

# Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

## Clinton Library

| DOCUMENT NO.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                    | DATE       | RESTRICTION                           |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| 001. schedule            | Phone Number; Secret Service (Partial) (3 pages) | 11/04/1994 | P6/b(6), b(7)(C), b(7)(E),<br>b(7)(F) |
| 002. memo                | Phone No. (Partial) (1 page)                     | 11/01/1994 | P6/b(6)                               |

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
First Lady's Office  
Speechwriting  
OA/Box Number: 8170

### FOLDER TITLE:

HRC [Hillary Rodham Clinton]/Massachusetts '94 11/4/94

2012-1004-S

ms541

### RESTRICTION CODES

#### Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

#### Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON  
REMARKS AT SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE  
NOVEMBER 4, 1994**

**TALKING POINTS**

**INTRODUCTION**

It's great to be here in Western Massachusetts, not only one of the most beautiful parts of our country, but also the true basketball capital of the world. I feel particularly welcome knowing that a few weeks from now, when Springfield College hosts the Tip-Off Classic, Arkansas will be playing in the first game [against UMass]. So I'll be following what happens here with special interest.

Those of you who are students, faculty, administrators, employees, or just friendly neighbors of Springfield College, know the importance that this school places on the ideal of service in our society. For more than a century Springfield College has integrated service into the academic curriculum. When President Kennedy created the Peace Corps more than 30 years ago, the first training session was here. Many of you enrolled here because you wanted to train for professions that are built around serving others. And that ideal is something that we need to strengthen and expand across our country, particularly at a time when we face so many new and complex challenges at home and abroad.

I raise the idea of service and community because it is so in keeping with the President's vision of America. It also has a lot to do with next week's election. It has to do with what direction we want to move as a country. It has to do with how we define ourselves as a people, and as a society. And it has a lot to do with how the various candidates -- candidates like Senator Kennedy and Congressman Neal -- approach the problems we face.

**WHY WE NEED TED KENNEDY IN THE SENATE**

I cannot overstate how important Senator Kennedy is to the workings of the United States Senate, to making sure that every single member never forgets the people back home.

Senator Kennedy is the one who always reminds his colleagues: "What about the children of working families who can't get health insurance? What about the jobs that are moved out of state and out of country? What about the environmental problems that get overlooked and untended? What about health care, education?" These are issues he's fought for over a lifetime of service. With Ted Kennedy there, no other senator can

ever, ever forget what is really at stake in their United States Senate deliberations.

He has repeatedly stood up to what he says is the job of government, "to do more than provide comfort for the comfortable but instead to provide opportunity for every American, particularly to give the capacity and the power over their own lives to working people so they could make the best decisions for themselves and their families."

He believes and his record demonstrates that government doesn't need to be on your back. Government doesn't need to be off your back. Government needs to be by your side and together in a partnership working to get things done for people.

And his service over the years has left an imprint on the lives of every American. I wouldn't have the time to go through the entire record, but I hope you are aware of the countless times he has intervened in the lives of your families, your neighbors, your friends.

His stance on crime and violence is just one example of how he has worked hard to ensure the security of American families. It was Ted Kennedy who sponsored the original gun control act in this country.

It was Ted Kennedy who wrote the bill that abolished parole for federal crimes, who wrote the bill that allows judges to consider how dangerous a defendant is when setting bail, and it was Ted Kennedy, often in a very lonely role for years, who was a lead co-sponsor of the Brady Bill.

And it was Ted Kennedy who helped turn that bill into a law and then to take it a step further by fighting and winning on the ban on assault weapons, which will have a major impact on making our streets safer and making our police officers safer in the face of such wanton violence.

**TED KENNEDY IS TRULY "THE EDUCATION SENATOR" AND "THE SERVICE SENATOR" BECAUSE HE KNOWS YOUNG PEOPLE ARE OUR FUTURE**

\* The National and Community Service Act, which encourages Americans of all ages to become more involved in their communities, would not exist today without Ted Kennedy's leadership in the United States Senate.

The AmeriCorps program, in which 20,000 Americans, many of them young people, are performing community service in return for help with their college tuition, would not exist without Ted Kennedy's leadership in the United States Senate.

\* We've all heard a lot of talk about gridlock in Congress.

But then take a look at Senator Kennedy's incredible record of accomplishment. Senator Kennedy was able to build enough bipartisan support to pass **SIX** major education bills during the last session of Congress. Bills that focus on education from pre-school through college.

-- An expansion of Head Start, in which 25 percent of all new funds will be used for better staff training, better working conditions, and overall quality improvement of one of our nation's most successful educational programs for small children. And a new "Early Start" program for kids ages zero to 3.

-- Goals 2000, which President Clinton put at the top of his agenda and Senator Kennedy paved the way for on Capitol Hill. This legislation is already enabling schools all over America to set standards for student achievement and to devise their own methods for improving the curriculum.

-- The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is revamping the largest source of federal aid to education and will provide \$60 billion to schools in every region over the next five years.

-- The School-to-Work Opportunities Act that will give high school students the combined academic and occupational training they need to acquire and keep good jobs.

-- The Student Loan Reform Act that will allow more American students to go to college by making it easier to obtain and repay loans. It will lower interest rates and allow more flexible repayment schedules so that our young people can concentrate on how to get a good education and not on how to finance an education.

As Senator Kennedy has said, and my husband has echoed over the years, "We need to keep college affordable and accessible. The road to a college degree should never be barred by a dollar sign."

No American who works hard, takes responsibility, and plays by the rules should be denied the opportunity to better himself or herself. No young person who has worked hard to get a good education should have to spend a lifetime paying off the loans, or should be forced into a career they don't want simply because it's the only way to ease the burden of loan repayment.

Education should not be a preserve of a wealthy elite. We need the talents of all of our young people, and particularly those who have the motivation and discipline to pursue a college degree.

The college loan reforms make a difference in the lives of

millions of Americans. But it wouldn't have happened without Senator Kennedy. And neither would so many other important programs that benefit our young people today.

### CONCLUSION

Every election is not just between two people; it's between competing visions of where each candidate wants to take us, between competing ideas about the kind of people we are and what our beliefs and values are. This is such an election because, in addition to being a race between Senator Kennedy and his opponent, this is a classic race between hope and optimism and fear and negativism.

Massachusetts is very fortunate to have had such a distinguished and respected Senator representing this state for many years. And Massachusetts has been well-served. Change and progress have been popular terms in recent elections, but Senator Kennedy has been trying to move this country forward for decades. A vote for Ted Kennedy is, and has always been, a vote for a better future. The people of Massachusetts know this and they will deliver him to the Senate once again on Tuesday.

Thank you very much.

###

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON  
LUNCHEON FOR KEVIN O'SULLIVAN  
NOVEMBER 4, 1994  
WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS**

**TALKING POINTS**

**INTRODUCTION**

We need partners at the state level who can help us move forward and achieve President Clinton's agenda for change and empower ordinary Americans with the tools they need to take responsibility and make better lives for themselves and their families.

The President has begun to get our country moving forward again. But it's a lot harder when some members of Congress insist on gridlock, insist on obstructionism, insist on getting in the way of progress.

That's why this election is so important. It's not just a choice between two candidates, but between two competing visions of America.

**KEVIN O'SULLIVAN OFFERS US HOPE AND POSSIBILITY INSTEAD OF CYNICISM AND FEAR**

Kevin cares about economic renewal and job creation, and he will be a partner working with the President, whose economic program already has produced new jobs throughout the country, including thousands here in Massachusetts. (His opponent voted against the President's economic package).

In eight years in the legislature Kevin has proven that he cares about keeping children, women and families squarely on the national agenda. As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, he fought for increased funding for breast cancer research. He fought for programs for battered women. He fought to make health care accessible to people in need, and in one case worked with community leaders in Worcester to convert the Worcester City Hospital into a Family Health Center providing prenatal and family health services to local residents.

(His opponent voted to weaken the Family and Medical Leave law with the Goodling Amendments and co-sponsored legislation to cut \$210 million in breast cancer research).

Kevin cares about ensuring that women have the right to choose. (His opponent opposes choice).

Kevin is committed to making our streets, neighborhoods, and

schools safe again -- and being tough on hardened criminals. (His opponent voted against the Brady Bill, which already has prevented thousands of irresponsible people from buying weapons).

Kevin knows that education is the ticket to a successful and productive future -- not only for Americans individually, but for all of us collectively. We need a pool of trained, skilled workers to help us compete in the global economy. That's why he helped found the Alliance for Education, a partnership between schools and businesses that promoted job training and volunteerism. (His opponent has received the worst grades of the entire Massachusetts delegation when it comes to education).

Kevin cares about protecting the environment and making sure our children enjoy safe, clean and plentiful water, air, and other environmental resources. (His opponent received the lowest rating in the Massachusetts delegation from the League of Conservation Voters).

#### HIS OPPONENT'S RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

The Fall River Herald endorsed Kevin recently and, while detailing his many accomplishments, also noted that his opponent "has shown little concern about jobs" in the area. The Boston Globe also endorsed Kevin, saying he has a strong record on crime, the environment, and economic issues, while his opponent is "a government minimalist."

I'm not in favor of big government, but I am in favor of a government committed to working for ordinary people. And I know Kevin feels the same way.

His opponent, meanwhile, was one of 350 members of Congress who signed a "Contract with America" that amounts to a trillion dollars worth of promises -- big tax breaks for the wealthy, billions more spent on defense, a revival of Star Wars, and inevitable cuts in some of our most important social programs.

It doesn't do much good to the people of Massachusetts if their representative in Congress is only against things. You have to have someone in there who believes government can be an agent of change, working to help people to fulfill their potential and become happy and productive citizens. You have to have someone who wants to move forward, not backward.

###

**FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON  
MEETING WITH SENIOR COMMUNITY LEADERS  
PEABODY, MASSACHUSETTS  
NOVEMBER 4, 1994**

**TALKING POINTS**

**JOHN TIERNEY IS ONE OF THE MOST ENERGETIC, INNOVATIVE CANDIDATES  
RUNNING FOR CONGRESS. HIS POSITIONS ON CRIME AND HEALTH CARE  
REFLECT A BROAD-MINDED, AGGRESSIVE APPROACH TO SOLVING THESE  
PROBLEMS**

This election is crucial because in the past 21 months we have begun to make real, lasting progress. To continue that progress, the President needs partners in Congress who will help move us forward not backward.

Fortunately for those of you in the 6th District, John Tierney is the kind of partner the President needs -- one who is aggressive about stopping crime and about reforming our health care system, not one who sits on the fence and undermines the changes we need to make.

**CRIME**

John Tierney doesn't pussy-foot around the crime issue. He is one of the most outspoken proponents of gun control running for election anywhere in this country.

His opponent, meanwhile, won't stand up to the gun lobby. He opposed the Brady bill. He opposed the assault weapon ban (he voted for the crime bill but against it in conference). He opposed the Brady bill.

Last month, the National Rifle Association endorsed him and gave him an A- on gun ownership issues, the highest rating of any state politician (for perspective, Governor Weld got an F).

**HEALTH CARE and FAMILIES**

John Tierney cares about families and cares about health care. That's why he voted for the Family and Medical Leave law, which his opponent opposed.

John knows that our health care system needs to be reformed. He knows that our economy depends on it. He knows that our families depend on it. He knows our senior citizens depend on it.

That's why he favors a system in which every American has coverage. [He favors a single payer system but is pragmatic enough to know that there are other ways to arrive at universal coverage].

## THE ECONOMY

John's opponent, meanwhile, along with more 350 other Republicans, signed a Contract With America that amounts to a trillion dollars worth of promises that can only be kept by hurting people in need. The contract will provide tax breaks for the wealthy. More spending on defense. And, although they won't say this, those expenditures will have to be offset by major cuts in Medicare and Social Security.

The President needs a partner who will support his economic recovery plan, which has created 5 million jobs across America, expanded our trade overseas, and reduced the deficit for three years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

John's opponent voted against the President's budget.

The choice is clear: A strong, outspoken, clear-headed leader, or an incumbent who has barely made his presence felt on behalf of his constituents in Massachusetts.

###

## 1992 Election results

|         |         |         |         |          |         |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|
| Clinton | 134,424 | Dukakis | 144,982 | Member   | 159,165 |
| Bush    | 96,857  | Bush    | 96,857  | Opponent | 130,248 |
| Perot   | 75,893  |         |         |          |         |

## District Statistics

|                                                    |        |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| EITC families (in 000's)                           | 15     |
| Taxpayers with higher rates (in 000's)             | 5      |
| Families with no change in rates (in 000's)        | 220.80 |
| Amount of EITC tax reduction (in millions)         | 23     |
| Number of uninsured families (in 000's)            | 55     |
| Number of of uninsured working families (in 000's) | 45     |
| Number of uninsured children (in 000's)            | 11     |
| Percentage of uninsured families who are working   | 83.3 % |

## Overall Clinton Support

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| When Voting | 48 |
| All Votes   | 48 |

## Votes on Economic Plan, Spending Reductions, and Tax Relief for working class families

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| 94 Budget           | NO  |
| 94 Conference       | NO  |
| Penny Kasich        | NO  |
| Stimulus            | NO  |
| Buyout              | YES |
| VA Buyout reduction | NO  |
| Balanced Budget     | NO  |

## Votes on Crime

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| Crime Bill          | YES |
| Conference Report   | NO  |
| 2nd crime Bill      | YES |
| Brady Bill          | NO  |
| Assault Weapons Ban | NO  |

## Votes on Family Issues

|              |     |
|--------------|-----|
| Family Leave | NO  |
| Head Start   | YES |

## Votes on Economic Redevelopment and Expansion

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Nafta            | YES |
| Goals 2000       | YES |
| Schools to Work  | YES |
| National Service | YES |

**Richard E. Neal**

**MA02**

**Springfield**

**1992 Election results**

|         |         |         |         |          |         |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|
| Clinton | 121,759 | Dukakis | 132,154 | Member   | 131,215 |
| Bush    | 76,277  | Bush    | 76,277  | Opponent | 76,795  |
| Perot   | 65,935  |         |         |          |         |

**District Statistics**

|                                                    |        |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| EITC families (in 000's)                           | 20     |
| Taxpayers with higher rates (in 000's)             | 2      |
| Families with no change in rates (in 000's)        | 219.60 |
| Amount of EITC tax reduction (in millions)         | 31     |
| Number of uninsured families (in 000's)            | 63     |
| Number of of uninsured working families (in 000's) | 52     |
| Number of uninsured children (in 000's)            | 17     |
| Percentage of uninsured families who are working   | 81.6 % |

**Overall Clinton Support**

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| When Voting | 90 |
| All Votes   | 83 |

**Votes on Economic Plan, Spending Reductions, and Tax Relief for working class families**

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| 94 Budget           | YES |
| 94 Conference       | YES |
| Penny Kasich        | YES |
| Stimulus            | YES |
| Buyout              | YES |
| VA Buyout reduction | NO  |
| Balanced Budget     | YES |

**Votes on Crime**

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| Crime Bill          | YES |
| Conference Report   | YES |
| 2nd crime Bill      | YES |
| Brady Bill          | YES |
| Assault Weapons Ban | YES |

**Votes on Family Issues**

|              |     |
|--------------|-----|
| Family Leave | YES |
| Head Start   | YES |

**Votes on Economic Redevelopment and Expansion**

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Nafta            | NO  |
| Goals 2000       | YES |
| Schools to Work  | YES |
| National Service | YES |

**Peter I. Blute**

MA03

**Worcester**

**1992 Election results**

|         |         |         |         |          |         |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|
| Clinton | 123,724 | Dukakis | 127,607 | Member   | 131,473 |
| Bush    | 85,047  | Bush    | 85,047  | Opponent | 115,587 |
| Perot   | 62,667  |         |         |          |         |

**District Statistics**

|                                                    |        |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| EITC families (in 000's)                           | 18     |
| Taxpayers with higher rates (in 000's)             | 3      |
| Families with no change in rates (in 000's)        | 217.00 |
| Amount of EITC tax reduction (in millions)         | 27     |
| Number of uninsured families (in 000's)            | 59     |
| Number of of uninsured working families (in 000's) | 48     |
| Number of uninsured children (in 000's)            | 14     |
| Percentage of uninsured families who are working   | 82.5 % |

**Overall Clinton Support**

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| When Voting | 48 |
| All Votes   | 48 |

**Votes on Economic Plan, Spending Reductions, and Tax Relief for working class families**

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| 94 Budget           | NO  |
| 94 Conference       | NO  |
| Penny Kasich        | NO  |
| Stimulus            | NO  |
| Buyout              | YES |
| VA Buyout reduction | NO  |
| Balanced Budget     | NO  |

**Votes on Crime**

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| Crime Bill          | YES |
| Conference Report   | NO  |
| 2nd crime Bill      | YES |
| Brady Bill          | NO  |
| Assault Weapons Ban | YES |

**Votes on Family Issues**

|              |     |
|--------------|-----|
| Family Leave | NO  |
| Head Start   | YES |

**Votes on Economic Redevelopment and Expansion**

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Nafta            | NO  |
| Goals 2000       | YES |
| Schools to Work  | YES |
| National Service | YES |

# O'SULLIVAN CONGRESS

P.O. BOX 875 • WEST SIDE STATION • WORCESTER, MA 01602 • (508) 798-1994 • FAX (508) 797-9293

Paul Matthews - campaign mgr.

500 people

3 November 1994

To: Karen Anderson  
From: Michael O'Sullivan *MS*  
Re: Material for Mrs. Clinton

Worcester City Hosp -  
used at county leaders  
to consolid.  
Commit into family health  
Center emphasizing  
pre-natal  
& Fam. Health  
services

We are sending along a couple of clips/endorsements, one from the  
Fall River Herald and the other from the Boston Globe.

Member of the  
Way +  
Mean

In the closing days of the campaign, the focus of the race is revolving  
around so-called "gender issues."

increased  
funding  
for hr.  
care,  
research.

We would be happy if Mrs. Clinton spoke in general terms about  
issues affecting women, families, health care, choice, and education.

We are actively courting women's votes. We have sent a mailer to  
voters pointing out Kevin's pro-choice position and Blute's anti-choice  
votes, including his vote against the Clinic Access bill.

Daybook  
battered  
women's  
shelter

ABOUT PETER BLUTE: He is a rabidly anti-choice Republican, and is  
attacking Kevin for being "dangerous" to women. Blute knows it is he  
who is vulnerable with women voters, particularly since Kevin has  
been highlighting Blute's co-sponsorship of legislation that proposed  
cutting \$210 million in breast cancer research. Blute voted to weaken  
the Family and Medical Leave Act with the Goodling Amendments.  
He has accepted over \$20,000 from special interest groups opposed  
to health care reform - big insurance companies, medical groups,  
tobacco companies - and then failed to sign on to any mainstream  
health care plan. For this race, Blute has raised over \$120,000 from  
PACs. [Kevin accepts no PAC money.] He has received the worst  
grades of the Massachusetts delegation on education.

found member  
of Alliance  
for Educ.  
School &  
business



started  
off college  
friendly floor  
- a consy  
center

If you'd like any more information, contact Kathy Robertson.

Thanks for all your help!

## OUR VIEW

## O'Sullivan for Congress

The 1992 presidential campaign rebuke, "It's the economy, stupid," might well be modified for this year's contest in the 3rd Congressional District: "It's jobs, congressman."

Rep. Kevin O'Sullivan is not only well aware of that battle cry, he has a solid record of saving and creating jobs in his district that could translate into more and better jobs for residents of the 3rd Congressional District, which O'Sullivan hopes to represent. Meanwhile, his opponent, U.S. Rep. Peter Blute, has shown so little concern



Kevin O'Sullivan

about jobs in the Fall River area that the word jobs didn't even leave his lips during a recent visit to *The Herald News* to discuss his accomplishments and goals for the future.

O'Sullivan, however, sees jobs as the No. 1 issue facing

the people of

the district. His record during his eight years in the state Legislature, plus his creative vision for the future back up his promise that he'll deliver on the jobs front if he's elected

grams, in particular Social Security. O'Sullivan has suggested that elimination of cost of living increases for Social Security recipients making more than \$60,000 be considered for deficit reduction. While even using the words Social Security and cuts in the same sentence treads dangerous political ground, O'Sullivan shows admirable courage in broaching the subject. "I have a fiscal responsibility to not tell people what they want to hear," O'Sullivan said. Moreover, his suggestion to hold the line on increases for wealthy individuals simply makes good sense and doesn't endanger any senior who truly needs and deserves assistance.

O'Sullivan is likewise pragmatic about education and crime, noting that we've spent more money on prisons than on schools. While O'Sullivan said he does not subscribe to the notion that throwing money at a problem will solve it, he points out that Fall River needs some \$50 million just to bring our schools up to code. "You have to make people understand that good schools make good communities," O'Sullivan said.

As a state legislator, O'Sullivan secured \$700,000 in community policing grants for his district, putting more cops on the streets. He supports truth in sentencing laws and gun control. In addition to such traditional crime fighting, O'Sullivan supports creative solutions, such as alternative sentencing for first-time, non-violent offenders.

(CONT ON NEXT PAGE)

O'Sullivan was instrumental in stopping the hostile takeover of the Worcester abrasives manufacturer Norton Co. His action helped to save 2,000 jobs in that city. O'Sullivan was also part of the team that developed the Worcester Biotechnology Research Park, demonstrating precisely the kind of foresight a city such as Fall River needs to revitalize and expand its manufacturing base.

O'Sullivan also recognizes that creating or maintaining jobs and improving education go hand in hand. While O'Sullivan is adamant about restoring the commonwealth's manufacturing base, he is realistic about the need to retool for the future, promising to expand the district's search for emerging technologies as part of his overall economic plan.

While countless other politicians have touted a commuter rail line to Fall River as an important economic tool, O'Sullivan has proven that he can get the job done. "The wave of the future is commuter rail," said Sullivan, who filed legislation to bring commuter rail to Worcester and accomplished it in an admirably short seven years.

O'Sullivan was the architect of this year's welfare reform bill in the House, which, had it not been vetoed by Gov. Weld, would have put in place the most meaningful reform to date. The representative realizes several issues, including a skyrocketing teen pregnancy rate, have to be addressed and resolved before the Bay State can significantly reduce its welfare rolls.

O'Sullivan reveals equally realistic thinking on other entitlement pro-

grams in terms of congressional reform. O'Sullivan has already shown his commitment to it before getting into office while Blute merely talks about it. O'Sullivan has accepted no PAC money for his campaign. Blute has accepted substantial sums from PACs. While in the state Legislature, O'Sullivan voted against a pay raise for members and then, even though the measure passed, he refused to accept it. Blute, then in the state Legislature, accepted the increase. O'Sullivan is a supporter of term limits and has made a pledge to serve only four terms in Congress. Blute has committed to serving five terms.

Throughout his career, O'Sullivan has shown a consistent knack for getting things done. Assigned the unenviable task of redistricting the state's House districts in 1992, O'Sullivan won the confidence and admiration of his colleagues.

His success in redistricting shows both his willingness to negotiate with others and his ability to build consensus among his colleagues. Such cooperation will be an asset to O'Sullivan and the people of this district in Washington.

Although his voting record indicates otherwise, Peter Blute has billed himself as an independent figure. O'Sullivan, however, will provide a strong voice of unity that will increase his effectiveness. His enthusiasm and energy will serve the residents of the 3rd Congressional District well.

*The Herald News* endorses Kevin O'Sullivan for Congress.

# Boston Sunday Globe

WILLIAM O. TAYLOR

Chairman of the Board and Publisher

BENJAMIN B. TAYLOR, President

MATTHEW V. STORIN, Editor

H.D.S. GREENWAY, Editor, Editorial Page

STEPHEN E. TAYLOR, Executive Vice President

HELEN W. DONOVAN, Executive Editor

WILLIAM B. HUFF, Senior Vice President

GREGORY L. MOORE, Managing Editor

Founded 1878

CHARLES H. TAYLOR, Publisher 1878-1922 WILLIAM O. TAYLOR, Publisher 1922-1935 WM. DAVIS TAYLOR, Publisher 1935-1977

JOHN I. TAYLOR, President 1922-1975

LAURENCE L. WINSHIP, Editor 1935-1965

THOMAS WINSHIP, Editor 1965-1984

## Choices for Congress

Although freshmen are no longer seen as the only vulnerable congressmen, the two hottest contests in Massachusetts for the US House involve first-term Republicans Peter Torkildsen of Danvers and Peter Blute of Shrewsbury.

Torkildsen, who beat indicted Rep. Nick Mavroules two years ago, has had difficulty establishing a record that argues for his reelection. Listing congressional reform and health care reform among his priorities going in, Torkildsen can claim modest accomplishments on the former but not even a coherent plan on the latter.

Salem lawyer JOHN TIERNEY, making his first run for public office, is challenging Torkildsen with one of the most progressive agendas advanced by a congressional candidate in years.

An aggressive anticrime package that stresses prevention and mandatory drug treatment for inmates rather than simplistic, false solutions like the death penalty; a health reform policy that insists on universality as the ultimate goal and boldly embraces the single-payer model as a starting point; and a willingness to make the tough choices of supporting defense cuts and last year's tax increases as a way to cut the deficit - these are among the initiatives Tierney puts forward. He even advises voters to support the best system of campaign finance reform - using public financing to encourage spending limits - by telling people to "buy your politicians back."

The Globe favors more of Tierney's approaches than Torkildsen's, and Tierney gives far greater promise of carrying his ideas out. We endorse his candidacy.

The campaign in the 3d District is a tougher call. Blute, of Shrewsbury, has been a diligent freshman congressman who has worked hard for his constituents in a district that now stretches from Princeton north of Worcester, through Attleboro to Fall River. His opponent, state Rep. KEVIN O'SULLIVAN of Worcester, is an energetic former colleague (for six years, when the two were both members of the Massachusetts House).

Blute is a government minimalist who has signed on to the Newt Gingrich "contract," saying "what's not to like?" in its provisions. We believe there is plenty not to like, including the twin promises of tax cuts and increased defense spending, a combination that threatens to send the deficit spin-

ning out of control again.

O'Sullivan takes a relatively conservative fiscal approach. Having served as vice president of the Worcester Chamber of Commerce, he calls himself a pro-business Democrat. Former Sen. Paul Tsongas has backed O'Sullivan with an endorsement based more on deficit reduction than on their common party affiliation.

On some issues, Blute has based his actions on local opinion. He supports a casino in New Bedford if citizens there support it, he says, and he opposed the North American Free Trade Agreement because it might harm the local apparel, textile and jewelry industries. O'Sullivan takes a similar position on gambling but supported NAFTA and says he is inclined to back the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, on which Blute is undecided.

Blute opposes abortion as a matter of conscience, while O'Sullivan has moved to a prochoice position and last year voted for state legislation to codify Roe v. Wade.

O'Sullivan has a strong environmental record, supporting recycling, green space and watershed protection, while Blute was recently given by far the lowest rating of any Massachusetts congressman by the League of Conservation Voters.

O'Sullivan has been a key sponsor of strong campaign finance reforms at the State House, including bills with public financing provisions, while Blute, though claiming to be in the forefront of congressional reform, opposes tough legislation that is the key to real reform.

O'Sullivan also has a stronger record on gun control, having voted for a ban on assault weapons in Boston while Blute opposed it. Our health care O'Sullivan is more strongly committed to the fundamental goal of universal coverage.

We believe O'Sullivan would match Blute's energy in the district and would advance better policies in Washington. We support O'Sullivan.

In the other districts, we believe that incumbents deserve reelection. In particular, we support Rep. J. JOSEPH MOAKLEY of South Boston, although he should be more willing to defeat Republican Michael Murphy. Rep. EDWARD MARKEY of Malden has also earned another term, though we find Republican Brad Bailey, a former prosecutor, to be an articulate conservative likely to be heard from again.

# O'SULLIVAN CONGRESS

P.O. BOX 875 • WEST SIDE STATION • WORCESTER, MA 01602 • (508) 798-1994 • FAX (508) 797-9293

## EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

### Representative Kevin O'Sullivan Candidate for Congress Third Massachusetts District

Kevin O'Sullivan believes our nation's economic prosperity depends on our society making a total commitment to educational excellence. Coming from a family of educators - his mother, brother, sister, and sister-in-law - he has consistently been a friend of public education in Massachusetts. He believes it is time to demand accountability and responsibility from everyone - parents, students, educators and the community.

Kevin O'Sullivan's commitment to reinvigorating the educational system in this country comes from a deeply-held belief in personal responsibility and his understanding of the link between education and accomplishment. As the link between education and job success has been undeniably proven, O'Sullivan believes we must invest in our students. When this country builds more prisons than schools, we must realize something is wrong. We must lock up the criminals, but we must also invest in the schools to end this vicious cycle.

O'Sullivan will make education a priority if elected. His strong record of achievement in education includes:

- Leading the fight to override Proposition 2 1/2 to fund Worcester's schools
- Supporting magnet and charter schools as innovative approaches to education
- Supporting school-to-work programs
- Developing the Alliance for Education, a private sector business/schools partnership he developed while working at the Worcester Area Chamber of Commerce
- Supporting the Massachusetts Education Reform which increased school funding, and allowed local schools more flexibility
- Successfully winning approval for a Regional Library System
- Supporting the 0.01% sales tax increase for education
- Supporting increased emphasis on early childhood education
- Making parents more accountable for student attendance and progress
- Supporting teacher testing for re-certification
- Supporting student competency testing for graduation
- Successfully increasing funding for resources such as books and computers
- Supporting the national Goals 2000 legislation to improve our schools
- Supporting the National Service Program allowing youths to earn money for college
- Increasing the availability of federal college loans
- Considering the lengthening of the school year

# **O'SULLIVAN**

## **CONGRESS**

P.O. BOX 875 • WEST SIDE STATION • WORCESTER, MA 01602 • (508) 798-1994 • FAX (508) 797-9293

## **ISSUES IMPACTING WOMEN**

**Representative Kevin O'Sullivan**  
**Candidate for Congress**  
**Third Massachusetts District**

Throughout his public life, Kevin O'Sullivan has been a committed and tireless advocate of issues affecting women. His career began by working as program director at a United Way House with at-risk kids. He went on to develop the Alliance for Education, a partnership between schools and businesses while working at the Worcester Area Chamber of Commerce. This was followed by serving the last eight years in the state legislature where he showed his commitment to economic parity, child care and protection, health care, education, homelessness, and domestic abuse.

His record in the State Legislature includes:

- Consolidating health care facilities including converting Worcester's City Hospital into a family health center, stressing prenatal and family services
- Increasing funding for AIDS and breast cancer research
- Increasing funding for Daybreak, a battered woman's shelter
- Advocating for teenage pregnancy prevention programs
- Voting to support a woman's right to choose
- Supporting the Education Reform Act to improve our schools
- Supporting tough stalking laws and gun control legislation

As a Congressman, Kevin O'Sullivan will fight for:

- Economic improvement through family friendly policies such as tax credits for day care, along with education and job retraining for women reentering the work force
- Safety for victims of domestic abuse by removing violent partners, enacting gun control, and creating safe havens for abused children
- Teen pregnancy prevention programs to break the cycle of generational dependency
- Universal health care including AIDS research, increased breast cancer funding, child immunizations, and expanded emphasis on primary care
- Legislation codifying a woman's right to choose

# O'SULLIVAN CONGRESS

P.O. BOX 875 • WEST SIDE STATION • WORCESTER, MA 01602 • (508) 798-1994 • FAX (508) 797-9293

## HEALTH CARE REFORM

**Representative Kevin O'Sullivan  
Candidate for Congress  
Third Massachusetts District**

Kevin O'Sullivan has always been a strong believer in accountability and personal responsibility. He believes that government's responsibility is to put the proper incentives in place and then allow the free market to work toward the goal of universal coverage. Achieving universal coverage is not only the moral thing to do, it is also the economically sound thing to do. We must contain costs in the health care system while maintaining quality. These are Kevin O'Sullivan's reform proposals:

### COVERAGE

- Universal coverage is the definite goal
- States have the right to establish their own system to increase coverage
- Establish National Health Board to make recommendations to reach universality
- Insurance reforms eliminating pre-existing condition clauses, allowing portability
- Community rating to strictly enforce rate similarities
- Allowing children to remain on family plan until age 27
- Design both catastrophic and comprehensive benefit packages that insurers and employers must offer
- Phase in subsidies as revenue increases to ensure deficit neutrality
- Individuals purchasing their own insurance will be 100% tax deductible
- States to set up voluntary purchasing alliances

### COST CONTAINMENT AND FUNDING

- Reexamine government programs to eliminate fraud
- Achieve malpractice and tort reform through caps and frivolous law suit reform
- Simplify paperwork with standardized forms and computerization
- Tax incentives to teaching colleges that encourage primary care providers
- Tax incentives to encourage cost effective medicine (biotech, alternative care providers, hospital mergers, equipment sharing)
- \$1.00 additional tax per pack on cigarettes
- Consider taxes on high priced plans

## Kennedy (Clayton)

"The Educ. Senate"

Built bipartisanship needed

- 6<sup>th</sup> ~~thru~~ <sup>thru</sup> This Congress alone - foc. on educ. from pre-K to college
- not everything is gridlock - educ.
- passage of ESEA 2 yrs of work bipartisanship

A decade ago - urgent action / rising tide of mediocrity

➔ restructure fed role

exp. Head Start more yrs

25% → quality improvement

early start 0-3 prenatal care / parent.

Kennedy / will say / higher ed = 2nd largest industry in Mass

Econ. impact \$20 B.

300,000 employees

a pool of educ. talented people = future

Goals 2000 could not have happened w/o Kennedy  
School to Work

Post-it Fax Note

7671

Date

11-3

# of

pages

11

LISSA MUSCATINE

CLAYTON SPENCER

Co./Dept.

Co.

SEN. KENNEDY

Phone #

Phone #

202-224-5501

Fax #

456-5709

Fax #

224-3533

1:30 pm -- Carey-approved

**THE EDUCATION CONGRESS****by Senator Edward M. Kennedy**

When the 103rd Congress adjourns later this week, the American people will begin their assessment of our accomplishments. We started this Congress with an ambitious agenda. While we have not met many of our goals, the 103rd Congress has been extremely productive on education, and we can be proud of our achievements. Fortunately for school and college students and their parents across the country, the gridlock that has affected Congress on so many other issues has spared education.

The passage of ESEA later today will be the culmination of two years of impressive bipartisan cooperation and accomplishment in all aspects of education. President Clinton can be proud of this record, and so can Democrats and Republicans alike in Congress. In this Congress, after ESEA passes, the Senate and the House will have completed action on six major bills that will strengthen all aspects of education for all students -- preschool through college.

In years to come, this Congress may well be known as the "Education Congress."

A decade ago, the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education called for urgent action to improve the quality of education. We all heard the warning -- a "rising tide of mediocrity" was eroding our schools and undermining our national strength.

Despite this warning, there was little immediate progress in rethinking the federal role in improving education. President Reagan tried to eliminate the Department of Education altogether. President Bush called himself the "Education President," and his Administration established an impressive agenda of goals, but the emphasis instead was on smaller-scale private school projects.

In the last two years, under the leadership of President Clinton, we have enacted an unprecedented series of bills with broad bipartisan support to restructure the federal role in education and make existing federal programs much more responsive to the nation's critical needs in the years ahead.

1. We expanded Head Start, so that more young children will have access to these highly successful educational activities. We set aside 25 percent of all new funds to be used in quality improvement projects, such as better training of staff and better working conditions.

As part of that legislation, we also created a new "Early Start" program -- a zero-to-three initiative for infants and toddlers to provide prenatal care, training in parenting, and comprehensive and continuous social services to families with very young children.

We have learned that for many children, Head Start starts too late. If we wait until the age of four, when Head Start begins, we have already lost the battle for many children. The goal of "Early Start" is to give them and their families the support they need when they need it the most.

2. To support local school reform, this Congress enacted the landmark Goals 2000 bill. This legislation is already helping schools across the country develop their own plans for improving the curriculum and set high standards for student achievement.

Over the next five years Goals 2000 will help schools to carry out reforms such as extending the school day and school year, reducing the size of classes, increasing parental involvement, and integrating various subjects into fewer courses. The legislation encourages voluntary standards for courses, so that parents and communities will know what students should learn in core subjects such as English,

history, math and science.

It also supports teacher development and training to revitalize teaching in American schools.

3. Today, with the passage of the pending major revisions in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we are overhauling the largest single source of federal aid to education. This massive bill will provide \$60 billion for schools across the nation over the next five years.

The reforms we have made in ESEA will target more funding to middle-income and low-income communities that need it most.

We give schools much more freedom to take aid earmarked for disadvantaged students and apply it to school-wide reforms. The bill also contains important initiatives to encourage the professional development of teachers, as well as significant steps to prevent violence in schools and fight drug abuse among students.

ESEA also includes the Technology for Education Act, to assist teachers in their efforts to bring computers and other new telecommunications tools into the classroom.

Computer software, video equipment, electronic networks, satellite broadcasting, and other technologies are revolutionizing learning in the best schools, and we need to make them more widely available to all schools.

3. This year, we also broke new ground in helping students enter the workforce with the academic and occupational skills needed to hold a good job. The School-to-Work Opportunities Act is designed to close a key education gap with other countries and end the relative lack and ineffectiveness of work-based learning programs in the United States.

Japan and European nations have extensive apprenticeship and company-based training programs that give graduates the skills to hold good jobs. The United States has done too little to ease the transition from school to work, especially for the so-called "forgotten three-quarters" -- the 75 percent of American students who do not earn a four-year college degree. The School-to-Work Act addresses this problem by encouraging coordinated programs that link classroom learning with actual work experience.

5. We also took a far-reaching step to make college more accessible and affordable for large numbers of students. The Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 established a new direct student loan program that will save students \$2 billion in loan fees over the next five years and give them more flexible repayment options. Direct lending will also save taxpayers \$4 billion in reduced subsidies to banks and other loan guaranty agencies.

6. Finally, we passed the National and Community Service Act, which encourages Americans of all ages to become more involved in their communities. Key activities include service-learning programs in schools, senior citizen efforts, and the new AmeriCorps project, which offers vouchers for college tuition in return for community service. In the long run, this new law may be the most important education reform of all, because it encourages citizens and communities to restore the ideals of civic duty and service to others to their rightful place in education. Congress cannot solve the profound problems we face in education, but involved citizens can.

Six bills in two years. It has not been easy. At times we have had to fend off

filibusters from our opponents. We have had to work hard to find common ground. We have threaded many needles, and adopted many compromises that were painful to achieve. But in the end we have succeeded in building a new bipartisan consensus on the basic principles that must guide federal education reform.

We need to start early. If we wait until children come through the schoolhouse door, it's already too late for many of them. They have fallen behind and will never catch up.

We need to emphasize high standards for all students. For too many years, we have been willing to accept too little from students and from schools. We need to set goals for what children should learn in school, and we need to give schools more resources to help meet those goals.

We must emphasize local responsibility for results. In the past, federal education programs have too often tried to micro-manage local decisions on schools. Teachers and parents know local needs best. I don't intend to try to dictate local school reforms, and neither should Senator Helms.

The best federal role is to let states to set their own performance standards and give

schools greater freedom to decide how to use federal money most effectively.

We need to invest in teachers. Good teachers are at the heart of good schools. But too many of today's teachers are overburdened and receive little backing in their effort to learn new teaching methods. With adequate time and support, they can be more effective in developing new ways to teach.

We must bring more schools into the future with new technology. Technology is transforming all other sectors of the economy. Yet most classrooms today lack a computer. For students to acquire the skills they need, they must have more opportunities to work with technology in school.

Communities and businesses must work in partnership with schools, and schools must work with them. Schools will not succeed as long as they are isolated from families and the rest of the world. Communities and businesses must take greater responsibility for the success of local schools and find new ways to work with students and teachers.

Schools can teach more effectively and better prepare students for future careers by

integrating community service and work experience into the curriculum.

We need to keep college affordable and accessible. The road to a college degree should never be barred by a dollar sign. Students who succeed in high school and want to continue their education should not be discouraged by the costs, or saddled with repayments so large that they cannot afford the career they prefer.

If college becomes the preserve of a wealthy few, the nation will be losing the talents of millions of its citizens who could contribute immensely to our society in numerous and satisfying professions where the chase for the almighty dollar is not the driving concern.

Our education system is and should be locally based. But as we have seen in this Congress, there is much that the federal government can do to assist education reform. Federal spending may constitute only 6 percent of the nation's education budget, but the federal government can offer urgently needed seed money for innovative projects.

Through research and targeted incentives, we can provide leadership and essential

aid to improve all aspects of education.

In a sense we have only just begun. As we look to the future, I hope we will continue the reforms we have begun so successfully in this Congress. Above all, let us never lose our grip on the bipartisan spirit and commitment by Senators, Representatives and the Administration alike that have made this unusual trend of achievement possible. We have kept gridlock at bay on education, and the nation is the winner.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

**THE CLINTON LEGISLATIVE PACKAGE FOR EDUCATION:  
"A REAL ACHIEVEMENT" -- *Washington Post*, Oct. 18, 1994**

Over the past twenty-one months, President Clinton has signed into law six groundbreaking education initiatives -- a cohesive set of programs that span from kindergarten through college -- all of which passed the Congress with bipartisan support. An October 18, 1994, *Washington Post* editorial said the 103rd Congress was "highly productive" in the area of education, passing "just about the administration's entire extensive agenda." The *Post* called the passage of the legislative package "a real achievement." A recent op-ed by Jack Anderson and Michael Binstein went even further, noting that "[i]t doesn't take a Rhodes scholar to realize that Bill Clinton has earned the coveted mantle of 'education president.'"

*The following is a list of bills enacted by the 103rd Congress:*

**THE GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT** is based on the premise that higher expectations produce better performance, that academic standards should be raised, and that schools and teachers should be specific about what they expect children to learn. The Goals 2000 act assists communities and states with funds to develop and implement their own school improvements based on local, "bottom-up" initiatives. Improvement plans will include ways to strengthen academic achievement, improve discipline, increase parent involvement, better utilize technology, and improve teaching. The act also provides schools, school districts, and states with a way to cut through red tape by allowing for extensive waivers. The new law formally commits the nation to pursuing eight national education goals and establishes a National Education Goals Panel to report progress. Forty states and territories have already applied for first-year planning funds.

*Also included in Goals 2000:*

**THE SAFE SCHOOLS ACT** recognizes that learning is almost impossible if classrooms and playgrounds are under siege. The act provides funds to schools plagued with serious crime to develop violence prevention initiatives. Schools receiving funds will be expected to teach students ways to resolve conflicts peacefully, and they also may use some funds for increasing security personnel and acquiring metal detectors. The act also authorizes the Secretary of Education to conduct various national activities, including research and evaluation, data collection, and training and technical assistance in support of safe and drug-free schools.

**THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT** strengthens the federal effort to support research and to collect and disseminate information about successful teaching and learning practices. The new law establishes priorities for research: basic and applied research on student

achievement; education of at-risk students; policy making and management; early childhood development and education; and postsecondary education, libraries, and lifelong learning. A new Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination will provide teachers, parents, administrators and policymakers with information on promising and exemplary programs.

**THE SCHOOL TO WORK OPPORTUNITIES ACT** is built on the knowledge that tomorrow's high-wage jobs will require high academic and workplace skills developed in secondary and postsecondary school. Under the act, states and communities form partnerships with schools, postsecondary institutions and employers to design systems in which students learn both in the classroom and at the worksite. School to Work is jointly administered by the Departments of Education and Labor. Initial state and community grants already have been awarded.

**THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT**, which reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, targets funds to areas of greatest poverty and provides schools with greater flexibility to use federal aid to ensure that students with special needs, especially economically disadvantaged, migrant, and limited English proficient students, are taught to high standards. The nearly \$11 billion bill also expands professional development opportunities for teachers, promotes safe and drug-free schools, and supports desegregation efforts through magnet schools. New provisions provide resources for improved use of technology for teaching and learning and federal seed money for local charter school initiatives.

**THE NATIONAL SERVICE TRUST ACT** creates opportunities to earn or pay back college tuition through some kind of public service. Under Americorps grants to various agencies and organizations, thousands of volunteers are already at work in neighborhoods and schools across the country.

**THE STUDENT LOAN REFORM ACT** broadens access to higher education by making it easier for borrowers to obtain and repay loans for higher education. A new direct loan program permits students to receive a loan from a campus student aid office, eliminating various "middlemen" from the transaction. In addition to the ease in borrowing, the new loan system will permit student borrowers to tailor their monthly payments to their income level. Taxpayers are expected to save billions of dollars in coming years through lower loan default rates. The loans are now available at more than 100 schools. More than 1,000 schools will offer direct loans next year.

###



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

**The Improving America's Schools Act of 1994  
Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act**

The Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA), provides nearly \$11 billion to school districts and schools to improve teaching and learning, primarily for economically disadvantaged students. The overhauled ESEA encourages states and schools to set high academic standards for students' academic achievement, addresses the problems of school violence and drug use, provides resources for professional development for teachers, creates incentives for educational innovation through charter schools and improved access to technology, eliminates federal red tape, and redesigns federal programs to strengthen and reinforce state and local school reforms.

*Highlights of the ESEA reauthorization include:*

**Title I: Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards**

At \$6.9 billion, Title I is the largest program in ESEA. It affects more than 50,000 schools and 5 million children in high poverty areas. The new Title I focuses its resources on improving teaching and learning to help students reach higher levels of achievement. It encourages innovation by allowing funds to be used for extended-day programs, effective transitions from preschool to school, increasing parental participation, and schoolwide programs.

Title I programs will be developed around challenging state standards for what students should know and be able to do. Accountability is guaranteed through the use of high-quality state assessments for measuring students' progress toward these standards. These two fundamental changes in Title I -- the role of high academic standards and the use of state assessments -- will ensure that Title I is an integral part of a state's reform efforts rather than another add-on federal program.

**Safe and Drug-Free Schools**

Effective instruction and learning require an environment that is both safe and drug-free. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act provides \$481 million to create a comprehensive effort to deal with problems of school violence and drug use. The act provides greater flexibility to local school districts in designing programs, which can include comprehensive school safety strategies, coordination with community agencies, implementation of violence prevention activities and the installation of metal detectors and hiring security guards.

States and local school districts will be required to measure performance and to report publicly on progress toward meeting their goals and objectives. A new national evaluation system will be established to assess the impact of the act on youth, schools and communities.

### **Professional Development**

Professional development for teachers, principals and other school staff is critical to provide the instruction and learning environments necessary to help all students reach higher levels of achievement. The new Eisenhower Professional Development program will support sustained, intensive, high-quality professional development tied to high academic standards. The program will require school districts and schools to develop plans for improving teaching. Most of the funds will go to providing district- and school-level teacher improvement efforts.

The Eisenhower Professional Development Program recognizes the different needs of schools and provides teachers and principals with important roles in determining what kind of training they need. The effort moves away from short-term, one-time professional development activities and toward more sustained, long-term efforts that become integrated into the daily life of the school.

### **Innovation and Flexibility**

The Improving America's Schools Act provides support for the development and initial implementation of public charter schools. Charter schools seek to improve school and student performance by replacing rules-based governance with goals-based accountability. The Public Charter School Program will make grants to charter schools to design and plan their educational program and to describe the educational results the school will strive to produce.

There are many other ways in which the Improving America's Schools Act provides greater flexibility to states, school districts and schools in the implementation of ESEA programs. States and local school districts will be allowed to consolidate their administrative funds and to administer the funds in a coordinated way without having to keep detailed records. If states and local school districts discover statutory or regulatory requirements that inhibit the implementation of effective programs, they will be able to request waivers.

October 17, 1994

**PRESIDENT CLINTON'S LIFELONG LEARNING AGENDA:  
A STATUS REPORT**

In today's rapidly changing economy, knowledge and opportunity are tightly linked: more and more, what you earn is dependent on what you can learn throughout your life.

On February 22, 1994 in an address to the American Council on Education, President Clinton presented his vision for lifelong learning and the legislative agenda needed to turn that vision into reality for all Americans. The following is a status report on the major building blocks of that agenda.

Head Start reform and expansion

Signed into law by the President on May 18, 1994

Goals 2000: Educate America Act

Signed into law by the President on March 31, 1994

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Passed by the House on September 30, 1994; Passed by the Senate on October 5, 1994; to be signed into law by the President on October 20, 1994

School-to-Work Opportunities Act

Signed into law by the President on May 4, 1994

Direct lending/income-contingent repayment

Signed into law by the President on August 10, 1993

National and Community Service Trust Act

Signed into law by the President on September 21, 1993

Reemployment Act of 1994

Transmitted to the Congress on March 15, 1994

**The New Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Key Points**

- o high standards for all students
- o better preparation for teachers
- o school safety and classroom discipline
  - \* new support for anti-violence efforts in schools and surrounding communities
  - \* mandatory expulsion for students caught with guns
- o accelerated use of learning technology (computers, information networks)
- o state and local flexibility, including enhanced waiver authority
- o public school choice
- o new authority to assist charter schools
- o parental involvement
- o character education

**What remains to be done: key points**

- o invest in reform. We made some progress last year on investments in education and training, but not nearly enough. We'll keep on pushing in the 104th Congress.
- o implement these new laws vigorously so that students and teachers and parents and communities can see and feel the difference
- o extend reform to adults/experienced workers; we're consulting broadly to revise and resubmit the Reemployment Act
- o preach the gospel of lifelong learning to all Americans, and especially young people. Everyone must understand the link between education and opportunity in today's economy. I've worked hard to send that message during my first two years in office, and I'll work even harder at it in the next two.

*Jack Anderson  
And Michael Binstein*

# The New Education President

**The Washington Post**  
October 16, 1994

A recent report from the equity research department at a top Wall Street investment house has turned up in the West Wing of the White House, and it has some presidential advisers buzzing about a "hot tip."

According to a report by the Morgan Stanley investment firm, the Clinton administration's political stock is blue-chip when it comes to keeping its promises on education reform.

In the report, Morgan Stanley was actually warning investors of negative impacts from President Clinton's direct-lending program for college students. Millions of students will receive loans through their schools, bypassing private lenders and saving taxpayers some \$4.3 billion over the next few years. Clinton has privately predicted that it will be remembered as "one of the most impressive single achievements for this administration" in terms of long-term impact on middle-class families.

But this means a phase-out of the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae), whose private investors had profited handsomely from the inefficient status quo. In the future, the Education Department is expected to hold all student loans.

Direct lending is part of a raft of Clinton education reforms passed by the 103rd Congress. In the past 20 months, President Clinton sent nine education-related bills to Congress—eight of which have been signed into law. Next week, Clinton will sign number nine: The \$12.7 billion Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some of the president's allies believe his success on education reform is a textbook example of how to win legislative battles through coalition-building and bipartisanship.

"I think the lesson for the administration is to stand firm, do what you believe in and then do the hard work that is needed to achieve a political victory," says Sen. Paul Simon (D-Ill.), who has spent years championing the cause of direct lending.

Simon confesses he felt jittery that the administration would retreat when faced with an onslaught of special interests and high-priced lobbyists. "This is one where Clinton prepared himself," Simon told us. "When the lobbyists went to work . . . I was worried, frankly, that there was going to be some compromise away from his really sound position. . . . To Clinton's credit he came down on the right side and stood like a rock."

The almost disbelieving tone of the Morgan Stanley document suggests even more astonishment that the Clinton team didn't blink on education reform. For White House aides, it's a source of well-deserved pride. Morgan Stanley notes the lack of "decisiveness" in administration policies ranging from Bosnia to welfare reform. Even when the administration has a focus, according to this analysis, it "simply cannot achieve a legislative solution. But there is one area where the administration's decisiveness and ability to achieve its ends is beyond reproach—student lending. The administration knows that it wants to end the federally guaranteed student loan program. And, thus far, the administration is hitting a perfect 1,000 in securing legislation."

Except for direct lending, when Republicans sided with the banks and Sallie Mae lobbyists, bipartisan accords have been forged over education. However, Republicans tried to block reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—which includes provisions to help the nation's poorest children—on school prayer grounds. Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) has been throwing red meat to the radical right by attacking what he calls Clinton's "left-wing secular approach" and predicting school prayer will be "one of the seminal fights of the rest of the decade."

Education Secretary Richard W. Riley and President Clinton understand better than Gingrich why some children haven't had a prayer of a chance of getting ahead. Riley told us:

"We both were from small, southern states with large African American populations, states that had come through very difficult times, probably hit harder in the Great Depression than any other region of the country. Tragically, large portions of our population really were undereducated."

It doesn't take a Rhodes scholar to realize that Bill Clinton has earned the coveted mantle of "education president."

©1994, United Feature Syndicate Inc.

TF

# Schools to Get Wide License On Spending Federal Money Under New Education Law

By WILLIAM CELIS 3d

The nation's public schools have long grumbled about the rigid spending rules that accompany Federal aid. But under legislation to be signed tomorrow by President Clinton, they will receive broad freedom in how they spend such money.

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which Congress reauthorized earlier this month, \$60 billion will be spent on the nation's public schools over the next five years, and educators herald the measure as the most extensive revision of the legislation since 1965, when it was enacted as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society program.

It gives schools more flexibility in spending Federal dollars and requires a much-needed overhaul of the Government's main program for helping poor children reach grade level in reading and mathematics.

***A revamped plan  
that provides more  
flexibility but fails to  
send more money to  
urban districts.***

The program, once called Chapter 1, used to require that students who needed academic assistance were to be pulled from their regular classes and tutored, often for only a few minutes a week.

The revamped program, now called Title I, strongly discourages the pullout program and requires that all students in schools that receive Title I money — not just those needing help in math and science — be required to perform at higher academic standards.

vocational education, aid for children of migrant workers and things like Christa McAuliffe fellowships and Eisenhower math and science grants.

School districts maintain that their allocations do not cover the growing number of students in special education or bilingual classes.

"We made some giant steps forward in this legislation," said Ramon C. Cortines, the Schools Chancellor in New York City, referring to flexibility in spending and the overhaul of Chapter 1. "But the downside is that we won't get enough money we need."

How the revamping of Chapter 1 will unfold in schools is still unclear, given that there are no deadlines. In New York, the nation's largest school district, each of the 1,085 schools will have the latitude to develop individual programs, Mr. Cortines said. The schools that do receive Title I money — a majority of those in school districts in the South Bronx, parts of Brooklyn and Queens and upper Manhattan — will have untold flexibility in spending the money as they see fit.

This will enable school administrators to be more creative in retooling academic programs, Mr. Cortines said. A school could design courses, for instance, to teach mathematics and science using art, an interdisciplinary approach gaining in popularity.

Such innovations were virtually impossible under the old program, which was criticized in two reports in the last two years as increasingly ineffective. The reports said the program was falling short of its goals because it pulled slower students out of their regular school day — allowing them to fall further behind — and because Chapter 1 students were not held to the same standards as other students.

The old program also penalized schools that brought students up to grade level. Once a student no longer needed the extra help, the school lost aid. Under the revisions to the legis-

is that schools with their new-found flexibility may shift money away from programs like bilingual education or special education.

All these revisions will be financed with less money in New York and other urban school systems. Mr. Cortines said such systems required more money to meet the burgeoning needs of students who are coming to school poorer and hungrier and, as a result, are more difficult to teach.

The New York City school system will receive \$376.5 million in the fiscal year 1995, which began on Oct. 1, under the reauthorized legislation, only slightly higher than the \$373.7 million it received in the previous year. Both amounts are eclipsed by the \$431.6 million that the city's schools received in fiscal 1993.

"This would be a better news scenario if there was more money," said Leonard Hellenbrand, the district's budget director. "We are being boxed in, even though services cost more and we have more kids in need."

But some educators complain that for all its improvements, the legislation still fails to send enough money to school systems. The aid comes in the form of several programs: special education, bilingual education,

lation, schools with high concentrations of poverty will continue to receive Title I aid, but schools must excel or face takeovers by their school districts or states.

One potential flaw in the revision

THE NEW YORK TIMES. WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1994

5

# Clinton, pushing to see schools make the grade

By Dennis Kelly  
and Tamara Henry  
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — Life and legislation don't seem to be separated by much for President Clinton, at least on matters of education.

In an interview Wednesday with USA TODAY, Clinton called up some Arkansas anecdotes to make points about education. He talked about his former sixth-grade teacher when discussing the need to improve pay for today's teachers. He talked about how he got rules changed to make federal money work better for Arkansas schools.

Mostly he was upbeat and relaxed, basking in the glow of a half-dozen education bills he's been able to pass since taking office, an area of notable successes stacked against notable defeats in areas like health care.

"I think this Congress will go down in history as a great Congress for education," Clinton said in the Oval Office interview.

But his critics think he shouldn't feel so positive, arguing that some legislation could cause long-term damage.

Clinton weighed in on a variety of education issues. He:

► Voiced support for the concept that public schools should be able to contract with private firms to run their schools, as the Hartford, Conn., schools voted to do recently. The test should be whether it's appropriate for the local district, he says.

► Said he opposed California's Proposition 187, the Nov. 8 ballot measure that, if passed, would bar illegal immigrants and their children from almost all public services, including school.

"I understand why people are frustrated. They don't want to pay for the education of other people's kids," Clinton said. "But I don't think the answer is to say we're not going to educate kids who are here or to punish the children because we can't figure out how to keep their parents out of the country."

► Said he's disturbed that the country hasn't made greater educational progress even though spending on elementary and secondary education has risen 40% above the rate of inflation the last 10 years.

"One thing a lot of money hasn't

now-deceased sixth-grade teacher, who, like many women of the day who chose to be teachers, made little money.

"We should be paying teachers more," Clinton said.

One of Clinton's education successes was passage last year of an income-contingent loan repayment plan — jargon for a program that lets students pay off college loans over a longer period of time. Clinton availed himself of an income-based plan at Yale that let him pay off loans when he wasn't making much money while teaching in college.

The draft regulations for Clinton's plans have come under attack, however. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities says the plan would reduce payments in such a way that they don't even cover monthly interest. The result is that unsuspecting students might be burdened by even greater amounts of debt.

Clinton responded that the key to the program is full disclosure so students understand the costs. If there are problems, they could still be worked out, he said. "But I think it's important we gave this option so that nobody need fear borrowing money and nobody need fear their capacity to pay it off."

Many black colleges have shunned Clinton's direct loan program, in which a percentage of colleges make loans directly to students, bypassing banks as middlemen. But Bernard Franklin, president of North Carolina's Livingstone College, says the concept has been made more palatable with recent adjustments in the law. "Whether we like it or not, I think it's kind of the handwriting on the wall that that's kind of the direction in terms of the

## Learning lessons with Chelsea

By Dennis Kelly  
USA TODAY

President Clinton says he and the first lady have always tried to help with daughter Chelsea's schoolwork.

When Chelsea was in grade school, she and then Gov. Clinton worked to improve her language skills by writing letters to each other daily.

"It was a great exercise," he says. "You think about it first, a good thing for working parents."

"In a single-parent home or a home where both parents work, a great little device is to say, 'You have to write me a letter' every day and I have to write you a letter every day."

Clinton says one of the reasons the Head Start program has been so "really popular" is that "we have involved parents." He says the Elementary and Secondary Education Act bill he signs today in Massachusetts contains "a similar outreach to involve parents in a more systematic way."

Clinton says now he works with Chelsea on her writing and discussions of classes like Latin American history.

"She comes in and we talk about her papers and she talks with her mother about her papers," Clinton says. "She asks for our criticism. We take a very active interest in her schoolwork. We always have. It's been a great deal of fun."

loan program. It's something that we have to be very sensitive to and be prepared for."

Clinton specifically rejected criticism by former education secretaries Lamar Alexander and William Bennett that the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act he signs today would fashion a "national school board" that usurps local control of curriculum.

"The last thing I want to do is nationalize education," Clinton said. "I'm a governor sitting in the White House" and the bill is a "triumph" of the debate governors have waged

with Washington for years on education funding, he said.

The bill does more, for instance, to give states flexibility in use of Chapter 1 money that's targeted at math and reading help for disadvantaged kids. When he was governor in Arkansas, he said, he got a federal exemption so the Chapter 1 and special education money could help an entire first-grade class, not just certain children. The results were higher test scores, he said.

"This is stuff we have known for years," he said. "And we're finally fixing it on a more systematic basis."

## Several measures become law today

With today's signing, several groundbreaking education initiatives become law. Congress passed, in the past 21 months, bills to:

► Create school-to-work programs that bring employers and educators together to train non-college-bound students for careers in high-skill, high-wage jobs.

► Establish a national service program that allows 20,000 young people to earn money for college by of-

duces paperwork and is expected to save taxpayers billions of dollars in fewer loan defaults.

► Develop tough academic and workplace skills standards, and put into law eight national education goals. Schools, school districts and states are allowed to cut through red tape by allowing for extensive waivers. In the six months since President Clinton signed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, nearly three-fourths of the states have applied for first-year

been spent on academics," Clinton said. "A lot more money has been spent on administration. And that's not good."

It's not higher teacher pay that's the problem, either, he said. That's what spurred his thoughts about his

fering service to their communities. Thousands of volunteers are already at work in neighborhoods and schools across the country.

► Revamp the student loan program by allowing borrowers to bypass banks and get loans directly from the schools. Students would be given flexible repayment options, ones that tailor their monthly payments to match their ability to repay. More than 100 schools are in the direct loan program with the number expected to increase to more than 1,000 next year. Education officials say the new program re-

funding to develop and expand school improvement efforts.

► Fund violence prevention programs at schools plagued with serious crime. The new law has mandatory one-year suspensions for students who bring guns to school.

► Spread \$12 billion among public schools to aid in the education of students with special needs, especially poor, migrant and limited English-speaking students. More federal funds will be provided to areas with the highest concentration of poor students.

By Doug Mills, AP

**MENTOR DAD:** President Clinton says he and first lady Hillary take 'very active interest' in daughter Chelsea's schoolwork and have fun discussing it.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1994 - USA TODAY

101

A18 TUESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1994

# The Washington Post

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER

## An Education Congress

**W**HATEVER ITS record in other fields, the Congress now home campaigning was highly productive in the field of education. Six bills were passed—just about the administration's entire extensive agenda. They would make some important changes; together they cover the entire span of years from Head Start to college student aid.

Part of the explanation for the success lies in Congress. The education committees have a tradition of strong and mostly bipartisan support for the programs under their care. The administration was also generally careful to keep its proposals within the envelope of acceptable policy. Where it ventured beyond, as in some of its proposals for confining school aid to needier districts, it was partly beaten back. The cause was helped as well by the persistence of the self-effacing education secretary, Richard Riley. The Cabinet member who is perhaps the quietest was also among the most effective. What might be the lesson there?

Congress reauthorized Head Start, in the process continued to provide for its expansion—it is on the way to becoming a de facto entitlement—but also set aside some funds to strengthen the quality of the program, which has sometimes been sacrificed in the name of growth.

The Goals 2000 bill was passed, putting in place a system—actually, several systems—for the setting of national education standards. The trick was to find

a way of setting high standards that wouldn't turn into a national curriculum and wouldn't consign large and vulnerable chunks of the population to failure. They may have pulled it off.

The main forms of federal aid to elementary and secondary education were also reauthorized, and somewhat reconfigured, though not as much with regard to the distribution of funds as the administration had proposed. A school-to-work bill was passed, another in a long series of efforts at the federal and lower levels to make school more relevant to work. The president's proposed national service corps was created, though on a smaller scale than he had asked. It is an effort to let young people work off the cost of college and perform community service at the same time. The student loan program was also restructured. Partly in hopes of saving money, the government will begin to make some of the loans directly rather than pay banks to make them. If repayment terms can be made more flexible—based on the student's future income—perhaps the new system will also help reduce defaults.

The federal government isn't in the business of education so much as it is in the business of funding education in ways it hopes will lead to certain results. The goal is not to encroach upon the system but nonetheless to cause it to improve. Not easy, but each of these bills takes some steps in the right direction. Together, they represent a real achievement.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 21, 1994

REMARKS BY THE FIRST LADY AT  
FUNDRAISER FOR SENATOR TED KENNEDY  
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you. (Applause) Thank you. Well, let's just vote right now. Well, if you're not fired up now, if you don't appreciate what's at stake in this election, then just play the tape again, because I'm here to support your senator, who not only has brought that level of commitment and passion and caring and intelligence to the problems of the State of Massachusetts but also to the problems of our country, and I cannot -- (Applause) I cannot overstate how important Senator Kennedy is to the workings of the United States Senate, to making sure that every single member never forgets the people back home, because he won't let them.

Sometimes they try to, but he is always there to say, "What about the children of working families who can't get health insurance? What about the jobs that are moved out of state and out of country? What about the environmental problems that get overlooked and untended? What about health care, education," all of the issues he's fought for over a lifetime of service. With Ted Kennedy there, no other senator can ever, ever forget what is really at stake in their United States Senate deliberations. (Applause)

And I want to thank Vicky for not only her kind words and her introduction but for adding a little Louisiana spice to the Massachusetts political scene and for being a constant voice about what is important. If you had the opportunity to spend time with them together, you know their lives really revolve around their children, their family, but again, she never lets anyone forget how lucky they are, and therefore what an obligation they have to make sure other people have the same opportunities, and she is a great asset not just to Senator Kennedy but to the State of Massachusetts as well. (Applause)

Those of you who are here tonight to support

MORE

Senator Kennedy, you know that he is the number one target of the far right wing of the Republican party. You know that the forces opposing him are the same ones that are trying to block the progress that needs to be made in solving problems. Senator Kennedy was right to quote (inaudible), because too often in politics today it is the quick, easy answer, the sound bite, the shrug of the shoulders, the deflection of responsibility that stands in the way of actually talking through and solving the problems that face America. Ted Kennedy doesn't engage in that kind of behavior. He stands up and calls it like he sees it. (Applause)

That is why the forces arrayed against him I consider badges of honor, because if he had not stood up to them repeatedly, they would not be working so hard to distort his record and to defeat him in this election, and it is absolutely critical that those of you who have worked with him, who have been his colleagues and his allies, who have been his constituents do not let the political climate of the moment obscure and undermine the record of one of the greatest senators who have ever served in the United States Senate. (Applause)

You know, I don't want to preach to the choir, but I think it's important that we remind ourselves what is at stake in this election and what Senator Kennedy has fought for over the years of his service, because once you see what he's fought for, you can understand why he is being fought against. He has repeatedly stood up to what he says is the job of government, "to do more than provide comfort for the comfortable but instead to provide opportunity for every American, particularly to give the capacity and the power over their own lives to working people so they could make the best decisions for themselves and their families."

He believes and his record demonstrates that government doesn't need to be on your back. Government doesn't need to be off your back. Government needs to be by your side and together in a partnership working to get things done for people. (Applause)

And his service over the years has left an imprint on the lives of every American. I wouldn't have the time to go through the entire record, but I hope you remember the times that he's intervened in the lives of your families, your neighbors, your friends.

MORE

Worcester and Southbridge and other communities right here in and around Boston who have had thousands of new jobs created because of his intervention, his advocacy and legislation that paved the way that he doesn't understand how to create jobs.

Talk to the people about what it takes for a productive economy to generate jobs in a complex, global economic environment. It is not a simple proposition, but I think the facts prove here very clearly that Senator Kennedy understands what it takes.

He also understands what it takes to do something about the violence that too often stalks our neighbors, rendering us all less secure. It was Ted Kennedy, not these Johnny-come-latelys to crime and violence and gun control who sponsored the original gun control act in this country (applause).

It was Ted Kennedy, not somebody with an R. after his name who wrote the bill that abolished parole for federal crimes, who wrote the bill that allows judges to consider how dangerous a defendant is when setting bail, and it was Ted Kennedy, often in a very lonely role for years, who was a lead co-sponsor of the Brady Bill. (Applause)

And it was Ted Kennedy who helped turn that bill into a law and then to take it a step further by fighting and winning on the ban on assault weapons, which will have a major impact on making our streets safer and making our police officers safer in the face of such wanton violence. (Applause)

You know, it's difficult to remember all of the things Senator Kennedy has accomplished, especially when the campaign season is on and the barrage of negative advertising begins, and I would just say a word about negative advertising. Nobody likes it. Nobody wants it. Everybody wishes it would go away, but isn't it interesting how it comes back campaign after campaign.

After weeks of letting his opponent run with negative ads, hoping that maybe reason or good sense or decency would begin to turn the tide against such ads, Ted Kennedy is going to return fire for fire. You will not see a unilateral disarmament in the war over what is important for the people of Massachusetts to hear. (Applause)

MORE

I wish we could abolish them. I wish that we could have instead the kind of debate that we all want. Unfortunately, in today's political climate it is the negative advertising that people remember. Most people in Massachusetts will not be able to recite to you the litany of the way that Ted Kennedy's legislation has helped them in their lives, but they'll remember the 30-second ad. That is an unfortunate fact of modern political life.

All I can tell you is it is absolutely imperative that Senator Kennedy's supporters understand that he's always been on the positive side of the political ledger, but we who support him and who need him in the United States Senate will not stand by while the negative machinery of the Republican party tries to have its way with him. That cannot be allowed.

Now, if I were here merely to recite his accomplishments that I had admired from afar for a long time, I would feel good about that, because I support what he's tried to do on behalf of the people here and around the country, but I have firsthand experience.

I've told some of you about working with Senator Kennedy on education issues even before my husband was elected President and how he constantly understood, and he referred to it in his remarks tonight, that we must continue to press forward on the education and skills front so that our people will be well prepared for the jobs of the future.

But I got a firsthand look when I worked on health care in the last year and a half, an issue that once again Ted Kennedy was way out front on. He was there sponsoring bills in 1970. He was there constantly talking about the need for health care reform, and he is amazing, because he understands this issue like he understands others.

I told a group of you one of my favorite experiences in going to a meeting with a group of senators after a very long document had been circulated raising a lot of issues about health care reform, and we were sitting around a big table filled with senators, and they were asking lots of questions, and Senator Kennedy was -- if any of you have ever been in a meeting with him like that -- leaning back on the back two legs of his chair, twirling his reading glasses, kind of looking very unconcerned because the conversation was just bouncing around; it wasn't going

MORE

with the help of Senator Kennedy again will put forward the most extensive education legislation that has been passed in a generation, setting goals for our students, giving children the chance to really make it on their own because they will be supported, and their teachers and schools will be supported for a change, giving youngsters who don't go on to college the opportunities for training and work and apprenticeships and taking the middlemen out of the student loan programs so that we can directly loan to students, creating many more billions of dollars so many more youngsters can go on to college," you might say, "Well. That sounds good. Hard to believe, but it sounds good."

If I'd gone on to say, "Not only that, we will finally have the kinds of bills passed that have been bottled up by a Republican President that would not let it go forward, whether it be the Motor Vote Bill, Family and Medical Leave, the Brady Bill or crime bill that has been languishing for six years," by about then I could just, sort of, see you all. You'd be kind of turning around saying, this is sounds too good to be true. She's promising pie in the sky.

Then, if I'd gone on and I had said, "And we're going to do a lot to put health care reform on the agenda and produce results. Not only will we provide vaccinations for children, but we will really begin the national debate about what kind of health care system we need, and welfare reform will be introduced and, in the meantime, we're going to be a peace accord between Israel and the PLO, between Israel and Jordan, and for the first time in 800 years we have the possibility of peace in Northern Ireland, and we're going to stop proliferation of nuclear weapons." (Applause)

"We're going to make sure that the weapons that used to be pointed at us in the former Soviet Union are destroyed, and we're going to take a new policy toward trying to preserve democracy and human rights in our own hemisphere," by this time I could just hear it. You'd be looking at each other and saying, "What is she smoking, and did she inhale?" (Laughter)

Who would have believed that this would have happened? But it did happen, and it happened because Massachusetts has always voted for a senator who believes in making things happen and voted for a President who could be his partner to get things done for this country. (Applause)

MORE

But in addition to all of those reasons, let me just add one more. Every election is not just between two people; it's between competing visions of where each candidate wants to take us, between competing ideas about the kind of people we are and what our beliefs are and our values are.

This is such an election because, in addition to being a race between Senator Kennedy and his opponent, this is a classic race between hope and optimism and fear and negativism. Now, it may be dressed up differently. It may have a much better looking face than you find in other parts of the country, but it is the same message.

It's a message about negativism. It's a message about cynicism. It's a message about playing on people's insecurities and anxieties. Is it any wonder that there are many Americans who are insecure? Of course not. We are at the end of an era. The Cold War is over. The world is not so easily ordered as it once was.

The economic order is changing. People who thought they would have the same job for 30 years find themselves out on the streets. They aren't secure about health care. They don't know if they can walk to the park at night. They don't know if they can let their child go safely to school. There are a lot of reasons why Americans are uneasy. You have, then, a contest between hope and fear, between positive change and negative change.

So, in addition to the reasons why you're supporting Senator Kennedy because of his record, because of his proven commitment to hope, to making it possible for people to have better lives together, for taking the privileges he was born with and plowing them back into the hard work of extending opportunities to others.

This is also about what kind of people and what kind of state this will be. Will it be a state that turns its back on positive progress, finding solutions to tough issues, or will it go forward? I learned today about one of the superfund sites in Massachusetts at Woburn -- some of you may be from near there -- a site that was identified in 1978, I believe, because of all of the cancer that was clustered there, a site that caused enormous pain and dislocation to many people.

MORE

That was a long time ago that it was first identified. Because of a long-term commitment to the people of that area, that site got cleaned up. Senator Kennedy never wavered, never gave up, just kept plugging away until it got done. It wasn't a glamorous thing. I bet those of you who live in Boston didn't even know that it got cleaned up and is now a new place that can be used for other purposes.

It didn't make headlines. It's not sensational. It doesn't grab you, but it made a real difference, and it could only have been made because there was somebody who was willing to stay after it year after year. Real change, whether in your life or in a country, is not easy. It's hard. You've got to face up to tough problems and be realistic about what's possible, but we are on the right track. (Applause)

We are finally willing to be mature enough as a country to face up to all of the issues that for too long have been denied, and the spirit of optimism and hopefulness that this senator and this President bring to our problems is married to a strong, steely commitment that stands the test of time to solve them.

Both Ted Kennedy and Bill Clinton could be enormously popular politicians in every walk of life if they gave speeches like you heard Ted give or that some of you have heard my husband give that said all of the right things but then never tried to do anything. It is in the doing that the controversy erupts, but it is in the doing that we define ourselves.

And be absolutely clear about this: Those who talk the talk but don't walk the walk don't deserve the vote, and if you take that message -- (Applause) -- if you take that message in the next six and a half weeks to everyone you know, if you ask them point blank what they've heard about Senator Kennedy and you set them straight and you talk about the future, then I know that you will have a great victory not only for Senator Kennedy but for the future of the people of this state, and that's what's really at stake. Thank you all very much.

(End of tape.)

\* \* \* \* \*

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

| DOCUMENT NO.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                    | DATE       | RESTRICTION                           |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| 001. schedule            | Phone Number; Secret Service (Partial) (3 pages) | 11/04/1994 | P6/b(6), b(7)(C), b(7)(E),<br>b(7)(F) |

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
First Lady's Office  
Speechwriting  
OA/Box Number: 8170

### FOLDER TITLE:

HRC [Hillary Rodham Clinton]/Massachusetts '94 11/4/94

2012-1004-S

ms541

### RESTRICTION CODES

#### Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

#### Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

[001]

SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON  
DATE: FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1994  
DRAFT: #3

---

WASHINGTON, DC/SPRINGFIELD, MA/WORCESTER, MA/PEABODY, MA

---

Traveling Party: HRC  
Craighead 1-800SKYPAGE #207-4790  
Caputo 1-800SKYPAGE #537-5733  
Verveer  
Kinney

(b)(7)(c), (b)(7)(e), (b)(7)(f), P6/b(6)

Lead Advance:  
Springfield, MA Steve Graham  
413-781-1010 RM  
413-734-3249 fax

Press Lead: Donna Daniels

Lead Advance:  
Worcester, MA Cathy McLaughlin  
617-495-1360 office

P6/b(6)

1-800SKYPAGE #883-5754

Press Lead: Anne  
508-753-3512 RM  
508-753-7104 fax

Lead Advance:  
Peabody, MA Pat Halley  
508-535-4600 RM  
508-535-8238 fax  
1-800SKYPAGE #537-3335

Press Lead: xxx

Scheduling Desk: Sara Grote  
202-456-2922 office  
202-456-2317 fax

P6/b(6)

800-514-7823 WHCA#4363

---

PREV RON The White House

7:40 am DEPART White House South Portico  
EN ROUTE Andrews Air Force Base  
[drive time: 30 minutes]

8:10 am ARRIVE Andrews Air Force Base

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON**  
**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1994**  
**PAGE 2**

8:20 am                      **WHEELS UP Andrews**

**FLIGHT TIME: 1 HOUR**

**MANIFEST: HRC, CRAIGHEAD, CAPUTO, VERVEER, KINNEY** (c), (b)(7)(e), (b)(7)(f), P6/b(6)

**FOOD: BREAKFAST**

9:20 am                      **WHEELS DOWN Springfield, MA**  
Westover Force Base  
FBO:  
Phone:  
Fax:  
**CLOSED PRESS ARRIVAL**

**NOTE:** Steve Graham will meet HRC at the airport.

**Greeter:** Sen. Edward Kennedy

9:30 am                      **DEPART Airport**  
**EN ROUTE Springfield College Child Care**  
**Center**  
[drive time: approx. 30 minutes]

10:00 am                      **ARRIVE Springfield College Child Care Center**

**Greeter:** Sandra Keith, Director, Child Care Center

10:05 am-  
10:20 am

**EVENT W/Sen. Edward Kennedy**  
**Holding Room**  
Phone: 413-788-3130  
Fax: NA  
Springfield College Child Care Center  
**OPEN PRESS**

**Format:** HRC and Sen. Edward Kennedy to tour  
day care center and meet and greet with  
children and parents.

**Participants:** 45 children, 10 parents. [See  
briefing for more info.]

10:25 am                      **DEPART Springfield College Child Care Center**  
**EN ROUTE Blake Arena, Springfield College**  
[drive time 5 minutes]

10:30 am                      **ARRIVE Blake Arena, Springfield College**

**Greeter:** Dr. Malvina Rau, Academic Dean and Provost, Springfield  
College

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON**  
**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1994**  
**PAGE 3**

*1st Peace Corps  
 try session here*

10:35 am-  
 11:05 am

**ADDRESS TO Springfield College and Community**  
 Blake Arena  
Holding Room  
 Phone: 413-748-3801  
 Fax: 413-748-3024  
**OPEN PRESS**

- Est. 1885 Y.M.C.A.  
 - 3,420 students  
 - pri. college on  
 - independent notion  
 of service

**Seated on Stage:**  
 -Program Participants  
 -Cong. John Oliver

*Resid. -  
 v. int'l students body  
 to learn recreation  
 & phys ed prog  
 where guests  
 found*

**Program:**

- Dr. Malvina Rau to deliver welcoming remarks
- Beth Gibney, President of Student Gov't, to deliver remarks
- Mayor Bob Markel to deliver remarks
- Cong. Richard Neal to deliver remarks
- Cong. Joe Kennedy to deliver remarks [T]
- Sen. Edward Kennedy to deliver remarks and introduce HRC
- HRC to deliver remarks
- Work ropeline with Sen. Edward Kennedy

**Participants:** Approx. 1000 people to attend.  
 [See briefing for more info.]

**Contact:** Randy Cooper  
 617-695-2327

11:10 am

**DEPART** Springfield, MA via motorcade  
**EN ROUTE** Mechanics Hall, Worcester, MA  
 [drive time: 45 minutes]

11:55 am

**ARRIVE** Mechanics Hall

**Greeters:** Kevin O'Sullivan, State Senator

12:00 pm-  
 12:30 pm

**RECEPTION FOR** Kevin O'Sullivan  
 Boyton Room

*State Senator  
 Goals 2000  
 school &  
 work  
 in higher  
 education  
 Transcript  
 Chris Heighs  
 Kennedy  
 Accomplishments  
 not / service  
 Student loans  
 he was to lend  
 or help raise  
 service  
 help new  
 to college  
 Kennedy  
 leader*

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON**  
**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1994**  
**PAGE 4**

**CLOSED PRESS-O'SULLIVAN PHOTOGRAPHER**

**Format:** Meet and greet/receiving line.

**Participants:** Approx. 100 people to attend.  
[See briefing for more info.]

12:35 pm

**PROCEED TO Main Hall**

12:40 pm-

1:25 pm

**LUNCHEON FOR Kevin O'Sullivan**  
**Main Hall**  
**OPEN PRESS**

**HRC's Table:**

**Program:**

- HRC to proceed to head table with Kevin O'Sullivan-meet and greet
- HRC to proceed to stage
- Kevin O'Sullivan to deliver remarks and introduce HRC
- HRC to deliver 15 minute remarks
- Work ropeline

**Participants:** Approx. 500 people to attend.  
[See briefing for more info.]

**Contact:** Deborah Kaufman/Maribeth Cronin  
508-798-1994

1:30 pm

**DEPART Mechanics Hall, Worcester, MA**  
**EN ROUTE Peabody, MA**  
[drive time: 1 hour 30 minutes]

3:00 pm

**ARRIVE Peabody, MA**

3:00 pm-

3:45 pm

**DOWN TIME**  
**Suite**  
**Hawthorne Hotel**

3:50 pm

**DEPART Hotel**  
**EN ROUTE Peabody Community Life Center, 79**  
**Central Street**

*Luncheon Fundraiser*  
*Closed*  
*press*

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON**  
**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1994**  
**PAGE 5**

[drive time: 15 minutes]

4:05 pm                      **ARRIVE** Peabody Community Life Center

**Greeters:** John Tierney, ?  
              Shelley Blake, friend of John Tierney ?

4:10 pm-  
4:15 pm

**HOLD/BRIEFING**  
Holding Room  
Phone: 508-531-2254  
Fax: 508-531-7176

4:20 pm-  
4:55 pm

**DISCUSSION WITH** Senior Community Leaders  
Community Room  
**OPEN PRESS**

**Format:** HRC and John Tierney to take Q & A  
form senior leaders. Meet and greet.

**Participants:** Approx. 40 people to attend.  
[See briefing for more info.]

5:00 pm

**DEPART** Peabody Community Life Center  
**EN ROUTE** Jimmy's Allenhurst  
[drive time: 15 minutes]

5:15 pm

**ARRIVE** Jimmy's Allenhurst

**Greeters:** Mr. Albert Tierney ?  
              Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_ Tierney ?

5:20 pm-  
5:50 pm

**RECEPTION FOR** John Tierney  
76 Room  
**CLOSED PRESS-TIERNEY PHOTOGRAPHER**

**Format:** Meet and greet.

**Participants:** Approx. 25 people to attend.  
[See briefing for more info.]

5:55 pm

**PROCEED TO** Banquet Room

6:00 pm-  
6:20 pm

**MEET AND GREET W/Supporters**  
Andover Room  
**CLOSED PRESS-TIERNEY PHOTOGRAPHER**

*gun control*  
*talking points*  
*control/see sec.*  
*h.c. reform*  
*my Medicare*  
*curbs*

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON**  
**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1994**  
**PAGE 6**

**Format:** Receiving line.

**Participants:** Approx. 30 people to attend.  
[See briefing for more info.]

6:25 pm

**PROCEED TO** Crystal Room

6:30 pm-

7:00 pm

**GENERAL RECEPTION FOR** John Tierney  
Crystal Room  
**OPEN PRESS**

**Program:**

- David Williams, campaign manager, to deliver welcoming remarks
- John Tierney to deliver remarks
- HRC to deliver 15 minute remarks
- Work ropeline

**Participants:** Approx. 500 people to attend.  
[See briefing for more info.]

**Contact:** Bill Wasserman  
508-740-5793/5794

7:05 pm

**DEPART** Jimmy's Allenhurst  
**EN ROUTE** Hanscom Field  
[drive time: 40 minutes]

7:45 pm

**ARRIVE** Hanscom Field

7:50 pm

**WHEELS UP** Massachusetts  
Hanscom Field  
FBO:  
Phone:  
Fax:  
**CLOSED PRESS DEPARTURE**

---

**FLIGHT TIME: 40 MINUTES**

**MANIFEST: HRC, CRAIGHEAD, CAPUTO, VERVEER, KINNEY** (b)(7)(c), (b)(7)(e), (b)(7)(f), P6/b(6)

**FOOD:**

---

8:30 pm

**WHEELS DOWN** Hartford, CT  
Bradley International Airport  
FBO: Air National Guard Ramp

**SCHEDULE FOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON**  
**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1994**  
**PAGE 7**

Phone: 203-697-8356  
Fax:  
**CLOSED PRESS ARRIVAL**

**NOTE:** \_\_\_\_\_ will meet HRC at the airport.

8:40 pm

**DEPART Airport**  
**EN ROUTE Sheraton Hartford**  
[drive time: \_\_\_\_\_ minutes]

xxx pm

**ARRIVE Sheraton Hartford**

**RON**

Sheraton Hartford  
Hartford, CT  
Phone:  
Fax:

**FORECAST FOR SPRINGFIELD, MA/WORCESTER, MA/PEABODY, MA:**  
-

*Rally for gov -  
practical problem - when*

NOTES -- IN VERY ROUGH FORM

November 1, 1994

**MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT**

From: Reta J. Lewis, Special Assistant to the President  
for Political Affairs

Re: Massachusetts Political Update

---

**1994 U.S. SENATE RACE**

Mitt Romney, a Boston businessman and the son of former Michigan Governor George Romney, trounced opponent John Lakian in the September 20th GOP gubernatorial primary. Romney received 82 percent of the vote to Lakian's 18 percent. Lakian conceded the race early into the evening on September 20th, with less than 20 percent of precincts reporting. Democratic incumbent Edward Kennedy did not face primary opposition.

Kennedy is facing the most difficult election battles of his career in the 1994 general election. However, a Boston Herald poll released October 20th showed Kennedy leading Romney 50 percent to 40 percent in the general election match-up. This showed significant movement for the Kennedy Campaign. A Boston Globe/WBZ-TV poll conducted September 21st - 22nd by KRC Communications Research, surveying 400 likely voters, showed a tighter race between Kennedy and Romney in the general election match-up, with Kennedy leading Romney 48 percent to 46 percent, and six percent of voters undecided. A Boston Herald/WCVB-TV poll conducted September 21st - 24th, testing 575 voters, showed Romney with a slight lead over Kennedy, 44 percent to 42 percent, with 14 percent of voters undecided.

Democratic consultants have asserted that Romney's surge in the polls may be attributed to recent heavy television advertising, in which Romney attacked Kennedy on the issue of crime. To combat Romney's rise in the polls, Kennedy's campaign has released a heavy string of its own television ads. Kennedy's "barrage of negative TV ads" appears to have "halted" Romney's momentum, but the race remains close. Particularly effective for the Kennedy Campaign has been a series of ads targeting Romney's business practices. Romney's favorable ratings have fallen from 44 percent to 40 percent since the airing of these ads, while his unfavorable ratings have risen from 23 percent to 31 percent. In addition, Kennedy now leads Romney among independent voters 46 percent to 44 percent.

In their September poll, the Boston Globe also asked likely voters who they thought "would do the best job" dealing with several key issues. The results were as follows:

|                                    | <u>Kennedy</u> | <u>Romney</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Fighting crime                     | 33%            | 45%           |
| Securing federal funding for MA    | 63%            | 24%           |
| Reforming welfare                  | 33%            | 50%           |
| Creating jobs                      | 47%            | 39%           |
| Protecting women's abortion rights | 56%            | 20%           |
| Reforming health care              | 49%            | 31%           |
| Personal character/moral values    | 21%            | 52%           |

In addition to crime and welfare reform, Romney has attacked Kennedy on health care and foreign policy. The Romney Campaign has consistently claimed that Kennedy has "lost touch" with his constituents, and represents an "outmoded" way of running government.

A pre-debate Boston Herald/WCVB-TV poll, conducted October 22-23 by the University of New Hampshire surveying 447 likely voters showed the following:

|         | NOW | 10/19 | 9/25 |
|---------|-----|-------|------|
| Kennedy | 50% | 50%   | 43%  |
| Romney  | 32% | 40%   | 46%  |
| Undec.  | 18% | 10%   | 11%  |

Romney's campaign continues to slide, hampered by a dramatic defection among independent voters, who now support Kennedy 44-33%. Romney has suffered a 23-point loss in independent support during the past month, and dropped 10 points among them from last week's Boston Herald poll. However, Kennedy's widening lead has not give him a lock on the race, largely because Romney's deserters moved to the undecided column -- not to Kennedy.

A Boston Herald/WCVB-TV poll conducted October 27-30 by a University of New Hampshire survey group surveying 513 likely voters and a Boston Globe/WBZ-TV tracking poll conducted October 29-30 by KRC Communications surveying 400 likely voters showed the following:

|          | HERALD |       | GLOBE    |          |
|----------|--------|-------|----------|----------|
|          | NOW    | 10/25 | 10/29-30 | 10/27-28 |
| Kennedy  | 49%    | 50%   | 55%      | 57%      |
| Romney   | 39%    | 32%   | 37%      | 35%      |
| Other/DK | 12%    | 18%   | 8%       | 8%       |

## 1994 GUBERNATORIAL RACE

Republican Governor William Weld remains in a strong position heading into the November election. In a recent feature story, the Boston Herald declared Weld a serious presidential contender in 1996, should he receive 60 percent of the vote in the 1994 gubernatorial race. A poll conducted by the Boston Globe in late July showed Weld with high job approval ratings. Approximately 59 percent of voters thought Weld was doing an excellent or above-average job as governor; 24 percent thought he was doing a below-average job; and 14 percent thought he was doing an average job in his position. A July poll conducted by the Boston Herald showed Weld enjoying a favorable/unfavorable rating of 71 percent/21 percent. These figures were up from March favorable/unfavorable ratings of 68 percent/26 percent.

State Representative Mark Roosevelt (the grandson of Teddy Roosevelt) won the Democratic nomination in the gubernatorial race with 48 percent of the vote. In his victory speech, Roosevelt challenged Weld on four key issues: crime, gambling, jobs and welfare. Roosevelt will also attempt to challenge Weld's "market-based, laissez faire libertarianism," which embraces casino gambling. Roosevelt has been outspoken on the need for Democratic Party reform, putting forth his own platform of "progressive ideals" and a "conservative insistence on accountability and personal responsibility." Political analysts agree that Roosevelt's strong showing in the primary has given his campaign a strong boost in stature. However, this seat is expected to remain Republican in 1994.

In an Opinion Dynamics survey conducted September 8th - 9th of 500 registered voters, Weld defeated Roosevelt 59 percent to 22 percent. In a poll conducted by the Boston Globe September 21st - 22nd of 400 likely voters, the Weld/Cellucci ticket defeated the Roosevelt/Massi ticket 60 percent to 29 percent, with 11 percent of voters undecided. In the most recent Boston Herald survey, conducted September 21st - 24th of 575 registered voters, Weld led Roosevelt 58 percent to 26 percent, with 16 percent of voters undecided.

## MARGINAL CONGRESSIONAL RACES

**CD03.** For the Democratic nomination, state Senator Kevin O'Sullivan defeated Moakley Press Secretary Jim McGovern 39 percent to 30 percent. Professor John Walsh followed with 17 percent of the vote. O'Sullivan will face incumbent Republican Peter Blute in the general election. Blute will have a difficult time holding onto this (leaning Democratic) district in 1994. Blute took advantage of Joe Early's bounced check problems as well as the strength of the Perot vote in 1992 to win this seat. He will not have these advantages in '94. This race is considered a toss-up in the general election with a slight lean towards the Republican candidate. However, the DCCC is confident that O'Sullivan can win in the general election if he can raise sufficient funds to stay on the air. Secretary Shalala participated in a fundraiser for the O'Sullivan Campaign, and Mrs. Gore also campaigned in the third district.

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

| DOCUMENT NO.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                | DATE       | RESTRICTION |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| 002. memo                | Phone No. (Partial) (1 page) | 11/01/1994 | P6/b(6)     |

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
First Lady's Office  
Speechwriting  
OA/Box Number: 8170

### FOLDER TITLE:

HRC [Hillary Rodham Clinton]/Massachusetts '94 11/4/94

2012-1004-S

ms541

### RESTRICTION CODES

#### Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

#### Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Page 4, MA

The O'Sullivan campaign has been using a two-pronged attack against Blute, arguing that he is an "extremist" on social issues and is an ineffective representative of the district's interests. The challenger draws a stark contrast between his support for abortion rights and Blute's pro-life position, and he also faults the incumbent for an allegedly weak record on education and the environment. On effectiveness, the O'Sullivan campaign argues, "When you go to Washington to fight Congress, you don't get anything done." O'Sullivan, who favors the death penalty and term limits, is using Mark McKinnon for media and John Blydenburgh of Clark University for polling. He is not taking PAC money.

The Blute campaign disputes O'Sullivan's characterization of both Blute and himself. They say O'Sullivan is not a moderate, but rather a liberal who voted in favor of higher taxes at least 36 times in the legislature. In addition, they claim that O'Sullivan flipfopped on abortion, term limits, and the death penalty upon entering the race six months ago. In response to charges of extremism, the Blute campaign points to a number of instances where Blute has gone against the Republican House leadership and voted with Democrats, including his support for the Brady Bill and the assault weapons ban, the crime bill, national service legislation, and the Family and Medical Leave Act. Though Blute limits himself by taking no more than \$1,000.00 per PAC, he has made a very impressive showing in the fundraising arena, pulling in \$669,883.00 this cycle through June 1994.

**CD06.** In the Democratic primary, attorney John Tierney won his party's nomination with 40 percent of the vote. Former state Senator Nicholas Costello followed with 29 percent, and state Representative Jeff Hayward with 21 percent. Tierney will face incumbent Republican Peter Torkildsen in the general election. Torkildsen capitalized on Nick Navroules' difficulties in the 1992 election to narrowly win the sixth district seat. However, his votes against the assault weapons ban and the Family Leave Act have left Torkildsen at odds with the majority of his constituents. The sixth district has a Democratic performance rating of almost 55 percent. The sixth district is considered a toss-up race.

Tierney, 42, has never held office, though he did run unsuccessfully for state Senate in 1978, losing in the Democratic primary. He is one of the most liberal candidates involved in a truly competitive race in this election cycle. Tierney supports a single-payer health care system and favors the elimination of all handguns from our streets and classrooms, including a ban on all handgun sales. Tierney faults Torkildsen repeatedly for the incumbent's record on gun control; he did oppose the assault ban in a vote specifically on that measure, though he did support the final version of the crime bill, which included the ban. Tierney also criticizes Torkildsen for an alleged "lack of leadership" on health care and for not bringing enough projects back to the district.

Torkildsen is highlighting his efforts to bring about congressional reform as he asks voters to give him another term. He served as co-chair of the House Freshman Republican Task Force and touts his work to apply laws to Congress, to reform the discharge petition process, eliminate select committees, and eliminate funds for former speakers and presidents. Also

by  
all  
the  
entire  
work  
store  
chain  
by  
the  
staff  
lead  
committee  
by  
the  
staff  
lead  
committee

by  
the  
staff  
lead  
committee  
P6/b(6)