the Senate bill. Because the NGA resolution calls for additional spending on child care, the contingency fund, and the performance bonus, its overall net savings are slightly below the Senate bill but still considerably higher than the Administration's balanced budget plan.

The Administration continues to have serious reservations about some other provisions in the NGA resolution:

Child Welfare -- The Administration has strongly opposed block granting child welfare. The Senate bill maintained current law in this area. The NGA resolution would allow states the option to block grant certain programs.

Food Stamps -- The NGA resolution fails to criticize certain Food Stamp provisions of the conference report which the Administration has strongly opposed, including the state option to block grant Food Stamps and the arbitrary cutoff of able-bodied childless adults.

School Lunch -- The Administration has strongly opposed block granting the school lunch program. The NGA resolution would maintain the entitlement for children, but block grant administrative costs.

Maintenance-of-Effort -- The NGA resolution is silent on the issue of maintenance-of-effort. The Administration strongly favors the Senate provision of 80% maintenance-of-effort, rather than the 75% requirement in the conference report. In addition, the Administration opposes the Conference provisions that enable states to transfer funds out of the block grant for other purposes.

Immigrants -- The NGA resolution is silent on the question of benefits for legal immigrants. The Administration's balanced budget plan requires deeming until citizenship. The Administration strongly opposes the level of immigrant cuts in the conference report and

the Senate bill.

Medicaid -- While details have not yet been provided, the NGA resolution on Medicaid suggests that welfare recipients should continue to be guaranteed health coverage. The Senate bill maintains this link between welfare and medicaid, but the Conference report broke it.

**REMARKS BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
TOAST AT THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION ANNUAL DINNER
THE WHITE HOUSE
FEBRUARY 4, 1996**

Governor and Mrs. Thompson, Governor and Mrs. Miller, ladies and gentlemen...Hillary and I take great pleasure in welcoming you to the White House. I always look forward to this evening. As you know, I have a deep appreciation and respect for governors and the work you do. I guess it's only natural, because before I was President Clinton, I was Governor Clinton, and I count that experience as one of the great blessings of my life.

You have come to Washington at a time of great promise. America is strong and growing stronger. Our mission is to make the American Dream a reality for all who are willing to work for it and to continue to come together around our basic values.

How do we get there? By working together. As I said in the State of the Union, the era of big government is over. I am reminded of an ancient Chinese proverb which says, "Governing a large country is like frying a small fish. You spoil it with too much poking." That's why I have challenged all of us in Washington to continue our efforts to reinvent government and make our democracy work better for the American people. For the past three years we have been doing just that. Tonight, our Federal government is 200,000 employees smaller than the day I took office. Our government is the smallest it's been in 30 years; states are assuming more responsibility -- and that is good.

But as we shrink government, we can't go back to the era where we simply tell people: Fend for yourselves. We have to go forward to the era of working together as a community, a team, as one America. We may be 50 states, but thank God, we are still the United States of America.

So, as we go about our work these next few days, let us do so in the spirit of unity that has made this country the envy of the world for more than 200 years. The disagreements we may have are very important. They are a part of the essential debate America must have as we move into a new era. But, we must always conduct that debate with a sense of humility. We must reach across the lines that divide us to find common ground.

Brother and sister governors, I pledge to you tonight to continue our partnership for an even greater America as we enter the 21st century -- the age of possibility.

I'd like to propose a toast to the Chair of the National Governors' Association, to his fine wife, Sue Ann, and to all the governors and their spouses tonight. May we always work in unity

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 1, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: LEON PANETTA

FROM: MICHAEL WALDMAN
DON BAER
MARCIA HALE

SUBJECT: NGA MESSAGE EVENTS

David -

Attached is the
draft of - ed we
discussed.

Vicki

As you know, the annual NGA meeting will take place from Sunday to Tuesday. The public events on Monday and Tuesday will be your major public statement for those days. In addition, because of the political season and because Sen. Dole will appear on the same program, this will be viewed by the press through the post State of the Union/ pre-primaries lens, rather than as a traditional NGA meeting. This is what we recommend:

Monday: Opening statement at roundtable. You make a 5 Minute opening statement. This is the day that your FY 1997 budget will be released.

Remarks:

- We must balance the budget. I am introducing a budget plan that will point us toward balancing the budget in 7 years. It's time for Congress to come back to the table, and at the very least enact the savings common to both our plans. That will enable us to balance the budget.
- Uncertainty about the budget is making it very hard for states to plan their finances.
- We can balance the budget in a way that protects our values on welfare reform, Medicaid, and education and training, which will be the topics of the subsequent discussion.

Tuesday: Speech to NGA plenary session. You will speak at 11:00AM, shortly after Senator Dole's address. The press will naturally see this as "State-of-the-Union, Round 2," and as an opportunity for Dole to repair some of the damage from last week's matchup.

Remarks: We recommend that your speech be thematic rather than heavily detail-laden.

- Age of Possibility/challenges. Reprising the themes of the State-of-the-Union, and implicitly drawing a contrast with the "fend for yourself" philosophy of the Republicans. "Some would say that national challenges are not susceptible to national action. That we should turn everything over to the states, and get out of the way. I disagree. National problems must be met by all of us, together, -- national and state government, schools, churches, etc., working as partners -- national standards and flexible local means to meet the standards. That is how we will give our children the future they deserve."

- Debt limit. You should explicitly call on the Republican Congress to act responsibly, work with you to balance the budget, and stop playing games with the full-faith-and-credit of the United States. No governor would consciously put at risk the good name of his state. And Congress should come back to the table and work with me to enact a balanced budget. We already have more than enough cuts in common to get the job done, etc.

- Education -- challenge to states on school choice/charter schools. Our greatest challenge is to give our people the opportunity to make the most of their own lives in a time of great change. The key to this is education -- renewing education at all levels, and making higher education available to everyone who will work hard.

- what we've done
- the federal government has a role -- but the states must do their part
- challenge all 50 states to pass charter school laws to enable teachers and parents to create schools that will be judged by performance.
- we will do our part: my budget establishes a charter schools/school choice fund, etc.

Other remarks/speakers:

- You will also speak at the **Democratic Governors Association** dinner on Monday night, as well as deliver a toast to the NGA dinner on Sunday night.
- Leon Panetta will be speaking on the budget on Monday afternoon, and both Leon and the Vice-President will speak at separate sessions of the Democratic governors. They will have the opportunity to cover detailed ground on the budget and other matters that you will not have time to address.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(San Diego, California)

For Immediate Release
1995

September 22,

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO COMMUNITY OF O'FARRELL COMMUNITY SCHOOL

O'Farrell Community School
San Diego, California

4:39 P.M. PDT

THE PRESIDENT: Let's give Henry Walker another hand. Didn't he do a great job? (Applause.) I sort of want him to keep on talking; I was having a good time. (Laughter.)

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the warm welcome. Thank you, Congressman Filner. Thank you, Dr. Bertha Pendleton, for doing such a good job with this school district. Thank you, Dr. Bob Stein, the O'Farrell Chief Educational Officer. I want to say a special words of thanks to a group of parents and teachers and students and others who help to make this school successful, who met with me for about a half an hour before we came out here to talk about what they were doing. I'd like to ask them to stand up and be recognized. Let's give them a hand. They gave me an education today. (Applause.)

I want to say to all of you how grateful I am to this school and to all the other schools here present for believing in our children. I believe in zero tolerance, and I thank you for that. I'm trying to get every place in the country to adopt that policy. And, most importantly, I believe in the high expectations that are given to all children in this school, because all of our children can learn, and we should expect them to and help them to. (Applause.)

I want you to know why I came here today. You know, I like San Diego, and I came here to sign the Goals 2000 bill, and I like to be in a community that cares about education. But I wanted to come to this school today for a particular reason, and that is because O'Farrell is organized as a charter school. They call it a family. (Applause.) And as a school organized in this way, it's freed a lot of the rules and regulations that keep some of our schools all across America from designing their own ways of educating children. They also are held accountable for results, and they do a good job.

I want the American people to see this because there are too many

MORE

people in America that not only don't have high expectations of our students, they don't have high expectations of our schools anymore, and they don't understand how much good can be done in a good school when people are working together and they believe in their children and the promise of their future. (Applause.)

I have been promoting schools that are organized and operated like this school for more than three years now, and I asked the United States Congress to appropriate just a little money as a part of the Goals 2000 program Congressman Filner referred to, to give schools all across America just a little start-up money if they wanted to become schools that were independent, that were energized, that were high expectation schools like O'Farrell.

Today, I'm pleased to say that the Department of Education has granted another \$6 million to open schools just like this one in 11 states across our country, including more schools in the State of California. (Applause.)

America has to be serious about education. We have to be serious about education if we want to have a strong economy, if we want these young people to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities. If we really believe that our obligation to our children is to give them the ability to make the most of their own lives in the world we are living in, that means education, education, education. We must face it, embrace it, and be glad about it. (Applause.)

I wouldn't be President of the United States today if it weren't for the educational opportunities I had. I was raised by my grandparents until I was four, boys and girls, and my grandfather left school after the 6th grade. But because I had a chance to go to a good school, I had a chance to get scholarships and loans and jobs to go to college, I had a chance to become President. None of it would have happened if it hadn't been for teachers like your teachers, parents like your parents, community leaders like your community leaders. It means everything, and it is more important today than it even was when I was your age. We have to give the children of this country a chance to get a good education. (Applause.)

There are a lot of things that have to be done here school by school that a President can't do much about. Teaching our young people to believe in themselves, organizing a system for high expectations and zero tolerance of destructive conduct, pointing out that freedom and opportunity requires a lot of personal responsibility.

But I'll tell you something -- there are a lot of things that we in public office can do to help. And I am tired of people in public life pointing the fingers and others and saying, you should do better, and then running away from their own responsibilities to education. That's not the example we should be setting for our children in this country. (Applause.)

Just yesterday in San Francisco, I announced a breakthrough that will enable by the year 2000 every classroom in America to be connected for computers if we do what people in California have promised to do -- business leaders -- which is to wire every school in California for the Internet, and to do it soon. (Applause.)

This is the kind of thing we have to do together. But you heard Dr. Pendleton talk about the money that these schools get from the national government to fight for better education for these children. Don't you let anyone convince you that this money cannot be well spent to improve education. And don't you let anyone convince you that we have to cut out this money to balance the federal budget. It is not true. (Applause.)

I favor balancing the federal budget, and I have given Congress a plan to do it. I hate the fact that we were up to our ears in debt when I took office. We had a deficit of \$290 billion a year when I became President, and in three years we've cut it from \$290 billion to \$160 billion. I want to go all the way and balance the budget. (Applause.)

But why are we balancing the budget? Because we care about our children. We want to lift the burden of debt off of them. We want to have a stronger economy for them. We want America to work better. Those are our values. If those are our values, we cannot balance the budget because we care about our children. We want to lift the burden off of them. We want to have a stronger economy for them. We want America to work better. Those are our values. If those are our values, we cannot balance the budget by destroying our commitment to education. Otherwise, we won't help our children and we won't strengthen our economy. So I say to you my fellow Americans, we can balance the budget and increase our investment in education. And that is exactly what we ought to do. (Applause.)

We need to make sure our schools are safe and drug-free. We need to make sure when little children show up for school that they've been given a chance to get off to a good start. We need to make

sure that schools that don't have the resources on their own can still have smaller classes, and have technology, and have the ability to have those higher expectations that were talked about here today. And your national government has an obligation to help you do that.

That is what I am fighting for in Washington today. The right way to balance the budget is to balance the budget while keeping our commitments and our values to the future of our children intact. That's what I am fighting for. You heard Congressman Filner talk about it.

The alternative budget in Washington today proposed by the congressional majority would undermine dramatically our commitment to education. It would cut back on our ability to promote charter schools like this one. It would cut back on our ability to help with smaller classes and more computers. It would cut back on our ability to help assure safe and drug-free schools. It would cut back on our ability to make sure little kids from poor families show up ready to learn. It would cut back on the availability of scholarships to go to college and on availability of low-cost college loans.

Now, California has seen what happens when you cut back on the availability of people to go to college. You have a decline in enrollment in your colleges because of the cost. I want to lower the cost and increase the enrollment of ordinary Americans in a college education. (Applause.)

I come here to San Diego to say to you that when things are really important in America, we ought to act like a family the way the O'Farrell family works. (Applause.)

Education is our meal ticket to the future. Let me tell you something, folks: There's not a country in the world any better positioned for the next century, for the global economy, for the rapid movement of people and money and ideas and technology around the world. No one is better suited for that than the United States because we are the greatest country that has people from everywhere in our country and in our communities.

Look around here today and you can see that. (Applause.) Look around here and you can -- for the rapid movement of people and money and ideas and technology around the world -- no one is better suited for that than the United States, because we are the

MORE

greatest country that has people from everywhere in our country and in our communities. Look around here today and you can see that. (Applause.) Look around here and you can see that.

But if we are going to fulfill our potential as a nation, these children have to fulfill their potential -- every one of them. We have to believe in what they can become. We have to believe they can learn, we have to insist that they do learn, we have to help them to learn. And they can learn a very great deal. We have to believe that our schools can work. And, yes, we've got to embrace all these new ideas like charter schools, but we also have to invest in them.

Before I came out here, the students were given a chance to ask me questions, and one of the students who is sitting right back there stood up and said, if we really care about education, how come we pay professional athletes who never get off the bench 10 times as much as the schoolteachers make? (Applause.)

This is not about money. It is about our values. It's about what kind of people we are. If you believe that every person should be responsible, that every person should be a good citizen, but that every person should have the opportunity to make the most of his or her own life, then you are required to say we have obligations to each other. We owe something to each other.

Yes, we can put a bunch of our money into entertainment and let those folks make a lot, but we have to invest some of our money where our values are, where our future lies, where everybody can come together.

This should not be a partisan political deal. America's existence as a great, free, democracy depends upon developing the ability of all the children who are here and the people they represent all over America. So I ask you -- I ask you -- (applause) -- without regard to your political party, your income, what you do for a living, your ethnic background -- if you believe this, if you believe this, if you believe that one of these little kids could grow up to be President of the United States with a good education, if you believe that all of these little children can assure that America will remain the strongest, greatest country in the world, if you believe it is not an accident that people here have gotten together and done something that is the envy of America in education, then I plead with you -- send a message to the Congress that it shouldn't be a matter of partisan politics, we

MORE

must balance the budget and invest in education to keep faith with the future of our children and the future of America.

Thank you, and God bless you all.
(Applause.)

END

4:52 P.M. PDT

celebrating the San Francisco

Can you hear me?
Mr. President, I

ce to hear your

you so much, sir.
to say to you and
l to all your won-
he whole season
and I think the
t the 49ers is, I
where in America
you've had. And
a real tribute to
he players in the
way you've con-
happy and proud

Mr. President, I
taking this time,
sy schedule. And
I thank you so
y heart.

you. Congratula-

ou very much.

seeing George
good.

10 p.m. from the
e. In his remarks,
n Francisco 49ers
ad coach George
men Policy.

l Governors'

nt to thank John
apin Carpenter.
know how hard
you're hoarse.

It doesn't get any better than this. You were wonderful. We thank you. It's been wonderful for Hillary and for me to have all of you here. There will be music out in the foyer and a little dancing if you have a little of that spirit.

I will say this: For all of us who come from small towns all across America, I wish I had a nickel for every time I drove through that town you sang about tonight. [Laughter]

Thank you all. God bless you, and good night.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:48 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to singer Mary Chapin Carpenter and her accompanists, John Jennings and Jonathan Carroll.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association Meeting

January 30, 1995

Good morning. First, I want to welcome you back to the White House. For those of you who were here last night, Hillary and I enjoyed having you; it was a great dinner and we enjoyed the conversation and the entertainment and the fellowship.

There are two or three things I'd like to speak about this morning before turning the microphone over to Governor Dean and Governor Thompson and the Vice President. First, let me thank the executive committee for its vote yesterday on our stabilization measure for Mexico. And let me urge the NGA as a whole to support that executive committee recommendation.

The United States has a lot at stake in Mexico. We have hundreds of thousands of jobs that are tied to the success of the Mexican economy. It is now our third largest trading partner—several billions of dollars a year. Our future cooperation and our ability to manage some very significant immigration problems could be affected by what is going on there, and the efforts that we are making to cooperate on the drug issue could obviously be affected by what is going on there.

I want to emphasize that the stabilization initiative is not a gift, not a loan, not a bailout; it is a loan guarantee. We are cosigning a note. We'll have good collateral. We're doing

it because it's in the interest of the United States. I worked on it extensively this weekend, and I realize that it's not politically popular back home, it's a rather complex issue, but it is clearly in the interest of American workers, American businesses, and the United States as a whole. So I thank the executive committee for your vote, and I hope the NGA as a whole will follow the recommendation of the executive committee.

The second thing I'd like to talk about is, very briefly, is the commitment that I made 2 years ago to have a better, stronger partnership with the States, to regulate less, to empower more, to try to push more responsibilities down to the State and local level. The Vice President will say a little more about that, and then tomorrow at the NGA I'll have a chance to speak in greater detail.

But we have worked not simply to reduce the size of the Federal Government, although we have by over 100,000 already; not just to reduce the burden of regulation, although we have in banking and interstate trucking and number of other areas; not just to reduce the cost, although we did, last year was the first time in 25 years when the Congress voted to reduce both domestic and defense spending, obviously, except for Social Security and the health care programs, but also to try to move responsibility to the States.

In the last 2 years, our administration, for example, granted more waivers in the area of health care and welfare reform than in the previous 12 years combined. And we want to do more of that. We also have worked very hard to try to help work through problems that have existed in the past with specific governmental agencies, and we want to do more of that. And as I said, the Vice President will have more to say about that.

We are strongly supporting the move to get unfunded mandates legislation passed in the Congress and are encouraged by the work that was done in the United States Senate where, as I remember, the bill passed 86-10 last week, after a really open and honest discussion of all appropriate amendments. The legislation is now moving through the House. I think there are about 100 amendments pending, but I think they will move

through it in a fairly expeditious way, just as the Senate did.

With regard to the balanced budget amendment, it has passed the House; it is now in the Senate. I will say again what I've said all along here. It seems to me that the State legislators, the people, and the Governors have a right to know what is entailed in the time line if the effort is made. And I would hope that we would continue to take that right-to-know position. You have a right to know what happens. You have a right to know what happens if we protect Social Security. You have a right to know what happens if we protect Social Security and Medicare. You have a right to know what happens in the details of this.

We have cut \$600 billion-plus off this deficit. I am going to give a budget in early February to the Congress which will take over \$140 billion more in cuts. We have eliminated 100 programs; we have cut hundreds and hundreds of others. I want to keep bringing this deficit down, but I think we ought to all go into a change in the fundamental document of this country with our eyes wide open and knowing what the consequences are.

The third thing I'd like to talk about, briefly, is welfare reform. For those of you who were present at the Saturday meeting, I want to thank you again for being there. It reminded me very much of the process that we went through in 1987 and 1988 when we had a Republican President and a Democratic Congress and a bipartisan group of Governors. And we worked in '87 and '88 toward the passage of the Family Support Act.

I thought it worked then; I think it will work now, if we all work in good faith. We agreed that welfare has to be reformed, that the most important thing is to change it from a system which fosters dependence to one that fosters work and independence, that we ought to support education where it is needed, and that we ought to support responsible parenting.

We agreed that, as we try to put more of the operational decisions back to the State and local level, there must be some strong national steps taken on child support enforcement, because so many of those orders

are multi-State in their impact and because we are doing such a bad job as a country now in collecting child support which should properly be paid to children.

We agreed that there must be more State and local flexibility; we agreed that there ought to be an effort to reduce teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock pregnancy, generally. Governor Carper gave a very moving presentation of what is going on in Delaware, and as you know, I announced in my State of the Union that we would make a national effort on this which we'll have more to say about in the next few days.

We did not reach final agreement on the questions of how the partnership should be structured, what the implications of a block grant would be, and what, in specific terms, the national interest is in preserving the welfare of the children of this country. I have to say that I basically am in favor, as I always have been, of maximum flexibility for the States. I was a strong supporter of the Community Development Block Grant Program, for example, when I served as a Governor. But we do have a national interest in protecting the welfare and the possibilities of our children.

In 1985, for the very first time in our history, at least since we've been keeping such statistics, the elderly became less poor than the rest of the population because of the cost-of-living adjustments and Social Security, because of supplemental security income, because of Medicare. That is something I think we're all proud of.

The flip side of that is that the poverty population itself has stayed the same, or has actually increased, and almost all the poor now are little children and their not very well educated parents, by and large. So we do have a national interest in the welfare of these children and in changing the welfare system so that it promotes responsibility and lifts people up without punishing children who were not the cause of the problems that they face in life. That, it seems to me, is the dividing line that we have to be animated by as we try to forge this new partnership. I'm excited about it; I think we can do it.

We must pass welfare reform this year, and it has got to be real, meaningful, different, and better and broader than anything we've

ever done before a great deal of else, out of a sense that no one has these difficult reality of our families.

So I am once again thank you again resolution on M with you to further the State and that we must pass what it ought to be the results.

NOTE: The President East Room at the he referred to Governor Clinton.

Remarks and Reporters Prior President Clinton January 30, 1995

The President
a real pleasure at the United States. Snegur here and Moldova. They have commitment to reform. And we have by the work they have made. my visit with him.

I also want to the nice Moldova which was very much White House.

Mexican Loan

Q. Mr. President bailout bill ready bolsa are dropping

The President
worked yesterday and secured again commitment of the in both Houses to it. at more strength.

I think... The time is

fact and because
job as a country
ort which should

st be more State
agreed that there
duce teen preg-
pregnancy, gen-
e a very moving
on in Delaware,
ced in my State
make a national
ave more to say

reement on the
rship should be
tions of a block
n specific terms,
serving the wel-
country. I have
avor, as I always
exibility for the
ter of the Com-
Grant Program,
as a Governor.
erest in protect-
ibilities of our

time in our his-
n keeping such
e less poor than
ause of the cost-
ial Security, be-
ity income, be-
omething I think

at the poverty
ne same, or has
st all the poor
eir not very well
rge. So we do
the welfare of
ng the welfare
ponsibility and
shing children
problems that
is to me, is the
o be animated
w partnership.
we can do it.
n this year, and
gful, different,
anything we've

ever done before. And it ought to give you a great deal of flexibility out of—if nothing else, out of a sense of sheer simple humility that no one has all the answers to deal with these difficult riddles that threaten the stability of our families and the future of our kids.

So I am encouraged by where we are. I thank you again for the executive committee resolution on Mexico. We are going to work with you to further the partnership between the States and the Federal Government. And we must pass welfare reform this year, but it ought to be the right kind with the right results.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:58 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Tommy G. Thompson of Wisconsin.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Mircea Snegur of Moldova January 30, 1995

The President. Let me say, first of all, it's a real pleasure and an honor for me and for the United States to welcome President Snegur here and the whole delegation from Moldova. They have been a real model of commitment to democracy and to economic reform. And we have been deeply impressed by the work they have done, the progress they have made. And I'm looking forward to my visit with him.

I also want to thank him for sending me the nice Moldovan wine last Christmas, which was very much appreciated here at the White House.

Mexican Loan Guarantees

Q. Mr. President, will you have a Mexico bailout bill ready today? The peso and the bolsa are dropping sharply.

The President. We certainly hope so. I worked yesterday for several hours on this and secured again the reaffirmation of the commitment of the leadership of both parties in both Houses to go forward. And we have put out more strong statements today about it.

I think we just—this is something we have to do. The time is not a friendly factor, and

I realize that the Congress had other important measures to debate last week, the unfunded mandates legislation in the Senate, the balanced budget amendment in the House. But this can be resolved fairly quickly, and it needs to be.

Q. Mr. President, there's a suggestion by some leaders that support is eroding for the package rather than increasing. Do you—is that the case?

The President. Well, I think it will increase again once people look at the facts, if we get a bill out there. We need to—the bill needs to go in. And Secretary Rubin has, and others, have negotiated in great detail and in good faith with the appropriate leaders in the Congress, the committee chairs and others. And I think they're ready for a bill to go forward. And it's time to get it in and go forward.

Q. What do you think of critics who say it's a bailout for Wall Street?

The President. It isn't a bailout for Wall Street. There are—first of all, helping the economy stay strong down there is more important than anything else for our working people and our businesses on Main Street that are doing such business in Mexico. If they want to continue to grow and to have that as a market, we can't let the financial markets, in effect, collapse the Mexican political and economic structure. Secondly, there are a lot of pension plans and ordinary Americans that have their investments tied up there. Thirdly, we have immigration and narcotics cooperation and control issues here involved. This is something for ordinary Americans. It's very much in our interest, and we don't want to let it spread to other countries and, indeed, to developing countries throughout the world. We're trying to promote countries that are moving toward market reforms and moving toward democracy, not to undermine them. And it's very much in our personal interest to do so. It is not a Wall Street bailout, it's in America's interest to build the kind of future we want.

Q. Are you optimistic you'll get a package this week or next?

The President. I'm optimistic that we'll pass it because more often than not in very difficult issues the Congress does the right thing. And we've got a new and different

land. I would urge you to read it. But it won't surprise any of you because you know how the system works today.

Again, I implore you to take this debate to Congress, get beyond the rhetoric, get beyond the ideology, talk to people in the Congress about the American people and how the American health care system affects them. That is the only way we can work through the real problems as opposed to the imagined one.

One distinguished Member of the House of Representatives who represents a district with a wonderful teaching hospital and who has been required by virtue of his membership—his constituency—to become an expert on health policy over the years, read our plan the other day, and he said, "It's the only one that really takes account of so many different problems that most people don't even know about. But I have no idea how to get my colleagues in the Congress to take this issue seriously and spend all the time it would take to absorb it all."

You can do that. Every Member of Congress has a lot of hospitals in his or her district. Every Member of Congress basically cares a lot about health care. And you can come to this debate with a perspective that is not ideological, not partisan, has no ax to grind, doesn't care who wins except the American people and the American health care system. That's what you can bring to this debate.

So I would ask you, at a time when some say we just need a little tinkering and others say there are ideological barriers to changing it, I just want to say that Dick Davidson, your president, in my view, said it as well as it could be said last December. He said, "Comprehensive reform is what the American people are asking us to do. To do nothing, or worse, to fall back on simplistic solutions, only postpones and complicates our task." And that's the truth.

Let us stand together for the health care of the American people. We have a chance finally for the first time in decades to do this right. You know what needs to be done. I pledge to you an open door, a listening ear, a firm partnership. Let's go out there and solve this problem for the American people.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: President spoke at 10:18 a.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Dick Davidson, president, American Hospital Association, and Carolyn Roberts, chairman-elect, American Hospital Association Board of Trustees.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association

February 1, 1994

Thank you very much. If anyone ever asks you what do Carroll Campbell and Bill Clinton have in common, you could say they have the same throat disease. [Laughter] He's doing better today than he was yesterday. I'm doing slightly worse. The good news is, you get a shorter speech.

I want to thank you all for being here and for your common concerns. Yesterday we had a good meeting and especially, I thought, a very good discussion about the problem of crime in our country and the crime bill, the necessity to put more well-trained police officers on our streets and to take repeat violent criminals off the streets forever but also the necessity to be smart about the crime bill, to do things that make sense to you and to your law enforcement officials.

Today, I want to talk a little bit about two other fundamental challenges that we face: health care reform and welfare reform. They are linked inextricably to each other. And in order to meet these challenges, we will have to have an open and honest partnership both in passing the laws and, perhaps even more important, in implementing them.

We began our partnership, at least with me in this new job, about a year ago today when we had a very long and fruitful meeting at the White House. I think it ran in excess of 3 hours. That meeting resulted, among other things, in the approval of every major waiver for State health care reform that you have requested. There have been 5 of them and about 90 smaller waivers to enable different changes to be made at the State level. In addition to that, we've now granted waivers to nine States in the area of welfare reform.

I do believe the States are the laboratories of democracy. I do believe that where people are charged with solving the real problems of real people, reality and truth in politics

0:18 p.m. at the
arks, he referred
merican Hospital
chairman-elect
board of Trustees.

Governors'

...er asks
and Bill Clin-
I say they have
daughter] He's
yesterday. I'm
d news is, you

being here and
sterday we had
y, I thought, a
he problem of
crime bill, the
ed police offi-
repeat violent
er but also the
he crime bill,
to you and to

bit about two
that we face:
reform. They
other. And in
we will have
tnership both
os even more
n.

at least with
ar ago today
itful meeting
ran in excess
ulted, among
every major
orm that you
n 5 of them
enable dif-
e State level.
ranted waiv-
welfare re-

laboratories
here people
al problems
in politics

often is more likely to give way to making progress.

Last August you all said, Democrats and Republicans alike, that our health care system is in crisis. In the last several days we've had a big linguistic battle in Washington about whether we have a crisis or a serious problem. I think it's better, since we're at the Governors' meeting, to focus on the facts. We do have a system, unlike any other in the advanced countries in the world, in which insurance companies decide who's covered and who isn't, what the cost of insurance is, and what's covered in specific policies. We do have a system in which the number of uninsured people is going up significantly. We do have a system in which more and more Americans, therefore, who have insurance are at risk of losing it if they get sick or if their job goes away.

We clearly have a system, as our SBA Director Erskine Bowles, from North Carolina, never tires of telling me, where small businesses have premiums that, on average, are 35 percent higher than large businesses or Government. We have a system in which State budgets have been extraordinarily burdened by the exploding costs of their Medicaid match, so that last year, for the first time ever, States spent more money on health care than on State-funded higher education.

We have a system in which the lowest estimate of uncompensated care burdens on hospitals is \$25 billion a year; in which 58 million Americans, according to the Medical Association, are without coverage at some time during the year; in which 81 million Americans have a preexisting condition, which means either that their premiums are higher or that they can't get insurance or that they can't ever change jobs, which is an enormous burden in a system in which labor mobility is, I am convinced, the key to personal and family prosperity as we move toward the 21st century.

Finally, we have a system in which three out of four insurance policies have lifetime limits, which means if you get really sick you might run out of insurance in the middle of the time when you need it most.

Now, those are facts. They can be seen in the million letters, almost, that the First Lady has received since we started this whole

effort to deal with health care. On the way in, I was describing briefly to Governor Campbell a letter I got from—or she got from Jo Anne Osteen of Sumter, South Carolina, who owns a small business, works 6 days a week, raised three children by herself with diabetes and arthritis. Although she had diabetes and arthritis, when she wrote us she hadn't been in the hospital one time in the 12 years that she'd been with her insurers. But her insurance rates went up to \$306 a month, even though she was only taking home \$205 a week from her business. Her doctors told her that the answer was to quit and go on disability. So she wrote, "Those high premiums are going to force people like me to the welfare and food stamp lines with no insurance. I am a proud American; and I don't want this to happen to me. I have thought about nothing but this problem, and I don't know where to turn."

Well, I think we ought to heed her call for help. A lot of you do, too, and that's why you've tried to reform your health care systems. After all, this woman has values that keep this country together. They're the ones that built our Nation. And we shouldn't force people like that to consider seriously whether they should go on to public assistance in order to take care of their children.

There's a flip side to this, too, this connection between welfare and health care, which I want to mention. I talked about it a little in the State of the Union Address. But we often say to people they should leave welfare and go to work. And we know that welfare benefits themselves in real dollar terms are lower today than they were 20 years ago in most States. So that the welfare check has almost nothing to do with why people stay on welfare. They stay because of the medical care and because of child care and because they have low skills. But we have this incredible situation in our country where if someone on welfare leaves welfare to take an entry-level job that doesn't have health insurance, as soon as the coverage of the Family Support Act runs out, you have people making low wages paying taxes to pay for health care for people who stayed on welfare and didn't make the same decision they did.

So these two issues are clearly tied together, and we need to see them together

as a part of what it would take to make America a place where people who work hard, play by the rules, and believe in the kind of values that permeate the efforts that all the Governors around this table are making are rewarded for that.

Now, we've made a beginning. Last year, the Congress passed in the context of the budget act a huge increase in the earned-income tax credit which lifts families with children on modest wages out of poverty. When tax bills come due this April, 15 million families with a total of about, we estimate, 50 million Americans, will be lifted beyond the poverty line by getting tax reduction under the earned-income tax credit. That means that there will no longer be an income incentive for people to choose welfare over work.

But the welfare system has a lot of other problems as well. Too often it still rewards values other than family and personal responsibility. Instead of encouraging those to stay together as we should, it often encourages families to break apart. Instead of encouraging children who have children to live with their parents or grandparents, it often encourages them to leave home. Instead of enforcing child support and asking those who bring children into the world to take responsibility for them, it too often ignores—it's too difficult to collect the \$34 billion absent parents should be paying to their children.

Perhaps most important—we were talking about this on the way in—an enormous part of this problem is the explosion of births to people who have never been married at all. And there is nothing in the present system, except where the States have taken the initiative to do it, to stop teen pregnancy from occurring in the first place. Even in the Family Support Act of '88, and I want to say more about that because I'm really proud of what we did on it, there was nothing to stop the condition from occurring in the first place.

And we need to devote, as this debate takes place, an enormous amount of attention to some of the decisions that we ought to make, some of them quite politically courageous. Governor Campbell was talking about some of the things they're doing in South Carolina which mirror some of the things we

tried to do at home to try to stop these things from occurring in the first place.

This year I have committed, and Senator Moynihan, I think, and Senator Dole probably both talked about this—to offer in the springtime a comprehensive welfare reform bill to restore these values of responsibility and family. We want to help those who are on welfare to get on their feet. We want to help them for up to 2 years with training and child care and other supports. But after that, we need to have a system that says anybody who can work and support themselves and their families must do so, in the private sector where possible, with a community service job if that's the only work available, to make welfare a second chance, not a way of life.

Now, those of us in this room have worked on this issue for years. I was privileged, along with the then-Governor of Delaware, Mike Castle, to be the representatives of the Governors who work with Senator Moynihan and with Congressman Ford and others on the welfare reform effort that became the Family Support Act of 1988. Mike Castle is now in the Congress, having changed jobs with Tom Carpenter. Guess who thinks he got the better deal out of that?

We never fully implemented that act. You know it, and I know it. So we ought to begin asking ourselves: Did we do a good job then? What progress has been made in the States? There's a lot of evidence that significant progress has been made in the States that have been most aggressive.

Why was it never fully implemented? Partly because Congress never fully funded it, partly because—as you will never hear the end of it, they'll say, "Well, but the States never fully used all the money we came up with. States must not have really cared about this because they never provided the State match to use all the funds." You know why the States never provided the State match, don't you? You had to spend all your money making the Medicaid match, which was not optional, it was mandatory, and building prison cells. That's where we spent all of our new money in the 1980's and the early nineties.

So I point this out not to do any finger-pointing but just to say one of the things we need to do is to go back and look at that

bill, see what's will be necessary can take full advantage it had incentive families. It was cause you had mandatory expenditure building prison also mandated Congress. So we

We also need again—though I about one in five people who get bad off do so for a huge so many people one has young health care coverage for people who disincentive to go

That's why I winter meeting, on the head of structural change health care system every legal residence insurance. I believe the welfare system and the welfare system linked.

Let me say just care. I'm encouraged was said by the today. And again in constant session a leveling effect the Nation's Comprehensive insurance for everyone we'll ever be able to system, simply people with security can never be taken too many will emergency room dollars to the hospital continue to not too many, for example Americans who are to our health care they can't afford them out of hospital to the hospitals people much more

to stop these things
place

ttted, and Senator
Senator Dole prob-
s—to offer in the
re welfare, reform
s of responsibility
elp those who are
feet. We want
with training and
rts. But after that,
that says anybody
t themselves and
the private sector
community service job
able, to make wel-
way of life.

oom have worked
privileged, along
Delaware, Mike
atives of the Gov-
or Moynihan and
nd others on the
became the Family
Castle is now in
ed jobs with Tom
ks he got the bet-

nted that act. You
ve ought to begin
a good job then?
de in the States?
that significant
the States that

plemented? Part-
fully funded it,
never hear the
, but the States
ney we came up
really cared about
vided the State.
You know why
ne State match,
I all your money
, which was not
nd building pris-
pent all of our
I the early nine-

do any finger-
of the things we
nd look at that

bill, see what's good about it, figure out what will be necessary to change so that the States can take full advantage of that bill, because it had incentives to work, it had supports for families. It was never fully implemented because you had to spend all your money on mandatory explosions and medical costs and building prison cells, many of which were also mandated by the Federal courts, not the Congress. So we need to begin there.

We also need to know that—to recognize again—though I will say that we estimate that about one in five, just under one in five people who get back on welfare after they get off do so for a health-related reason. Because so many people on welfare, virtually everyone has younger children, the loss of the health care coverage for the younger children for people who leave welfare is an enormous disincentive to get off of it.

That's why I think that a year ago in the winter meeting, the Governors hit the nail on the head when they said the kinds of structural changes that must occur in the health care system can't be effective until every legal resident of America has health insurance. I believe that the health care solution and the welfare solution are inextricably linked.

Let me say just a few words about health care. I'm encouraged by what I understand was said by the speakers before I got here today. And again, I wish I could keep you in constant session here. You seem to have a leveling effect on the political rhetoric of the Nation's Capital. Guaranteed private insurance for every American is the only way we'll ever be able to control the cost of this system, simplify it, and provide the American people with security of health benefits that can never be taken away. Unless we do that, too many will continue to get their care in emergency rooms, which will add billions of dollars to the health care bill. Too many will continue to not have certain things covered. Too many, for example, will be part of the Americans who add an estimated \$21 billion to our health care bills every year because they can't afford medicine that would keep them out of hospitals, so they wind up going to the hospitals and costing the American people much more. We certainly won't be

able to simplify the system and reduce the unnecessary bureaucracy.

One of the things that I challenge all the folks to do who believe that the beginning of health care reform is to tax the benefits of middle class workers who have generous health care packages, is to say: How can we do that? How can we start with that when we know we have a system where we spend 10 percent more on paperwork, bureaucracy, and insurance premiums than any other nation in the world? And these things have nothing to do with health care. We just have a system that is organized so that we spend a dime on the dollar more on paperwork than any other country in the world, paperwork in the insurance office, paperwork in the hospitals, paperwork in the doctor's office.

I just left the American Hospital Association, and they have said, clearly, the only way you'll ever fix this is to have a system that provides basic coverage to everybody, so that you can have a single claims form which will be imposed on the patients, single claims form for the hospitals, single claims form for the doctors. It is imperative that we do that.

There was a study in the New England Journal of Medicine a year or so ago: two hospitals, one in the United States, one in Canada, same number of beds, same rate of occupancy, same general mix of treatment, one of them had 200 people in their clerical department, the other had 6. Now, I don't advocate going to the single-payer system for other reasons; there are other problems in the Canadian system. And it is the second most expensive in the world. I think managed competition will work better. But it is clear that we cannot justify, in my view, taking something away from the working people of this country before we clean up the administrative costs of the present system.

I also will say without full coverage, I don't see any way to avoid the conclusion that States will continue to bear a disproportionate burden of skyrocketing health care costs. The Lewin study showed that States would pay less under our approach than if we just left things the way they are and that health care would improve.

I still believe in the requirement for employers to cover their employees. First of all, that's the way most people get their health

insurance today. Under our approach people would have a choice in their health care program. There's been a lot of discussion about this. Let's go beyond the rhetoric to the reality to.

Today, fifty-five percent of all employers and 40 percent of all employees who are covered with health insurance through the workplace have no choice in the health care plan or the doctors they get, they are selected by the employer, today. Under our plan, every employee would have to get at least three choices once a year, one of which would be just picking your doctor and having fee-for-service medicine.

So I'm all for choice, but we need to recognize that if we want the benefits of competition and the benefits of choice, we have to move away from the trend that we are setting now. We are moving in the direction of getting the benefits of competition and market power for big business and Government. And some of you have asked for reforms, Governor McWherter, among others, to put Medicaid into a managed competition environment to get the benefits of that. But the problem is some people will get the benefits of that, other people on the other end will lose choice. So if you want to pursue both values at once, we plainly have to change the direction in which we are going. And we have to have a different framework if you wish to have both.

Now, in spite of some of the interesting art work that you've seen in the last couple of weeks, the Washington Post said that our approach would create, and I quote, "a surprisingly simple world for consumers." You make a decision once a year, among at least three plans, based on what you want. I wish we could even have more choice. We haven't figured out how to do that yet. But Federal employees have a great deal, for example, and many of you in States have given your State employees more and more choices. And because you have market power, you can do that, which is why you have to give some framework for the small businesses to have the same market power that big business and Government does.

Now, a lot of this approach builds on what I have seen a lot of you do in the States. Hawaii proved a long time ago that if you

did it right, you can have an employer requirement to cover employees without bankrupting small business but providing better coverage, stronger work force, and lowering health care costs because of the way the market can be organized. The Governor of Hawaii has spoken eloquently about this. You can say, "Well, Hawaii is geographically isolated and, besides that, we all like to go there and surf and play golf or whatever." Well, that's why we want to do it for the whole country instead of just impose it on one State or another.

We learned from Minnesota that health care cost targets can be set and met through strong leadership, market-forces competition, and high quality. And I might say, Governor Carlson, that the Mayo Clinic stands—if there were no other example in this country, and there are—but if you just take that one example, it is a sterling and a stunning rebuke to those who say you cannot provide the world's highest class health care and control costs.

We learned from the example of Washington State and of Florida and most recently of Maryland that you can pool businesses and families together to change the David-and-Goliath equation, and then small businesses and families can get affordable health insurance that covers the things which need to be covered. We learn from Pennsylvania—we learn two things from Pennsylvania. The first thing is that the Governor of Pennsylvania proves that you can do anything in the health care system. We also learn that better tracking of costs and outcomes improves the quality and lowers the cost. This is an amazing thing they did, and our approach encompasses this. Whatever the Congress does, this should be a part of it. Pennsylvania actually took the time to study and report on the cost of different procedures in different hospitals in different parts of the State and then measured the cost against the results, proving that there was not a necessary connection in many areas between cost and quality and changing the whole environment in terms of what consumers then could ask for and get. This sounds like a simple thing, but in a system this complicated this information, available in a way that people can act on it, is a rarity, not the rule, in American health care.

have an employer re-employees without bank- but providing better rk force, and lowering. se of the way the mar- The Governor of Ha- nently about this. You is geographically iso- we all like to go there f or "ever." Well, do it for the whole impose it on one State

Minnesota that health e set and met through rket-forces competi- And I might say, Gov- Mayo Clinic stands— example in this coun- t if you just take that erling and a stunning ay you cannot provide s health care and con-

example of Washing- da and most recently n pool businesses and ange the David-and- then small businesses rdable health insur- hings which need to from Pennsylvania— m Pennsylvania. The overnator of Pennsylvan do anything in the also learn that better tcomes improves the ost. This is an amaz- our approach encom- e Congress does, this Pennsylvania actually nd report on the cost in different hospitals State and then meas- e results, proving that y connection in many quality and changing n terms of what con- t for and get. This ing, but in a system- nformation, available act it, is a rarity, health care.

So I believe that if we at the Federal level can learn from these things and finally solve this problem in a comprehensive way, we will go a long way toward dealing with the welfare reform issue, and we will lay to rest one of the biggest problems for American families and for the long-term stability of our society.

Now, what normally happens around here is that everybody gives their speeches, and then we have Washington-style reform where we tinker at the edges, expand the Medicaid program a little more. That's what we've been doing for years, you know, just kind of backing toward universal coverage by expanding Medicaid mandates. And then at the same time, we try to ratchet down the Federal spending a little more and pass some other incremental reforms. You know what's going to happen? We do that, more mandates on you and less money for you to pay. That's what's going to happen. More State money put into a system that is fundamentally broken, without enough security, where someone else is making the fundamental policy decisions.

I talked to you a few moments ago about Jo Anne Osteen from Sumter, South Carolina. She wrote us last June, struggling to hang on to both her small business and her insurance. She had to make a choice, and she chose her business and lost her coverage. After decades and decades, it's time to solve that woman's problem, because her problem is our problem. And her problem is now the State government's problem.

We really can do things around here when we put our minds to it. We've got the deficit going down instead of up. We all got together, some of you mentioned it yesterday, in a bipartisan and Federal, State way and passed NAFTA when it was given up for dead. That enabled us to get a GATT agreement which was stalled for 7 years. Congress passed the Brady bill after a 7-year stall. We actually can do things around here when people work at it and they keep pushing us to make a decision and they keep us all in the right frame of mind and they keep us thinking about real things. You cannot escape the real world and the rhetoric. You can't do it because you're too close to your folks.

Here, we communicate most often with the American people through an array of

intermediaries. And most times, too many times people can't get to us with their real problems. So there is always a danger here that the policy apparatus will just slip the tracks and that we'll forget what this is about.

Yesterday, Families USA issued this report, which I urge you all to get and read. It just takes 10 typical health care situations that actually happen to real Americans and identifies how those things would be dealt with under the major bills pending before Congress. In other words, it's not about politics and rhetoric and theory, it's about real lives.

So I ask you to help us do this. You all, differ among yourselves; we have some differences with you. That's fine, that's good, that's what this is all about. But I remember in 1987 and 1988, we were struggling to deal with welfare reform. And every Governor in the country wanted to do something about it. And the political rhetoric—the Governors were converging around an issue, but the political rhetoric in Washington was diverging right and left. And we sat around here and talked; we tried to get agreement on a policy position. And Governor Campbell had just left the Congress where he had been the minority leader of the subcommittee that dealt with welfare. And he said to the Democrats and Republicans alike, "Look, I had to go talk to a bunch of people on welfare, and here is the way this works. Here is the intersection of welfare, health care, food stamps, the whole thing."

It was an incredible moment where all of us had to say, this is not about rhetoric, this is about real people. And we went on and passed the Family Support Act, which Senator Moynihan said was the most significant piece of social reform in the welfare area in three decades.

Now, we can do this on health care. I don't believe we can do it unless everybody gets coverage. But we can do it, and you can help us do it if you push the thing together around real problems, real facts, and real issues, and don't let Washington rhetoric pull the country apart. The country needs you, and I hope you'll stay with us until the job is done.

Thank you very much.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Nashua, New Hampshire)

Embargoed for Release until 10:06 A.M. EST
February 3, 1996

RADIO ADDRESS
BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. I would like to talk to you this morning about how we can meet one of the challenges outlined in my State of the Union address: providing greater economic security to Americans who work hard, and especially, how we can ensure that those Americans have access to health care, because millions and millions of working Americans and their families don't have access to health care.

There can be no doubt that we do live in an age of great possibility, a time of exploding technology and information, a time that will enable more Americans than ever before to fulfill their dreams.

But this new economy, with so much opportunity, also has very stiff challenges, as most Americans know. Our news is not all good. While this new economy has produced a record number of new business in each of the last three years and nearly eight million new jobs, too many of our fellow citizens are still working harder and harder just to keep up. They are rightly concerned about the security of their families. They are worried about job security. They are worried about never seeming to get a raise. They are worried about access to education, the security of their pensions and access to health care.

Our challenge is to make sure that all Americans can be winners in this time of change. How are we going to do it? First, we have to keep our economy growing. That's one reason we should balance the budget: It will keep interest rates coming down, bringing in more investments, generating more jobs. After many weeks of negotiations, the Republicans and I already have agreed on more than enough cuts that are common to each of our plans: to balance the budget in seven years and still provide a modest middle-class tax cut, to maintain our obligations to parents and children and to the future through the Medicare and Medicaid programs and through our investments in education, and to protect the environment.

I urge the Republicans in Congress to keep working with me so that we can actually pass a balanced budget. We have the savings in common, we can do it, and we owe it to the American people to do

it.

Second, we have to work together to create more new high-wage jobs in the new industries of the future. That's why I was very pleased that just this week Congress passed landmark telecommunications legislation -- legislation we have been working on for more than three years. It will create a lot of high-wage jobs. It will give consumers more choices in communications and in entertainment. It will help to unlock the power of the digital revolution.

This legislation was passed the way we should deal with all our challenges, with members of both parties working together and working together until they got it right.

The third thing we should do is raise the minimum wage. Millions of people are raising children on the minimum wage. But if we don't raise it within a year it will be at a 40-year low in its purchasing power. We can't build a new economy with that kind of income to raise children on.

And fourth, we must make sure that every working American has the personal economic security to make the most of his or her own life and to support a family. That means lifetime access to education and training. It means portable, secure, pensions. And above all, for people with families especially, it means access to health care.

Our nation is the only leading economy in the world where insurance companies are allowed to deny you coverage or raise your rates just because you're sick. If you have a preexisting condition, like diabetes, high blood pressure or heart disease, an insurance company can simply turn you down. If you are healthy but your child has asthma, your child can be denied coverage. And in some cases, if you're pregnant and you move to a new job, that can be enough to turn you away.

Many millions more people simply lose their health coverage as they move from one job to another. Believe it or not, between 1991 and 1993 some 64 million people went without health insurance for some period of time. For working families that's like walking on a tightrope without a net below.

We shouldn't put obstacles in the way of people who want to move to better jobs. We certainly shouldn't put additional burdens on people who lose their jobs that they want to keep. At the very least, our first step should be to make sure that working people who have health insurance can take it with them from job to job.

The State of New Hampshire, where I am today, is one of 42 states to take some action to try and solve this problem. But only if we take national action will we truly be able to give working people access to health care. There is bipartisan legislation that would protect these working families, sponsored by Senator Nancy Kassebaum, a Republican from Kansas and Senator Edward Kennedy, a Democrat from Massachusetts. The bill would require insurers to cover men and women who have lost insurance because they change or lose their jobs. It would limit the ability of insurance companies to exclude you from coverage if you have a preexisting condition. And it would help small businesses and individuals pool their resources to buy insurance at cheaper rates.

It could help as many as 25 million Americans each year to have or to keep their health insurance. It's good common sense and it's the right thing to do. The Kassebaum-Kennedy Bill has 43 co-sponsors from both parties in the Senate. It passed through its committee unanimously. It has the support of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, and the National Small Business Union. It is supported by doctors as well as consumer groups. It should pass easily.

When I challenged Congress to pass this bipartisan health care reform in my State of the Union address, nearly every member of Congress jumped to their feet and applauded, but now the bill is stalled. It turns out that some Senators have quietly been working to keep this bill from coming up to a vote even though it passed out of the committee unanimously. Why are they doing it? Because that's what the insurance industry wants them to do. And the insurance industry is lobbying hard against the Kennedy-Kassebaum Bill.

This health reform, however, is sensible, it's straightforward, it's fair, it is genuinely bipartisan. It will help to give peace of mind to literally millions of American families. I call on every member of Congress who stood up for this bill when the cameras were on to stand up for it now, to pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy Health Reform Bill and to pass it without delay.

If we believe that hard working people deserve a chance to better their lives without sacrificing their health insurance, then we must pass this bill now. If we believe it's wrong to deny health coverage to a person just because he or she is sick, then we must pass this bill now. If we believe a sick child should not be denied health care while her healthy brothers and sisters are still covered, we must pass this bill now. This bill is an example of what we can do when we put aside partisanship and work together for the common good. Millions of lives will be changed for the better when it becomes law. We shouldn't let any special interest get in the way now.

Let's work together to and pass the Kassebaum-Kennedy Bill, and let's do it now.

Thanks for listening.

MORE

DRAFT

March 31, 1995

Memorandum for the President

From: Working Group

Subject: Communications Plan for April and May

This memo presents for your review and comment a communications plan for April and May. The following plan reflects the consensus of your senior staff. If you approve the outline of the plan, we will submit a separate memo on the structure and form of each speech.

Four Major Speeches

We propose that we designate four of your upcoming speeches as the building blocks of our message in the months ahead:

- American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 7, 1995.
Dallas, Texas
- Michigan State University Commencement, May 5, 1995.
East Lansing, Michigan
- US Air Force Academy Commencement, May 31, 1995
Colorado Springs, Colorado
- Dartmouth College Commencement, June 11, 1995
Hanover, New Hampshire

In these speeches, we propose that you outline your vision to renew the American Dream as we approach the 21st century.

The commencement addresses, in particular, offer you an opportunity to spell out for the next generation the realities of the new world they will inherit -- the challenges they will face, the opportunities they will enjoy, and the responsibilities they must assume to achieve the American Dream. Like the Georgetown speeches, the three commencement speeches should each address a distinct part of that vision, e.g. the challenges of the new economy, American leadership in the new world, and the mainstream values -- opportunity, responsibility, family -- that must guide us. Unlike Georgetown, the speeches need not outline our policies; those policies are on the table already. Instead, the speeches should allow you to articulate your vision for the future and describe for Americans their common mission as we approach the next century.

The speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors -- which occurs next Friday -- serves a more tactical purpose and warrants a separate discussion.

Speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors

We propose that this speech serve two purposes: set the stage for **a month-long focus on education as the key to economic growth**; and suggest the major **contrast between our values and those of the Republicans**. This speech must **pivot** away from the heavy focus on the New Congress's mixed record -- to your vision for the future, a vision that links education to the economy. It will be followed throughout April by events echoing that message. The basic outline of that message follows:

Education and lifelong learning are the key to opportunity in the new economy.
Cutting education in this era of global competition is like cutting defense during the Cold War.

ASNE SPEECH OUTLINE

A detailed outline of the speech by Don Baer and David Shipley -- follows for your review:

- I. The debate on government's role has been good for the country.
 - A. Lots of good has come from it: the line-item veto, new restrictions on unfunded mandates, legislation making Congress subject to the laws it applies to others.
 - B. Now is a moment of definition and clarity for America: an opportunity to focus on where we agree and disagree about our direction for the future. GOP motivations and concern for the country are sincere, but their **approach does little to help us meet the challenges of the 21st century**.
- II. Our visions could not be more different on a number of issues, nowhere more clear than on Education and Training. Refer to Southern Trip and Conference.
 - A. Underline why education is important, a metaphor for all we must do to create opportunity and expand responsibility.
 1. Importance in President's and his family's life story.
 2. Importance in POTUS career: Arkansas reforms, role in national debate.
 3. **Importance for our future at this crossroads.** At a time of global competition, education is the key to our ability to compete and win.
Cutting education now is like cutting defense during the Cold War.
 - B. Outline Differences between President and Republicans on Education.

Essential Contrast. The President's record on reform, his vision for the future versus the GOP approach: Education cuts to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.
- III. Conclusion. 50 years after FDR's death, we are putting hope over fear by empowering Americans for the future.

Opportunities and Dangers. The audience, major newspaper editors, virtually guarantees that the ASNE speech will be treated seriously. However, the Q&A session following the speech poses a major trap. Last year, you delivered a thoughtful speech to the ASNE that was drowned out by your assessment of the press's coverage of Whitewater in response to a question. As we saw this week, there is enough "hot news" out there, e.g., Guatemala, Iraq, etc., to divert attention from a serious, positive speech. Your responses to Q&A should be perfunctory enough to keep attention where it belongs: on the speech.

100 Days. Friday, April 7 is the day Speaker Gingrich has chosen to celebrate the 100 Days of his "Contract with America." He has planned a flag-waving rally at the Capitol and a live evening address to the nation that CNN will broadcast. The networks will broadcast their evening news from the Capitol on both Thursday and Friday. The speech to the ASNE is your response. By not attacking the Contract head-on, you can rise above the media blitz around the 100 days, while allowing others to drive home the contrast.

The basic thrust of that contrast is between our commitment to education and the Republican effort to cut education to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. This contrast will paint a larger picture about what we stand for: our commitment to protect the middle class, not the wealthy. That effort begins next week with the Vice President's speech on Monday. Democrats in the House and Senate, Governors, mayors, elected officials and other groups will amplify your message and paint the contrast throughout the week and month.

Other Education Events

The following is a preliminary sketch of April events designed to show your commitment to education as the key to renewing the American Dream.

April 1, 1995 **Radio Address on Education.** Allows you to follow-up on message of the Economic Conference and kick off the month by previewing education and economy theme.

April 3, 1995 **Arkansas School Dedication.** Allows you to highlight commitment to education at the beginning of a week when Senate Republicans vote on education cuts and House Republicans vote on tax cuts for the wealthy.

April 7, 1995 **ASNE Speech.** Previously discussed.

Local Event. Reinforce and echo ASNE speech with Dallas residents. Designed not to make news and "trump" the ASNE speech.

April 8, 1995 **Speech to the National Education Association.** Focus on challenges and solutions that schools, parents, students, communities and government face in creating safe schools where children can learn.

Radio Address on Education. Excerpts from NEA speech.

Please Note. NEA speech is after deadline, so we must approve excerpts in advance and use radio address to move the story.

- April 12, 1995 **Primetime Press Conference.** Lead with the announcement of 500+ new institutions admitted into the third year of direct lending.
- April 13, 1995 **Local Event on Middle Class Bill of Rights.** Event with young people highlighting the education provisions of the Middle Class Bill of Rights.
- April 15, 1995 **Radio Address on Education.** Coincides with taxes and College Admissions Day. Summarize the week, with anecdotes from "people events." Restate the case for lifelong learning.
- April 24, 1995 **American Association of Community Colleges.** Focus on advanced training as the key to opportunity to the new economy.
- April 25, 1995 **National Rural Conference.** Devote some segment of the program to highlight rural education, including the role of telecommunications.
- April 27, 1995 **Teacher of the Year.** Focus on White House agenda for world-class public education, including reform, investment and choice.

Other Message Events -- Opportunities

There are several other message events we will do in April. Given the high concentration of education events, the likelihood that these other events will dilute our focus is somewhat diminished. Unlike the education events which we will designate publicly as the main thrust of our activity, the following events -- grouped thematically -- should be seen as attempts to lay down markers -- in some cases for future fights.

Reinventing Government. Two events.

- Social Security on April 13, 1995. Message is that we are fixing government and preserving Social Security for the next generation.
- Missouri on April 26, 1995. Highlight our effort to cut red tape and allow states to reform welfare, move people to work.

Protecting the Environment and Public Health.

- Earth Day on April 21, 1995. Chance to lay down a strong marker against GOP efforts to roll back environmental protection.

Dangers

The Political - Campaign Stories.

More dangerous than events on other initiatives is the danger that our efforts be portrayed against the back-drop of the nascent presidential campaign. We have already seen coverage of your trip to the South colored by political reporting. With Republicans up and running, reporters are increasingly likely to cast all our efforts as political and diminish their significance. We can counter that tendency in part by avoiding heated rhetoric and partisan challenges. However, it will be difficult to paint a contrast between our vision and that of the Republicans is that contrast is too flat.

Distractions from The Non Message Events

Throughout the month, you will be addressing groups before the press in settings where we would prefer not to make news, e.g. the American Jewish Congress, the California Democratic State Convention, the Construction and Trade Workers, etc. We must be careful not to allow these secondary, political events to "trump" our public message. That is best done by keeping the rhetoric and partisan nature of these speeches unusually muted.

PART FOUR: THE 1968 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN ♦ 183

elation for many of the traveling press and for some of Kennedy's closest aides. One of them, Jeff Greenfield, later reflected that "Nebraska was the first time that I really saw . . . Robert Kennedy's ability to command very different kinds of political constituencies. In Nebraska I saw the way he related to people who had nothing in common with him at all. You don't think of Robert Kennedy as a man of the cities, exactly, but he was of New York, Boston, and Washington—that scene. And he certainly wasn't a farmer. Yet, there was a kind of communication between him and . . . almost Grant Wood kind of characters in a sense—leather-skinned, very hard working people, very traditional values . . . they probably didn't like . . . antiwar demonstrators. Outside of Omaha, they might not have seen a Negro in their lives . . . the people who would be the last people in the world you would imagine Robert Kennedy to have any relationship with, who really had come not to scream and to yell and to cheer, but to listen. And he got through. . . . It really taught me a lot about him." ♦

REFORMING THE WELFARE SYSTEM

Press Release

Los Angeles, California

MAY 19, 1968

THE PRIMARY PACE quickened after Nebraska: Oregon's was two weeks later, and the season's second richest delegate prize, California, one week thereafter. Accordingly, although he had failed in Oregon to establish a functioning campaign structure or to connect with the state's largely suburban electorate, Kennedy raced through a hectic three-day schedule in the Golden State. As the foray was beginning, the campaign released a major white paper setting forth Kennedy's views on welfare reform (he had delivered a shorter version to a crowd of ten thousand at Los Angeles Valley College on May 15.)⁹

Kennedy's insistence on real and fundamental change never had been satisfied merely by the passage of legislation or the establishment of programs. Increasingly after entering the Senate, he strongly questioned

304 ♦ RFE: COLLECTED SPEECHES

the efficacy of many government actions designed to benefit poor Americans—including those programs he had helped design. Key among the failures, in Kennedy's view, was the welfare system, which he had criticized for years. His approach transcended traditional ideology—for welfare failed those who funded it, as well as those who received its assistance. ♦

Perhaps the area of our greatest domestic failure is in the system of welfare—public assistance to those in need. There is a deep sense of dissatisfaction, among recipient and government alike, about what welfare has become over the last thirty years, and where it seems to be going.

Welfare is many things to many people. To the recipient it may be the difference between life and starvation, between a house and homelessness, between the cold wind and a child's coat. To the taxpayer—facing inflation in the cost of living, paying for his home and educating his children—welfare may be an unwarranted imposition on an already overburdened tax bill. To certain politicians, willing to oversimplify and confuse the issue, it may be a means to easy popularity. . . .

The bill is rising further everyday.

With all this enormous expenditure, might we not expect that the recipient would be satisfied? Yet the fact is that they are not. They are as dissatisfied with the welfare system as is anyone in the U.S. . . . Is this rank ingratitude—or is it an indication of how the welfare system has failed? For what are we to make of a system which seems to satisfy neither giver nor recipient—which embitters all those who come in contact with it?

The worst problem is in our very concept of welfare. . . . Welfare began as a necessary program of assistance for those unable to work. But we have tried as well to make it the easy answer to the complex, but by no means insurmountable, problem of unemployment. . . .

(The unemployed) are men like other men. They marry and have children; or they do not marry, but have children just the same. In either case, they often leave home under the strain of joblessness and poverty. We have dealt with the resulting female-headed families not

PART FOUR: THE 1968 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN ♦ 385

by putting the men to work but by giving the mothers and children welfare. They might have wanted fathers and husbands; we have given them checks. In fact, the welfare system itself has created many of these fatherless families—by requiring the absence of a father as a condition for receiving aid; no one will ever know how many left their families to let them qualify for assistance so that they might eat, or find a place to live.

More basically, welfare itself has done much to divide our people, to alienate us one from the other. Partly this separation comes from the understandable resentment of the taxpayer, helplessly watching your welfare rolls and your property tax rise. But there is greater resentment among the poor, the recipient of our charity. Some of it comes from the brutality of the welfare system itself: from the prying bureaucrat, an all-powerful administrator deciding at his desk who is deserving and who is not, who shall live another month and who may starve next week.

But the root problem is in the fact of dependency and uselessness itself. Unemployment means having nothing to do—which means nothing to do with the rest of us. To be without work, to be without use to one's fellow citizens, is to be in truth the Invisible Man of whom Ralph Ellison wrote. . . .

We often quote Lincoln's warning that America could not survive half slave and half free. Nor can it survive while millions of our people are slaves to dependency and poverty, waiting on the favor of their fellow citizens to write them checks. Fellowship, community, shared patriotism—these essential values of our civilization do not come from just buying and consuming goods together. They come from a shared sense of individual independence and personal effort.

They come from working together to build a country—that is the answer to the welfare crisis.

The answer to the welfare crisis is work, jobs, self-sufficiency, and family integrity; not a massive new extension of welfare; not a great new outpouring of guidance counselors to give the poor more advice. We need jobs, dignified employment at decent pay; the kind of employment that lets a man say to his community, to his family, to his country, and most important, to himself, "I helped to build this country. I am a participant in its great public ventures. I am a man." . . .

386 ♦ BFE: COLLECTED SPEECHES

It is a myth that all the problems of poverty can be solved by ultimate extension of the welfare system to guarantee to all, regardless of their circumstances, a certain income paid for by the federal government. Any such scheme, taken alone, simply cannot provide the sense of self-sufficiency, of participation in the life of the community, that is essential for citizens of a democracy. . . .

Certainly, all the proposals for various systems for income maintenance deserve careful study. But if there is anything we have learned in the last three years, it is that we cannot do everything at once—that we must understand, establish, and adhere to a clear sense of national priorities. The priority here is jobs. To give priority to income would be to admit defeat on the critical battle front. . . .

Work is a mundane and unglamorous word. Yet it is, in a real sense, the meaning of what the country is all about—for those of us who live in affluent suburbs and for our children no less than for the children in the ghetto. Human beings need a purpose. We need it as individuals; we need to sense it in our fellow citizens; and we need it as a society and as a people.

IN THE SECTIONS of the press release omitted above, Kennedy called for replacing the welfare bureaucracy with an automatic system based entirely on need, having national standards and substantial incentives (not penalties) for people to work and raise happy families. The speech included one of the earliest calls for improved and expanded day care and a passionate argument against a system that penalized out-of-work fathers who remained with their families. Many of the inadequacies he spotlighted remained in the welfare schema in the decades after his death. ♦

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

February 5, 1996

OPENING REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT ROUNDTABLE WITH
THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

9:45 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Governor Thompson, Governor Miller, to all the governors, welcome back to the White House and back to Washington for the annual meeting of the NGA. I know that you have been working very hard in a bipartisan fashion to try to reach agreement on a number of issues that are important to your people and to us here in Washington, including Medicaid and welfare, issues of education and training, and I look forward to discussing those.

I do want to say that all these issues have to be seen in light of the most important issue still facing us here today, and that is the federal budget. As required by law, today I am submitting to Congress my proposed budget for fiscal year 1997. It balances the budget in seven years, according to the Congressional Budget Office's economic estimates. I want the governors now to work with us to balance this budget and I am very hopeful that we can achieve a balanced budget this year.

The plan I propose cuts hundreds of programs, continues our efforts to downsize the government, but it protects Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment and cuts taxes for working families. It reforms welfare and addresses our challenges to renew schools, provide economic security and preserve the environment with the initiatives that I announced in the State of the Union, including those on the environment and the educational initiatives of a \$10,000 deduction for college tuition, more merit scholarships and a million young people able to work their way through college in work study. It includes the health care reforms that have historically received bipartisan support in the Congress, including requirements that people can't be cut off their insurance when they change jobs or when someone in the family gets sick.

As you know, the Republican congressional leadership and I have spent many months discussing this budget. We have spent well over 50 hours together in small meetings. Now in common, our plans have \$700 billion in specific spending cuts. That is more than

enough to balance the budget in seven years and to provide a modest tax cut. I hope we can set aside partisanship and divisions, as you often do in the NGA, and provide a balanced budget plan to the American people in the near future.

You know how important this is. You have seen some of what happens when we have government by continuing resolution. It really leads to irresolution. We have Head Start programs all over the country now staggering from month to month, school boards across the country actually planning for some lay-offs because we do not have a final budget passed by the Congress.

I know you all have a stake in resolving this matter. I know we're going to discuss at least two issues today, that if they could be resolved would help us to pass a balanced budget. And I am looking forward to it, the discussion of Medicaid, which I would like to say just a few words about, more when our private discussion starts. We want to restrain the cost of Medicaid. Our budget proposal has a rate of increase for Medicaid, which is far below the projected rate of increase of overall health care costs. We know to achieve this we have to give the states far greater flexibility on how Medicaid will work.

We also know, in this administration, that we must maintain a commitment, a national commitment, to seniors, to pregnant women, to poor children, to people with disability, that they will receive the quality health care they are now receiving.

Second, I believe we're close, Congress and I, to an agreement on sweeping welfare reform that is very consistent with what the governors have advocated for years. It would reward work, require family and responsibility strengthening. It would advance the values of the United States instead of undermining them. I know that you have some new proposals on that today, and I look forward to hearing them. I do believe we're quite close on welfare reform with the Congress. I do believe it is terribly important, and I hope we can do it, again, just in the next few weeks.

Third, I hope we have a chance to discuss how we should overhaul our nation's job-training system. More and more business leaders I speak with around the country tell me that they believe that in order to break this cycle of stagnant wages and job insecurity that is gripping about half our work force, we are going to have to do more to upgrade the skills of the existing work force. We're going to have to do it in a more innovative way. The GI bill for America's workers that I proposed would provide a collapsing of these scores of government training programs the federal government has into a voucher that workers could receive directly and take to their local community college or other approved institution. I know we have some differences of opinion on that, but I do believe that in this case people are most likely to know their own best interests as long as they are protected from

fly-by-night operations by our common endeavors.

At any rate, it is clear to me that unless we do something substantial to upgrade the skills of the existing workforce, it's going to be difficult for them to break out of the cycle of stagnant wages and job insecurity that has prevented a large number of American families from enjoying the economic recovery that our country has had for the last few years.

Now, finally, let me say something that I think we can all agree on. This is President Reagan's 85th birthday. They're having a big party in California. And I think every American citizen, and I know every American governor, will join the Vice President and me in wishing him a very happy birthday and sending our best wishes to his entire family.

Thank you very much.

END

9:53 P.M. EST