

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mail-Server (Mail-Server@CLINTON.AL.MIT.EDU@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-MAR-1997 23:54:00.00

SUBJECT: 1997-03-10 First Lady and Sec Riley in Roundtable on Education

TO: Jeffrey H. Cohen (Jeffrey H. Cohen@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 10, 1997

REMARKS BY THE FIRST LADY AND SECRETARY RILEY

IN ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON EDUCATION

The Map Room

4:25 P.M. EST

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you all very much. Some of you --I

guess none of you, maybe -- were at the last of these briefings that we did on microcredit about, I guess a little over a month ago. And I found it very helpful, and the reporters who were part of it also told me then and later that they found it helpful, too. So it's something that we want to continue doing on issues that are of importance, and ones in which I'm involved in some way or another.

And today we're going to talk about education, which those of you who cover the President regularly know is one of his primary concerns for this second term. But it's really a concern that goes back to his time as governor. And I know Ron -- I don't think anybody else ever covered the President when he was governor -- knows it's been something that I've been involved in and worked on even back then, with Dick Riley, when he was a governor in South Carolina.

And what I'd hoped we'd do is to have a chance to talk with you. We've got Mike Smith, from the Department; Mike Cohen from the White House staff -- because sometimes those of you who cover the White House generally don't get a chance to really talk with the people who are helping to not only make the policy, but answer the questions about it. Because this is going to be a major effort and it's a very challenging one to try to follow up on the President's call for action for American education. And there are a number of issues, and we can talk about any of those. And as I'm sure Marsha told you, we can talk about other things as well. But I hope that we will be able to talk to a great extent about any questions or concerns you've got about what the President's proposing, how people are responding to it, what it means,

will it work, what the point of it all is.

And I wanted to start by saying that we see this whole education agenda as a continuum of actions and concerns that the President's policy is attempting to address. It really starts with the very beginning of a child's life, which is why you've heard the President -- and those of you might have covered me -- talking a lot in the last several months about the first three years of life and the importance of preparing a child to be able to compete academically.

And we're going to be having a conference on early childhood development and learning to look at what the new research on the brain tells us about our youngest children in about a month or so from now -- the date will be announced, I hope, on Wednesday, so we can get it locked down. But it's going to be a look at what the latest neuroscientific research has really opened up to us as a better understanding of what happens to a brain in those first days, weeks, months of life -- and then what does that mean for parents.

You know, some people are already concerned that they haven't done enough to raise their children's serotonin level or to create a lot of synapses in the brain. And this is not supposed to be a discussion about research that makes parents feel inadequate but, instead, to make it clear that good parenting without knowing about serotonin levels has always done what works. If you read to your child, if you talk with your child, if you -- now we know -- play music for your child, you are doing what is necessary to feed that child's brain.

It used to be, perhaps, a little softer. And for those of us who have talked about early childhood for more than 25 years, I sometimes felt that I didn't get maybe a lot of people's awareness raised as high as I would like, because the people who worry about these issues are very often the ones that don't need to worry about them. And for many other people whom we would like to help with their parenting, this information never gets to them. So talking about the brain, we think, gives us a tremendous opportunity to reach people who have not been reached before and to, perhaps, put into scientific terms what most of us have tried to do just because we thought it would be a nice thing to do and might help our children.

Then we're going to talk about what all sectors of society can do to enhance early development and support families. It won't be any surprise to you that I think it takes a village. And I think that when we talk about what we should do to help parents -- particularly young parents, single parents, parents in stressful situations -- to get the support, the example that they may need to find the time to read 20 minutes to their child, that there's a role for a lot of people to play in putting into effect this new research which is very exciting.

But that's how we really think of where we begin with the call for action, because if we do a better job in helping parents talk with, relate to, stimulate their children positively, then everything else that we're going to be doing will have a much better chance of succeeding. We're going to be focusing on the pre-school years. We're

going to be trying to determine how we can do a better job of reaching child care providers, Head Start programs, others who care for children with this information, as well; and to try to help them, too, understand what their opportunities are when they do care for children.

And then we see all the way through this call to action what happens once a child enters school, how to keep the partnership with the family going, and then what does a school have to do and how do we begin to define what it is that we expect from our education system.

If you have followed education -- I know there are some in here today who are very involved in reporting on education -- you know that there has been a movement for a number of years to try to set rigorous national standards, which is what the President has called for. And you'll hear in a minute that that has been proceeding, that practically all the states are in the process of setting standards. And that is exactly what the President foresees.

But in order to help bring some focus to the setting of national standards, the President has called for national tests in 4th grade reading and 8th grade math, to make sure our children are able to master the basics. And this is what he has been talking about in legislatures, like Maryland and Michigan, and it really fits in with America Reads, it fits in with the technology initiative, it fits in with teacher training -- all of which are part of this overall call for action.

I'd like to ask the Secretary to speak because, as I said, I guess I first worked with then-Governor Riley, I don't remember, 15 years ago, a long time ago, when we were all working on education reform in our states, the southern states particularly where the need was so demonstrably great. And nobody has been at this longer, worked harder at or has actually more to show than this Secretary in terms of what has been done for the last four years.

SECRETARY RILEY: Thank you very much. And I appreciate the chance to be with you and Dr. Marshall Smith; my acting deputy, Mike Smith, is here also.

When I think back to 1983, when The Nation At Risk first came out, I was in the middle of school reform in South Carolina. The Education Improvement Act we called it, which was very controversial and it was said by the Rand Corporation to be the most comprehensive of any of the states -- it was in here, it was big. It involved a lot of controversial things like taxes or whatever. Our state was a very low support system for education. And we were in the middle of this important fight and I was going all out with it. The people were for it; the legislature wasn't. And the people and I were trying to get the legislature to support this major education reform.

And about that time The Nation At Risk came out. Ted Bell was here, as you recall. And I can't tell you how much it helped in South Carolina to have a national thrust of something that was important to the nation. It just caught on with our state reform. It gave us a

tremendous impetus forward and it was right exciting to see that happen.

Then as we followed a lot of reform then in the '80s, a lot of governors were very much involved in a lot of ways -- a lot of them started out of the south. And then in, of course, '89, when we had all the governors come together -- Bill Clinton was one of the leaders with George Bush -- and came out for the goals and the standards discussions, which were serious. So we come on in to where we are then with Goals 2000 in 1994 and School-to-Work and a lot of the things that have happened.

When I first came here and the Department of Education was considered to be on the "hit list" -- somebody said the other day now we've gotten on the "hot list." So we've gone from the "hit list" to the "hot list." But when we were looking at things in 1994, we were so excited to see the framework being made for national support of the states in terms of developing a national standards movement that was really meaningful. And now we see 48 states now that have content standards -- some are stronger than others, but see that kind of energy occurring. Getting standards down into the classroom is very difficult, and that's the process that is taking place now.

And then the testing that the President has proposed really puts a focus on it that we think is going to be extremely important. I've been all over the country, talked to parents and educators and whatever -- leaders -- and it is to me seen as a very important focus for us to -- in those two basic skills, 4th grade reading and 8th grade

math, with algebra and some geometry.

I was just up in New York this morning, and to show you how that's moving, this was a look at Central Park East Secondary School, a little small high school that has a well-known reputation. But we're looking at the school-to-work kind of approach, preparing young people for careers and college -- all young people, to have them thinking college. This school, a very disadvantaged generally student body, and 97.5 percent of the students finish high school and they would be entitled to a HOPE Scholarship under the President's proposal. Ninety percent go to college. Not too many years ago it was under 50 percent in that area.

So what we're doing is taking that school and four others in four other urban areas and showing what works and how it works well. And we've gotten some of the top educators in the country involved in that process -- we announced it this morning in New York -- really getting standards out there where they're meaningful to all students and all families and all parents. And it's not just something that we talk about in educational circles, to get the engaging work down in the classrooms where young people are learning in depth and what matters.

Now, if you look at what we then need in this country to do the job in education that the American people are absolutely into -- and I think all of you that have polls in your papers or networks or whatever know that -- is leadership. That's what we need. We need to reach parents. We need to reach students and teachers and others --

leaders, community leaders in this movement for high standards. And the things are in place. The states are getting the standards in there on down to the classroom. So leadership I think is what we need. I think the President and the First Lady are providing that leadership, and I am very honored to be a part of this team.

I would close my little remark by saying Richard Elmore -- who many of you perhaps know as a education research person at Harvard, very well respected and written a number of books -- and he said the other day of a goals panel meeting that he traveled all around the country, been in a lot of major urban areas and in every urban area -- major urban area in this country, he said, you can find three of the very best schools in the world, and you can find three of the very worst. Now, that says to me that there is a best way of doing it, like Central Park East, and you can develop that kind of motivation, that kind of a spirit of the belief in education. That can be done and we're going to show it. And it's really from here on out, I think, it's very important just to stimulate parents and grandparents and others to believe in their children and believe in education and that's a big part of what we're doing.

MRS. CLINTON: I also want to be sure that you understand how the President sees this and how the Secretary is planning it, because he often -- the President often says we want national, not federal standards. And that's really what he means; that there are, as the Secretary said, about 48 states that are working, and most of them very effectively, on creating standards.

But what we need in order for those states and the parents who live in those states and the kids who go to those schools and the teachers who teach in them to know whether or not the standards that are being implemented are really going to produce the results that we all want for our children is some form of measurement. And that's where the test comes in. And Mike Smith has been involved in education for a very long time and is really on the front line working on determining what tests to be used, how the tests will be used. And I wanted him to talk a little bit about what it is we're going to do, what these tests are, because I think that's where a lot of the questions as we proceed will come.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. Let me motivate this a little bit. Last week, Mr. Engler came out for the tests. And on Saturday night, I guess, Mr. Lott came out against the tests. So there has been some disagreement in the Republican Party.

The Secretary mentioned that we were now at the point where about 48 states had standards, and a number of those states have assessments that measure those standards and things. In your packet, there is a chart which compares the National Assessment of Educational Progress standards with state standards. And what you see in that chart is that an awful lot of students pass state standards but do not pass National Assessment of Educational Progress standards. That happens in southern states; it also happens in states like Wisconsin. And what this is indicating is that while the standards movement is really moving

well -- that is, lots of states are adopting standards; lots of states are moving with assessments; they're beginning to even train teachers to be able to teach to those standards so that kids can get rewarded for what they're taught -- although they're doing well, they're not setting very rigorous standards in many instances.

And they're also running into a little bit of a problem occasionally at the state level. In a way, we've hit a plateau in the standards movement. It's the plateau of implementation. It's a lot easier to put standards in place and assessments in place. It's a lot harder to bring it down to the classroom, as the Secretary said. And we're hitting the point where the states are not, in many cases, adopting really rigorous standards. So we have two problems.

The President thought about it; the Secretary has thought a lot about this problem -- that is, the problem of not having the states set high standards and of the plateau itself, thought about a bunch of different strategies to try to overcome the problem, and settled on the strategy of having two national tests.

Now, it's kind of an odd thing to choose in some ways, but really these tests are seen as a wake-up call. It's putting high octane gasoline into the engine of the reform in some sense. The two tests were very carefully chosen. A 4th-grade test based on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and the 4th-grade test is in reading. And if there is one time in reading, one time in a child's life when a test in reading is absolutely critical, it's in 4th grade,

because children that don't do well in reading in 4th grade end up not doing well throughout high school, not going on to college. It's the best predictor of not graduating from high school.

And the reason is that in the United States most schools stop teaching reading at 4th grade, in the middle of 4th grade and beyond. Students are expected to read for meaning, read for understanding. They're expected to read textbooks in science and in English literature and in social studies and history to get understanding from them. And if they can't read independently, they're lost. They're lost for all those other subjects. They're also lost for math, because at that point they're beginning to get word problems in math. So reading at 4th grade is an absolutely critical time. And if we don't have all of our children reading well by the 4th grade, we as a country suffer.

Right now, on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, there are three levels of proficiency: basic level; proficient level, which is the level we'd like everybody to get to at some point; and an advanced level. Even at the basic level, 40 percent of our students don't succeed to that level. That's a real tragedy, and those students need to be helped.

That's, in effect, what America Reads is all about. It's real attempt to help those students reach at least a basic level. And there is also an attempt to get other kids up beyond the basic level to proficient and so on. But that's why we chose the test, 4th-grade

reading, because it has this tremendous importance to the nation and because it's a basic skill and because it's a proficiency that everybody believes in. I mean, it's not controversial, like evolution or like teaching about the Civil War and reasons for it and so on. It's completely noncontroversial.

The same thing is true about 8th-grade mathematics. In 8th-grade mathematics, if you haven't gotten decent mathematics by 8th grade, you're not going to get the opportunity to go and take college courses in high school. If all you've had is basically arithmetic up through 8th grade, you're going to end up in remedial courses in high school, maybe a pre-algebra by the time you hit your sophomore year or so, but you're never really going to have the chance to go into those kinds of courses where the kids are going to go on, and know that they're going to go on to college.

Now, the United States received a wake-up call in mathematics about three months ago or four months ago, when the Third International Math and Science Study came out. And what that study showed was that in science we did above average internationally. This is a study of 41 nations, I believe. In science we did above average. In mathematics we did well below average, as an entire country. Statistically we were ahead of almost no country that we would consider advanced. They were all developing nations that we were ahead of. I believe we were ahead of 10 or 12 countries, something like that. So it's really pretty discouraging to take a look at a set of scores like that.

But what was encouraging about the study was that it gave some reasons why we didn't score as well as many of our competitors. And these reasons are not -- this is not rocket science, folks. These reasons are pretty straightforward. What it says is that we don't do as well -- is, one, we don't teach the content that others learn in schools. We don't get the algebra and geometry and the more complicated math problems. We just -- are kids just aren't taught them. It's very, very simple. They just aren't taught them.

And second, our teachers teach differently than teachers in other countries. Teachers in other countries spend much more time on problems, much more time interacting with their students about the nature of the problems and about how to go about solving the problems. Teachers in the United States spend much more time showing you how to solve the problem, not inducing you to solve it yourself, not inducing you to get actively involved, not inducing you to think hard about how to solve that problem and how to solve problems like it in the future. So our teachers teach differently and our teachers give different content.

Now, that's the second reason -- that's a second reason for doing algebra or doing mathematics in 8th grade. The first reason was that it is a tipping point; it's a gateway into high school, into good high school math. The second reason is that we know what to do about this.

And the third reason is that we also have good tests in 8th grade mathematics. We have the National Assessment of Educational Progress test, and we have this Third International Math and Science Study.

So what we chose then were two basic skill areas, one in 4th-grade reading and one in 8th-grade math, both noncontroversial. The nation believes that students should be able to achieve to high proficient levels in each of those grades in those two subjects. And we were able to adopt tests based on existing good assessments. Now, the existing assessments are given out to samples. They're not given out to individual students. So we have to create some new tests. We have to create a new test in reading for individual students and a new test in math for individual students. And we'll do that over the next two years. These tests will be ready in 1999. They will be tests that are then in effect licensed to states and to private test developers so they can put in their test batteries. This is not a brand new test that's going to added on to schools, in effect. It will be introduced in the context of the assessments that are already given.

The tests themselves will give students an idea -- students and their parents and their teachers and so on -- an idea about how they measure up nationally. Did they reach the basic level? Did they reach the proficient level? Did they reach the advanced level in both of them? And in 8th-grade math, how do they compare internationally. Did they at least reach the international mean or median? Did they reach higher than that?

Information from those tests will not be gathered by the federal government. We ask that that information be used at the state and local level, at the classroom level, be given to parents along with a lot of explanation about the nature of test itself and what students should be expected to learn.

After those tests are given in the spring of 1999, they will be released on the Internet and made available to everybody --

MRS. CLINTON: The problems.

MR. SMITH: The problems themselves, right. To home schoolers, for example, or to anybody else who wants to give these test or study the tests. In the interim, between now and 1999, the Department of Education, as the President announced yesterday, consortia of different agencies in the government, all of us will enlist the help of nongovernmental organizations outside of all the educational groups of the states and local governments and education, to try to get our nation ready for those kids to take the test in 1999.

So we will push very, very hard to get everybody reading independently by 4th grade and very, very hard to get everybody up to snuff in mathematics by 8th grade. So these tests aren't there just to embarrass people. They aren't there just to get people to give people scores. They're there to really give a call to action, in effect, for the nation -- a call to action to get our students to a point where,

one, every child can read independently, and, two, we can be competitive in mathematics as a nation.

There's lots of detail on this that you may or may not want to hear, so I think I'll just stop here.

Q Should they be given the tests if they're not even getting the training or the instruction?

MR. SMITH: I think that's a very good question. That's exactly the right question. If they're not getting the instruction, then they aren't going to do well on the test. Between now and 1999, we want to encourage everybody to give them the instruction. We're going to make available all the information about the tests. We're going to make it available to everybody out there what are good methods to teach. And we still don't expect lots of kids to do very well. It will take five years or maybe even 10 years to get them to do as well as we'd like them to do. But if we don't do this now, if we don't do it now, we'll never break into this cycle.

We tolerate a weak curriculum for poor kids and a strong curriculum for the well-to-do. And as a nation, we can't continue to tolerate doing that. And the curriculum for well-to-do kids isn't even very strong in mathematics. So we're tolerating weak curriculum in mathematics for everybody and a very weak curriculum in mathematics for our kids in our inner cities.

Q Have they solved the discipline problem where they can actually get down to teaching again in these schools?

MRS. CLINTON: That's another really good question, Helen. I think a lot of districts, at least as I've traveled around and talked to principals and school board members, are beginning to take back discipline from this false idea that grew up sometime in the last 20 or so years that legally it was very difficult for a teacher in a classroom to discipline anybody. And many school boards and administrations didn't stand behind teachers. And so there were and are a lot of classrooms that are disruptive and difficult to teach in.

But my sense is -- and Mike and the Secretary are out there all the time -- is that there is a growing willingness on the part of school districts to take back their authority and to be willing to set much tougher rules, remove disruptive kids from classrooms, and try to create an orderly learning environment which, if you don't have that, a lot of what Mike is talking about that needs to be taught can be taught.

Q Will there be a clearinghouse where we'll be able to call and find out how people have scored across the nation, or are we going to have to call each state individually? You know, you talk about -- you were trying to be careful to get heavy-handed with the federal role, but are we going to be able to find out on a nationwide basis how people scored?

MR. SMITH: Well, there are two ways to find out on a

nationwide basis. One would be aggregate all the scores for the individual level. The test is voluntary. We don't expect every community to take this test. We expect lots of states to take it. We hope every community in every state takes it. We expect -- you know, there will be some holdouts, at least the first year. So one way would be aggregate the individual scores, and we don't intend to do that now. So it would put you to work a little bit; you'd have to call a bunch of different places. The second way, though, is that there will be -- continue to be this sample basis, national assessment, which will give a national score but it will be based on a sample.

SECRETARY RILEY: The NAEP test will still be going on and they are equated. The NAEP test, some that might be of help to you, is done on a sample basis. As some of you I'm sure know, you have a country or a state or a city or whatever and get a NAEP test, but you -- it would be a sampling -- the person that takes the test -- if you were taking math in NAEP in 8th grade, you might just do the multiplication part and then you would do the division and somebody else would do another part. If you took the whole test it would take like seven hours.

So, that -- so, this is different. So, now we've got to equate with the NAEP baseline and individual test, so you would take all subjects -- if you see what I mean -- and all students would take all subjects. Every child in the 4th grade and every child in the 8th grade would be offered these tests.

Q So you don't really intend to collect all the results --
is that -- nationwide? Is that right?

MR. SMITH: That's right.

Q You may have a sample for us to give us an idea, but you
won't have --

MR. SMITH: We'll have a sample for you. We also expect
and we'll -- we will get out models for local districts to report the
results of schools, report the results of their districts. We expect
states to accumulate their results to take a look across the states at
schools and at the districts. So, I think we're going to find that
willy-nilly will have across the country scores kind of bubbling in.

But these will -- these tests will given at the same time
that tests are now given. And if you think back to your school time,
that could be at any time during the spring -- starting April up through
the middle of May or so. So, the tests will be given at a number of
different times. It's not all going to be given at once. Scores will
come back sometime in the middle of May, and then the cities, states
will begin to report them out to the public. And as they begin to
report out, we'll accumulate -- of course -- after they're reported out.
But we're not going to go in and take those measures ourselves. We're
walking a little bit of a line here on the federal-state issue.

SECRETARY RILEY: But the important thing is that every

parent -- every parent and every student will know how they stand on these two very basic -- in a transitionAL period in the whole nation.

Q -- districts where they've chosen to give these tests, and isn't one problem you're going to have here is that the districts that already have the problems -- have these inherent problems of either teachers not teaching right or not enough money in the district or the administrators not doing their job -- they're going to be the least likely teachers unions and least likely administrators to put their credibility in line and allow these tests to be given in their schools?

SECRETARY RILEY: Now, that will be more or less on a statewide basis. And as you know, the President's proposal is -- number one, is that we would develop the test. We would equate it with NAEP and TIMSS. That takes -- and also, we would have it administered free the first year. So, it would be zero cost to them. And we think there will be just a national --

Q What's the real purpose of the test? Is it to inform the teachers?

Q Given what happened in Milwaukee, will people want to take that test? Because you saw what happened in Milwaukee -- there were very few students who actually passed the test. And one thing we know about public education in this country is that the quality varies greatly. And will we -- are you concerned about this sort of academic stratification and we create this chasm between the haves and the

have-nots?

MR. SMITH: We're completely concerned about that. And that's one of -- that's the major reason we're doing this.

SECRETARY RILEY: This will affect it positively.

MR. SMITH: Michigan just signed up for the test.

MRS. CLINTON: That means all the districts in Michigan.

So that sort of solves the --

MR. SMITH: And Maryland has signed up, so, it's Baltimore. And so, in many cases, what you're going to have are states signing up. In the other cases -- I guarantee you're going to see New York come in at some point soon and New York City and L.A. and so on.

Mike, you might want to --

MR. COHEN: Well, you actually made several points I was going to make. But the states that we've been talking to were signing up to do this on a statewide basis, so that every kid in the state will take it. And one of the things that that will do, I think, is tell parents in urban areas -- the ones that you're concerned might not want to sign up for the test -- in ways that they have very difficult time of finding out now -- they will be able to find out how well their kids are doing compared to real standards that the kids going to be judged

against once they leave schools. You know the phenomena of kids in any schools, but particularly in urban schools, getting all easy chair and being promoted and being told they're doing a really wonderful job only to discover that they're not doing very well in any external measure of quality.

This will be the first time that parents, particularly in urban areas, will have honest, accurate information about how well their kids are doing compared to the same kind of expectations that are set for students in surrounding suburban communities and for students all over the world. It ought to give -- it ought to empower parents to call for and mobilize for education reforms in ways that have been more difficult for them to do now, which is exactly what you saw in Milwaukee once the shock of the low performance on the test began to take hold.

Q Can this work, Mrs. Clinton, unless states require testing in all their schools?

MRS. CLINTON: I'm sorry --

Q Will this work unless states -- can this work if states do not require testing in all their schools?

MRS. CLINTON: Ron, I think it can work initially for this first effort because what we're trying to do is to get enough states and enough districts to agree voluntarily to do that. I think we will have that. I mean, I can, sitting here right now, tell you exactly how many

we'll have. But the response to the President's call has been very positive.

And I think there will be then a kind of public pressure on school districts and states for those that perhaps choose not to participate in the test in 1999, because as a taxpayer, as a parent of a child in a school -- if you start reading about this and you call us and you say, well, how are our kids doing. And they say, well, we're not going to take the test. Why not -- why aren't we going to take the test? Well, we just decided we're going to take a different test. Well, why don't we take the test that everybody is taking? I may be transferred next year to some other school district. How do I know whether that's a good school district?

So, I think there will be increasing awareness on the part of the public. As Mike was saying, what happened in Milwaukee, I think, is a positive example. I mean, the initial shock of it was disturbing to people. But the positive feedback then was, alright, what are we going to do about this?

So, I'm actually very optimistic that once we get the test fielded with enough people taking it in 1999 that that will create a momentum of its own. At least, that's what we believe will happen.

Q Mrs. Clinton, are there ways beyond these speeches to the state legislatures to try to bring Republicans on, to get them to join -- to participate in -- is the White House doing other outreach,

too, not just to Democrats but to Republicans?

MRS. CLINTON: Yes. And again, Mike and the Secretary can fill you in on more details. But from the very beginning -- and I think the President said this most memorably in Maryland when he said that algebra and other courses are not partisan -- and there's got to be a way to enlist all kinds of people. And I think that with Governor Engler signing on, I believe there will be some other announcements in the next couple of weeks of other Republican governors signing on -- I know there has been an intensive effort on the part of the White House and the Department of Education to work with members of Congress of both parties, and I think that we're very hopeful.

Now, are we going to be able to get everybody to agree? No, we're not. And, is there still going to be continuing questioning about what this means and how it's going to work? Absolutely, there will be. But I think, on balance, for having just announced it a month and a half ago, everybody is pleased at the way it's proceeding.

Dick, do you want to add anything about the partisan --

SECRETARY RILEY: Well, first of all, it's our position that education is not a partisan issue, and we don't teach children, as you've heard me say, as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans. And the fact that since the President has really placed education as a first priority and see it rise to the top in terms of the people's interest, I think it's very clear that really what we are seeing is a

movement, kind of a standards movement. And I think it's happening.

And I would invite you to look at any numbers out there of public interest or whatever -- people -- and I go to schools every day -- people are absolutely into this thing. They want their children to be able to read when they are should be able to read -- at the end of the 3rd graders. If they can't then, that means they're going to demand and we're going to be demanding with them that something be done to make sure in the 4th and 5th grade that that child then gets the resources put to him or her to learn how to read. The whole volunteer program is to have a mentor or a tutor be with that child, perhaps from kindergarten forward at the teacher's request. The teacher is the one that says who will have a mentor or not, working closely with the teacher. And then, all of the teachers are into raising standards, principals and everybody else.

I think you're seeing a very exciting thing take place that I call a movement. And I hope that's going to be true. And it will be the best thing that will happen to this country.

Q Mr. Secretary, if you will, though, your enthusiasm for this movement seems contradictory to Mr. Smith's assertion that you've hit a plateau and that the states are themselves underachievers in not setting rigorous standards. What leverage do you have to move the states to set higher standards, or is it just through this kind of sort of bully pulpit approach?

SECRETARY RILEY: That has a lot to do with it, Charles.

And it is the bully pulpit because I think it's something that they're listening to the leaders on. And that's why I'm glad we're here talking about it today. I don't think we've reached some kind of a plateau at all. If you look at the --

Q I'm sorry, I could have sworn I heard the word plateau from your colleague. That's what I find --

MRS. CLINTON: I'll give Mike an equal chance to respond because I think I know what he said, but he maybe --

SECRETARY RILEY: In reading, we have been pretty level in reading for some time. In math, where we've had math standards out there -- and just think about standards, if you would -- standards is a definition of what a child should know and be able to do in a certain grade in a certain subject. And then you put all the resources into reaching that standard. And you're not all here, there and yonder. And that makes sense. And that's what everybody's doing. In math, we've had the standards out there since the late '80s. In math, the recent NAEP test -- '90, '92 and '96 shows a constant uplift in 4th, 8th and 12th grade.

Now, reading, we haven't done as good a job, but internationally we stand pretty well reading. We're one of the top countries in reading, but our competitive problem is math and science in other countries. But you're right about reading being rather leveled

off, and that's why we want this impetus on reading. And a lot of it is afternoons and evenings, and a lot of it is kids -- to some of you television people that are watching television instead of reading -- (laughter) -- and we're trying then to get more of an interest in reading early.

MRS. CLINTON: Mike, do you want to -- I want Mike to just

--

SECRETARY RILEY: Defend yourself. (Laughter.)

MR. SMITH: If you take a look at -- let me just borrow this for just a second -- at this one chart, which is, I think, a telling chart in here, state NAEP scores for 4th grade reading compared to state's own assessments. And if you've looked at that, what you'll see is that in Connecticut against NAEP 38 percent scored proficient, in their own state assessment 48; Wisconsin 35 percent scored proficient, 88 in their own assessment; and so on.

That's the plateau I'm talking about. That is -- we have a movement that we hope -- we hoped -- and we still hope will result in high challenging standards for all kids. And if in fact our standards are low, that movement's stalled a little bit. Remember, it's only six years old. But if we let it stay with low standards, it will never succeed. We've got to jar it out of the low standards part of it. And that's what I meant.

MRS. CLINTON: It's like the end of Garrison Keillor, when he does his Lake Wobegone thing, he says, well all the children are above average. A lot of the states that Mike's talking about --the standards that have been set did make movement. I mean, I know that for a fact from Arkansas, where I know where we started in 1993 and I know where we are now.

But there's always a tendency to kind of rest on your laurels a little bit -- say, oh look how much better we're doing -- when, in fact, if you look at a broad-based assessment, like what we're going to be trying to do with this set of tests in 1999, everybody can do better.

And, Mike, you had your -- you wanted to add something to that?

MR. COHEN: Yes, I wanted to go back to an earlier question also about the bipartisanship and what we're doing to reach out to Republicans because I think that's very important

(End of side one of tape.)

(Begin side two of tape; in progress)

-- and one of the nice things is that actually, and one of the nice things is that actually, a number of the Republicans are reaching out to

each other on our behalf in this. Just about a week and a half ago, there was an op-ed piece in The Washington Post by two former Assistant Secretaries of Education -- one, Diane Ravich (phonetic) from the Bush administration who led the effort for that administration to promote standards and Checker Finn (phonetic), who was an Assistant Secretary in the Reagan administration who did the same thing there. The two of them wrote an op-ed piece, I think we may have a copy of it here someplace if you're interested, that basically says the President's right on this issue. We do need national standards, we need them in these subjects, kids ought to be subject to the same tests so that everyone has a fair opportunity to find out how well the students are doing, and I think we're going to see even more of that kind of effort where people who you don't normally associate with this administration are signing on to this effort.

The Business Roundtable -- thank you, I'll pass this around -- the Business Roundtable, for instance, the day after The State of the Union addressed -- endorsed the testing proposal and mostly the other business groups have been very positively responding to it as well. So I think people who are not, again, part of what you would normally associate with the Clinton administration are nonetheless seeing this is the kind of effort that can bring people together around what's important in education. I think we will see them continue to build support for it.

Q So where is Chelsea going to college? (Laughter.)

MRS. CLINTON: Somewhere with high standards. (Laughter.)

I wanted to get back to your question about stratification, and it was really Helen's question as well. Nobody looks forward to the results of this test confirming what many of us assume by other evidence and anecdotally will be the case, which is large numbers of children, principally in disadvantaged situations, are not going to do well on this test; there is, I don't think, any way to get around that.

But that is the case right now. They're not doing well in any fair assessment of what they are learning and what they're able to at a level they're able to perform at when they leave school. And the real issue for us as we look at this is, what is the best way to try to help those children? How do we equip parents and schools and communities with the tools they need to demand and then to obtain better educational outcomes for these kids.

Well, the first thing, we believe, is you have to have honest, accurate information about what it is that they are learning right now, and that is a lot harder than it might seem, because there is not a willingness on the part of many people to trumpet their failures and their disappointments, and instead there is a tendency to say, well, what would you expect -- we have children from a certain socioeconomic background and you can't expect them to do very well. But we now know so much more than we knew in 1983, and even in 1989, about what works with such children.

As the Secretary said, we can go into any urban district

and we can find, as he visited this morning, a school that takes the same kids from the same kind of neighborhoods where failure is the norm, and turns them into academic successes. The key is, why don't we replicate that more? Why don't we take the schools that work for these vulnerable children and make them the models? They are everywhere in our country, but for some reason that is often difficult to understand, they don't serve as models, and people don't line up at their door to find out what works, and in part because there's no sense of accountability out there in the entire educational system.

This is a first step to try to obtain that accountability.

And then, if you look at the rest of the call for action, we know we have to do better teacher preparation and training. We think charter schools will be a way of helping. We think technology will be a way of helping. So we have a whole set of responses to what we think will be the unfortunate results of the tests for some people.

Q Let me follow up on that. How much -- you said you don't want the fact that it's a poor district to be an excuse for complacency or to explain away failure. How much of it, in your view, though, is explained by the resources that individual school districts have?

MRS. CLINTON: You know, that's a hard question, because I think -- I would rather answer it like this: I'd rather say all of it is probably explained by the resources available to a child from the moment that child is born until that child leaves school. Because I

think if you only look at the school, you may miss some of the very important resources that have to take place in the family prior to the child going to school.

I've also -- and I think both the Secretary and Mike have seen this -- I've seen classrooms that are not all that well equipped where the magic of learning goes on and where the children are motivated and they do well. And I've seen other schools where they have a lot of computers and new equipment and the teachers aren't trained to use it. So that you can find almost any set of circumstances in an American school, and I guess I would say that, yes, resources count, but when I think of resources I think about the motivation and training of teachers, not just the salary or the facilities. I think that's one of the reasons we're trying to look at this in a comprehensive way.

SECRETARY RILEY: Let me mention something I think would be interesting to you when you're talking about disadvantaged people. Our biggest program by far, of course, is Title I, and that is a major help to state and local schools for disadvantaged kids.

When we came here four years ago, it was -- oh, Chapter I it was called then -- and it had a special watered down curriculum for disadvantaged kids, starting from kindergarten forward, went all the way through high school. It had a watered down set of assessment where a kid could go through school and virtually be practically learn very little and still get by, and one of the first things -- and the President and I talked about this a number of times is, we did away with

that and we came out -- what has been the reauthorization, the new Title I -- it's the same standard for all children. And, yes, the test scores show a difference at first, but you will never, by being dishonest with them, you will never help them. Dishonesty can never be a good policy in education.

So the first thing we did is we urged, through Goals 2000 and everything else, to get standards up there, all the states, and then to do away with for poor children a watered-down curriculum and watered-down testing and making it tougher and harder, and it's the best thing in the world for those kids.

MRS. CLINTON: I just want to -- one quick example on that -- I've been in and out of schools a lot in the last couple of years, and just within the last couple of months I was in a school with kids who were poor, disadvantaged kids, however you want to describe them -- multiracial school, and the classroom was crackling with excitement. I mean, the kids were into hands-on learning, they were asking questions, they were talking with each other, and then a little while later I was in another school, a different district, same kind of socioeconomic and racial mix of kids, and they were sitting there in their seats copying sentences from a workbook.

Now, it broke my heart, because I walked around there and I looked at these bright young kids, laboriously copying what was in that workbook, and the teacher was very proud. This was the class they chose to show me. They could have taken me anywhere else. You know, it was

so difficult, because here is a teacher who is devoted to these kids and the kids are trying hard, and yet the whole system in that school -- and I would I guess say in much of that district that the school was in -- just doesn't -- is not organized to prepare the kids with even the resources that it has -- better than they are doing. Because what I saw in the first school was not expensive. I mean, they were doing experiments with what floated and what didn't float and making lists about things. And these workbooks probably cost as much as what they were doing in the first class.

So part of what we have to do by using this testing information is to kind of open up the minds of people who are in the classroom already so they're more willing to change what they do and to use the resources they already have. And we think we can do that.

Q Mrs. Clinton, are you concerned that you might find more of those classrooms? I mean, the TIMSS studies said the teachers do not focus enough on problem-solving. And one of the reasons is that so many teachers teach to the test. They know that they face these standardized tests at the end of the year and they want to prepare the students for them, and so we've got this rote learning in the classrooms. We might see many teachers do this as they try to prepare their students for this test in 1999.

MRS. CLINTON: Well, Mike is the expert on this, but I'll let you -- go ahead.

MR. SMITH: They will teach to the test, but they won't teach to the test questions, which is what they often do in the United States. That is, they give the same tests year after year after year, something like the Lake Woebegone effect, actually, that a man reported a few years ago. And one way that happens is that the -- in many, many districts they give exactly the same form of the test year after year after year. And after a while, the teachers know what's on the form. And, lo and behold, if the word "ambiguous" is on that reading test, magically it occurs in the classroom three or four days before your test.

So teaching to the test has two meanings. One is teaching specifically to the test. The other is teaching the kind of content that the test is going to cover. And we're going to be very clear about what the content is that the test is supposed to cover. We're going to give examples using not the federal government now, but using the International Reading Association and using other organizations of what are good books that kids could be reading at second grade, third grade, fourth grade, reading independently -- the kinds of inferences they're expected to make out of paragraphs and short stories and so on -- the kinds of sentences they're expected to be able to write, for example when they're answering a question that isn't just a multiple choice question. Many of these questions will be questions actually to expect them to actually produce some language.

Q And you're confident that that will lead to dynamic classroom teaching and hands-on learning?

MRS. CLINTON: We've seen it. We have seen it.

MR. SMITH: It's not the test alone that will do that, it's an example, it's giving examples of teaching strategies that in fact lead to good results from those tests, and that will do it.

Q How far along are you in the development of the tests now? You say it's going to be arranged through competitive contracts. And the other thing I wondered was whether you could quantify so far your reaction to the tests -- you know, how many states are on board or whatever.

MR. SMITH: We're a month and a half into it, right -- this whole business announced -- we will be going out in the next 10 days on the Internet with what's called an RFP, which is a request for a proposal, which will attract comment for 10 days or so. We'll then have another 10 days to take advantage of those comments and change things, and then we'll put out the RFP. So within the next month and a half we'll have the RFP -- request for proposal on the street, we'll have it awarded by the summer, and we have a very detailed -- as you might imagine, this is a tight schedule -- we have a very detailed time line and right now we're a little bit ahead.

Q When you ta MR. SMITH: No, I think we'll probably have one group for one test and one group for another test, would be my guess. There will be a third group.

Q What kind of group are we talking about? Can you --

MR. SMITH: Well, it will be -- one obvious example is the Educational Testing Service, which now does the national assessment of educational progress. And I'm sure that they could be one of the winners of this. But they could have considerable competition as well.

SECRETARY RILEY: Well, we're building on the reputation of NAEP and TIMSS, which these are equated with and done the same way. So I mean, it's not like we're coming out of nowhere on this. We have a baseline, they're going to equate this test on the baseline, you'll be able to compare how you stand with how things were in the country five years ago, and so forth.

MR. SMITH: That's a very good point. Most tests take four or five years to develop. The reason they take four or five years to develop is you have to settle on the content that you want in the test first, and you have to settle on something called the performance standards. That is the levels that you want students to be able to achieve to.

We leapfrog those, because they're already in the National Assessment of Educational Progress. They have a content standard, basically, that we would base the test upon. And that, in fact, we'll use that content standard to provide us with ideas about information that we should be putting out there to teachers and to parents and so on

about what kind of content to teach.

SECRETARY RILEY: It is very well respected. And that's why you see people like this saying this makes good sense.

Q The second question was could you quantify how many states are interested already or have indicated interest? Is D.C. --

MR. COHEN: So far two have publicly signed up, but I would say there are another eight to 10 that we have talked with in the last couple of weeks that have expressed a serious interest. Keep in mind, states don't adopt tests overnight. This is a serious decision for a state to make.

Q -- don't know what the test is yet.

MR. COHEN: They know what's on the test and they know a fair amount about what the specifications for the test are going to be.

Q Who has signed --

MR. COHEN: Michigan and Maryland. And I think you'll see

--

Q Have you had any communication with them --

MR. COHEN: I have not talked to anyone in D.C.

Q Will there be any consequence for the test for either the school districts or students themselves, either encouraging the schools not to pass them on to the next grade, or is this just an assessment of how they --

MR. SMITH: Well, remember those decisions are all made at the local and state level. and that's not a cop-out, in the sense that this test will be like any other test in that sense. It will be in a test battery and -- a set of other tests. And if they use the other tests for purposes of that sort, they might use this test. Now, this test will have to meet the same standards. There is something called psychometric standards and they're set by the American Psychological Association, and the National Council of Measurement in Education and so on, and they set out a set of standards. The test will have to meet all those standards.

Part of the standards have to do with what a test is used for, and so the test has to meet certain standards in order to be used for what's called a high stakes test -- a retention test or graduation test.

Q Mrs. Clinton, in Arkansas, when you decided something needed to be done about the schools that you and your husband had some effect over, you worked to require that teachers be tested, you worked to require the school districts have certain standards that be met. I know it's apples and oranges and maybe you

can explain why it is, but why didn't you require here that states perform these tests?

MRS. CLINTON: Because education is primarily a state and local responsibility in our country, and I think there are a lot of strengths to that. And when the President talked about national, not federal, standards, and voluntary testing, he was respecting that division of responsibility. So in Arkansas, which at the state level accredits schools, accredits teachers, there were certain ways of exercising that responsibility that could be connected with the outcome of the test. At the federal level that is not authority vested in the federal government and it's not authority that the President and the Secretary is seeking.

Q Are you afraid that with Mr. Lott's opposition that there may be some way Congress tries to block this, and if not Congress, individual state legislatures that may challenge decisions made by their governor or their state chairman of the Board of Education?

MRS. CLINTON: The Secretary has Mr. Lott's statement in front of him so --

SECRETARY RILEY: I don't see where he opposes testing as such. He made a broad statement to a group of conservatives -- now derail the President's plan to revitalize education standards. I mean, certainly someone could say, well, that testing was a part of

that, but I don't see that as an attack on testing itself.

MRS. CLINTON: But I think part of the reason why I thought that we might want to talk about education standards is that I think there's a lot of misunderstanding about what this proposal is and what it would do. And I would hope that everyone would take the time to talk to the Secretary or Mike Smith about what it is we're trying to achieve and how it is not an attempt to micromanage what goes on in the classrooms of America, but instead, to set a national benchmark against which local districts can measure themselves.

And I think in this time of accountability in both the public and the private sector, and particularly in education, as more school districts and states learn that that is what this test is for, I think they will be more and more willing to say they want to be part of that. It will help them with their job.

Q How worried are you by the sort of extreme right -- it's not the Business Council that's going to provide the opposition to this, it's a group that you're familiar with and have spoken with on other occasions -- it's talk radio, it cultural conservatives, it's the Christian right who this touches a nerve on them and, frankly, you touch a nerve on them -- or so I've heard. (Laughter.) How do you deal with that?

MRS. CLINTON: Well, I think the President's speeches in Maryland and Michigan really did deal with that effectively. There

will be opposition no matter what is done in education because it's such an important issue and people feel so personally about their children's education and about the future of education in the country. I don't think that the opposition should be troubling at all. I think that's healthy for people to raise questions and debate.

But what I'm hoping is that through speeches by the President and others who share his commitment to this effort, more and more Americans will understand what it is, so that if someone makes a charge against what the President is trying to do, they will be able to sort that out and say, well, that's not what he's trying to do. He's not going into a local school district and say here's what you must teach on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. He's saying here's what we think 4th graders ought to be able to do in reading, and here's what we think 8th graders ought to be able to do in math. It is up to you, local school districts, to think of the most effective way to move your students to be able to achieve at that level.

Q He raises a good point, because you have become identified with this initiative, you're traveling around the country, and groups for whom this is a lightening rod have also in the past made you a lightening rod. And I'm wondering, given that circumstance, both how you are received when you go out and why you would take this on, because of that -- of the opposition.

MRS. CLINTON: Well, I guess the first reason is because I've worked on it since 1983 when I chaired the Commission on Education Standards in Arkansas and we ran into some of the very same issues. And I think I have a good appreciation for the legitimate concerns people have. But there are those who for partisan or ideological reasons will not ever support any kind of national standard or national assessment. And I just respectfully think that they are wrong and that a commitment to national standards is the best way we know to help local districts benchmark their own practices and to come up with ways that will help all the children achieve at a higher level.

So it's something that I have a long history with, I am very committed to, and I think is the most important way that I know of that we can try to move every young person up the educational ladder.

But Dick was the Governor of South Carolina; he's well aware of the kind of opposition that is out there, but we just don't see it. It may burn up some radio talk show host's telephone lines, but that's not what we hear and see as we're traveling around talking to teachers and parents and students.

Is that your experience?

SECRETARY RILEY: I think you're exactly right. And the President, of course, is a former governor, I'm a former governor

--we are very respectful of the state's responsibility. Every state constitution requires free public education for all children in the state. That's a state responsibility. The federal role is very important in this country in this education era-information era, and certainly our role we think is very important.

The conservatives, if there's anything that they are clear about, is to emphasize the basics. That is in education terms, that is the clearest message -- one of the clear messages you get from strong conservative parents, is to emphasize the basics. That's what we're doing, and that's why this is, in my judgment, something that I think is going to be uniformly accepted and even demanded by conservative parents. They want to know how their children are doing on the basics. And as the President said, reading is reading, and math is math, and that is a clear demarcation of the very basic basics in education.

Q On a different subject, I think we'd be remiss if we didn't ask you about the campaign finance controversy that's going on. Specifically, do you think in perfect 20-20 hindsight that it would have been better if Maggie hadn't taken that check -- or rejected the check and said, hey, just bring that down the street to the DNC?

MRS. CLINTON: Oh, I think as the President said on Friday, in retrospect, I'm sure that she wishes that's what she had done. But many of you know Maggie and she's an honorable and

courteous person, and what she did is legal and proper under the prevailing rules. But given the concern that it raised, I'm sure she wishes she had said, go mail it or go walk it over yourself.

Q Do you wish she had done that?

MRS. CLINTON: Oh, for her sake, certainly, yes.

Q Do you wonder, or have you wondered how it was that this fellow, Johnny Chung, came to sort of apparently camp out in your outer office, hoping that he would see you, chatting up the staff, there for reasons that were not apparently readily apparent to anyone there? What happened?

MRS. CLINTON: Well, I think that my staff is a polite and courteous group, and certainly has over the last four years been very willing to be courteous to people who came into the White House or who had business they said in the White House or the Old Executive Office Building. And if you were there, I guess the only way I can explain it is that that's what they thought they were doing, is being courteous.

Q And may I just ask how it was that he came to be admitted so often?

MRS. CLINTON: I don't know that. I don't know anything about that. But it wasn't only people in my office who admitted him,

as I'm sure you know; other people did as well. And I really don't know anything about why or under what circumstances.

Q Well, given the whole campaign and the Lincoln Bedroom and all of the things -- the revelations and may even be sort of deflecting from the issues you're trying to promote, it seems to be -- what would you do differently in retrospect? I mean, do you have any regrets? Did you talk to these people at midnight in the Lincoln Bedroom?

MRS. CLINTON: We certainly did, Helen. I mean, I think that -- I'd say a couple of things about that. First of all, anyone who knows my husband knows that he enjoys people, he counts thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of people among his friends. He likes spending time with people. When we arrived here at the White House, I think we were overwhelmed by the honor of living here and by the history that happened here, and we were excited to share it with a lot of people. And we did.

We invited friends of longstanding, people we wanted to get to know better, public officials that -- well, Secretary Riley spent the night here with his father. It was something that --

SECRETARY RILEY: A confession is in order, I think.

MRS. CLINTON: It was something that we really felt privileged about being able to share with people who felt the same

regard and valued this house the way I think Americans do. We also invited hundreds of thousands of people to events here at the White House of all kinds. You've covered many of them. And so when I look at people asking questions about why did you have these people spending the night, it, to me, was a very natural part of who my husband is and who are friends are and who people that he wants to talk to are. And he would, oftentimes when he heard somebody was in town or might be on the way to Washington, say, gosh, I'd love to see him or her and talk to them, which he did with Dick Riley's father.

And during the day, because he worked so amazingly hard, there wasn't time. But if they'd stay up and stick it out, he could come and talk to them at 10:00 p.m. or 11:00 p.m. or 12:00 a.m. or 1:00 a.m. in the morning. And he did on countless occasions. These are people that he enjoyed being able to give tours to -- I cannot tell you how many times, in the middle of the night, we'd be walking up and down the ground floor or the first floor, and the President would be talking about the significance of a portrait, or what happened in this room. Anyone who has ever spent any time with him knows that he just reveres living here. But I hope everyone knows how gregarious and truly outgoing he is, that he would want to share that with as many people as possible.

SECRETARY RILEY: Since my name came up -- (laughter) -- I had -- my father was 93 years old and was really beginning to slip. He was very close friends with the President and the President asked him to come spend the night. And so we came with him, and it was a great gesture.

Q Mrs. Clinton, do you feel confident there was no blurring of the lines on your side, whether it was the stop in Guam which has been written about, or anything subsequently? And have you taken any additional steps beyond what the White House has to ensure some things be done differently in the future?

MRS. CLINTON: Well, I think that the President has pretty much outlined what people will be thinking about in the future, and certainly no one likes to be held up for any kind of public inquiry, and nobody did anything that they thought was wrong at the time or that they were advised was wrong. So, that certainly nobody did anything that was improper, but nobody wants to raise even the shadow of a doubt about what is or is not appropriate behavior. So that's why, even for actions that are within the realm of propriety and legality, that it's going to be common sense to be much more careful so that nobody does anything that can raise any questions.

Q Mrs. Clinton, on Johnny Chung, I believe the record shows that on 21 of the 50 occasions he was here, he was, in fact, cleared through your office. Are you saying you don't know why any of those 21 events occurred, other than a courteous staff?

MRS. CLINTON: I don't know. I don't keep track with who is waved into the White House. That's not something I have any knowledge of. And I don't know what he was telling anybody or what

he was asking anybody. I just don't have any knowledge of that.

Q Could I just ask, did it ever occur to you, since this is your house as well, who are these people -- the ones that perhaps Ann Lewis described as not yet friends? That's a curious locution.

MRS. CLINTON: Well, we knew everybody who was invited. We may not have been the best of friends with everybody; we may not have known everybody for 30 or 40 years, but we knew everybody who was invited. And some we knew very well and some we were just getting to know. But they were all people that the President wanted to spend time with. And he did.

Q Mrs. Clinton, do you know specifically who in your office admitted Mr. Chung?

fundraising phone calls, and the President said he couldn't quite rule that out on himself. Did you make any of those kind of phone calls yourself during the campaign?

MRS. CLINTON: I do not recall making any, but I'm not going to say absolutely never. I just don't ever recall being asked to make any; I don't recall making any.

Q Were you involved in fundraising?

MRS. CLINTON: I certainly was, and I'm very pleased

that I was, Helen. I think that there's a tendency to fast-forward through what was going on in '94 and '95 that made all of us who believed in what the President was doing and what the odds were against the policies that he had been championing, to be as hard-working and enthusiastic as we could about trying to help him with his agenda. And that included many things. It was many, many speeches; it was many, many events. And it was also trying to help raise money for the message that the President wanted to try to get out.

Because when I think back on that period, it is very clear in my mind as I think back, that the Gingrich revolution, the Contract on America, all of that was going full-blast, and the message about deficit reduction and the crime bill and gun control and education and the environment was just getting swallowed up -- so that the President's agenda, those of us who supported it, thought was right for the country.

Q It never occurred to you that some of this money might be coming from foreign sources?

MRS. CLINTON: No, it never occurred to me. But, Helen, I didn't have any responsibility for keeping up with any of that.

Q Can I ask one non-campaign question before we go back on policy, although not totally related to education? On welfare reform -- did you see the article in the Atlantic that Peter

Edelman wrote about Bill Clinton's biggest mistake? If you didn't see it, you must have clearly been familiar with the argument of both Marian Wright Edelman. They are such close friends and this has been an issue that has been so close to you -- I was curious to your reaction when people who are longtime friends and longtime ideological soulmates make criticism that direct about administration policy. How do you react to that and how do you respond to those people?

MRS. CLINTON: Well, I respect their opinion, because they have earned the right to express an opinion. They have worked, both of them, very hard over many years on behalf of the underlying social and economic problems that cause people to be impoverished and have less opportunities than we'd want them to have. And this was an honest disagreement, and I have no bad feeling at all about that. We just see differently the way to the same objective.

There's no doubt in my mind that we all want to give people the tools of opportunity including education so that they can make good decisions in their own lives. The question is, how do we get there, and sometimes people who agree on goals will disagree on process or steps to be taken.

Some of your questions about the test suggest legitimate concern -- what will happen when this test is given and people don't do well. I'm very concerned about that. But having thought it through for many years, I don't see any other way. And the President

has become the leading spokesman for saying we have to do this in order to get to the goal we all want. And I feel the same way about welfare.

Q Well, you supported his signing.

MRS. CLINTON: Yes, I did.

Q You never said that at the time, though. I mean, you were very silent.

MRS. CLINTON: Oh, yes, I did.

Q Did you?

MRS. CLINTON: Oh, yes, I did. I said that I supported his signing. I had problems with certain sections of the bill; I said that at the time as well. But we are in a new era of working out the relationships in our society and certainly understanding the role of government and creating conditions in which people have a maximum chance to flourish and make their own way in life. And I'm not sure that any of us know exactly what's going to work, so that we're all trying as hard as we can to make the best decision based on the evidence we have available to us. And we have to be flexible and we have to be willing to take evidence like the results of tests and make hard decisions and try to do better. And we have to take evidence like what happens when welfare reform is implemented and

what happens to the children, particularly, and make sure that we have plans to be able to deal with that.

But I think you have to proceed on the assumption that we are trying to get to the same goal. And that's why I have absolutely no argument with people who say, that's not how I would have done it. And I think we have to keep the dialogue going and keep open to what critics who are acting in good faith are saying, so that we can try to do a better job.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

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

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IGH0KE7N4G0153D2@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for "Jeffrey H. Cohen"@oa.eop.gov; Thu,
13 Mar 1997 23:54:06 -0500 (EST)

Received: from gatekeeper.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IGH0KBCHS000MKVF@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Jeffrey_H._Cohen@oa.eop.gov; Thu,
13 Mar 1997 23:54:02 -0500 (EST)

Received: from cinnamon-life.ai.mit.edu by gatekeeper.eop.gov;
(5.65v3.2/1.1.8.2/17Oct95-0424PM) id AA16268; Thu, 13 Mar 1997 23:53:59 -0500

Received: from CLINTON.AI.MIT.EDU (clinton.ai.mit.edu [128.52.33.14])
by cinnamon-life.ai.mit.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5AI/cinnamon-life.ai.mit.edu:1.3)
with SMTP id XAA15809; Thu, 13 Mar 1997 23:16:48 -0500 (EST)

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 23:03-0500

Errors-to: Mail-Server@clinton.ai.mit.edu

Precedence: Bulk

Delivered-By-The-Graces-Of: White House Electronic Publications

Document-Id: PDI://OMA.EOP.GOV.US/1997/3/13/4.TEXT.1

Keywords: Arkansas, Connecticut, Economy, Education, Federalism, First-Lady,
Government, Joint-Appearance, Maryland, Michigan, Mid-Atlantic-Region,
Midwest-Region, New-England-Region, New-York, Personnel, Question-Taking,
Social, Social-Values, South-Carolina, South-Region, Urban, Welfare, Wisconsin

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Robert Clayton (CN=Robert Clayton/OU=EDUC/O=GOV [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-MAR-1997 13:28:18.00

SUBJECT: Education's Weekly Report for March 16-22 -- RESEND #2

TO: Cabinet Affairs (Cabinet Affairs [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

To: Cabinet Affairs

cc:

From: Robert Clayton/EDUC/GOV

Date: 03/13/97 07:03:05 PM

Subject: Education's Weekly Report for March 16-22 -- RESEND

To: Cabinet Affairs

cc:

From: Robert Clayton/EDUC/GOV

Date: 03/13/97 04:25:54 PM

Subject: Education's Weekly Report for March 16-22

March 13, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR ERSKINE BOWLES, THE WHITE HOUSE

FROM: Richard W. Riley

SUBJECT: Weekly Report for March 16-22

KEY DEPARTMENT NEWS

Sexual Harassment Guidance: DOEd transmitted to the Federal Register on March 10 policy guidance to schools regarding sexual harassment of students; publication is expected March 13. The guidance provides information about applicable legal standards under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 regarding peer sexual harassment and harassment of students by school employees.

DC Special Education Compliance: At public meetings in early February, parents and community members stated that the DC Public Schools (DCPS) continues to fail to comply with many requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which relates to provision of services to students with special educational needs. DCPS acknowledges that it is not in compliance, and DOEd's Office of Special Education Programs, rather than conducting a monitoring review, will immediately begin working with DCPS to develop a plan to bring the district into compliance.

CSSOs Meeting: Forty-two chief state school officers (CSSOs) will be in DC during the week of March 17 for a series of meetings. Secretary Riley and other senior officers and staff will meet with the CSSOs prior to their meeting with you. One of the principal issues will be states ,

participation in voluntary national reading and math tests.

Meeting with House Republican Groups: Secretary Riley will discuss education issues with members of the House Wednesday/SOS/ Chowder and Marching groups on March 19.

WV Visit with Senator Rockefeller: Secretary Riley will participate in several events, including two school visits, with the Senator in WV on March 24.

Meeting with Gov. Thompson: Secretary Riley will meet with Governor Tommy Thompson in DC on March 27 to discuss the new organization Achieve, which will provide technical assistance to states developing academic standards. The Secretary will also discuss his letter to the Governor responding to the Governor's recent New York Times op-ed piece opposing your testing initiative.

Speeches by Secretary Riley: The Secretary will address the the Council of Great City Schools legislative conference in DC on March 16; the Consortium of School Networking Conference and the Council of Chief State School Officers legislative conference in DC on March 17; the American Publishers Association in DC on March 21; the Rural Education Conference in DC on March 25 (tentative); and the University of South Carolina Law School in Columbia on April 4.

AGENCY WORK ON PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVES

Balanced Budget Bill: DOEd forwarded to OMB final versions of the three principal education pieces of the bill, relating to student loan programs and the Hope Scholarship, the School Construction initiative and the America Reads Challenge, on March 7. OMB has approved the School Construction component, which will be transmitted to Congress on March 14. Staff are working to plan a press conference with Secretaries Riley and Rubin regarding the Hope Scholarship component during the week of March 16.

School-to-Work: The March 18 Satellite Town Meeting will focus on the School-to-Work initiative.

America Reads Challenge: As of March 13, 122 college and university presidents had committed to join the America Reads Honor Roll. Carol Rasco will be interviewed by satellite on NBC's Today Show March 15.

Technology Challenge Grant Fund: DOEd notified members of the HI Congressional delegation of a \$1 million grant under the program March 12. Congressional notification is planned for VT (\$1 million), MD (\$2,447,449) and AL (\$3,536,029) March 13. The FL grant (\$7,901,240) is also ready but will be announced March 16 unless you announce the grant in FL on March 13.

NOTABLE CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY

Appropriations Hearings: Secretary Riley testified before the House Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Subcommittee on March 11.

Members questioned the Secretary on a variety of issues including the school construction initiative, the effectiveness of DOE's Safe and Drug Free Schools programs, and your national testing proposal. Some members were concerned that the Administration might proceed with development of national tests without explicit Congressional approval, and members also expressed concern that your planned expansions in student aid and tax incentives for higher education might result in tuition inflation. Acting Deputy Secretary/Acting Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement Mike Smith also testified regarding educational research. Secretary Riley is scheduled to appear at a Senate Appropriations Committee hearing on March 20.

IG to Testify: DOE's Inspector General, Tom Bloom, is scheduled to testify at a March 20 House Government Reform and Oversight Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations hearing examining management and programmatic issues.

SECRETARY'S SCHEDULE

Please see attachment.

PRESS/MEDIA INQUIRIES

Department Officials Interviewed: Secretary Riley was interviewed on March 6 by the San Francisco Examiner regarding education in California. AP covered the Secretary's March 6 speech to the National Association of Christian Schools. The Secretary's remarks to the National Association of

Secondary School Principals in Orlando, FL, were covered by AP, Fox, the Orlando Sun-Sentinel, the Daily Universe and Central Florida Family Magazine. Acting Deputy Secretary Mike Smith discussed the Hope Scholarship initiative with Rolling Stone reporter Bill Grieder on March 5.

FOIA REQUESTS

Wall Street Journal Request: DOEd received on March 13 a request for documents related to contacts with the Democratic National Committee, and will begin preparing a response.

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D34]ARMSZZ0006UOM.000 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D34]ARMSZZ0006UOM.001 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====

Tape Restoration Project
Hex-Dump Conversion

Secretary Richard Riley April 16, 2018 [autodate]

April 1997						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		MC Gumbleton	Kittu Sians	Kittu Sians	Edward Prewitt	Jau Blanchard
Mar 30 EASTER	Mar 31 Goals 2000 Anniv WH Easter Egg Roll	1 Opening Day	2 11:45-2:00pm Hold for Lunch PerSandy TBD DNC Dinner	3 DO NOT SCHEDULE	4 COLUMBIA, SC 5:30-9:00 US Carolina Law School SPEECH Advance: Edward	5 DO NOT SCHEDULE
Jau Blanchard	MC Gumbleton	Shawn Polk	Kittu Sians	Edward Prewitt	MC Gumbleton	Jau Blanchard
6 Daylight Savings Time (Spring Ahead) DO NOT SCHEDULE	7 1:00-1:30pm Mtg. w/ Employers for Learning Steering Committee PerVosburgh	8 12:00-1:30pm Magic School Bus Tour w/DC Kids REMARKS 7:00-10:00pm Canadian State Dinner	9 TBDam Al Shanker Memorial Service @ Lisner REMARKS	10 NYC TBD Principal for a Day, REMARKS Advance: Shawn	11 KANSAS CITY, MO 7:05-12:24 Flu to KC 1:00-2:00 Lunch Meetina w/Gov. Mel Carnahan 2:00-3:00 TIMSS Event w/Gov Mel Carnahan REMARKS 4:46-8:05 Flu to BWI	12
Jau Blanchard	Kittu Sians	Edward Prewitt	MC Gumbleton	Edward Prewitt	Kittu Sians	Jau Blanchard
13	14 BURLINGTON, VT	15 6:00-9:00pm	16 TBD WH Teacher	17 TBD WH Zero-to-Three	18 TBD	19 DO NOT

Tape Restoration Project
Hex-Dump Conversion

Secretary Richard Riley April 16, 2018

April 1997						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	TBD Goals 2000 Celebration w/Sen Jeffords REMARKS Advance: Maru Clare	STM re: Charter/Magnet Schools REMARKS	of the Year Event 6:00-8:00 CSSO Teacher of the Year Dinner SPEECH	Conf REMARKS 1:00-2:00pm Interview w/ WYFF S.C.	NetDay 1997 CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 8:00-10:30am Drive to UVA 10:30-12:00pm UVA Currn Ed School SPEECH per Longanecker 12:00-2:30pm Drive to WDC Advance: Edward WDC 7:30pm State Dept. Dinner	SCHEDULE
Jau Blanchard	Jau Blanchard	MC Gumbleton	Shawn Polk	Kittu Sians	Edward Prewitt	Jau Blanchard
20 DO NOT SCHEDULE 6:00 Kennedy Center Gala	21 Passover Begins DO NOT SCHEDULE	22 Earth Day	23	24	25 8:30-9:30a Meet w/Assist Secs and Hispanic Higher Ed Commission Exec Committee TALKING POINTS	26 7:00-10:00p WH Correspondents' Dinner
Jau Blanchard	MC Gumbleton	MC Gumbleton	Edward Prewitt			
27	28	29 TENTATIVE	30 NEW YORK			

Tape Restoration Project
Hex-Dump Conversion

Secretary Richard Riley April 16, 2018

April 1997						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
PHILADELPHIA WH Citizens' Service Summit	PHILADELPHIA WH Citizens' Service Summit	9:00-5:00 PCSD TENTATIVE PHILADELPHIA WH Citizens' Service Summit REMARKS 12:00-1:00p Cable TV Assn SPEECH (WDC)	ALBANY 1:00-2:00pm STARS Conf. SPEECH			

Tape Restoration Project
Hex-Dump Conversion

Secretary Richard Riley April 16, 2018 [autodate]

March 1997						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
						1 6:00pm Kennedy Center Millennium Stage Dedication
	Edward Prewitt	Kittu Sians	MC Gumbleton	Kittu Sians	Shawn Polk	Jau Blanchard
2 4:00pm-6:00pm WH Celebration of Ford's Theater. Black Tie. 7:00pm Ford's Theatre Event @ Ford's Theatre	3 9:00-10:00am Direct Lending Conference 11:30-12:15pm WH PSA Release 12:30-1:00pm DNS Drop-By SC Interns PerHolleman 1:30-2:30pm Briefing for Goodling Hearing 2:30-3:00pm Mtg. w/ NASDC Principals REMARKS 3:00-3:30pm Briefing for Drug-Free America	4 9:00-9:45am Meet w/House Dems TALKING POINTS 10:00-11:00am School Visit w/ FLOTUS and Bob Rubin @ Ketcham Elementary 11:15-12:15pm Partnership for Drug Free America Press Conf. REMARKS 12:30-2:30pm Briefing for Goodling Hearing 2:30-3:00pm Mtg. w/ Stan	5 8:30-8:45pm Pre-Briefing for Goodling Hearing 9:00-11:00am Goodling Hearing Ed Agenda TESTIMONY 11:45-12:00pm Mtg. w/ Marvin Carmichael and Dallas Martin 1:10-2:10pm WH Meeting on Standards w/ POTUS 3:15-3:45pm AASCU SPEECH 4:15-5:15pm Mtg. w/ Judy Winston and	6 LANSING, MI 8:50am Wheels Up AF1 @ Andrews TBD POTUS Address to State Legislature 3:00pm Wheels Down AF1 @ Andrews 6:30-8:00pm Nat'l Christian Schools	7 ORLANDO, FLORIDA 12:15-2:32pm Flu to Orlando FL 3:15-4:15pm Press Avail 4:00-5:30pm NASSP SPEECH Advance: MC Gumbleton 5:15-7:23pm Fly to WDC	8

Tape Restoration Project
Hex-Dump Conversion

Secretary Richard Riley April 16, 2018

March 1997						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	Press Conf. 3:30-4:00pm Briefing for School Visit w/ FLOTUS 4:00-4:30 Briefing for Coverdell Mtg 5:00-6:00 Mtg w/ Paul Coverdell, et al TALKING POINTS	Ikenberry 3:00-3:30pm Briefing for AASCU Speech 3:30-5:00 Briefing for Goodling Hearing 7:00-9:00 Dinner for Swiss Amb	Senior Staff 5:30-6:00pm Briefing for MI Trip 6:45-7:15pm AASCU Recpt.	Assoc SPEECH		
Shawn Polk	Kittu Sians	Jau Blanchard	Kittu Sians	Kittu Sians	Kittu Sians	MC Gumbleton
9	10 NEW YORK CITY 7:30-8:30am Fly to NY 9:00-10:00am Brkfst. w/ Business and Education Leaders 10:15-10:45am Press Avail 10:45-12:00pm School-to-Work event @ Central Park East H.S.	11 10:00-12:00pm Porter Hearing TESTIMONY 12:00-1:00 CAPE Leg Conf SPEECH 2:00-3:00pm Mtg. w/ Rep. Tim Roemer 3:30-4:00pm Hold for Calls to Hill on E-Rate 4:00-4:30pm Briefing for PTA	12 9:30-10:00am Briefing for Mtg. w/ Sen. Ted Kennedy 10:00-10:15am Mtg. w/ Largo H.S. Students 10:30-11:00am Mtg. w/ Dr. Eric Smith 11:00-12:00pm Mtg. w/ Mario Moreno and Senior Staff 12:30-1:30pm	13 RALEIGH, NC 9:10-10:05am Fly to NC AF1 11:00-12:00pm POTUS Address to State Legislature 1:00-2:00 Event TBD 3:04-3:59 Fly to WDC Advance: MC Gumbleton	14 9:00-9:30am Mg. w/ Dr. John Kelly 9:30-10:00am Briefing on School Construction 10:00-11:30pm Press Briefing PerSFrost Noon-1:00 NASBE Leg Conf SPEECH 2:00-2:30pm PSA for	15 1:30-2:30 "Do Something" Event w/Andrew Shue REMARKS Advance: Leslie Thornton 7:00pm Gridiron Dinner 10:00pm Gridiron Recpt.

Tape Restoration Project
Hex-Dump Conversion

Secretary Richard Riley April 16, 2018

March 1997						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	1:30-2:30pm Fly to WDC Advance: Shawn 3:00-3:30pm Briefing for HRC Briefing 3:45-5:00 Press Briefing w/HRC @ WH REMARKS 5:15pm Briefing for Porter Hearing on 3/11	Teleconference 4:30-5:00pm Mtg. w/ Dr. Amos Brown 5:00-5:30pm Phone Call to Hill 6:00-7:00 PTA Teleconference Dinner 7:00-8:00pm Teleconference Prep 8:00-8:45pm PTA Teleconference REMARKS	Lunch w/ Roger Kennedy 1:30-2:00pm Mtg. w/ Rosanne White, Tim Dyer and Tom Koerner 2:30-3:30pm Mtg w/ Sen. Ted Kennedy and Cmte. Dems. 4:00-4:45 Live Satellite to NC Ed Conf. REMARKS TBD POTUS Town Hall Mtg. w/ Kids @ WH	8:00-9:00pm Music Educators Dinner SPEECH	Annenberg TV SCRIPT 2:30-3:30pm Mtg. w/ Kay Cassstevens and Senior Staff	
Jau Blanchard	MC Gumbleton	Jau Blanchard	MC Gumbleton	Kittu Sians	MC Gumbleton	Shawn Polk
16 Noon-1:00pm Great City Schools Leg Conf SPEECH	17 St. Patrick's Day 9:00-9:30a Consortium of School Networking Conference SPEECH 10:15-11:15am CSSO Leg. Conf. REMARKS & TALKING	18 9:30-10:00am Briefing for Mtg. w/ Brian Atwood 10:00-10:30am Mtg. w/ Brian Atwood 11:00-11:30am Press Conf. Call w/	19 8:00-9:00am Cap Hill Wednesday Group Bkfst. PerFleming REMARKS 9:30-10:30am Mtg. w/ Elem. & Sec. Ed. Execs.	20 First Day of Spring 9:00-12:00pm TBD Hope Scholarship Event PerFrost 12:00-1:00 Vernon Jordan lunch 1:50-2:00pm	21 Congressional Recess (3/21-4/8) 9:00-10:00am American Assoc. Of Publishers SPEECH 11:30-11:45am Drop-By Archer Interns	22

March 1997						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	POINTS 12:00-1:00pm Mtg. w/ POTUS and CSSO's @ WH 1:30-1:40pm Drop-By Mtg. w/ Bill Youngblood & Trish McNeil 2:00-3:00pm Meeting w/ Frank H. @ WH 3:30-4:00pm Mtg. w/ Arthur Levine 4:00-5:00pm Mtg. w/ Delaine Eastin 5:00-7:00 WH Irish Party 8:00pm Dinner @ Irish Embassy	Rep. Carolyn McCarthy 1:00-1:30pm Briefing for Mtg. w/ Elem. and Sec. Ecexs. 2:00-3:00pm Mtg. w/ Judy Heumann and Senior Staff 3:00-3:30 Courtesy Call w/ UCLA Members 4:00-5:00pm Mtg. w/ Norma Cantu and Senior Staff 6:00-9:00pm STM re: School-to-Work REMARKS	12:00-1:00pm Senior Staff Lunch 1:15-2:00pm Mtg. w/ Delia Pompa and Senior Staff 5:30 DNS 7:00pm PBS Dinner	Drop-By Mtg. w/ George Scalise PerLRoberts 2:00-3:00pm Mtg. w/ Linda Roberts and Senior Staff 3:15-4:15pm Mtg. w/ Tom Bloom 7:30pm DNS	PerFleming 1:00-2:00pm Mtg. w/ Trish McNeil and Senior Staff 3:00-4:00pm Mtg. w/ Gerry Tirozzi and Senior Staff 6:00-8:00pm Recpt. @ State Dept.	
Jau Blanchard	Kittu Sians	Kittu Sians	Shawn Polk	MC Gumbleton	MC Gumbleton	Jau Blanchard
23	24 WEST VIRGINIA Martinsburg, WV 8:00am	25 TBD Rural Education Conference SPEECH	26 10:00-11:00am Mtg. w/ Netherlands	27 3:00-4:00pm Mtg. w/ Gov. Tommy	28 Good Friday	29

Tape Restoration Project
Hex-Dump Conversion

Secretary Richard Riley April 16, 2018

March 1997						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	Fly to WVA 9:00-10:00am School Visit w/ Sen. Jau Rockefeller Charleston, WV 12:00-1:30pm Lunch w/ Educators TALKING POINTS 2:00-3:00pm School Visit w/ Sen. Rockefeller 3:30-4:30pm Recpt. w/ Rockefeller 5:00pm Fly to WDC 7:00pm Dinner @ Embassy of Netherlands		Education Minister 12:45-1:45pm Mtg. w/ David Longanecker and Senior Staff 2:00-3:00pm CFC Awards Per Longanecker 6:00pm Picasso Exhibit Event @ National Gallery	Thompson		

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mail-Server (Mail-Server@CLINTON.AL.MIT.EDU@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-MAR-1997 01:55:00.00

SUBJECT: 1997-03-13 President Remarks to North Carolina Legislature

TO: Jeffrey H. Cohen (Jeffrey H. Cohen@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

(Raleigh, North Carolina)

For Immediate Release

March 13,

1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE JOINT SESSION OF THE
NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

House of Representatives Chamber

Raleigh, North Carolina

11:09 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Lt. Governor Wicker, Speaker Brubaker, Senator Basnight, the other state elected officials who are here; my good friend, Governor Hunt; Mayor Fetzer. I'd like to thank those who came down here with me today. I brought some of the members of your congressional delegation home -- they don't need to hear this speech, they've heard it before, but I was glad to have them here in moral support-- Congressman David Price; Congressman Bob Etheridge, your former superintendent of education; Congressman Mike McIntire; and Congresswoman Eva Clayton. I thank them for coming. (Applause.)

I also want to say I'm glad to be joined today by your neighbor, the Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, former governor of South Carolina -- (applause) -- and by our new Secretary of Defense, Bill Cohen of Maine. We're glad to have him with us today, too. Thank you, Secretary Cohen, for coming. (Applause.)

I was glad that you mentioned my Chief of Staff, Erskine Bowles. He wouldn't come here with me today because he was afraid all of you would think that he was shirking his duties and not at work. But let me tell you, he is doing a magnificent job. I'm very proud of him. I couldn't believe it when he agreed to come back to Washington and take this job -- especially because I knew it would cost him a small fortune. And he reminded me that his father used to tell him, once you have the

tools you've got to spend some time to add to the wood pile. So he's up in Washington adding back to the wood pile. And you should all be very proud of him. He is a remarkable man. He's doing a good job.

(Applause.)

I'd also like to thank the other North Carolinians on my staff -- two of the three of them are here today. Doug Sosnik, my former political director and senior counselor, is not here; but my Director of Communications, Don Baer, is here; and Charles Duncan, the Associate Director of Presidential Personnel. They both came home with me and they were glad to have the excuse to come home. And I appreciate their being here and their service.

I was told that this was the first time a sitting President has addressed the North Carolina State Legislature. If it's not true don't disabuse me now, because I'm about to say something here. (Laughter.) And I am very honored to be here. Even more important, I've spent a little time here over the years and I am honored and mildly surprised that you are here, because it's tournament time and you've got four teams, as usual, in the tournament. (Applause.)

You may know that I am something of a basketball fanatic. And you may know that one of my most memorable basketball experiences -- I once saw North Carolina and Kentucky play in the Dean Dome, and the car that I came in was towed. (Laughter.) But I had so much fun at the ball game I would have walked all the way back to Arkansas after it was over. (Laughter.) I make it a point never to take sides in basketball

games unless my home team in Arkansas or my alma mater, Georgetown, are playing. But I am looking forward to the day when the great Dean Smith breaks Adolf Rudd's record. (Applause.)

There is much for the rest of the nation and especially the rest of the South of to admire in North Carolina -- the determined and visionary leadership that has characterized this state for many decades in education and economic development, in bringing harmony among peoples of different backgrounds.

When I was a young man, I followed the work here of then-Governor Terry Sanford who later became my friend and colleague. Eighteen years ago, when I first started my career as Governor of Arkansas, my best mentor and friend was Jim Hunt. And he is still my mentor and friend. Dick Riley were laughing with Jim Hunt -- we were together 18 years ago as the governors of Arkansas, South Carolina and North Carolina, and we were laughing that Jim was probably the only one of us who could still get elected governor in our home states after 18 years. (Laughter.) And I applaud him on that.

It was in Chapel Hill that the cornerstone was laid at our nation's first publicly funded university, in Kitty Hawk where man first took to the skies. And today, North Carolina is an aeronautics and an air travel hub center for millions of people. Your state universities receive the highest level of funding for research and development in the nation. You have connected more of your communities than any other state in the country to the Information Superhighway -- something I'm

trying to do for every classroom and library in America by the year 2000. The Research Triangle has one of the highest per capita concentrations of Ph.D.s in the world, and you are clearly one of America's most dynamic centers of economic activity.

The most important thing about all this is not for me to brag on you, you know that already, but to emphasize the main point: These things do not happen by accident. They are the product of vision and disciplined, long-term effort.

Now, our country faces the challenges of a new century -- a whole new economy, a whole new way in which people will work and live and relate to each other here at home and around the world. It is driven by information and by technology. Its best hopes may be undermined by its darkest fears, by the old demons of racial and religious and ethnic hatreds, by terrorism and narco trafficking and organized crime.

This new time that we're moving into that, coincidentally, will be part of a new century and a new millennium, will give more people in this state and this nation the chance to live out their dreams than at any period in human history if we take advantage of it to seize our opportunities and deal with our challenges.

There is unprecedented peace and prosperity now. And it has been very rare in our country's history -- you can go back and find maybe a couple of other examples when we've had real security, a feeling

of prosperity, and yet, a whole lot of challenges before us. Usually when people feel secure and relatively prosperous, one of two things happens -- neither of them very laudable, but it's part of human nature -- we either get sort of happy and self-satisfied and don't do anything, or because we are not gripped by big differences, we fall out with each other over small things and petty things make us less than we ought to be.

The point I want to make today is that we cannot afford either to be complacent or to be divided among ourselves about small things. For we have been given an opportunity almost unique in American history to fashion a future that will embrace everybody. And we cannot and dare not blow that opportunity.

If you look at where we are now, you can see the vistas of the future. Our economy produced 12 million jobs in four years -- never happened before in a four-year period. We've had constant decline in crimes. We've had the biggest drop in the welfare rolls in American history in the last four years. In North Carolina, you've seen the unemployment rate drop to 4.2 percent -- 75,000 people off the welfare rolls; 350,000 new jobs. That's going on all over America. But you know that we have more to do.

I have been going around the country to the Michigan and the Maryland state legislatures -- today the Vice President is in California speaking to the state legislature as I am here with you -- because I know that to achieve the vision that we share for America we

all have to do our part. I've said many times that the era of big government is over. Your federal government is now 285,000 people smaller than it was the day I took office. It's the smallest its been since President Kennedy was in office, in real terms. As a percentage of the civilian work force, the federal government is now as small as it was when Franklin Roosevelt was sworn into office the first time before the New Deal.

But the challenges we face are still very big, indeed. If they cannot be solved by government alone, and especially by the federal government, obviously, a new partnership is required. And new efforts, new activity, new responsibility is required of people at the state level, at the local level and in their private lives. The biggest challenge we face today, I believe, is the challenge of creating a world-class education system that embraces every child that lives in this state and in this nation. And this must not be a political football.

In the Cold War, because we knew that communism threatened our existence, it became commonplace that politics would stop at the water's edge. And the Democrats and the Republicans would fight like cats and dogs over whatever it was they were fighting about, but when it came to standing up to the threat of communism we were together. If the President of one party went abroad on a mission of world peace, he was never criticized back home by members of the other party because politics stopped at the water's edge.

I think we understand today intuitively that education holds the key to our future in the 21st century. And I believe politics must stop at the schoolhouse door. (Applause.)

When I was governor, a long time ago now, North Carolina already had the highest percentage of its adults in institutions of higher education of any state in the South. The economy was growing and it was diversifying, and yet you still had more success in maintaining manufacturing jobs than any state in our region, and indeed, in the country. You know all this. Last year you had the biggest increase in 8th grade math scores, I noticed, in the country. I was in Michigan and I said that they had had the second biggest increase in math scores, and the minute I got in the car Governor Hunt made sure I knew who was number one. (Laughter.) So I knew that.

The Governor chose to be sworn in at the Needham Laughton High School, his old school, to make clear that school standards and teaching excellence will be his top priorities. But with all the progress that we have made, you know we've got a lot more to do.

Between 1992 and the year 2000, 89 percent of the new jobs created in this economy will require more than a high school level of literacy and math skills -- 89 percent. Today, even though over 80 percent of our children are graduating from high school, more than half -- or about half the people entering the work force are not prepared with these skills. We all know that is true.

For 20 years, inequality among working Americans grew. In the last few years it started to shrink -- in the last couple of years -- as we've gotten -- more and more of our new jobs are becoming higher-wage jobs and as growth and productivity are permitting wages to rise again.

Many people, just a couple of years ago, were saying, well, is the middle class vanishing in America, will it always be squeezed, are we going to create a country with a huge number of people that are very well off and an even much larger number of people that are poor, with a smaller middle class. We've seen in the last few years that that does not have to happen. We can begin to grow the middle class again with productivity and growth and the right kinds of new jobs, but we have to be able to provide the people with the skills to hold those jobs if we're going to maintain a high-wage, high-growth, high-opportunity society in America in the 21st century. And our schools are still turning out millions of young people who simply cannot do that.

That is why our number one priority has to be to make America's education the best in the world. We have to have a nation in which every 8-year-old can read independently, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go on to college and every adult American can keep on learning throughout an entire lifetime.

In my State of the Union address, I laid out a 10-point call to action for American education that describes the steps we have to meet. First, we have to make sure the all of our children come to

school ready to learn. Our balanced budget will expand Head Start to a million children. But we all must do more, and a lot of that has to be done at the state level. And I hope every state in the country is looking closely at the Smart Start program in North Carolina.

(Applause.)

The idea of having all elements of a community in a community nonprofit environment working on not only education, but health care and parenting skills and child care, trying to give our poorest children a coherent early childhood is terribly important. Scientists have discovered that learning begins in the earliest days of life. And now we have to explore how parents and educators can best use these findings.

On April 17th, the First Lady and I will host the White House Conference on Early Childhood Development and Learning in Washington, and I want Smart Start to be an important part of what is considered there.

Let me just give you one simple example of the scientific findings. Over half of the capacity of the brain to absorb and to learn and to grow, the capacity is developed in the first four years of life. In the first four years of life, if a child has parents who understand this and who constantly -- whether they have a Ph.D. or they were high school drop-outs -- but who constantly work at nourishing the child's learning capacities, that child will get 700,000 positive contacts.

But in the typical experience of a child with a single parent, let's say, with very little education and no self-confidence about parenting and no training and no understanding, and a sense that no difference can be made, and the child that's left in front of the television in the first four years, that child will get 150,000 positive contacts -- a more than four-to-one difference.

Now, you tell me what the future is going to be life for them. Smart Start can change that. And our cooperative efforts can change that. But we have to understand that we have totally underestimated the impact of this whole thing. And the new scientific findings impose upon all of us a heavier responsibility than we have ever had for developing the capacities of our children in their earliest years. So I look forward to that. (Applause.)

I believe we have to do more to give constructive alternatives, creative alternatives for our young children in our public schools. I favor public school choice. I've been a pioneer supporter of the charter school movement. I think that it's important to open schools that stay opened as long as they do a good job, but only as long as they do a good job. And I know that this afternoon, your State Board of Education has the opportunity to open more charter schools than any state has ever opened at one time, to foster innovation and competition and renewal. I hope the Board will take that step today, and one more time, North Carolina will be in the vanguard of a movement you can be proud of. (Applause.)

We have got to have a commitment to rebuild our schools and give our children the facilities they need to learn in. We have the largest number of children in public schools in history. The Secretary of Education never gets tired of reminding me, since I am the oldest of the baby boomers, that our generation has finally been eclipsed in numbers by the people that are in the public schools today. We also have the physical facilities in many of our schools deteriorating at a rapid rate. So, for the first time in history, I have proposed a program that will enable us at the national level to support local efforts to increase their investment in the physical facilities of the schools by making sure that the interest rates are lower and the costs are lower in the places where the need is most critical.

I'm going to Florida after I leave you, and tomorrow morning, I will be at a school where there are 17, I understand, according to my briefing -- 17 trailers for classroom space around the existing school facility in a modest-sized community in Florida. That is not an atypical experience in many of our states.

We have to meet our national goal of connecting every classroom and library to the Internet by the year 2000. We have to open the doors of college to all. North Carolina pioneered, with your network of four-year and two-year higher educational institutions, pioneered the idea that education ought to be a lifetime experience and that the doors ought to be open to everyone.

In the last four years, we have lowered the cost and

improved the reach of the student loan program, added 200,000 slots to work-study, opened up almost 70,000 slots for college through the national service program, AmeriCorps. We have worked very, very hard, but I think we have to do more.

It is clear to me -- if you look at the job profile, where 89 percent of the new jobs will require more than a high school education, we have to make two years of education after high school -- the 13th and 14th grades -- just as universal in America by the year 2000 as a high school diploma is today -- every bit as universal. (Applause.)

To achieve that our balanced budget plan proposes a \$1,500 HOPE Scholarship -- a tax credit that reflects the cost of the typical community college tuition in America, modeled on Governor Zell Miller's HOPE Scholarship program in Georgia. We propose to give people a tax deduction of up to \$10,000 a year for the cost of any education after high school; an expanded IRA that you can withdraw from tax-free if the money is used to pay for higher education; and the largest increase in Pell Grants in 20 years, along with another 100,000 work-study slots. That will help North Carolina, and it will help America.

Finally, let me say on this subject, we know we have to make sure learning continues throughout a lifetime. We know that we have older and older students going back to community colleges, changing their careers and getting new careers and opening up new vistas. We have a federal response which I think is totally antiquated. There are

at least, conservatively speaking, at least 70 different federal programs that were developed with the best of intentions to try to help to pay for various training programs for people who lose their jobs or people who are grossly underemployed.

I have proposed for four years -- with a Democratic Congress and with the Republican Congress -- getting rid of these programs and putting the money in a pot and sending a skills grant to an unemployed person or an underemployed person who has qualified for any of them, and let them go to the nearest community college or four-year college if it's the appropriate one -- whatever is nearest and best to get their education. We do not need a lot of government intermediaries here. People know -- people know what they need. They're capable of making a judgment.

In a state like North Carolina and most places in the country, nearly everybody's within driving distance of a community college that works. And that's -- I call that my G.I. Bill for America's Workers. And if you could prevail upon your legislators to support it, I would appreciate it. I've been trying for four years to pass that thing. I would appreciate it. (Applause.)

I think the most important thing we have to do is to make sure that our children have met certain national standards in basic courses. In 1989, when President Bush and the governors met at the University of Virginia, I had the honor of being the Democratic governor chosen to try to write the nation's education goals. And at the time we

always assumed that out of those goals there would come national standards and a system, a nationally recognized system of testing our children to see if they met those standards.

Well, that hasn't happened yet. And as a result, we still don't know. We don't really know whether every child in every classroom knows what he or she needs to know when he or she needs to know it in math and in basic language skills. I have challenged every state in this country to adopt high national academic standards, not just in math and language, but in other areas as well, to participate nationally by 1999 in an examination of 4th graders in reading and 8th graders in math so that we can see how every child is doing in meeting those basic standards.

Now, this is, I know, somewhat controversial. There are people who have actually argued that you couldn't possibly have a national examination reflecting national standards in a country as diverse as America -- as if it's some sort of plot, as if math is different in Raleigh than Little Rock; or any board of education could rewrite the rules of algebra for Alaska as opposed to Florida. I think that is inherently implausible.

When you compete here in North Carolina for a new high-tech plant, when the Research Triangle finds some new breakthrough, you do it based on an international competition --you have to win based on standards that are imposed. We have to be willing to hold our children to the same standards and to hold ourselves to the same standards.

Governor Hunt told me today that he will endorse our call for national standards and a testing plan. North Carolina, therefore, would be the third state to do so. The Republican governor of Michigan joined in, along with his legislative leaders, just a few days ago.

But let me say what I think we need to do. A lot of you know a lot about this. We have some standardized tests in America, but we don't have any tests to nationally accepted standards. The closest we have is the so-called NAEP test, the National Assessment of Education Progress. But, as all of you know, it only is given to a sample of students in various districts. There is no examination in America which says, here are the standards that everyone should know in language or math, and here is a test which reflects those standards; and it doesn't matter whether you're first or last in your class, it matters whether you get over this bar. If you're first in your class and nobody is over this bar, nobody know what they need to know. If you're last, but you're over the bar, you're still going to do okay in this old world.

I think that is very important. We all need to know that. We all need to know that. You know -- and let me also say that I know it won't be easy, because some of our kids won't do all that well at first. If you saw the State of the Union address you know that I introduced two students from 20 school districts in Northern Illinois who took the Third International Math and Science Survey and the 20 school districts up there tied for first in science and second in math in the survey, with Singapore for first. But if they had finished dead

last I would have been equally proud of them because they were willing to actually hold themselves to international standards of achievements and measure themselves.

And this is where we need all of your help. I'm convinced that one of the reasons that we've never done this in America is that we were afraid if the news was bad we wouldn't know what to do about it. And I think that in so doing we have sold our children short. All the evidence is, all the scientific evidence is, all the anecdotal evidence is that almost all of our children, without regard to their race, their income and where they live, can learn what they need to know to compete and win in the global economy. And when we do not hold them to high standards because we are afraid that in the beginning they won't meet them, we are selling their futures down the drain and we are insulting them, because they can meet these standards.

What we have to be willing to do is to say, okay, we'll have these exams, we'll hold people to high standards; some people won't make it first; we don't want to punish people, we want to lift everybody up; but we can't know how to lift people up unless we know where we start.

When I go around the world people find it unbelievable that we have no national standard in America to tell our parents and our school leaders whether our children know what they're supposed to know in the basic skills that are necessary to learn all the other more sophisticated things we want people to know.

And I tell you, I believe in the kids of this country. I have been in schools in circumstances where it would be unthinkable that people could learn -- because of crime in the neighborhoods and because of poverty in the neighborhoods. And I have seen children performing at very high levels, meeting standards that would be acceptable in anyplace in the entire world. And I am tired of people telling me that there is some reason we shouldn't have that opportunity given to every American child. We are not protecting our children by denying them the chance to develop their God-given capacities to measure up to what they need to know and do, to do well in the future. And we ought to stop it and do better. (Applause.)

Now, on a lighter note, you may wonder why the Secretary of Defense is here with me today. (Laughter.) Before I came down here, Senator Helms asked me to tell you that he is not the guard that Jesse once said I would need to come to North Carolina. (Laughter and applause.) Ever since I got a Chief of Staff that does not speak with an accent, we've been getting along a lot better, Senator Helms and I. (Laughter.)

There is another reason that the Secretary of Defense is here today. We want to set an example -- we want to set an example, we think we ought to start the standards movements with the schools that we run at military bases. At 66 schools across our country and 167 more around the world, our Department of Defense educates 115,000 of our children every year. The Department of Defense runs a school system as

big as that of the state of Delaware. And I met some of the children, some of the teachers and some of the parents out at the airport when I came in today.

Sixteen of those schools are at Camp LeJeune and Fort Bragg, right here in North Carolina, and nearly 8,000 students attend them. It's important that we give these children the best possible education, too -- especially these children, because their families sacrifice, they live far from home, they often risk their lives for their country. It's important, too, because these students come from every racial and ethnic background. They move from place to place as their parents are transferred from base to base.

Because of this mobility, no groups of students better underscores the need for common national standards and a uniform way of measuring progress than this group. If standards can work in these schools, they can work anywhere.

So I am pleased to announce today that, with the strong support of the Secretary of Defense, the Department of Defense schools have stepped forward to ask that their students be among the first to take the new tests when they become available. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Education Riley have both committed their work.

Starting in 1999, students and classrooms, from Wiesbaden Air Force Base in Germany to Kadena Air Force Base in Okinawa, to Camp LeJeune will learn the same rigorous material and take the same national

tests as students throughout this state, and I hope throughout our entire nation. We can make our public schools just like our military, the best on Earth, if, like our military, we are willing to adhere to high, rigorous standards for all people, regardless of their background. That's what we ought to do.

And I thank you, Mr. Secretary, for being here today.

(Applause.)

Let me also say that we know we have to do more work to prepare all of our students. And the Department of Defense is being directed today through its school system to use every resource to prepare the students for 1999 when the new math and science tests -- or math and reading tests are ready.

Let me mention one other thing that I think is very important, and it goes well with a lot of what you are doing here with your pre-school years and your early years. It is appalling to me that 40 percent of America's 8-year-olds cannot read a book on their own. But it's true. And the rest of this stuff is just sort of whistling the breeze if people can't read. So we have launched the America Reads Initiative, through the Department of Education, to mobilize an army of a million reading tutors, properly trained, to help make sure that by the year 2000 every 8-year-olds can read independently.

Thirteen North Carolina college presidents have pledged to commit a portion of their work-study students to serve as tutors, and I

thank them for that. We're going to have 300,000 new work-study students over a four-year period. If we can put at least a third of them into reading instruction for our young children, we'll be a long way toward those million volunteers.

We ought to be clear about something else, too -- and here's something that I really take my hat off to Governor Hunt for. We cannot expect our children to meet high standards unless we demand that our teachers meet high standards. We have to do whatever is necessary to make sure that they do.

Last year, the report of Governor Hunt's National Commission on Teaching and America's Future laid out a blueprint for the road ahead. And all of you have together across party lines to develop a comprehensive legislative agenda that implements the report's recommendations. We have to start by recognizing and rewarding our best teachers. We all know what a difference a good teacher can make in the life of a child. I know what a difference my teachers made in mine.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, led by Governor Hunt, has encouraged teachers all over the country to improve their skills and seek certification as master teachers. North Carolina already has more certified national teachers than any other state in the country. And the Governor was kind enough to bring five or six of them out to the airport to meet me, and they were not ashamed of the fact that they had been board-certified master teachers.

Over 20 percent of all the teachers that have been certified are here in North Carolina. That's the good news. The bad news is that only about 500 teachers have been certified. In our balanced budget plan, there's enough money to help 100,000 teachers achieve this important credential. Now, the states need to do things like North Carolina has and offer to pay -- the Governor's plan would pay master teachers another 12 percent more. You have to encourage people. But we need 100,000 at least, because what we really want is at least a board certified master teacher in every single school building in America. If you get one in every single school building in America, we know from the research that they will change the education environment and help lift the standards that other teachers achieve and help to lift the quality of teaching in all the classrooms.

So that is one of the things that we're trying to do in our budget. But again, I'd say that we are following your lead and especially the years and years and years that Governor Hunt has put into this. In April, Secretary Riley will hold a national forum on attracting and preparing teachers with 50 of our nation's best teachers and thousands of others. And we are going to have to do more to encourage our brightest young people to become teachers.

Finally, we also have to make sure, as the Governor said, that while good teachers get a raise, the truly bad teachers who can't measure up should get a pink slip. We have to do that in an expeditious and fair way. Today, that is too time consuming and costly. In some states, it can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. That same money

could be and should be used to reward good teachers and to train those who are trying to improve their skills. We can change this, as they have in Cincinnati where school boards and teachers unions have worked together in partnership to find more efficient and fair ways to remove teachers who should leave the classroom. Encouraging teachers is not easy or cheap, but again, I say, we know what a phenomenal difference it makes.

Finally, to elevate teaching, I think we have to reform the way we spend money in our schools and give parents the tools to demand more accountability. Today, the Vice President is discussing that at the state legislature in Sacramento, California. His reinventing government initiative has helped us to shrink the national government to the smallest it's been in three decades and to take that money and invest it in education, invest it in technology, invest it in transportation, invest it in growing the economy and building a better future. We have to have the same sort of national effort to analyze the way expenditures are made in public education throughout America, so that we can support those who are committed to reducing unnecessary bureaucratic expenditures and increasing expenditures on children and teachers and learning.

Yesterday I did a town hall meeting, with 35 children, on drugs. And I asked all these kids -- and some of these kids had been on drugs and were off drugs, a couple of these kids were in treatment, some of them had been in families of gang members who had been involved in drugs, and then some of them had never used drugs. It was a whole

panoply of kids. But I went through child after child after child, and I asked them to tell me about their circumstances. And they all said, we need mentors, we need programs we're interested in. And one after another they kept telling me about how their school had had to abandon its music program or its art program, its physical education programs, its intramural athletic programs -- all the things that happen after school or on weekend that keep kids involved in positive things.

We have to understand that however much money we have for our schools we have to make sure we are spending it first and foremost on instruction and, secondly, on ways designed to give the children the best chance to live productive, wholesome, good, constructive lives -- and that ought to be a national effort as well.

We have found phenomenal amounts of money that we could redirect in the federal government to reducing the deficit or investing in our future simply by slowly, but deliberately, eliminating hundreds of unnecessary programs, thousands of unnecessary regulations and reducing -- without running people off -- just slowly reducing the size of government until we have got it to the point where I mentioned to you earlier.

And we have to work on that in our schools because we cannot afford to waste a single dollar when it comes to these children's future. And it is folly to believe that we're not paying for it when we take these kids away from a chance to have a full, wholesome experience and to be in those schools after school hours or before school hours and

doing things in addition to their academic learning. So I hope you will support that. (Applause.)

Let me just say one final word in closing about another big job we have to do together. We have to finish the work of welfare reform. In the first four years of my presidency, we gave waivers from federal rules to 43 states to do all kinds of things to help move people from welfare to work. We now know that partly because of the growing economy, partly because of state welfare reform efforts, and partly because of a 50 percent increase in child support collections nationwide, the welfare rolls went down by 2.6 million in four years -- a record number.

Then the Congress passed and I signed the welfare reform bill, which says there will still be a national guarantee for poor children for food and medicitheir plans to move people from welfare to work.

Well, what I want to tell you folks is that this is like that old country singer, Chet Atkins, used to say, you've got to be awful careful what you ask for in this old life, because you might get it. And now you've got it. And here is what you have: In order to meet the demands of the law that was supported by almost every governor and every state official in the country, we must move about another million people from welfare to work. Now, keep in mind, when we reduced the welfare rolls by 2.6 million some of those were children -- only about a million of those were people moving from welfare into the work force. So we moved a million people in four years when the economy

created almost 12 million jobs. We have to move another million in the next four years because of what the law says, whether the economy creates jobs or not. And it is your responsibility to design a plan to get that done.

Now, I want to help. And I have proposed federal legislation to give a tax credit of 50 percent for up to \$10,000 in salaries for people who hire people specifically off welfare. I have proposed to give extra cash to high-impact, high-unemployment areas so people can do public service work, community service work, if necessary.

But there are more things you can do. Your Work First program here in North Carolina is encouraging private employers by subsidizing paychecks and holding job fairs. These are the kinds of things we have to do everywhere. But you really need to look at how your program works. And you need to look at whether you have a system for challenging private employers to look at the incentives that are available. And you need to figure out how many people every country is going to have to move from welfare to work in order for you not to have a train wreck at the end of the next four years.

Every state has to do this. And it's going to have to be done county by county, community by community. Because I'm telling you, everybody that ever said people who are able-bodied on welfare ought to have to work now has a moral obligation to make sure that the people who have been told they have to work actually have jobs so they can work. We have to do that. (Applause.)

Let me just say -- I have been to a lot of states and looked at a lot of programs. In Missouri, they go to employers and say, we'll give you the welfare check for up to four years if you need it; but you have to pay people \$1.75 over the minimum wage and we'll give you the welfare check as an employment-in-training supplement. And you can have it for a slot, but not for a particular individual, for up to 10 years if you'll just keep being part of our program. So they've got a lot of employers -- small, medium and large -- who are part of that .

You have to do something like that to do something for the employers who are not taxed. Community nonprofits and religious organizations can hire a lot of people from welfare into their ranks, and have a lot to do with integrating their families into the mainstream of life in North Carolina. But they have to have some incentive to do so.

The second thing I would urge you to do is to make sure that as you realize savings from people moving from welfare to work, I think you can meet your goals better if you turn around and invest at least the initial of those savings back into the transition. We did a good job of adding \$4 billion to child care for people moving from welfare to work. But we still may not have enough child care to do the job. And we know that is a huge barrier. You cannot ask people to hurt their kids when they go to work. And a lot of folks entering these entry-level jobs don't make much money. Now, we can carry them over with Medicaid health insurance for their kids for a while -- they've got

to have the child care.

This bill gives you a lot of flexibility and now you have to design this program. I would just implore you to really get down to brass tacks, get the facts: How many people does North Carolina have to move from welfare into jobs in four years? How many is that per county? How many is that per community? What are the tools we have? Who have we asked to do the job?

I believe that the private sector is anxious to be asked to participate in this. I believe they want to end the permanent underclass in America and help people move into the thriving, growing middle class. But we have to do it in an organized, disciplined way state by state. We're going to do our part, but we need you to do yours.

Finally, let me say that it is obvious from looking at education that we have to have a new partnership in America. Washington can lead the way, but the work has to be done by all Americans. North Carolina has led the way for a long time.

I was smiling today when I got up and I thought about coming down here, and I thought about the first time I was ever in a meeting with Governor Hunt and Governor Riley -- 18 years ago -- we were all much younger then. And we had this idea that all the southern states would reach the national average in per capita income and have all these great opportunities for our people if only we could have an

education system that was as good as anyplace in the country and it would reach everybody, without regard to race or income.

And, ironically, the mission that many of us who are southerners have carried for 20 or 30 years in our hearts is now the mission of America in a global society dominated by information and technology. And it is within our reach, literally, to give every single child in America the greatest future in human history if we create the conditions in which we can flourish -- that's partly our job, through national defense and meeting the security challenges and providing a good economy -- but also having the tools.

We cannot guarantee the future for any child, but we can give every child the tools to make the most of his or her own life. That is now America's mission. It is a mission this state has pursued for a long time. If you will lead the way, America's best days are still ahead.

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

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

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IGH4T11QB401664F@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for "Jeffrey H. Cohen"@oa.eop.gov; Fri,
14 Mar 1997 01:55:36 -0500 (EST)

Received: from gatekeeper.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IGH4SYAGCG01458C@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Jeffrey_H._Cohen@oa.eop.gov; Fri,
14 Mar 1997 01:55:31 -0500 (EST)

Received: from cinnamon-life.ai.mit.edu by gatekeeper.eop.gov;
(5.65v3.2/1.1.8.2/17Oct95-0424PM) id AA14860; Fri, 14 Mar 1997 01:55:28 -0500

Received: from CLINTON.AI.MIT.EDU (clinton.ai.mit.edu [128.52.33.14])
by cinnamon-life.ai.mit.edu (8.8.5/8.8.5AI/cinnamon-life.ai.mit.edu:1.3)
with SMTP id AAA16150; Fri, 14 Mar 1997 00:46:25 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 00:32-0500

Errors-to: Mail-Server@clinton.ai.mit.edu

Precedence: Bulk

Delivered-By-The-Graces-Of: White House Electronic Publications

Document-Id: PDI://OMA.EOP.GOV.US/1997/3/14/2.TEXT.1

Keywords: Alaska, Arkansas, Business, California, Communications, Computers,
Defense, Delaware, Economy, Education, Federalism, Florida, Foreign, Georgia,

Government, Illinois, Infrastructure, Kentucky, Labor, Maine, Maryland,
Michigan, Mid-Atlantic-Region, Midwest-Region, Missouri, New-England-Region,
North-Carolina, Personnel, President, Security, Social, South-Carolina,
South-Region, Speech, Technology, Topical-Remarks, Virginia, Welfare,
West-Region

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Julia R. Green (Julia R. Green@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-MAR-1997 14:38:00.00

SUBJECT: HOPE Scholarship event

TO: Anne M. Edwards (Anne M. Edwards@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: April Mellody (April Mellody@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (Barry J. Toiv@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Darby E. Stott (Darby E. Stott@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (Jeremy M. Gaines@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Silverman (Joshua Silverman@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen M. McKiernan (Kathleen M. McKiernan@EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori Anderson (Lori Anderson@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Glynn (Mary E. Glynn@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael McCurry (Michael McCurry@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov (Paul K. Engskov@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stuart Schear (Stuart Schear@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 18-MAR-1997 13:38:00

FYI -- On Thursday, VPOTUS, Riley and Rubin will participate in a round
table

discussion at a suburban VA school to announce that Administration is sending

our HOPE Scholarship legislation to the Hill. Surprisingly, there are some details still to be worked out but there are likely to be state by state

#s on

Pell Grant increases and the reduction in loan figures. VPs office will issue

press advisory, and Riley and Rubin will brief reporters at the school.

We'll

have final materials to distribute as well and we can try to get time from

Gene

for regional radio and print interviews.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: William H. White Jr. (William H. White Jr.@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-MAR-1997 10:25:00.00

SUBJECT: Education Briefing

TO: Floydetta McAfee (Floydetta McAfee@eop [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 20-MAR-1997 09:25:00

Please let me know if you have groups attending the Education Briefing

today at

1:00 PM in the Indian Treaty Room (474).

The legislation is called the "Hope and Opportunity for Postsecondary

Education

(HOPE) Act of 1997, and includes the \$1500 Hope Scholarship tax credit,

\$10,000

tuition tax deduction, and the largest Pell Grant increase in two decades

(\$40

Billion over 5 years).

**Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System
[EMAIL] and Tape Restoration Project [Email]**

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

This marker identifies a responsive email, already made available within another collection.

Collection: 2017-1075-F

Bucket: Default

Creation Date: 1997-03-21

Subject: Re: Budget Talking Points

Creator: clare.giesen
clare.giesen@hq.doe.gov@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]
