

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. transcript	HRC Meeting [partial] (1 page)	01/27/2000	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Lissa Muscatine
OA/Box Number: 21401

FOLDER TITLE:

Interview Transcripts 1/2000 - 6/2000

2015-0275-S

rc2043

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]

CBS'S EARLY SHOW
JUNE 28, 2000

SPEAKERS: HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, THE FIRST LADY
BRYANT GUMBEL, ANCHOR

GUMBEL: Mrs. Clinton, good morning. Thank you very much for being with us. I appreciate it.

CLINTON: I'm delighted to be here, and I'm glad that we're doing this in Syracuse. And I'm so pleased we have an audience that we can hear from in a little while as well.

GUMBEL: Sixteen percent, 17 percent undecided is a considerable number at this point. Does that suggest this race is personality-driven, race-driven or issue-driven or none of the above?

CLINTON: You know, Bryant, I think it's going to be a tight race, because there are a lot of issues at stake, but it's also a race I'm sure about who can do the best job for New York. And people will be making their minds up. I find as a travel around the state that the people I talk with are taking the race very seriously.

I'm excited about it. I mean, I don't have any problem with the number of people who are undecided, because, to me, that means people want to be convinced. And I hope I can convince them.

GUMBEL: Your numbers in the city have always run very well; 62 percent, I think, the latest figure I saw down in Manhattan. It is outside the city, also known as upstate, where you've had a number that's been varying and of late has been falling since Rick Lazio got in the race. I think at this point, he's 11 percentage points ahead of you up here, despite the fact that he's just got in the race, despite the fact that he's a virtual unknown. How do you explain?

CLINTON: Well, you know, it's traditional that Republicans do better in upstate New York, and that is a fact of life that I accept, but I'm not giving up on a single part of the state. I really believe strongly that when I'm in the Senate, the most important priority I have is the upstate economy, and I'm going to keep coming back time and time again. And despite the fact I'm a Democrat, and someone who believes strongly that we need to work hard to change the economy, but to build on the progress we've made, I'm going to try to get that message out. And I hope that people here in Syracuse and central New York, western New York, throughout the state, will listen to that.

But it's tough. It's tough for a Democrat because it's a traditionally Republican area.

GUMBEL: I'll buy part of that, but it goes deeper than party lines. Let me run some other numbers by you. Also in the same poll, New York Times-CBS poll, while only 7 percent of your supporters say they are against Rick Lazio, a whopping 53 percent of his supporters say they are dead-set opposed to Hillary Clinton. How do you explain that kind of antipathy?

CLINTON: I just have more optimistic, positive people supporting me.

(LAUGHTER)

GUMBEL: Good answer. But, seriously, how do you explain the antipathy?

CLINTON: Oh, look, for the last eight years obviously there's been a lot of controversy and a lot of things have happened. I'm new to the state. I have to get around, and people have to meet me face to face. I mean, the most common thing people say to me after I spend time with them is I'm not what they thought I was like, which is, I think, a compliment, although a little bit lefthanded.

I just have a lot of work to do, to make sure that people know really who I am, what I've done for 30 years, what I would do in the Senate, what my real positions are. And the people who are working with me and supporting me are, you know, basically very positive about what we can do to help the state.

GUMBEL: Are you being held accountable for you or your husband?

CLINTON: Probably everything, including the weather. I think it's a broad range of accountability, depending on the person who is looking at it. But, you know, we're running very tight and competitive races across the country between Democrats and Republicans. And, you know, you throw in personality, you throw in controversy in any race, it's going to be an intense race.

I don't mind that at all. I find that invigorating because there's a lot at stake. I mean, if I didn't think this was an important race to make, if I didn't think I could make a difference, I wouldn't be doing this. And because I feel passionately about the issues that I've worked on and that I believe I can make a difference in, people are going to have strong reactions to that. I understand it.

GUMBEL: You continue to be haunted by charges of carpetbagging. You were born in Illinois, you were schooled in Massachusetts and Connecticut, you've lived in Washington and Arkansas. Why New York? Why here?

CLINTON: Well, because I've been fortunate to live in other places, and I've always wanted to live in New York. And that's where Bill and I talked about having a home after the White House years. I did not expect to be so encouraged and persuaded to run for the Senate when Senator Moynihan withdraw because of his retirement, but I'm delighted that I was persuaded to look hard and to think hard about doing this.

I think I can make a real contribution. I believe that, you know, the kind of strong and consistent positions that I've advocated for so many years have a real resonance with people of New York, that I've listened to now for nearly a year.

So I say, why not? Why not? Who wouldn't want to live in New York, who wouldn't want to have the opportunity that I've had to travel the entire state, to go to every county.

I'm so pleased you're here in central New York. It's one of the most beautiful places in the country. And for some people, it's a really well-kept secret. Maybe by my running and being around the state, more people will pay attention to the entire state and what is available in New York from one end to the other.

GUMBEL: With that as a backdrop, let's turn to some questions from the audience. I might note that Matt Mulcahey (ph) and Liz Aires (ph) of WTVH-TV are going to be handling the microphones for us today. And we'll start with the question over here.

Young lady?

QUESTION: Hi, good morning, Mrs. Clinton, Bryant. My name is Helen Hudson (ph). I'm a New Venture Gear (ph) employee. And what I want to know is, I'm with the local 624, what is your view on government training for our youth?

CLINTON: I have been to New Venture Gear (ph), and I'm so glad you're here because New Venture Gear (ph) is one of the most impressive manufacturing facilities, I think, anywhere in the country.

Is it still running three shifts?

It has more work than it can get done without running three shifts. And part of the reason New Venture Gear (ph) is so successful is because of training, because of the partnership between management and labor, because of government support for training.

I'm a very big believer--I think if we did more government training, we'd have more plants like New Venture Gear (ph) up here in central New York and in western New York, because we have got to train the work force to be able to do the jobs that the new economy demands.

I remember when I went through New Venture Gear (ph)--were you there the day, were you on the shift that I was there when I came through, when I went through on the golf cart, and I stopped and talked with people?

There was an excitement in that plant, there was an enthusiasm and an optimism that I think we can replicate and make available throughout New York and America. But we can't do it unless we invest in a three-part partnership between management, labor and the government to train people for those jobs.

GUMBEL: Let's turn to this gentleman right here.

QUESTION: Good morning, Mrs. Clinton. My name is Todd Scott (ph). I'm an elementary school teacher from Whitesboro, New York, which is near Utica.

My question is threefold. I think you agree that the voucher system hasn't had the expected effect. I'm interested in what other strategies you have for improving the public education in New York state, especially in the urban and rural areas.

Also, I'm interested in how you feel about charter schools, as well as I've heard you talk about new teacher recruitment, troops to teach, teacher corps, things like that. What can we do to retain the teachers and reward teachers who are already in the classroom, as there is a very high turnover rate?

CLINTON: You've asked wonderful questions. And I know they always want you to talk fast on television, but I think these are really important and substantive questions.

First, thank you for teaching and thank you for teaching in elementary school, because if we don't get our kids off to a good start in the elementary years, a lot of what we want to do happen won't.

I think there are several ways that I could be a good partner in the Senate to help give you more support and tools that you need. I think that's why we should have 100,000 federally funded teachers, mostly aimed at elementary schools, to lower class size, to get all our kids up to speed in reading and be well-prepared.

That's why I support the kind of funds the federal government could help provide in places like Utica, like Syracuse, that have a wonderful old school-building problem, because we have a lot of buildings that need to be modernized and repaired, and some new schools throughout the state that should be constructed. I think the federal government should help provide that through financing authority, so we don't have to raise our property taxes to meet those needs.

I also believe, though, that we've got to focus on recruiting qualified teachers and keeping qualified teachers. We're going to face a big teacher shortage in our country.

So several things: One, I'd like to have a national teacher corps where young people are encouraged to go in for teaching. We'd give them scholarships, if in return they would teach for four years. Two, I'd like to give incentives for people to come back into teaching or go into teaching for the first time. If we give signing bonuses to athletes, we ought to give signing bonuses to teachers. And, finally, we need to pay and reward our existing teacher force. I believe in pay for performance on school-based model, not an individual teacher-based model. And so I'd like to do that.

And I'll get to the rest of your questions in a minute.

GUMBEL: I'm going to interject. In 30 seconds, the computer is going to take us away for a commercial. Real quick, how would we pay for this national teacher corps?

CLINTON: We would pay for it out of the surplus and out of the priorities that we already have. Everything I've proposed is within a balanced budget.

GUMBEL: And 52 percent of the voters here in New York state favor school vouchers. Why did you call them gimmicks?

CLINTON: Well, because they do not have the results in terms of evidence that people have touted in the experiments that have been done. Secondly, we should not be taking money away from the public schools just when we're getting to the point where we know what works, like getting lower class size. And, thirdly, I don't know how we would do it, constitutionally. I would be happy to talk about that because we would could think about people lining up for their vouchers, but there are some people in this country I wouldn't want my tax dollars going to do just because they called what they did a school.

GUMBEL: We'll come back with more.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

GUMBEL: We left talking education. Let's talk about the campaign. You said you wanted this to be a clean campaign, but within the last week you initiated five new ads. I think they could be fairly called attack ads on Rick Lazio. Let's take a look at the latest one, and then we'll talk about it.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

ANNOUNCER: Congress just defeated a plan by only two votes to lower home heating oil costs for New York and the Northeast. How did Rick Lazio vote? He didn't. He skipped the vote.

Rick Lazio: The more you know, the more you wonder.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

GUMBEL: Why did you feel the need to go negative?

CLINTON: I don't know what you showed because it wasn't showed here.

GUMBEL: Oh, it was shown right there. I apologize.

(CROSSTALK)

GUMBEL: It was the ad on the vote that he missed.

CLINTON: Well, you know, I think that campaigns are about information. I think providing information about people's positions and about their record is part of how

voters make up their mind. I don't think that giving that information is negative; I think it's informative.

And from my perspective, there is going to be a lot of contrasts in this campaign, because we have very different positions on a lot of issues.

GUMBEL: Do you expect it to get uglier?

CLINTON: Well, I hope if it's informative, it's not ugly. And if it stays at that level, I think that's a very good way to help educate the electorate.

GUMBEL: The voters will be the arbiters of that.

Let's get some more questions from them.

QUESTION: Good morning, Mrs. Clinton. My name is Pat Tov (ph), and I'm the host of a local NPR women's radio show, "Women's Voices."

The question I have for you is, New York state, like many state, has a growing gap between the poor and wealthy. Among the poor, there is a disproportionate number of single mothers. As a senator, what legislation would you introduce to make life better for single mothers and their children?

CLINTON: You know, you're right, because New York now has the largest gap between the rich and poor of any state in the country. And that's not good news for us. I mean, we should not be satisfied by any means with that. I think there are several things.

First, we have to do a better job of collecting every dollar of child support that is owed to any person, and that's primarily mothers. And we have to work very hard to have fathers take responsibility and be willing to help support their children.

Secondly, we've got to do a better job of providing the kind of economic opportunities and training and educational opportunities that will equip single moms and everyone else for the jobs in the new economy.

We also have to, I think, take a hard look at the surplus that we've got, and maybe we'll get into this later. I'd like us to, among the many things we put at the top of the national priority, try to ensure that we cut the number of children living in poverty, most of whom live in female-headed households, most of whose mothers work full-time but do not make enough money to lift themselves and their children out of poverty. That's why I would raise the minimum wage, I would expand the earned income tax credit, I would try to provide more support for working parents so that we can make work really pay. And that means child care so working moms can so the security that when we go to work are children are well taken care of, it means transportation so that you can get to and from the places where the jobs are.

I think if we focused on really trying to cut child poverty in our country, there's a lot that we could do to help those mothers and their children.

GUMBEL: We're going to head for a commercial break.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

GUMBEL: Mrs. Clinton, Jane noted that this may be the last day that Elian Gonzalez spends in the United States. Would that be a welcome move, in your opinion? Should he be heading back to Cuba?

CLINTON: Well, I have said for many months that I think the decisions about this little boy's future should be made by his father.

GUMBEL: Plain and simple? The Miami people should have no say in it whatsoever?

CLINTON: Well, I think they had their say. They litigated this matter through the courts and the courts have made a decision and the ultimate outcome is now in his father's hand.

GUMBEL: Were they way out of line all along?

CLINTON: I'm sure they were motivated by their deep concerns. Everybody who saw this boy knew that he had gone through a terrible tragedy with the loss of his mother trying to get to freedom and America. And I knew that there was an enormous amount of sympathy across the country for him.

And certainly people who have very personal experiences with Cuba and the experiences they had under Castro and what happened to their parents or grandparents are going to feel intensely about this.

But at the end of the day, we can't be making decisions about a child's future where there is a competent, from all appearances, loving and concerned remaining parent who survives, without upsetting generations of precedent and without having the government interfere in ways that I don't think are good for any of us. So that's what the court determined, and that's what will happen now.

GUMBEL: We're mid-year of 2000. The Cold War is non-existent. Communism has crumbled. We no longer even use the term rogue states. Is the embargo antiquated, should it be scrapped?

CLINTON: You know, I believe that the ball is in Fidel Castro's court. You know, several years ago, I think, there was a movement toward trying to increase trade and some kinds of interchanges between the United States and Cuba, and out of the blue he had an unarmed small plane shot down, which I think is just inexcusable.

He has not done what both the United States government and the pope and others have urged, which is to really pay more attention to human rights, quit imprisoning people for their political positions. If he were to take some kind of affirmative steps demonstrating that he would open up his society, I think a lot of things could be considered. But until he does that, I doubt that there will be any movement.

GUMBEL: Why is his situation any different from now our friends in Beijing, who also deny human rights, who also don't open up their society? Why do we befriend them and continue to ostracize Castro?

CLINTON: Well, I don't know that we're befriending them. We're certainly trading with them. We're having a partnership, which we hope will put us in a position...

(CROSSTALK)

GUMBEL: Considerable friendship.

CLINTON: Well, to have a peaceful relationship. I wouldn't go so far as to say friendship.

But I think it's different with Castro. It's the last remaining dictatorship left in our hemisphere. We've changed so many countries toward democracy, ended bloody civil wars in the last 10 years. This is a dinosaur regime which, I think, has caused problems in the hemisphere and other places around the world. There isn't any doubt in my mind that the Cuban people deserve the kind of freedom that should be available to them. And it's up to Mr. Castro to try to start providing that.

GUMBEL: This young lady is waiting with a question.

QUESTION: My name is Lindsay (ph), and I live right here in central New York, and I'm going to be a freshman next year in college. I have kind of a different type of question for you.

You're familiar with the TV show "Survivor," correct? OK, well, picture this. It's me, you and your opponent, Rick Lazio. We're the last three people on the island. And it's my turn to decide who gets thrown off next. Who do I choose to remove and why?

CLINTON: Well, that's a very interesting question.

GUMBEL: No, we didn't put her up to that.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: Your parents work for CBS. No.

(LAUGHTER)

You know, I would say that you will have to look at the experience each of us bring to this race. You know, for more than 30 years, I've worked on behalf of children and families, I've tried to provide opportunities both in my roles in the private sector as well as the public and not-for-profit sectors to make sure that everybody in this country has a chance, if they're willing to work hard and be responsible, to make their own dreams come true. And that work has led me to advocate for expanding health care, particularly for children; for improving education; for trying to provide economic opportunities for all people, never to forget that there are people who are left behind and forgotten.

And I believe, the way that I was raised, I have an obligation to try to help others. And I think that we can be a better society if we practice the Golden Rule and we really try to look out for each other. But my primary emphasis and concern has been for children and particularly vulnerable children, children who are abused and neglected; children who are in the foster care and adoption system; children who go to schools that are not adequately equipped, that have 30-35 kids in the room and can't get the individual attention they need; children who's moms don't get the child support that they require to give them a decent standard of living.

And I also think that we have some big work ahead of us in our state, in our country, to make sure people can get along and can work with each other despite our differences. You know, we just mapped the human genome project and so we now know that we're 99.9 percent the same, that one-tenth of 1 percent is all the difference we see in skin color and height and eye color. I want to try to do everything I can to convey to people that we have to figure out how to work and live together in this century.

So for me, it's a simple question of what are our values and what kind of vision can we have to create a better society.

QUESTION: I have question about, on the Senate level, what would you do about the economics of a smaller city like Syracuse where you see a lower tax base but higher rates in crimes, the schools are declining. And on that issue, what would you do on the Senate level to revitalize a city like Syracuse?

CLINTON: Well, that's one of my top priorities because the economy has done very well, as everyone knows, in our country over the last eight years. But we haven't done what we need to do here in central New York or western New York. And I've talked about the obstacles to our economic development here and opportunities.

Obstacles: We have a high state and low local tax rate, which does not encourage businesses to come and create jobs here. That's mostly a state and local matter, but I'd like to get more of our fair share back from Washington so that we could use our dollars to lower our tax burden. We have high energy costs here. That also does not keep people and businesses in central and western New York. I've been in businesses that can move to Ohio and Pennsylvania and cut their energy costs by a third or a half. And we don't have adequate transportation. Airfares are not what they should be; transportation on road and railroad is not adequate.

But then we also have opportunities. And I would do, in the Senate, more to create technology, bonds and training people and revitalizing our agricultural economy, and dealing with the problems that I've heard about here in central and western New York and upstate.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

GUMBEL: Last Thursday, independent counsel Robert Ray said he'll not charge you with giving knowingly false statements regarding the firing of the White House travel office. But he said there's substantial evidence you played a substantial role in those firings. His final report is due out in September, just a month before the election. Does that concern you?

CLINTON: No, because, you know, what he said in his press release is what I said seven years ago, that I did express concerns, and I'm just glad it's behind us. I'm glad after seven years, and all the money that was spent investigating it, that it's over.

GUMBEL: You don't think the charges that there's substantial evidence that you misled people will haunt you in the campaign?

CLINTON: Well, I don't think there is substantial evidence. I think that what he said is what I did say I did. I said that to anyone who asked me, that I expressed concerns. I did not have a role in the direct decision-making. And that's what he found, and it's over.

GUMBEL: In the final month, are you going to have to spend your time defending that?

CLINTON: No, I think people make up their minds on it. I think New Yorkers and Americans have pretty much concluded whatever they're going to think about that.

GUMBEL: When your president--when your president ran for husband? I'm all right.

(LAUGHTER)

When your husband ran for president eight years ago, it was often said you get two for the price of one, meaning if you elected him, they get your expertise. Does the same now apply? Do we get two for the price of one? If we vote for you, do we get his expertise?

CLINTON: Well, he has a lot of expertise on important issues, and he's very interested in making sure we keep the progress going in our country. And any way that he can be helpful here in New York or in the rest of the country after he's out office, I know he's going to try to keep trying to do that.

GUMBEL: So he would be a kitchen adviser.

CLINTON: Well, he'll be a member of Senate's spouses club.

(LAUGHTER)

GUMBEL: You have twice said that if elected, you'll complete your full Senate term. Do you want to run for president someday?

CLINTON: No. No, I want to be a senator.

GUMBEL: Come on. Once you get a taste of it...

CLINTON: A taste of it? I've been tasting it for years.

(LAUGHTER)

I mean, for goodness sakes.

GUMBEL: You wouldn't want to go back into the big house?

CLINTON: Are you--I tell you, a senator has so much more privacy. Do you know where your senator is today? I mean, think about it. I mean, it's the kind of job that you can do a lot of good, you can make a real impact, you can try to help people, all of which is part of why I'm running.

GUMBEL: If it doesn't go your way in November?

CLINTON: I'll keep doing what I've always done. I will keep working on children's issues, economic, health care, education issues. You know, that's what I would have done anyway before people started to encourage me to run for the Senate. And one of my friends said, well, you can be in a foundation or you can be writing and you be encouraging the Senate to take care of economic issues or training issues or education issues, or you can go and you can try to do it yourself. And that's what I finally decided to try to do.

GUMBEL: We're going to come on back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

GUMBEL: One final note, we saw Chelsea by your side at a campaign event not long ago. Is she going to be engaged in the campaign?

CLINTON: No, we're not changing our policy that she will be with me from time to time, she'll come and go, but it's really her choice, and I'll be glad every time she does.

GUMBEL: Mrs. Clinton, thank you very much.

END

Telephone Interview Transcript with Al Hunt
April 25, 2000

AH: The proposition compared to what some are [inaudible] today

HRC: I agree with that.

AH: Yeah I just wanted to talk to you for a second about that 'cause as I read – I actually went back and reread that 1973 piece

HRC: Oh my goodness

AH: Correct me if I'm wrong but my understanding of what you were basically arguing is yes there oughta be an expansion of children's rights, talking primarily about I guess totally about teenagers and secondly that it oughta be done in extreme cases - abuse and things of that sort - and thirdly that it always oughta handled if at all possible by the family rather than by the courts.

HRC: That about sums it up! Yep that's right...you know I had done, I had started doing work on child abuse back in my law school years when I became really interested in how kids develop and I thought the law didn't pay enough attention to the needs of children – needs really more than rights – and I worked at Yale New Haven Hospital and one of the first people I guess who really worked with the hospital staff to come up with guidelines about child abuse because it was a relatively new phenomenon in the law that it would be recognized as a crime and as something that happened more frequently than we cared to admit. So as part of that I became really convinced that there were certain extreme cases in which trying to keep a family together and always acceding to parental wishes in the face of obvious mistreatment and physical and other abuse of the child was just wrong and we had to be more willing to end the parental relationship with the child in order to keep the child safe and to get the child a better chance in the future.

But I also was very conscious of a lot of cases that we had in our country going back quite some time in which really decisions about the appropriateness of a child's environment were made removing the children from parents without regard to the fitness of the parents or the needs of the child. You can go back and look at the case law in any state and you'll find cases where there is no evidence that a child is being mistreated but a parent has unpopular political beliefs or a disreputable profession of some sort – a bar keeper or maybe a prostitute – but there is no evidence that anybody comes forward with that the environment or the parental activity is in anyway harming the child. We might prefer the child be in a different environment but you can't make the link that this parent is unfit as the law understood it and yet children would be taken away for really what amounted to parents offending the mores of a community or in some respect stepping on the toes of people in power or even in extreme cases - you know, family dispute – where the grandparents wanted a child or other relatives wanted a child and made accusations against the parents without any really strong evidence of the kind of abuse or neglect that should be the only factor that is looked at when you remove a child from a functioning home and a fit parent

Then I also became involved in the New Haven legal services organization in the Yale law clinic and one of the first cases that I did as a law student involved a foster mother, a black foster mother who had raised an abandoned, abused, and neglected infant from birth and had had

this little girl for probably four years and the foster mother was in her early 50s and she raised her only children and she really wanted to adopt this girl. She had bonded with her. All the psychological evidence had shown that this child was really well adjusted and the – at the time as you remember from your own experience with adoption foster parents were not allowed to adopt and there were very strict rules in most states including Connecticut. So when this foster mom went and said “I’d like to adopt this little girl” who was half black and half white – the foster mother was black – the state welfare people said – no, you know, you’re a foster mother – you can’t do that and besides we’re going to put this child in a better home, because this woman lived in a modest home in New Haven and so the foster mother came and I was on the case to represent her rights and we lost the case because the state basically argued that yes the child was well adjusted- they bonded and all of that but she’d be a lot better off in the suburbs in a bigger house with wealthier people and so they took the child away. And that also just really upset me because again I think the most important issue is what is best for the child and if there is a preexisting relationship, then that relationship has probably meant a lot to the child and should not in any way be broken up for reasons like affluence or political affiliation or some of the other reasons they gave.

So that has been a concern that I have had for more than thirty years now as a lawyer and as a children’s advocate arguing that accepting cases of provable abuse and neglect or where truly the parent is absolutely unfit. I mean it is conceivable for example that you could have a parent who can summon themselves enough to take care of the basic needs of the child but who because of addiction or alcohol – something like that - where you just had to make the decision that it wasn’t in the best interest of the child. But other than that I believe that you should keep families together. But if you can not, than a child obviously as I argued in my piece has rights to be removed from an abusive, neglectful or harmful environment for his own safety and well being. And that those should be decided on a case by case basis.

AH: You were a [inaudible] a couple years ago – I mean they really let you have it, didn’t they?

HRC: Yeah but you know, Al, that was really déjà vu all over again to me because even in Arkansas in some of the cases that I’ve tried and that I’ve advocated, there was in a lot of circles – such an overwhelming presumption of parental rights that –

AH: Well one of the problems was the very well intended – that 1980 Welfare and Adoption...

HRC: Absolutely. I can remember being involved in a case in Arkansas, God, 20 or more years ago – 25 years ago – where the children were being beaten incredibly brutally and the father who was administering the beatings was doing them from his point of view for discipline according to God’s word – you know, spare the rod, spoil the child. When the social workers were called to the home it was a tremendous upheaval in the community and the vast majority of the people in the community sided with the father. And you know I was called in and tried to deal with some of the leaders in the community and make the argument that, of course, parents have the right to discipline the child and corporal punishment is not against the law but as with any human activity it can go over the line – it can go too far and these children were being not only physically abused but from what I knew of the case – psychologically and emotionally stunned – but you know I ran up against a brick wall and you know I think that in the end that case was also sort of politicized because the welfare industry went in and removed the children and there

was a big court battle and the father brought in ministers and other people and these are always tough cases. And you know, they should not be an easy, matter-of-fact kind of proceeding to remove any child from a family and anytime a community makes that decision it's not just the social workers and the judges and the police officers that should make it – it's really all of us because we're acting in a sense as in loco parentis as a society to pass a judgement on a child's well being and the fitness of a parent and the safety of a home. And it is something that should only be done under the [inaudible] of extreme circumstances – [disconnected].

Conversation Begins at the middle of Side B

HRC: But we'd raise money and, ah, it was just always what I was – you know – maybe it was because you know my mother understood so keenly what it was like to be on the outside, um, so that became a (undecipherable)

Q: ____ of this century, this past century?

HRC: But the other thing is you know I had always been interested in politics – don't forget I was a Goldwater girl in 1964 so it was not like, I mean I always saw politics as a way of bringing people together to solve problems...so now I'll tell this story. My first real introduction into national politics was at the 1960 elections – my social studies teacher came to school that day beaten up because he had gotten into a fight at the polling place. He lived in Chicago and there Daley was vigorously stealing the election for John Kennedy and this man was a staunch Republican, pro-Nixon, who had gotten into a fight, got beaten up, looked like hell – he was outraged talking about you know making a mockery of democracy and I was outraged that this would happen in my country so during lunch I called the mayor's office to complain about my social studies teacher being beaten up and then about two weeks later there was a big ad in the Chicago Tribune called "Operation Eagle Eye" – if you're sick of voter fraud, in Chicago come and help us stamp it out...so Betsy Johnson Evelyn who was equally incensed about Mr. Kennedy being beaten up – she and I went down to the Drake Hotel and signed up and it was all sort of Republican do-gooders in Chicago of which there weren't very many – they were all from the suburbs, and I didn't tell my parents we were going downtown 'cause you know that was...I was whatever I was in 1960 – I was in eighth grade – and you know these people were you know so goo goo that they assigned Betsy to a couple, they assigned me to a couple and we went south of the Dan Ryan expressway which you all don't know – it's the equivalent of the south bronx, and I went door to door on a Saturday morning, by myself – this couple left. We parked and this couple said, "Ok, here's where we have to go. Meet back at 12 and we'll drive you back." By myself I knocked on doors saying, "Scuse me, does Mr. Jones live here?" I found an empty lot where 18 people were registered – I found a bar where people were registered. I didn't know it was a bar – it was like a store front with dark windows and I open the door and I walk in and people were drinking and dancing and (indecipherable) – It was all so weird to me - I was 13 years old – I was a little girl from the suburbs. That was my first introduction to national politics – to foreign politics. And we came back with our election sheets all marked up about all the people that were dead, that were registered and had voted, and so I was always interested in politics and what could be done.

Q: There's a picture of you – it looks like the end of your senior year of high school with Gerald Ford and ...

HRC: Oh that was junior year – I was a Wellesley intern – ok here's the...so 64 I was a Goldwater Girl – my high school government teacher – his name was Jerry Baker and he's the

executive director of the Airline Pilots association. He said, "You don't even know if you're a republican. You have no idea if you're a republican. You just think you're a republican because everyone in Park Ridge is a republican." And there was one girl in my class who said she was a democrat so he assigned her to represent Goldwater and assigned me to represent Johnson in a high school debate. And that was the first time I ever had to look at anything that the democrats proposed. And that was the beginning of my, as my father would say, the beginning of the end of my political purity and so I thought about things like the civil rights act, medicare proposals and all the things the democrats were proposing or what made up the platform for Johnson's election. But I still supported Goldwater. Because I was you know it was the way I was raised. And I liked Goldwater. I actually met him dressed up in my cowboy hat and my sash – went out and met him –

Q: How very appropriate...(laughter)

HRC: And then I went to- and then the next year I had two young teachers – one was from Smith and one was from Wellesley and the first day and they taught some other government course and the first day my teacher, Miss ____, said, "I want you to read other national newspapers besides the Chicago Tribune so that you can see what other people think about what's going on in the world. So I want you to read the New York Times." And I started to laugh and she was like, "Why are you laughing?" And I said, "I would read that eastern establishment paper...(laughter)" And she made me read it and she forced me to think about it...and she came to me – this turned out to be Father Walton's sister – she came to me and she said, "We want to talk to you about going east to school." So they basically brow beat me into applying to Smith and Wellesley and made me go to all of these gatherings with all of these good ol's at these places like Michigan Avenue where I had never been and the richer suburbs where I had never been in anybody's home...and I got to Wellesley and there weren't many republicans who weren't interested in politics then and I was glad to be president of the Young Republicans. My first year at Wellesley when I was a freshman – the vice president was a young woman named Betsy Griffith who as you know is married to John Dierdorff, the headmistress of Madira. And she and I went to the Massachusetts Republican convention and I was so turned off – so I worked for Ed Burke which was one of the real ironies and then I just decided in my freshman year that I wasn't a republican – I didn't know what I was so I resigned as president and I became more active in anti war and civil rights stuff....

Q: ____ move to Washington?

HRC: After my junior year I was a Wellesley intern and again but now I had become more – I was against the Vietnam war, I spoke out about ____

Q: So the picture on the Capitol steps with college students er, with students on the steps – what would that be?

HRC: I would assume that would be the Wellesley interns...But I have a wonderful picture of me with Gerald Ford.

Mumbles – more picture discussion and then picks up where side A begins

HRC: Oh that was, yeah, that was um,um, Joe W.'s race and lieberman's race – both of those races. I guess it was you know it was '71 because I helped Bill open up the head quarters for Montgomery (??) in '71. Um, yeah that was probably right. The best I can remember.

Q: So in '71 and '72 you and Rudy Giuliani were both democrats?

HRC: Right.

Q: Now that was the one crossover point?

HRC: Right.

(mumbles)

Q: Gidell was senator during..?

HRC: Charlie Gidell, yeah he he was appointed after Kennedy was killed, I think. Is that right? Er, no he was elected. I can't remember the sequence. He'd been a congressman. He was a congressman right? And Rockefeller appointed him, didn't he?

Man: Yeah. There wasn't an election.

HRC: Because Gidell was in the House in '68 and so Rockefeller would have appointed him to succeed Robert Kennedy which he only held for two years.

Q: And that became the Buckley se _____. Yeah ok.

HRC: That's right.

(mumbles - laughter)

HRC: You know I worked at the New Hampshire primaries in when did, yeah, when was McCarthy?

Woman: '68.

HRC: Yeah I worked for McCarthy in '68 in New Hampshire. Until I met him.
(laughter)

Q: Wasn't Rockefeller challenging Nixon in '68?

HRC: Yeah but that was that's why I was so mad at my advisor because I had worked in the New Hampshire primary in '68 for McCarthy and then my advisor made me, assigned me as an intern for the House Republican conference. That's how that worked. And then I met McCarthy after I worked in his headquarters and he had failed to vote. He had been in washington and he failed to

vote for some kind of fair housing legislation in '68 – like the '68 housing bill or something like that and I remember meeting him and I said, "Senator, I'm just curious why you didn't vote on that issue?" And he said, "You know I um I didn't know they were voting – nobody told me." And I thought, "You jerk." I could not believe it. So then I quit – I just I switched to Bobby but it was pretty rough on the road there... anyway, that's the best I can recall.

Q: But Rockefeller was after McCarthy?

HRC: Yes, that summer right.

Q: At that point they were still trying to get Nixon out and put in Rockefeller?

HRC: Rockefeller ran a whole little rough operation down there and I don't know that he though he had much hope but it was a last gasp to do it. So he had offices and all kinds of things. And there wasn't much for us to do but I got to meet Frank Sinatra and John Wayne.

Q: So you go from a Goldwater girl to victim of _____ = I think that's a nice progression right there.

HRC: I haven't left if they've left.

(laughter)

HRC: I still have my values.

Lissa: You know it's really sad though if you talk to people like Betsy Griffith. There's no place for her anymore – she's still a republican but only in name – pro-choice, anti-gun you know –

HRC: She's a rockefeller republican.

Lissa: feminist.

HRC: It's really sad. (pause) So anyway I don't know whether that helps but that's sort of the sequence.

Q: when did you go to legal services?

HRC: Um, I went to work as a law student for legal services in new haven at the legal services organization . Then after I graduated from law school I went to Children's Defense fund and then I went to the impeachment staff and then when I went to the University of Arkansas I ran a legal aid clinic – ran prison projects and started a legal services corporation. Then when Carter was elected he appointed me to the legal services corporation and so I had to be confirmed by the senate so that was the first time I ever appeared before the senate.

Q: On the ABA commission is it fair to say that as a result of your work um there have been major reforms as far welfare

HRC: Elaine Weiss in the interview apparently told them all that and I don't...

Q: I mean I know it was generally what the report said I just want to know what we can say about in real life about what happened.

HRC: Well it was actually a new yorker who appointed me to all that – it just reminded me I haven't talked to him. He was a partner at Sullivan and Cromwell (sp?) or something and he was president of the ABA. His name was Bob McWright.

Q: mumbled – women lawyers – 'we changed the structure of our law firm because of blah blah blah' or 'every law firm in the country started thinking about balancing work and family'

HRC: They thought about it – it was a passing thought (laughter).

Q: you were with the legal services corp before you were 30? Carter runs in 77...

HRC: No, he came in 77 so I would have been nominated when I was like 31. Well, I worked for Carter. I did field operations.

Q: In indiana right?

HRC: Yeah. They had this delusion that Indiana would vote for a democratic president or would for him. It was at least a decent try.

Q: There weren't a lot of 30 year old commission members back in those days.

HRC: I guess I was 30 in 77 so I would have been 30 or 31.

Q: Your question is basically what has gotten lost in all of this...

HRC: Well it was the esquire magazine – I don't know when it was but you can go back and find it – this was an esquire magazine cover in probably 19 - late seventies.. I was one of those 100 Americans under 40 and this was when he was attorney general or governor – I can't remember but if you pull it and we were always viewed as independent until I got *here*. *Much to my surprise* – Washington is the most conservative place I've ever lived – when it comes to women's roles. When it comes to you know talking about issues and listening to people – washington is by far the most conservative place. It makes Little Rock look like a bastion of Progressive thought. Um, but such as it is. It's partly the role It's now been seven years and the irony is I wanted an upfront public position so that nobody would ever wonder what I was doing behind the scenes and that was just too much for the system to bear. Go back behind the scenes. WE don't care what you do so long as we don't know it. That's basically the message.

Lissa: That and they're going to be mad at you if you don't do anything.

HRC: Ruthless. If you can find that esquire piece, I guess that should cover it.

Pause
Mumbles

HRC: I know the first time I worked in Washington was an impeachment – well first full time job because I had worked here during the summers but when I was on impeachment staff, I'll never forget um and I was there like at midnight working like crazy - I shared an office with Tom Dell (?) who was a wonderful rep from Wisconsin whose sister is married to Governor Hilsack (?) in Iowa and so Tom and I were there late one night and one of the senior lawyers on the whole thing who shall remain nameless comes in and says to me and this was when I was like 26 and hadn't turned 27 until October and he said, "I just don't understand, why would you as a young woman want to work this hard? Why would you want to give up your social life and everything that you could be doing to be here at midnight?" It was the most absurd conversation...

Man comments – indecipherable

HRC: Yeah, I mean I was just like, what a dumb question.

Q: So what did you think of Liz Holtzman and Barbara Jordan

HRC: I loved them – I loved them

Q: It must have been a lonely place without them there

HRC: My public career on the impeachment staff ended abruptly when I went to a hearing – I had written the rules – this is so ironic. I wrote the rules for ____ the information and the provisions of confidentiality because of course we believe that you shouldn't be putting raw FBI and other information out into the general public because we wouldn't want to be unfair to President Nixon. SO I was sitting at the table with John Delore and Joe Woods and I was obviously the most junior of all lawyers and we finished the hearing and I was gathering my stuff up and Sam Donaldson came over and said, "Well, Ms. Rodham, what does it feel like to be the Jill Wein Bowler of the impeachment staff?" Because Jill Wein Banks was the woman on the Watergate Staff because remember she cross-examined (name) and of course I didn't answer and I got back to the office and (name) called me into his office and he said, "You're just raising too much public interest so from now on you're not going to be able to have a public role. Because I don't want any of my lawyers..." and I said, "You know you're right." I agreed with him a hundred percent and I used to leave – we were in the old hotel up on the hill – it is now like condos or something but it was then the Capitol Hotel right across from the canon office building and so I would go walk out to get some air and something to eat and Donaldson would suddenly be out there, "HEY, come on – come talk to me! Don't you have something to say." And so you know I knew that I'd be fired if I ever talked to press...and I saw the zoo that they made around the impeachment staff and it was the most outrageous show – it was just so ridiculous...so anyway that was my first big experience in Washington...

Mumbles

Q: Well the press is still the same today

HRC: Yes it is. That's the way it works. Sam is still there. I've never talked to him – I don't know if he remembers any of that.

Q: Have you ever seen the movie, "The Birdcage"? There's this great part about the enquirer talking to a reporter and a U.S. Senator was caught up in all this and they can't find him for the longest time and the networks find out where he is and so they send a camera crew and ... and they are walking around the corner and see them there and are like, "Can you believe they found us?" It shows a little moment of what we've become.

HRC: Ok, anything else you need?

Lissa: Just so you know, Roxanne Roberts is doing this piece for Style, did I tell you this?....

Q: On what?

Lissa: Hard to tell 'cause she's so inarticulate about it – seems like its going to be balancing the roles –

HRC: Yeah you know I think it's very important – you know – the right's newest angle is since I'm running for the senate I don't need a stand...

Lissa: What we've been very clear on ... we've been on top of that. The other story that's I think potentially could be helpful is Debra Rosenberg is doing this piece for Newsweek on how your white house experience will help you in the senate – at least that's what I hope she's doing...I've tried to give her this context...and what I've said to her is that, "She's done a lot more than people realize. And the way to think about it is convenient power of the office – that you've sort of convened people in gatherings from White House Councils just to people sitting around a table making decisions or having ideas about things. I've done a lot with her – giving her examples of when you were out in the field listening to people and came back and your staff was instrumental within the White House with agencies, with congress and so on. We've given her a lot of really good details that I think will illustrate this.
(indecipherable)...lists...Charitable...We gave her stuff that she can use because their not coming out til after state of the union...(indecipherable)...

HRC LEAVES MEETING

Indecipherable discussion

Lissa: What I care about is trying to change the story of what her...and I think we're giving her enough little tidbits that haven't been used that should show....

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. transcript	HRC Meeting [partial] (1 page)	01/27/2000	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Lissa Muscatine
OA/Box Number: 21401

FOLDER TITLE:

Interview Transcripts 1/2000 - 6/2000

2015-0275-S
rc2043

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]

Q: mumbled...I think your frame with her should be ...after health care

Lissa: Exacly – that she disappeared into a black hole...the other thing that I've tried to suggest to her is everytime that you've gone out and you've met with people, you've come back and you've gotten your staff to start doing something....It's not as if she's come back and you know, gee...

Continued discussion about stance

What she and her staff does and what they will continue to do

(b)(6)

[001]