

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

S

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Speech File Backup Files
Subseries: Alpha File, 1987-1991

OA/ID Number: 13847
Folder ID Number: 13847-005

Folder Title:
Bush Vice-Presidential Speeches, [n.d.] [3]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	23	3	4

AIDS

George Bush for President

CONTACT: ALIXE GLEN
(202) 842-1988

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Tuesday, June 28, 1988

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT ON THE AIDS COMMISSION REPORT

X The Commission Report is a landmark analysis of the problems facing our country due to the AIDS epidemic. There is little doubt that it will be the benchmark for future discussions. Admiral Watkins, the Commission members and staff have done an excellent job.

X They have proved their critics wrong. Many pundits believed that the Commission would fail, yet Admiral Watkins and his colleagues have set the right tone for how we should approach AIDS in the months and years to come.

I am particularly pleased that the Commission recognizes the need for patient notification and wide-spread testing as a means to limit the spread of AIDS. Such programs will be ineffective without being coupled with strict confidentiality and anti-discrimination provisions.

I am also encouraged by their understanding that the AIDS crisis and the drug crisis are intertwined. We will be unable to stop the spread of AIDS if we do not stop the spread of drug abuse.

X The Commission identified the problems confronting our scientific and medical communities in the search for a cure, vaccine and treatment of those with the disease. The Commission's recommendations to make these efforts more effective should be given the highest priority.

It is our duty to do all we can, not only to find a cure and a vaccine, but also to make sure we never create a climate in America where friend turns against friend, where countrymen turn against countrymen.

#

Speeches - AIDS

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS FOR
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 1988

I'd like to begin with three stories, three episodes from my experience as Vice President, which, like snapshots in an album, tell a larger story, in this case, the story of our vision of American foreign policy, its management and its purpose.

The first takes place in Vienna, Austria, in 1983, the last stop in a trip that had taken me to the capitals of Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Romania, behind what we used to so descriptively call the "Iron Curtain." In a speech at the Ceremony Hall of the Hofburg, I spoke of the unnatural division of Europe, of the wall that cuts like a scar through the heart of that continent, doing violence not only to the people held captive behind it, but to all norms of human decency.

I said that we could "accept no legal division of Europe," that we would make no accommodation with such a profound moral wrong. To those who spoke of "realpolitik," we answered that the truest form of political realism is based on an abiding commitment to the American ideals of freedom and democracy, and that to forsake those ideals is to forsake America's purpose -- it is to forsake America itself. We would continue, I said, to hold all parties to the Yalta accords, guaranteeing free elections and self-determination for all the nations of Europe, East and West. In that speech, I also for the first time spelled out the United States policy of differentiation -- a pro-active policy to encourage the countries of the Eastern bloc to march to a different drummer, to begin to open up their closed societies and move toward independence from the Soviet line.

Picture two: Later that same year, Krefeld, West Germany. The car in which Chancellor Kohl and I are riding is attacked by demonstrators and the bus carrying our staff is stoned. The demonstrators are protesting the planned deployment of Pershing INF missiles in Europe. Luckily, no one was hurt, and we got away with only a few broken windows and some shaken staff members. We could not be so certain at the time that the NATO alliance would escape equally intact.

In response to the unilateral escalation posed at the introduction of Soviet SS-20s in Eastern Europe, the allies had agreed on a two-track policy of negotiations backed up by deployment. But the Soviets had their own two-track approach -- stall the negotiations while exerting all the political leverage at their command to split the alliance and prevent us from deploying. It seemed that hardly a month went by without a major demonstration mobilized in some European capital against the American missiles. The Greens in Germany, the Labor Party in England, various parties in the Low Countries and Denmark, as well as some in this country, exerted tremendous political pressure for a "freeze" that would have locked in the Soviet advantage and doomed the INF negotiations to futility. The Soviets had 1000 warheads deployed versus the West. The West had 0 weapons deployed versus the East.

The Soviet game plan seemed to be working: The Europeans were feeling the heat, less and less sure they could withstand the political fallout of deployment. They had to be convinced of America's reliability, that we were committed to deployment and prepared to carry it out. They couldn't afford to take the chance that we might pull the rug out from under them, as the previous Administration had when it cancelled the neutron bomb. That was the job I was in Europe to do.

When we returned, I was a bit surprised to receive some praise from an unaccustomed source -- an editorial in The Washington Post proclaimed, "George does it." The Secretary of State, of course, also played an instrumental role. What did it, in fact, was the President's determination and the steadfast commitment of the entire Administration. The allies, assured of that commitment, carried out deployment on schedule. The Soviets would eventually abandon the tactics of stalling and intimidation -- and together we would sign the first treaty ever, not only to reduce, but completely eliminate an entire class of nuclear missiles.

Picture three: San Salvador, 1983, the residence of President Magana, the sounds of war audible in the distance. From the balcony of his heavily guarded home, one could see the mountains where the Salvadoran army had recently engaged the guerrillas in heavy fighting.

Shortly before, in two elections, the people of El Salvador had braved communist bullets and death threats to come to the polls in record numbers and vote overwhelmingly for democracy -- now that democracy was in grave jeopardy. The communist Sandinista government in Nicaragua, with the help of the Cubans, was stepping up its supply of arms to the communists in El Salvador. As left-wing terrorism intensified, the right-wing responded with a resurgence of death-squad activity, and because it seemed that some members of the military might be implicated, Congress threatened to cut off aid to the fragile new democracy.

Without U.S. aid, the fate of El Salvador was clear -- a brief, bloody interval of mounting violence on the left and right, before the torn and battered country fell into the permanent grip of the Soviet-Cuban camp, another Nicaragua on the American mainland.

In President Managua's house, I spoke to leaders of the government and military. The objective of our Administration was to explain in no uncertain terms that they had to get their own house in order, that either the death squads ceased, or American aid would. It was their choice.

Reassured of America's commitment, the democratic forces in El Salvador were strengthened, the violent right was in large measure suppressed, and Congress passed aid.

A new era was launched for El Salvador, and Napoleon Duarte, now suffering from cancer, led the way. I went to visit him in the hospital the other day, and I thought of the dramatic progress for democracy that had been made in El Salvador; and I wondered if the world would ever give this noble and heroic man the credit he deserves.

I describe these three episodes because running through each of them is a constant theme -- the necessity of American might, commitment and resolve. They are three case histories in the annals of peace through strength, illustrations of how America in the last eight years has dramatically turned in our favor what has sometimes been called the "correlation of forces," so that today the freedom that was once in retreat around the world is now on the advance.

We should never forget the crisis of confidence created by American weakness the late 70s. A vacillating foreign policy that seemed to have lost its moral bearings won the contempt of our enemies and friends alike. As Congress consistently sacrificed our military preparedness for domestic spending programs, our armed forces became dangerously weak. I won't recite the by-now familiar litany of planes that couldn't fly for want of spare parts, ships that couldn't leave port for want of fuel, the morale among servicemen that seemed to have bottomed out.

While the Soviets continued their military buildup, surpassing us in many critical areas, crucial weapons systems in this country were cancelled, or put on hold. Arms control negotiations did little to slow the Soviet escalation -- some said it only codified the existing imbalance. After years of negotiations, SALT II was thrown out by Congress.

As America's commitment to protect freedom around the world waned, tyranny advanced. The Soviets saw their opportunity and they seized it: in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cambodia, South Yemen, Ethiopia, and Angola. Our response -- to talk of withdrawing American troops from South Korea. It seemed as if America was willfully abdicating its role as a global power and protector of the free world.

The waning of American power didn't make the world safer, but more dangerous. It didn't slow the arms race, only led the Soviets to believe they could win it.

We came into office in 1981 with a mandate to rebuild our military. We sped up the production lines on major new weapons systems such as the B-1 bomber, and we made it clear that the only position we would negotiate from a position of strength.

Yes, our military build-up was costly, but how much greater would have been the cost if we had allowed the neglect of our armed forces to continue -- cost not measured in dollars but in the permanent crippling of American might. It should not be forgotten that we faced a crisis situation when we came into office in 1981 -- we had to act quickly and decisively.

It is in this light that I want to take a moment to discuss the procurement scandals involving Congress, the Pentagon and the defense industry. When the accusations were first made public last week, I expressed my thoughts in no uncertain terms: This could be worse, by far, than a common case of corruption. If the news stories are true, the accused have done more than steal from the public treasury, they have undermined America's security and broken faith with the American people. They have also done millions of patriotic and dedicated men and women who are in our nation's defense industry a serious disservice. They will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law, and, if guilty, we will throw the book at them. We can not tolerate lawlessness, in the Congress, in the Pentagon, or on the streets.

-more-

The defense industry has a responsibility here, as well. They must clean house. We have a right to expect those doing business with the United States government to hold their employees to the highest ethical standards.

There is also a separate but in some ways more costly problem that must be addressed. The Packard Commission described it as one of overcomplicated organization and rigid procedure. Far more defense money was lost to the heavy hand of bureaucracy, the commission noted, than to fraud or corruption.

Their recommendation: strip away the layers of red tape and bureaucracy and establish short, unambiguous lines of authority. Congress, said the Commission, must cooperate in simplifying the system and streamlining the acquisition process.

Following the report by the Commission, I began, as head of the President's Task Force on Regulatory Relief, to pursue many of the commission's procurement recommendations -- starting a program to cut the paperwork, regulations, red tape, and bureaucracy that complicate the contracting process. For example, having the Pentagon buy commercial products "off the shelf," where possible, instead of more expensive custom-made items; contracting out commercial services to the private sector; and starting a demonstration program to cut red tape in research grants.

The first reaction in Congress to the scandals -- to increase the regulatory bureaucracy at Defense -- though understandable, will only add to the complexity and worsen the problem. The answer is to reduce, cut and simplify, including staff and executive overhead. We should commit ourselves to carrying out the Packard Commission proposals, and the executive should develop a new compact with Congress -- to take the patronage and pork out of defense.

Let me be clear: we may reform the system, but it's unlikely we'll ever completely reform human nature. Even if every one of Dave Packard's recommendations were implemented tomorrow, it would not eliminate human greed. That is why we must be constantly vigilant, bring in the best people, and hold them to the highest standards.

The greatest tragedy would be if the conduct of a few individuals were to be used to undermine the consensus on rebuilding America's strength -- for that strength has not only made the world a safer place for freedom, it has opened up new possibilities that few dared ever to hope for 8 years ago.

Today we watch with guarded optimism the changes being talked about in the Soviet Union. Yes, much is still just that, talk, but in a totalitarian society talk can be revolutionary.

The steel door has opened a crack and the fresh air of freedom is beginning to seep through -- will that door slam shut again, as it has in the past, or open up to a new age of hope, a new age in which peace is predicted upon its only true and lasting basis, the mutual interests and interdependence of free societies.

We can't know that now -- but we can know that the promise of glasnost, of perestroika, didn't take place in a vacuum, but in the context of reinvigorated American strength. During the late seventies, at the ebb tide of American power, it must have seemed to the Soviets that they could win the world competition. But I suspect that dream rapidly faded as America pulled out of the malaise economy of the seventies and into the entrepreneurial growth economy of the eighties; as we rebuilt our military and met Soviet aggression and subversion around the world with a renewed resolve to support those fighting for their freedom and the cause of human liberty.

It is this support that has enabled the Afghan Resistance to force the Soviet Union to pull its army out of Afghanistan. The USSR says its withdrawal stems from a new outlook on regional disputes. Perhaps this will be so, but only if strong support for freedom around the world is sustained. Where our support and our leadership has been strong -- as in Afghanistan and the Gulf and Salvador -- our allies join us, as do regional states, and the cause of freedom triumphs. Where it is not -- look at Nicaragua -- the opposite is true.

With SDI, we focused the competition on our great strength, and the Soviets great weakness, technology. Even though the Soviets have spent some \$200 billion on their own strategic defenses, it was clear to them that if they couldn't convince us to abandon our program -- as they tried to do in Reykjavik -- they would never win the technological competition.

My point is that it was eight years of American strength that confronted the Soviet Union with the true costs of aggression and necessity of reform. That is why the Moscow summit was such a fitting capstone to the President's career, for the hope of that summit built on eight years of moral determination and hard work rebuilding American might.

But this said, we must remember, the cold war is not over. We must be bold enough to seize the opportunity of change, but at the same time prepared for, as one pundit titled his column, "The Protracted Conflict." We must remember that America's military strength is not simply a line-item in our budget, it is the cost of the defense of our freedom.

For most of the post-war era, a bi-partisan consensus on deterrence has kept our armed forces strong and kept that freedom secure -- now is not the time to risk it with radical change. We do not fear American power. We have no wish to curtail it. Abraham Lincoln spoke of this country as "the last, best hope" of mankind on earth -- and in a dangerous world, military might is the foundation upon which that hope rests. As long as there is danger in the world, that long America must remain strong -- a challenge to the tyrants, a powerful, shining light of hope to the oppressed and down-trodden who yearn to breathe free.

Thank you very much and God bless you.

#

Angola

George Bush for President

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Thursday, June 30, 1988

CONTACT: Alixe Glen
202/842-1988

STATEMENT BY VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
ON DR. JONAS SAVIMBI
WASHINGTON, D.C.
THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1988

Jonas Savimbi is a true patriot, and during his visit with me this morning, I was pleased to once again reaffirm my strong support for his struggle and the struggle of UNITA to rid Angola of communism. Jonas Savimbi's courage and tenacity are paying off, much to the chagrin of his critics, who are unwilling to acknowledge that Angola is moving toward political reconciliation.

Negotiations on the Angolan situation are now underway among the United States, Cuba, and Angola, with the Soviets also playing a role. It was Jonas Savimbi's bravery and determination, and the commitment of this Administration to his efforts, that have brought about those negotiations and the possibility of reconciliation and freedom in Angola.

I would like to see reconciliation which results in:

- The pull-out of Cuban troops
- The pulling back of South African forces, and,
- The granting of independence to Namibia.

You don't change a winning strategy -- a cut off of support of Dr. Savimbi, as suggested by the Democrats would be an immoral sell-out of a loyal friend, and a foreign policy disaster.

† † †

Dukakis

George Bush for President

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Friday, July 8, 1988

Contact: Alixe Glen
202/842-1988

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS FOR
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
VICTORY '88
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
FRIDAY, JULY 8, 1988

The choice our nation will have to make this November is as profound as any we have ever faced. It is a choice not just between two different styles of government, but between basic values and principles, between two fundamentally opposed views of what America is and what America should be.

Low tax rates, growth and opportunity; new ideas and the courage to take them on; a belief in American might and faith in America's destiny as leader of the free world -- these are the hallmarks of what we stand for, and they are what divides us so profoundly from our opponents.

They are values we share with increasingly large numbers of rank-and-file Democrats -- in this region and across the country. But it's a different matter when it comes to the two surviving contenders for the Democratic nomination.

Take their stand on taxes. In an attempt to cover a rapidly growing budget deficit in Massachusetts, brought on by excessive government spending, the Democratic Governor of Massachusetts pushed through a \$115 million tax hike for his state. And he says he wants to do for the nation what he's done for Massachusetts.

When he announced the tax hike, the Governor said it represented a "sharp contrast" with this Administration. I couldn't agree more. Because I believe it was our tax cuts that fired this economic expansion -- the longest peace-time expansion in American history. It was our tax cuts that helped create 17 million new jobs -- averaging over 200,000 new jobs each month. And the new economic figures released today show unemployment dropped to the lowest rate since 1974. It was tax cuts and low inflation that helped bring down interest rates, increase the income of the American family, and ignite an entrepreneurial renaissance the likes of which this world has never seen.

To raise taxes now would strike at the heart of our economic expansion and put at risk millions of the new jobs we're creating. Raising taxes now would do nothing to cure the deficit, because every time Congress raises taxes, Congress just spends more of the taxpayers money. The Governor says he wouldn't raise taxes as a first resort, but when confronted with a budget mess in his own state, he did just that.

Well, here's my position. I'm not going to say I won't raise taxes as a first resort. I won't raise your taxes, period.

Personally, I don't think the American people want to risk 8 years of peace and prosperity by raising taxes.

Let's get this appalling deficit down, but let's do it by holding the line on spending and by getting the President the line-item veto.

When it comes to foreign policy, our differences couldn't be more profound. My opponent brought a suit to prevent the President from deploying a state's national guard overseas without the consent of the Governor. You can't run a foreign policy if 50 state Governors each have the right to veto a Presidential decision. You might as well invite the mayors in, too, and have a real party.

Thank heavens, the courts rejected the case and didn't hamstring the President's ability to defend our nation. Here's my view: The national guard is part of the national defense -- and that's the President's primary Constitutional responsibility. I believe, as George Washington did, that America must speak to the world with a single voice. I believe in a strong executive who can carry out a strong, consistent foreign policy that protects America's interests around the globe -- and that's the kind of President I'll be.

Wouldn't it be nice to return to the days when partisanship stopped at the water's edge and we had a strong, bi-partisan foreign policy.

On another subject, "Multi-lateralism" seems to be my opponents answer to Soviet aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

Well, I was Ambassador to the U.N., so I've had some experience with multi-lateral organizations. They have their good points, and they do a lot of good in some areas; but believe me, they have their bad points, too. Let me just say that the United States can never subjugate its vital national security interests to multi-lateral institutions. America shouldn't sacrifice one ounce of sovereignty to any organization.

The fact is, the Governor and I have very basic disagreements about the conduct of American foreign policy. He supported a "freeze" that would have locked in the Soviet nuclear advantage in Europe and doomed the INF negotiations to utter futility. I have opposed the freeze. Now he's proposing to cut the MX, Midgetman, and SDI -- leaving the continental United States with an aging and increasingly obsolete deterrent.

I support the policy of deterrence that has kept the peace for 40 years. I support strategic modernization. I support MX and Midgetman -- and I support the Strategic Defense Initiative because it strengthens deterrence and will make the world a safer place for our children.

In negotiating START we are dealing with the security of the continental United States -- pre-emptive concessions are no way to bargain with the Soviets.

We have a very different approach -- we believe in negotiating from a position of strength. That's how we got the Soviets to begin withdrawing from Afghanistan. That's how we got the historic INF treaty that completely eliminates an entire class of nuclear weapons, and that's how we'll negotiate START.

Perhaps nothing better illustrates the fundamental distinctions between two parties than our attitude toward crime. My opponent opposes the death penalty. I support the death penalty for people who murder police officers in the line of duty and for drug kingpins -- those who poison our children and deal in death deserve society's strongest sanction.

The Governor of Massachusetts has called himself, and I quote, a "card-carrying member of the ACLU." I'm not, and never will be.

There's one very simple way to tell where the parties stand on crime: Judge us by the judges we've appointed.

The American people know that the man they elect President will very possibly appoint two or three judges to the Supreme Court, where they'll sit well into the next century. The decision the American people make this fall will shape the character of our courts not just for the next four years, but for a generation to come.

I will appoint judges that will interpret the Constitution, not legislate from the bench. I will appoint judges who don't reserve all their sympathy for criminals -- who understand that victims have rights to.

But there couldn't be a better symbol of my deep disagreement with the Governor than his veto of the "Pledge of Allegiance." I would have signed that bill, because I think our teachers should say the Pledge of Allegiance.

I've had few more thrilling experiences in my life than this Fourth of July, when I went to St. Louis to meet 250 new citizens sworn in that day, and together we recited the Pledge of Allegiance. There we all were: Poles, Thais, Vietnamese, Mexicans, Chinese; people from around the world.

The Pledge is a way for all of us to remind ourselves of our unique responsibility as Americans: that this is "one nation, under God," and we must always strive to make ourselves worthy of Him; that it is our mission to stand for "Liberty and Justice" in an all-too-troubled world.

The Pledge is one way we relearn the fundamental lesson of what America is and should always be -- a shining light of freedom, a refuge for the oppressed and down-trodden yearning to breathe free.

That is why it is our duty, not just to our children, but to all the children of the human race, to keep America strong, prosperous and free -- to keep the fire of the American dream burning brightly in our hearts, so that we can share it with all the world.

Thank you all very much and God bless you.

* * * *

George Bush for President

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Friday, July 8, 1988

Contact: Alixe Glen
202/842-1988

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS FOR
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
VICTORY '88
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
FRIDAY, JULY 8, 1988

The choice our nation will have to make this November is as profound as any we have ever faced. It is a choice not just between two different styles of government, but between basic values and principles, between two fundamentally opposed views of what America is and what America should be.

Low tax rates, growth and opportunity; new ideas and the courage to take them on; a belief in American might and faith in America's destiny as leader of the free world -- these are the hallmarks of what we stand for, and they are what divides us so profoundly from our opponents.

They are values we share with increasingly large numbers of rank-and-file Democrats -- in this region and across the country. But it's a different matter when it comes to the two surviving contenders for the Democratic nomination.

Take their stand on taxes. In an attempt to cover a rapidly growing budget deficit in Massachusetts, brought on by excessive government spending, the Democratic Governor of Massachusetts pushed through a \$115 million tax hike for his state. And he says he wants to do for the nation what he's done for Massachusetts.

When he announced the tax hike, the Governor said it represented a "sharp contrast" with this Administration. I couldn't agree more. Because I believe it was our tax cuts that fired this economic expansion -- the longest peace-time expansion in American history. It was our tax cuts that helped create 17 million new jobs -- averaging over 200,000 new jobs each month. And the new economic figures released today show unemployment dropped to the lowest rate since 1974. It was tax cuts and low inflation that helped bring down interest rates, increase the income of the American family, and ignite an entrepreneurial renaissance the likes of which this world has never seen.

To raise taxes now would strike at the heart of our economic expansion and put at risk millions of the new jobs we're creating. Raising taxes now would do nothing to cure the deficit, because every time Congress raises taxes, Congress just spends more of the taxpayers money. The Governor says he wouldn't raise taxes as a first resort, but when confronted with a budget mess in his own state, he did just that.

Well, here's my position. I'm not going to say I won't raise taxes as a first resort. I won't raise your taxes, period.

Personally, I don't think the American people want to risk 8 years of peace and prosperity by raising taxes.

Let's get this appalling deficit down, but let's do it by holding the line on spending and by getting the President the line-item veto.

When it comes to foreign policy, our differences couldn't be more profound. My opponent brought a suit to prevent the President from deploying a state's national guard overseas without the consent of the Governor. You can't run a foreign policy if 50 state Governors each have the right to veto a Presidential decision. You might as well invite the mayors in, too, and have a real party.

Thank heavens, the courts rejected the case and didn't hamstring the President's ability to defend our nation. Here's my view: The national guard is part of the national defense -- and that's the President's primary Constitutional responsibility. I believe, as George Washington did, that America must speak to the world with a single voice. I believe in a strong executive who can carry out a strong, consistent foreign policy that protects America's interests around the globe -- and that's the kind of President I'll be.

Wouldn't it be nice to return to the days when partisanship stopped at the water's edge and we had a strong, bi-partisan foreign policy.

On another subject, "Multi-lateralism" seems to be my opponents answer to Soviet aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

Well, I was Ambassador to the U.N., so I've had some experience with multi-lateral organizations. They have their good points, and they do a lot of good in some areas; but believe me, they have their bad points, too. Let me just say that the United States can never subjugate its vital national security interests to multi-lateral institutions. America shouldn't sacrifice one ounce of sovereignty to any organization.

The fact is, the Governor and I have very basic disagreements about the conduct of American foreign policy. He supported a "freeze" that would have locked in the Soviet nuclear advantage in Europe and doomed the INF negotiations to utter futility. I have opposed the freeze. Now he's proposing to cut the MX, Midgetman, and SDI -- leaving the continental United States with an aging and increasingly obsolete deterrent.

I support the policy of deterrence that has kept the peace for 40 years. I support strategic modernization. I support MX and Midgetman -- and I support the Strategic Defense Initiative because it strengthens deterrence and will make the world a safer place for our children.

In negotiating START we are dealing with the security of the continental United States -- pre-emptive concessions are no way to bargain with the Soviets.

We have a very different approach -- we believe in negotiating from a position of strength. That's how we got the Soviets to begin withdrawing from Afghanistan. That's how we got the historic INF treaty that completely eliminates an entire class of nuclear weapons, and that's how we'll negotiate START.

Perhaps nothing better illustrates the fundamental distinctions between two parties than our attitude toward crime. My opponent opposes the death penalty. I support the death penalty for people who murder police officers in the line of duty and for drug kingpins -- those who poison our children and deal in death deserve society's strongest sanction.

The Governor of Massachusetts has called himself, and I quote, a "card-carrying member of the ACLU." I'm not, and never will be.

There's one very simple way to tell where the parties stand on crime: Judge us by the judges we've appointed.

The American people know that the man they elect President will very possibly appoint two or three judges to the Supreme Court, where they'll sit well into the next century. The decision the American people make this fall will shape the character of our courts not just for the next four years, but for a generation to come.

I will appoint judges that will interpret the Constitution, not legislate from the bench. I will appoint judges who don't reserve all their sympathy for criminals -- who understand that victims have rights to.

But there couldn't be a better symbol of my deep disagreement with the Governor than his veto of the "Pledge of Allegiance." I would have signed that bill, because I think our teachers should say the Pledge of Allegiance.

I've had few more thrilling experiences in my life than this Fourth of July, when I went to St. Louis to meet 250 new citizens sworn in that day, and together we recited the Pledge of Allegiance. There we all were: Poles, Thais, Vietnamese, Mexicans, Chinese; people from around the world.

The Pledge is a way for all of us to remind ourselves of our unique responsibility as Americans: that this is "one nation, under God," and we must always strive to make ourselves worthy of Him; that it is our mission to stand for "Liberty and Justice" in an all-too-troubled world.

The Pledge is one way we relearn the fundamental lesson of what America is and should always be -- a shining light of freedom, a refuge for the oppressed and down-trodden yearning to breathe free.

That is why it is our duty, not just to our children, but to all the children of the human race, to keep America strong, prosperous and free -- to keep the fire of the American dream burning brightly in our hearts, so that we can share it with all the world.

Thank you all very much and God bless you.

* * * *

Civil Rights

George Bush for President

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Tuesday, July 12, 1988

Contact: Alixe Glen
202/842-1988

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
79TH ANNUAL CONVENTION
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
TUESDAY, JULY 12, 1988

It's an honor for me to be here today, and an important moment for me personally. Speaking here represents both a challenge and an opportunity. Before you go forward from this hall and carry out the convention theme of "Vote: Be Heard," I want to "be heard" because I do not intend to concede the vote of any American.

Dr. Martin Luther King once said, "The most important walk we can take is that short walk to the ballot box," and that is no less true today. For nearly 80 years, the NAACP has fought for the right to make that walk, going back to the case of Guinn v. United States in 1910.

You have led the way toward greater justice and equality for all Americans -- from W.E.B. DuBois and the Niagara Movement to Thurgood Marshall and the majestic triumph of Brown v. Board of Education; from the courage of Rosa Parks in the front of the bus to the tragic murder of Medgar Evers just 25 years ago -- with strong and determined leaders like Roy Wilkins and Benjamin Hooks.

Yours is a proud history, but the name of my autobiography is Looking Forward, and that is what I intend to do today. I'm a candidate for President now. I'm not in the on-deck circle any more, I'm at the plate. And let me just say: It's a new day.

I am here to tell you who I, George Bush, am, and where I want to take this country.

I will have a positive civil rights agenda. I guarantee you, I will be personally involved in protecting the civil rights of all Americans. This effort will be at the top of the agenda of my attorney general, and he or she will be directly accountable to me for results.

To me, this is not just a matter of social policy, but of fundamental right -- the inherent equality of all men and women. Who we are as a people can be measured by how we uphold and

defend the rights of all. And it is our willingness to respect and uphold these rights -- even when it is difficult -- that sets America apart from every other nation on Earth.

As I said nine months ago when I announced my candidacy for President, I intend to stand for a new harmony among the races. We are on a journey to a new century, and we must finally leave the tired old baggage of bigotry behind us. Wherever racism rears its ugly head -- Howard Beach, Forsyth County, wherever -- we must be there to cut it off.

I intend to attract to government and to the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, the broadest base of Americans possible. I will have minority men and women of excellence as full-scale partners in my Administration.

Ben Hooks was at my house last month, along with several other black leaders to give me their counsel and advice. I told them then, and I tell you today, they will always be welcome at my house, even when my house is your house -- the White House.

The challenge we face in the years ahead is to go beyond the notion of merely upholding and enforcing the law -- to go beyond the protection of rights to the creation of opportunity.

For the past seven and a half years this Administration has been building a record of economic success -- the longest peacetime economic expansion we have ever enjoyed. Unemployment is now at its lowest level in 14 years. Since November 1982, we've created more than 17 million new jobs, and more Americans are at work today than ever before.

That economic growth means more opportunity for all Americans. Those 17 million jobs have put more than \$250 billion a year in the hands of those who were unemployed. The jobless rate for black teenagers is lower than it's been since 1973.

If we continue our rate of job creation, we will create 30 million new jobs in the next eight years -- more than \$450 billion in additional annual income. And that's my goal -- 30 million new jobs.

In recent years, we've seen explosive growth in the black middle class. A third of all black families today earn more than \$25,000 a year.

But there's much more left to be done. We've cut the poverty rate below where it was when we took office, but it's still too high. Some people are so far down, they can't see or feel the change. We must do better. We must help those who are trapped in poverty break out and break free.

You know the numbers as well as I do. Black families are three times as likely to be poor. Forty-three per cent of them are headed by single mothers. Nearly half of all black children are born into poverty. Black teenagers are twice as likely to become pregnant and twice as likely to drop out of school.

The answer to these problems involves the government, but not just the government. The answer also lies in the values that are passed on from generation to generation -- values like family, faith, education, the importance of work.

There are neighborhoods that have tackled their problems and reduced teen pregnancies, stopped gang members from killing each other, and forced out the drug dealers. They have done it by working together, by reasserting moral authority over their children, and by instilling in them discipline and respect -- for themselves and others. We can learn from them.

Government functions best as a catalyst, not a cure. We need a smarter, more effective government, not a bigger one.

I am a practical man; I like what works. Policies of opening up economic growth and opportunity can work and will work because they help people help themselves.

A Bush administration will begin with education, because education is the key to opportunity. In the NAACP you've recognized this with your program, "Back to School/Stay in School," and your theme, "Knowledge is Power."

As W.E.B. DuBois once wrote, "Education and work are the levers to uplift a people. Work alone will not do it unless inspired by the right ideals and guided by intelligence."

Give any American kid an equal place at the starting line, and just watch what that kid can do. But too many kids are denied that equal chance, particularly if they are black and poor.

Head Start helps kids get that equal place at the starting line. It's a federal program that works. But it doesn't reach all the kids it should.

If the child is lost, so is the adult -- and paying for the damage is much more expensive than preventing it. Every dollar you spend in preschool, you get back as much as seven times. I pledge to you today: In my first budget, I will ask that funding for Head Start be increased sharply.

We should also provide more assistance to the disadvantaged with better targeting of federal education funds through Chapter I. We can reach more than 80 percent of the black children in this country by targeting just four percent of the school districts.

I have also proposed a "merit schools" program that would provide \$500 million a year to reward significant improvement by schools that primarily serve disadvantaged students.

And we should undertake a major assault on illiteracy. Every kid in America should be able to read and write English.

Can we afford it? Well, consider this: The chairman of Xerox estimates that businesses spend \$25 billion each year to train workers who "can't read, can't write, and can't count." We can't afford not to do better.

The challenge of the future will not be finding jobs for our people -- it will be finding people for our jobs. Our world is evolving rapidly into a high-tech, information-based workplace that demands a good education.

In the years ahead, three out of four new jobs will require at least a high school education. Young people who turn their backs on school not only lose their place at the starting line, they take themselves out of the game, and our whole society suffers. The best investment we can make is in our children.

We must also encourage the teaching of values in our schools -- because too often, in too many families, those values aren't being passed on at home. We must teach kids the difference between right and wrong. We must teach them how to say no to drugs and no to teenage pregnancy. We must stop the cycle of babies having babies. And we must emphasize the importance of family and work and education.

Because if they don't understand these things, if they don't share these values, how will they ever have the strength to say no to the drug dealer who seduces them with quick and easy money? No matter how many jobs we create, we can't compete with that pay scale.

These drug dealers -- these urban terrorists -- are poisoning our children. We should throw them in jail and keep them there. Every child -- every family -- should have the opportunity to grow up in a safe and peaceful neighborhood. Our country was founded to secure the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that should be the first responsibility of our government.

In some schools, policemen patrol lunchrooms. Ambulance services park outside school yards, knowing they will be called. Children carry knives and guns as if they were pocket combs. Teachers worry more about their lives than about their lessons.

We can do better. We can encourage programs that work -- programs like Cities in Schools; programs like the ones at Ivy Leaf in Philadelphia, Orangeburg-Wilkinson High School in South

Carolina, George Washington Prep in L.A. These are schools that achieve more because they demand more of their students -- more academically, and more in the way of discipline.

Providing education and training and teaching self-responsibility are the first steps to getting the next generation out of poverty, to breaking the cycle of dependency.

For those who can not "do" for themselves, society must respond -- in a generous, adequate way. And where the family is divided, we must insist that the absent parent carry a fair share of the load. But we also need to bring people who can care for themselves into the mainstream, not because we want to save money, but because it is morally right, and because it works.

Three key principles should guide our efforts on welfare reform: We should seek to keep families together, not split them apart; move recipients from dependence to independence -- off welfare and into the world of work; and involve the private sector.

The welfare reform bill that passed the Senate reflects these principles, and I urge Congress to take prompt action on these long-overdue reforms.

As President, I also will seek decent, affordable housing for all Americans. In this context, let me commend the action the House took last month to strengthen enforcement of the open housing law, a law I voted for when I was in Congress 20 years ago.

I will work toward policies to enable every American to have the opportunity to own or manage their own home, to have a piece of the American dream. The legislation passed earlier this year -- allowing public housing residents to manage or buy their own projects -- is a dramatic step in the right direction.

It is just one of the steps we should take to help bring black Americans and other minorities more fully into the free enterprise system -- steps we should take not just because they are right, but because it's in the best interest of America to help economically empower everyone.

I want to help more black Americans and other minorities experience the pride and dignity of ownership, of building something in the private sector.

It's been nearly 20 years since the Office of Minority Business Enterprise was created at the Commerce Department. In the years ahead, I aim to restore and reinvigorate the vision behind OMBE.

Welfare

Housing

OMBE

Government can't do it alone. But government certainly can lead in this area. Government can work with the private sector to provide technical assistance, loan guarantees, and new capital sources.

A Bush Administration will help build the bridge of capitalism and entrepreneurship to the black community.

The first responsibility of any President is to work for peace in the world and prosperity at home, and so it will be for me. But I offer you as well my strong commitment to do whatever it takes to ensure the full participation of all Americans in our economy and our government.

To reach these goals, I will need your help. I know I will get your constructive criticism. I promise you, you will be called upon, and you will be heard. You will be partners in my Presidency. By working together -- and only by working together -- we can finally be one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Let this be our legacy -- for our children and our children's children -- so that they might, in the words of Isaiah, "mount up with wings like eagles... run and not be weary... walk and not faint."

Thank you, and God bless you all.

#

George Bush for President

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Sunday, July 10, 1988

Contact: Alixe Glen
202/842-1988

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS FOR
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
LITHUANIAN FESTIVAL
KENNEBUNKPORT, MAINE
SUNDAY, JULY 10, 1988

Thank you... Thank you very much.

Today is a day to share the joys of your proud heritage. But it is also a day to rededicate ourselves to the dream of freedom returning once again to Lithuania.

It is 48 years now since the Soviet Union invaded your homeland and the other Baltic States. Tragically, many of you were forced to flee Soviet persecution; your children may never know the thrill of laughing and playing on Lithuanian soil. The United States has always condemned the violation of your national sovereignty, and in the years ahead we will never condone the forced occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union.

This is a time of change in the Soviet Union, and for the Lithuanian people, it is a time for hope.

There is hope because talk of nationalism is no longer merely whispered behind closed doors, it is shouted in the streets during the demonstrations that grow larger by the day.

There is hope because Soviet troops are now pulling out of Afghanistan.

But if this is a time for hope, it is not a time for complacency or weakness.

It is a time, I believe, to test whether the reforms are genuine. Does glasnost mean true openness? Does perestroika mean true reform? There is no question that change has taken place in the Soviet Union, and we welcome that, but true reform will mean:

The release of Petras Grazulis, and the other Lithuanian prisoners of conscience,

The re-opening of the Vilnius Cathedral, the cradle of Lithuanian Christianity,

Permitting the Holy Father to share his faith with his followers in Lithuania,

And, restoring the birthright of freedom to the Lithuanian people.

The Soviet leaders like to say what happens inside their walls is an "internal matter."

Not so -- Soviet compliance with international agreements on human rights is an essential element in improving relations between our two countries.

We Americans look upon freedom as a gift -- a gift from God. We treasure freedom. Accepting the suppression of the most fundamental human freedoms would be turning our backs on our own values and heritage. Only the United States is strong enough and committed enough to stand up for the freedoms of oppressed people all over the world.

Only the United States cares enough. Last Monday, July 4, I was in St. Louis to lead 250 brand-new American citizens in saying the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

There were men and women and children from around the world -- Chinese... Hispanics... Africans... Vietnamese... East Europeans. During the ceremony, I held a boy from Somalia in my arms. And I could tell how he felt because my right hand was resting on his chest, directly above his heartbeat. Let me tell you: That little guy was excited.

As we said the Pledge of Allegiance together, I looked around and saw two things -- smiles... and tears. But I knew both meant the same thing -- freedom.

As Lithuanians, you are proud people with a proud heritage, who followed the beacon of freedom to these New England shores. As Americans, you are citizens of the freest, the fairest, the most generous and decent nation on the face of the earth. Let us pray that someday the torch of true liberty will pass to Lithuania.

Thank you. God bless you.

. # # # #

George Bush for President

IMMEDIATE RELEASE
JULY 24, 1988

CONTACT: SHEILA TATE
202/842-1988

FACT SHEET VICE PRESIDENT BUSH REMARKS TO NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS OF THE UNITED STATES

Today, Vice President George Bush discussed his comprehensive proposal for child care.

PRINCIPLES

George Bush proposed a comprehensive child care strategy embodying the following principles:

Help to parents, not bureaucracies.

Child care is a decision every parent must make, and our role, at the federal level, is to support parents' responsibility and authority, and to improve parents' choices.

Parents' child care needs and preferences are complex. There is not a one-size-fits-all solution as some in Congress have proposed.

Bush opposes a federal day care bureaucracy with federal standard setting. He shares the views of the mother who wrote in the Washington Post last Sunday, who said... "we believe, we know better than anyone else -- the state, the county, the federal government -- what our children need to thrive."

Parents can best ensure quality when they have the broadest range of choices from which to choose. Some parents work during the day or at night, swing-shift or part-time. They want caregivers who are neighbors or relatives, care at school or at church. They want caregivers who share their values. The improvement of every child's opportunities is our goal.

Help to low-income working families is our first priority.

These families share the goals we all do -- standing on their own, providing for their families, a better life for their children than for themselves. Yet these families face far larger hurdles to reach those dreams.

Leadership is the key to improving affordable, quality child care.

The changes in our families and our workforce require a fitting response from government, our educational system, and employers. We have changed dramatically over the last fifteen years and our institutions must keep pace.

COSTS AND FEATURES OF THE BUSH FOUR POINT PLAN ON CHILD CARE

George Bush outlined a specific four-point program for child care.

NEW CHILDREN'S TAX CREDIT

Cost: \$1.5 billion

George Bush proposed creation of the "Children's Tax Credit," a new refundable tax credit of up to \$1000 per child under age 4, to recognize the increased costs of families with children. Implementation could be tied to the earned income tax credit. The tax credit would phase out as income rises.

Because low-income working couples face the greatest needs, families with very low incomes would be eligible immediately. To accommodate budget goals, this new tax credit would be phased in from very low income levels in annual household income to \$16,000 to \$20,000 over the first four years; it would be phased higher as budgetary goals allow.

REFUNDABLE DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT

Cost: \$.4 billion

George Bush proposed to maintain the existing dependent care tax credit, and to take an additional important step to make it refundable. Too many low-income families go without the assistance we have made available to upper income families because they do not earn enough to pay taxes. A family could take the greater credit -- the Children's Tax Credit or the refundable dependent care credit.

CHILD CARE FOR EMPLOYEES

Cost: \$50 million

George Bush would initiate more employer sponsored day care, starting with the federal government as a model. He would see that every agency provided federally-sponsored child care to government employees.

Bush proposes expanding the role of employers by establishing a federal reinsurance revolving pool to reduce obstacles presented by lack of available liability insurance. He encourages employer sponsored child care, flexible work schedules and benefit plans which allow workers to choose the benefits they need. He indicated that employers must better demonstrate flexibility and sensitivity to family needs.

Employers have a major role in helping parents find needed child care, but Bush does not support give-aways of taxpayer dollars to get business to recognize what it already knows: that is must provide assistance for more and better child care. Workers demand it; productivity demands it; a business's bottom line demands it.

MORE CHOICES, BETTER INFORMATION

Cost: \$250 million

George Bush proposed additional resources to address specifically the needs of all working parents for a broader range of choices and higher quality child care. Many states and localities are addressing the needs of pre-school and after-school care, improving the quality and availability of care, but many more must catch up.

George Bush would authorize federal resources to provide seed money for new program designs in sick child care, and before- and after-school care, using educational facilities in innovative and productive ways. He proposed additional federal funds that would also be devoted to the following initiatives designed to expand the availability of day care alternatives:

- a.) Incentives would be given for school districts to create or expand programs for before- and after-school care, and for public/private community partnerships. Ideally, these programs would also have an educational component.
- b.) Employers would be encouraged to provide employer-sponsored child care, work schedules, and benefit plans.
- c.) Phase in funding to enable enrollment of all eligible 4 year olds in Head Start.
- d.) Instruct the Department of Labor to develop consumer education guidance and information and referral services.

Cost: \$2.2 billion

####

George Bush for President

IMMEDIATE RELEASE
JULY 24, 1988

CONTACT: SHEILA TATE
202/842-1988

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE
NATIONAL FED. OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
SUNDAY, JULY 24, 1988

Albuquerque represents something that I came to talk about:
change.

Incorporated less than 100 years ago, this city was not much more than a trading center for sheep ranchers. Less than four thousand people lived here. Compare that with today. In the last 25 years, Albuquerque's population has grown by 230 percent.

This city now contains many of the future-oriented characteristics that make communities successful in the changing American economy: a highly educated work force, a thriving foreign trade zone, and, perhaps most of all, an outstanding quality of life.

It's only fitting, then, that the BPW should have chosen Albuquerque as the site of this convention. For almost 70 years, you've been working for full participation, for equal opportunity, and for economic self-sufficiency for working women. But how the environment in which that work takes place has changed! Maybe BPW's founders wouldn't have predicted it in 1919 -- but today, working women are the backbone of the American economy.

As I travel across the country the next few months, I will focus on peace and prosperity. Today, I'd like to talk about America's growing prosperity from a different perspective... one that I believe many of you are especially concerned about. As you well know, the American work force has undergone a revolution in these past few decades, and the entry of women has been the principal feature of that revolution.

Your own testimony to the Republican Platform Committee said it best: "We are experiencing the greatest change in the American economy since the industrial revolution."

In determining how to adapt to the changes happening every day, there are two key questions. First, what forces are creating and driving change? And second, what principles, what values, shall guide our response?

Let's examine the answers to those two questions.

First, what is the nature of the change?

America, I'm proud to say, is in the midst of a period of economic growth unprecedented in postwar history. The great

American job creating machine has churned out 17 million new jobs since 1982 -- and they're good jobs. Eighty percent of those created last year were in higher-paying skilled categories where the average income was \$26,000.

And the job boom cuts across all categories. White employment up 2.4% a year -- black employment up 4.7% annually -- Hispanic employment up 6.8%. And two-thirds of all new jobs created since 1980 have gone to women.

From 1980 to 1985, the number of women-owned businesses increased by over 47%....income for women-owned businesses increased three times as fast as that for men-owned businesses.

So when we talk about the recovery, we're talking about an achievement we've all shared in.

The expanded role for women in the work force is dramatic. It is the single most important demographic change in the second half of the twentieth century. But, some things don't change. Women work for the same reasons men do: to support themselves and their families, and to seize the golden promise of opportunity.

It's clear, too, most women work due to economic necessity. 60% of the women in the civilian work force are providing the sole or critical support for their families. Many women choose to start their own businesses, and for the same reasons men do. And, this has not just been good for women. Our economy could not have grown as fast as it has without women. Moreover, when we look ahead, our economy will not be able to fill the jobs that will be created without the continued growing participation by women.

Whatever the reasons for the expanding role of women in the work force, the net effect is the same: increasingly, women and men must fill more than one role in our society. More and more Americans have both jobs and family competing for their time. And for growing numbers of Americans, "family" means not only children, but parents as well.

That brings us to my second question -- what values should guide us in meeting these new challenges? What are the principles upon which we can draw in designing a federal policy that responds -- with creativity and compassion -- to a changing world?

I believe there are several:

- first, and most important, is the concept of opportunity. The goal of federal policy in every area should be to give people the opportunity to make their lives more productive, happy and fulfilling.

Maybe we can't guarantee the result, but every American deserves an equal chance at the starting gate of life and help in overcoming hurdles.

- My second principle is that it is not enough for this generation to just worry about today; we have a responsibility as well to work for a better tomorrow. The way to do that is clear: we must invest in our children.

- My third principle is that government -- by itself -- will not solve America's problems and guarantee opportunity. You

understand. You've worked hard; you've fought and laughed; you've sacrificed and dreamed.

That's why we have worked hard in these last eight years to reduce the tax burden on average Americans. A typical American family now pays \$2,200 less in federal income tax than it would have under the Democrats.

And the burden has been reduced for low- and middle-income Americans. Those earning less than \$50,000 have seen their share of the nation's income tax burden drop by almost one-third, while those earning more than \$100,000 carry twice as much of the load as they did when we took office.

Some argue that my approach -- which quite frankly takes a mistrustful view of big government institutions -- lacks compassion. But what's more compassionate than rolling back the tide of joblessness to its lowest ebb in 14 years? Or saving a family from the ravages of 12% inflation or interest rates at 21%.

Some say that holding the line on taxes shows callous disregard for the needs of average, everyday Americans. But I've been all over this country, and I haven't met a working man or woman yet who thinks they're undertaxed.

The fact is that our policies of lower taxes and greater opportunity have resulted in the longest peacetime economic recovery in our history.

Democrats talk vaguely about "good jobs at good wages" -- but that's exactly what our policies have delivered.

Have we finished our work? No. Is economic opportunity sprouting in every single corner of America? No. Will we rest until it is? No. But do we really want to turn back to policies that didn't work? To high inflation, high interest rates, and high unemployment? No. No way.

But more remains to be done. I remember the green buttons that were worn not so long ago. "59 cents," they read, because that's how much women were paid for every dollar earned by a man.

Today women working full-time earn 70 cents for every dollar earned by men.

There is only one amount that women should earn for every dollar earned by a man: and that is one dollar.

Equal pay for equal work is not a slogan, not an opinion, not an interesting idea. It is a right. It's a right to be safeguarded by vigorously enforcing existing laws -- and that's something I have pledged to do.

One reason, perhaps the principal one, for the gap between women's pay men's pay is that, historically, women have been segregated in traditionally lower paying occupations. That's changing, too.

The Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics lumps all jobs into six broad categories. Between 1972 and 1987, the number of women in the three highest paying categories has skyrocketed -- dwarfing the rise in lower paying categories.

And you can bet that this trend will continue. Today, fully half of those enrolled in our country's institutions of higher education are women. A third of all graduate students in M.B.A. programs are women. But the reality is that the majority of

working women -- the substantial majority -- are still working in lower-paying jobs.

The number of families headed by women has grown sharply -- sixfold in the last three decades. And the majority of women who head households -- some 61% -- are in the work force.

These are not just statistics. They are lives. Greatly challenged lives. And they demand our attention.

I've travelled quite a bit in the past year. I've spent time in the kitchens of rural Illinois, and in the classrooms of East Los Angeles. I've spoken with young entrepreneurs in Florida, truckers in New Hampshire, and struggling families in my home state of Texas. You see parents who have to drive to far too find the child care they want; and those who want it but can't afford it.

I have spent time discussing the child care issue with mothers and fathers, employers and employees, liberals and conservatives. There are wide differences of opinion about the right approach. What came through clearly is that the single most important issue arising from the changes in our work force is child care.

Years ago, some may have viewed child care as a special and limited need. As recently as 1960, only 19% of women with children under six years old were working. By 1985, that number was 54%.

Today, over 70% of women in the primary family building years, ages 25 to 44, are working. That number is expected to reach 80% -- four out of five -- by 1995.

So today, child care is nothing short of a family necessity. And, because of that clear truth, I am proposing today a set of policies that enables families -- not government -- to decide the right approach for themselves.

My philosophy with respect to child care is to put choices in the hands of parents, and not in the hands of the state.

A letter from a mother to The Washington Post tells a heart wrenching story.

The mother wrote, "...we believe we know better than anyone else -- the state, the county, the federal government -- what our children need to thrive... Now, in the name of protecting children, the state law has thrown me back into the pool of anguished parents searching for good day care, while a superbly competent day care provider is forbidden to care for children."

Something is wrong here. Of course we must insist on the highest quality child care. But, the government should be encouraging flexibility, not clamping down on parental choice. The government should be expanding options, not restricting availability.

This mother is saying let her decide. The Democrat proposal denies her that right. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to raising our children.

Parents work during the day and at night, swing shifts and part-time. Some parents want caregivers to be relatives or neighbors or at school or at church. Or, they want only after school child care or care for special children. They want

caregivers to share their values. The Democrat approach would not provide these options.

I will build a policy around parental choice. Particularly, we must find a way to put a greater range of choices in the hands of low income parents -- because they face the greatest difficulty in meeting the demands of work and family.

As businesswomen, I don't need to tell you that child care is a significant business expense. But for very low income workers, child care can eat up a disproportionate share of their income.

Today, I would like to propose to you one means of creating greater choice, while targeting our resources at those who need them most. I propose that we create the "Children's Tax Credit," a new, refundable tax credit of up to \$1000 per child under age 4, to recognize the increased costs of families with children. Implementation could be tied to the earned income tax credit. The tax credit would phase out as income rises.

Because low-income working couples face the greatest needs, families with very low incomes would be eligible immediately. To accommodate national budget goals, this new tax credit would be phased in from very low income levels in annual household income to somewhat higher levels over the first four years. And, it would be phased higher as budgetary goals allow.

I would also maintain the existing dependent care tax credit, and take an additional important step to make it refundable. Too many low-income families go without the assistance we have made available to upper income families because they do not earn enough to pay taxes. A family could take the greater credit -- the Children's Tax Credit or the refundable dependent care credit.

There are other steps we could take to help. I would encourage more employer sponsored child care, using the federal government as a model.

We should establish a federal reinsurance revolving pool to reduce obstacles presented by lack of available liability insurance to employers. I would encourage employer sponsored child care, flexible work schedules and benefit plans which allow workers to choose the benefits they need. Employers must demonstrate more flexibility and sensitivity to family needs.

Employers have a major role in helping parents find needed child care, but I do not believe in give-aways of taxpayer dollars to get business to recognize what it already knows: that it must provide assistance for more and better child care. Workers demand it; productivity demands it; a business's bottom line demands it.

Let me give you an example of one employer. At the Department of Transportation, under the leadership of former Secretary Elizabeth Dole, a private, non-profit day care facility was started -- DOT Day Care, Inc. DOT put up the money to renovate the space, and a committee of volunteers raised the money to pay for initial expenses.

Today, DOT Day Care is up and running, getting ready to provide infant care. Secretary Dole's findings were the same as

those of companies who have engaged in similar efforts; worker productivity improved and absenteeism declined.

Finally, the states and the federal government ought to provide additional resources to specifically address the needs of all working parents for a broader range of choices and higher quality child care. Many states and localities are addressing the needs of pre-school and after-school care, improving the quality and availability of care, but many more must catch up.

Federal resources could provide seed money for innovative program design in sick child care, and before- and after-school care. And, I am committed to building the Head Start Program to a level where all eligible 4-year olds attend class.

I've heard it said that there are only two lasting bequests we can hope to leave to our children: one is roots; the other, wings.

We can talk about economic growth, but the key to future economic growth is the education we give our children. The key to our competitiveness is the minds of our children. We can talk about values in our society, but our society's values will be those we instill in our children today.

One important way to guarantee good values is to encourage good teachers. I would, as President, encourage greater rewards for teachers, and greater respect for teachers -- from students, and from society.

Before closing, I want to acknowledge the importance of small business to America's growing prosperity.

Many of you work in, or are the owners of, small businesses -- the creators of most of the new jobs in America. You realize the importance of education in training the workers of tomorrow. You probably also realize something else. Conditions are not equal for owners of small businesses who happen to be women.

Some women-owned businesses have extraordinary difficulty getting credit. I think credit decisions should be based on merit, not on gender.

I believe that change is inevitable and exciting. Government must not mandate how society responds. Lets give people the tools to make better choices in a changing society. Lets give people the opportunity for a better life.

The opportunity for a better life. That means the freedom to choose, and the skills to grow.

The opportunity for a better life, that's what drew people to America centuries ago. That's what drew Coronado to New Mexico in 1540. It's what drew the Irish and Germans to New York in 1840. It's what I fought for in 1944. It's what draws the Vietnamese and the Koreans, the West Africans and the Central Americans to this great country today.

The opportunity for a better life. That's what stirs us all: the young student burning the midnight oil, the entrepreneur risking it all on new venture, the auto worker striving to improve productivity, the young mother supporting her family.

The opportunity to make a better life... a better America... that's what's drawing women into the work force. That's what

motivates my concern about child care and education. And that's
what will drive me if I am elected President.
Thank you very much.

#

THE VICE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY

July 26, 1988

FACT SHEET

VICE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

Speaking before Congressional Interns, the Vice President outlined a comprehensive ethics in government program saying, "What is intuitively right, will invariably be the written rule."

The Ethics Program Rests on Six Principles

- * First, the right people. The recruitment of people dedicated to public service is a sine qua non to any ethics program. Talent and moral fiber will be the yardstick by which candidates will be measured for jobs in the Bush administration.
- * Second, bright-line and well understood rules of conduct. The code of conduct for government employees must be expressed in unambiguous terms, with clear and concise definition.
- * Third, Congress must be covered by federal ethics law. To hold otherwise is to set a double standard that feeds public distrust and breeds cynicism.
- * Fourth, federal ethics law should provide for civil, as well as enhanced criminal sanctions. This serves two purposes: (i) it permits prosecutors to enforce the law in a wider variety of situations and (ii) it provides for penalties that are fair and proportionate to the conduct under review.
- * Fifth, substantive provisions of federal ethics laws should be amended to reach "revolving door" abuses that are not proscribed under current law.
- * Sixth, the prestige and powers of the Office of Government Ethics and Designated Agency Ethics Officials should be enhanced and reinforced.

Simplification of the Government Ethics Code

- ✓ *
- The Vice President stated that he would simplify and improve the current government ethics code to make it clear and understandable. The standards of conduct will be based on common sense. None will be hyper-technical.- What is intuitively correct will invariably be the written rule.

White House Ethics Office

- ✓ *
- The Vice President will establish a White House Ethics Office, the staff and resources of which are dedicated solely to compliance with the federal ethics program. ~~The responsibilities of this office would be to:~~

- (i) Establish bright-line rules for White House and executive branch personnel.
- (ii) Issue advisory opinions to White House personnel regarding conflict of interest issues.
- (iii) Investigate alleged ethical improprieties committed by White House personnel.
- (iv) Supervise mandatory annual ethics briefings for White House personnel.

Designated Agency Ethics Officials ("DAEO's")

- ✓ *
- DAEO's are the front-line of the federal ethics program. The Vice President proposes to increase that profile and visibility and the resources dedicated to agency ethics programs.
- (i) He would establish a permanent ethics office in each department and major agency, headed by senior government officials of a rank such as Deputy Assistant Secretary;
 - (ii) He would provide a permanent staff for each such office dedicated solely to implementing and monitoring compliance with the ethics program;

- (iii) The office/staff would be provided with adequate funds to do the job and, indeed, would be included as a separate line item in the budget process;
- (iv) The Vice President would require mandatory annual briefings for all senior government personnel by agency ethics officials.

Recruitment of Talented People, Dedicated to Public Service

- 7
- * The centerpiece of any federal ethics program is the recruitment and retention of talented people. The Vice President pledged to seek people of unquestioned character, integrity, and dedication to public service.

Standards of Conduct

- * The Vice President pledged to establish unambiguous, clearly defined bright-line rules for standards of conduct of White House and Executive Branch personnel. He proposes to include in the Code the following, without limitation:
 - (i) All blind trusts will be managed by institutions -- not individuals;
 - (ii) No Presidential appointee may receive outside earned income for services rendered while holding office;
 - (iii) The term "negotiations" for prospective employment, for purposes of triggering disqualification or refusal action under 18 U.S.C. 208, will mean any affirmative step taken by a government employee to initiate job discussions or to follow-up on a job feeler.
 - (iv) Formal rules will be adopted to govern all White House contacts with investigative agencies, including the requirement that all such contacts be made through the Office of White House counsel.

Substantive Conflicts of Interest

✓ *

18 U.S.C. 208 makes it a felony to act on certain matters of a personal financial interest while in office. The felony is punishable by up to two years in jail and a fine of \$10,000. It is limited in its use and application as currently drawn. ~~The Vice President proposes to:~~

- (i) Extend 18 U.S.C. 208's prohibitions on acting on matters of a personal financial interest to members and senior staff of Congress.
- (ii) Prohibit the acceptance of anything of monetary value -- e.g., meals, entertainment, travel -- by members and staff of Congress and executive branch personnel from lobbyists.
- (iii) Provide for civil sanctions and proof of misconduct by a preponderance of the evidence for violation of 208.
- (iv) Provide for enhanced criminal sanctions for conduct that is undertaken with corrupt purpose and specific intent to violate 208's prohibitions against acting on matters of a personal financial interest.

Post-Employment Restrictions

✓ *

18 U.S.C. 207 makes it a felony to engage in certain post-employment activities that raise questions of conflicts of interest. The scope of the post-employment restrictions imposed by the statute is sometimes confused. The statute is therefore limited in its use and application. Violation of the statute is punishable by up to two years in prison and a fine of \$10,000. The Vice President proposes to:

- (i) Eliminate the power of the Office of Government Ethics to subdivide agencies and cabinet departments for purposes of defining the scope of post-employment restrictions under 18 U.S.C. 207, as proposed in the Senate's Integrity in Post-Employment Act of 1988 ("the 1988 Post-Employment Act").
- (ii) Bar members of Congress (and senior Congressional staff) from lobbying Congress for one year -- a one-year "cooling-off" period -- as proposed in the 1988 Post-Employment Act.
- (iii) Provide for civil sanctions and proof of misconduct by a preponderance of the evidence for violation of 207's post-employment restrictions, as proposed in the 1988 Post-Employment Act.
- (iv) Provide for enhanced criminal sanctions for knowing and intended violation of 207's post-employment restrictions, as proposed in the 1988 Post-Employment Act.
- (v) Prohibit the use of confidential information in post-employment activity with civil and criminal sanctions impose both the former employee and his/her new employer in the private sector.



GEORGE BUSH

August 1, 1988

Mr. Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.
The Heritage Foundation
214 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

Dear Ed:

As a follow-up to our breakfast on Tuesday, I want to take this opportunity to restate my position on SDI.

I am a strong supporter of SDI. Successful research on SDI can lead to an effective defensive shield, one that lifts the fear of nuclear annihilation from the shoulders of humankind. It is both moral and logical to look for a solution that is better than the idea of Mutually Assured Destruction.

SDI has strong moral underpinnings. A deterrent strategy based on strategic defenses, coupled with deep reductions in offensive forces, could offer us the most stable and secure environment of all.

The contrast between my position and that of my opponent couldn't be more clear. Governor Dukakis is on record labelling "Star Wars" as a "fantasy and a fraud." He wants to cut research funding to its pre-1983 levels. In clear contrast, I am on record supporting full funding of research, development, and deployment of a comprehensive strategic defense system.

These positions will become clear during the campaign. I trust the sound judgement of the American people to vote for SDI and for America's defense.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Bush". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "George" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Bush".

George Bush

THE VICE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Tuesday, August 2, 1988

CONTACT: 202/456-6772

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS FOR
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
MID-AMERICA COMMITTEE LUNCHEON
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1988

The "American Century" -- it dawned as World War II closed, and for the next three decades the United States fulfilled its historic mission. We defeated the Nazi tyranny, and from the rubble of a war built a new international order that ushered in a period of peace and prosperity unrivaled in human history. We travelled to the moon, and on earth kept alight the flame of freedom and the hope of a better life for all men.

Eight years ago, however, when Ronald Reagan and I took office, it seemed that the American Century had come to a premature end. America, we were told, suffered from "malaise" at home and a crisis of confidence abroad: high taxes, exorbitant interest rates, and double-digit inflation had sapped our once mighty economic strength, while our military might and international prestige had fallen to all time lows. The Soviet Union had invaded Afghanistan and Soviet power advanced in Southeast Asia, Africa, and even into our own hemisphere. The Iranians had seized our embassy in Tehran.

But it wasn't the American people who suffered from "malaise" -- it was our leaders, who lacked the understanding, experience and resolve to pursue American greatness and seemed resigned merely to preside over our decline.

President Reagan and I immediately set about the task of returning America to its role as world leader -- to its strategic role as peacemaker and apostle of prosperity. We repaired our nation's defenses, modernized our strategic nuclear forces, deployed INF's in Europe, and restored pride in our nation's military services.

We didn't just preach about human rights, we pursued a forward strategy for freedom. We provided the Mujahadeen in Afghanistan with weapons and now the Soviet tanks are rolling home. We liberated the tiny island nation of Grenada from a dictatorship controlled by Cuba, supported freedom in El Salvador, and helped restore democracy to the Philippines.

We struck back against terrorism, teaching Quadhafi a lesson he'll not soon forget.

And at home, we liberated the American economy from high taxes and over-regulation, creating what our allies came to call "the American Miracle" -- 17 million new jobs and low inflation in what is now the longest peacetime expansion in American history.

In the 1980's, we rebuilt the foundations of American strength, restored America's self-confidence, and with it, our stature abroad. But we did more, much more, than simply undo the damage of the late seventies. The revival of American leadership is today changing the world and shaping the future, creating new opportunities, new possibilities, barely dreamt of eight years ago.

In the 1990's, we can move the world once again -- or we can be pushed along by it. It is not a time for timidity, hesitancy, and on-the-job training. We must draw on our experience, creativity, and special genius to mold these changes to make the world a better place. For the American people, born in revolution, will have the chance to benefit from five other revolutionary changes that are reshaping the international landscape.

First, the democratic revolution. Ten years ago, 25 per cent of the people of Latin America lived under democratic governments -- today 90 per cent do, with the Philippines and South Korea also firmly joining the family of free nations.

Second, is the revolution of free enterprise. The American model of low taxes and economic growth is being adopted around the world: from the Pacific Rim to the Atlantic Borderlands of Europe, Africa, and South America, socialism is discredited and economic liberty is the new driving force.

The third revolution is the ferment in the communist world. Concepts of political democracy and market economies are being debated from Budapest to Moscow, from Warsaw to Beijing -- we even hear supply-side arguments advanced inside the Kremlin walls, and the first, cautious, attempts to tell the truth about Soviet history. While it is too soon to know where the pressure for reform will lead, what is taking place in the Soviet Union today would have been unthinkable only a short time ago. We should not underestimate the power truth can work even on totalitarian societies.

The fourth revolution is in arms reduction: Take the INF treaty -- for the first time in history the United States and Soviet Union will completely eliminate an entire class of their nuclear missiles -- and we have agreed in principle to a 50 per cent cut in strategic weapons.

The fifth revolution is in information and communications. A single individual, sitting at his or her desk-top computer, can access more resources of information world-wide than were recently available to the most powerful governments -- just one example of the developing new world economy that increasingly shrinks space and time and transcends political and geographic barriers.

We have come to the end of the post-war era -- a unique moment to determine America's place for the rest of the century. All these revolutions present unparalleled opportunity -- and risk. With the proper leadership, America should be able to direct these changes for the common good. Indeed, our efforts helped set them in motion, and each plays to our greatest strength as a nation -- our openness and capacity for change.

Yet, in the wrong hands, revolutions can drift into frightening forms. Young democracies are fragile and may be overcome by authoritarian pressure. Economic competition may slip into protectionism and mercantilism. The communist world could snap back to its old ways, or the ferment could produce a more powerful force with unchanged objectives. Arms reduction could become an excuse for a weak defense and create dangerous instability. And the new information flows could be used to control instead of to liberate.

This new era demands from America, and its elected officials, firm, consistent and experienced leadership with a program that can shape the course of change.

My program for the 1990's will have seven elements:

The President is the Commander-in-Chief. The national security must be his first occupation. That means U.S.-Soviet relations must be high on our foreign policy agenda as long as the Soviet Union has the power to destroy our civilization.

We welcome the developments in the Soviet Union -- but we should not let our hopes outrun our practical experience. Soviet ideology has proven bankrupt -- but Russia remains a formidable military power. We welcome what Mr. Gorbachev says -- I am impressed by the steps he has taken for more openness, more reform, but in the final analysis the Soviet Union will be judged by what it delivers -- on conventional and chemical arms reduction; on defusing regional tension and reining-in aggressive Soviet clients; on human rights and emigration, and repudiating the Brezhnev Doctrine in Eastern Europe. These are the measures of meaningful change.

My program would avoid swings between unjustified euphoria and exaggerated pessimism. I know we can attend realistically to common problems by working together without false illusions.

-more-

The second element is arms reduction and control, a process relating primarily to U.S.-Soviet relations -- yet given new realities -- increasingly extending to other quarters as well.

Here our experience with intermediate-range missiles is instructive. I worked closely with NATO leaders in 1983 when the allies bit the bullet -- in the face of all the power the freeze movement could muster -- and stuck to our planned deployment despite unprecedented Soviet pressure. Then we stood together again, successfully, when Mr. Gorbachev finally took up Ronald Reagan's offer to scrap all these missiles.

The lesson is clear: real arms reduction, real improvements in East-West relations, and real security can only be achieved through strength and consistency. We can pursue negotiations tenaciously while proceeding with the military measures to guarantee our security. To halt the modernization of our strategic deterrent is to disarm unilaterally -- rendering the United States increasingly vulnerable and reducing incentives for serious negotiations by the Soviets -- who incidentally continue a fast modernization program of their own.

My policy will be continued modernization as we pursue a verifiable and stabilizing agreement to reduce each strategic arsenal by 50 percent, mindful that a reduction in arms must also mean a reduction in danger. The ratio of forces must leave us more, not less, stable.

My policy will recognize that despite the drama of nuclear weapons, the imbalance in conventional weapons is a basic source of instability in Europe. For over 40 years, the Soviet Union has maintained a huge forward-deployed land army. If the change in the Soviet attitude is genuine, the Soviet Union should accept the forthcoming NATO proposal to reduce both NATO and Warsaw Pact forces to lower balanced levels of tanks and artillery in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals -- these are the weapons that make an attack thinkable. Let's reduce them in a way that lessens the danger of war, strengthens deterrence and secures the peace.

My policy will be to develop a viable strategic defense system, an outgrowth of the SDI research program, to protect our people from ballistic missile attack. The fact is, that this city, Chicago, just like every other city in the United States, has absolutely no defense against an attack. Even if only one missile were launched against us, the President would have no choice but to stand by as destruction hurtled toward millions of Americans -- helpless to defend them.

Already, the first phase of a space-based SDI technology is ready to come out of the lab and begin demonstration. The technology isn't the problem, that's progressing faster than its most ardent supporters ever imagined -- it's the Democrats in

Congress that are dragging their feet, for instance, cutting the space-based interceptor appropriations from over 300 million to 85 million and boasting they've "taken the stars out of star wars."

I am confident we can find a better way than mutual assured destruction, with all its admitted shortcomings. I am committed to deployment of SDI, as soon as feasible, and will determine the exact architecture of the system in my first term, as the technologies are tested and proven. As President, I will not leave America defenseless against ballistic missiles.

Precisely because of the spread of dangerous military technologies, we must also extend the arms control process beyond the narrow confines of the superpowers. States like Iran, Syria, Iraq, and Libya are working to develop the capacity to produce chemical arms, and to acquire -- in some cases produce -- the ballistic missiles to deliver them. The danger is real and we have to get active now if we are to avert disaster.

We must start by giving new life to multi-national programs to limit these modern plagues.

My program includes a drive to ban the production of chemical weapons and create an intrusive verification system to guard against violations. Anyone who has seen the pictures from the Gulf War -- of women and children killed by chemical poisons -- knows that we must put this terrible genie back in the bottle.

We must also intensify our drive to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. I will work to secure universal adherence to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, and to strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency.

But that's not enough. We must also stop the spread of ballistic missiles and ballistic missile technology. There are few developments more frightening than that of unstable, sometimes irrational, Third World regimes being able to press a button and deliver weapons of terror across great distances.

I will work to revitalize the missile technology control regime -- the mechanism created to stop the transfer of missile technology -- get it moving and make it effective. Those who refuse to join it or who violate its principles must know that they will pay a price for doing so.

New circumstances necessitate new direction. I will put one senior official in charge of the ballistic missile problem and give him the responsibility to integrate the intelligence, military, technical, diplomatic, and economic resources needed to respond. But we must also cope with the reality that ballistic missiles have already spread too far -- that, for instance, Israel is already threatened by them. That is why I

am proud that we are developing with Israel an ATBM system -- a derivative of SDI research -- to protect that nation from ballistic missile attack. It is one thing to say you are committed to Israel's security, but in an age of ballistic missiles, if you are against defensive systems such as SDI, that slogan has little meaning.

The third element of my program is a strategy to help douse regional flashpoints where these arms might be used. Arms do not cause wars, and arms control alone cannot secure the peace. Conflicts in the Middle East, Southern Africa, Central America, and South Asia could spark further violence and destruction -- and inflame outside involvement.

We can and should work with other nations to settle these disputes. Yet, in the end, there is no substitute for us; we must take the lead in the search for negotiated solutions.

Our leadership will reflect a strategic design that is different from that of our critics, whose constant refrain amounts to using diplomacy while depriving it of its tools. We will integrate every available and suitable policy instrument into a multifaceted approach. That means using negotiations, intelligence, economic strength and aid, public diplomacy, and, yes, military power.

By way of example, our deployment of naval forces in the Gulf, with the support of five European navies, is not a military solution, as sometimes charged by those with a narrow foreign policy vision. To the contrary, we are employing military force to enhance our ability to achieve satisfactory political results. And make no mistake about it, the U.S. military presence in the Gulf, our willingness to use it, and our refusal to back down to threats, have sobered the Iranian leadership and contributed to the conditions that seem, at last, to be bringing the Gulf war to an end. At the UN the other day, I told the Iranians in no uncertain terms what would be necessary for the peace process to go forward -- and now it's happening.

The fourth component is to increase the scope and momentum of the democratic revolution. Its lights are burning brightly in locations around the globe, but many other regions remain dark. We know from experience that the march toward democracy will not be without setbacks, but it always progresses. Our resolve starts with encouraging freedom and prying nations away from oppression, both external and internal. Then we must support genuine freedom fighters and assist fledgling democracies. And throughout, our actions must not diminish the bright light from the long-lasting American experiment and

example. We are the beacon on the hill. When all is said and done, democracy depends on the soul of a people, and the American beacon can only reach that deep if we keep it strong and clear.

The fifth element of my program is an international alliance against the scourges of drugs and terrorism. We confront sophisticated networks of death, sometimes intersecting, sometimes existing independently. It is, in essence, a war against humanity, devouring young and old. To be most productive, we must channel our rage into a broad-based counterattack, working with other nations on a sustained basis to defeat this evil. That means generating complementary support to gather intelligence, eradicate supplies and causes, interdict traffickers and agents, and respond with swift justice. With drugs in particular, we will never win unless all the American people recognize the face of the enemy -- through education, prevention, treatment, and most importantly, a new public attitude that will not tolerate the presence of drugs.

The sixth element is international economics -- an increasingly important feature of our relations with the world. Our work over the past eight years has complemented the rebuilding of the world economy after 1945. We returned the world to prosperity, through both our economic reconstruction at home and a new network of initiatives spanning the global economy.

My program would refine and build on this new, sophisticated United States leadership for modern times. One of the first priorities of the Bush Administration will be to build upon the US-Canada Free Trade Agreement by aggressively negotiating elimination of tariffs and barriers around the world. We will look to the west, to our allies in the European Community -- and convince them that the integration of the European Community scheduled for 1992 should also reach across the North Atlantic. We will look to the east, to Japan and the rising economies of the Pacific Rim, and bring them into a new economic system based on cooperation, rather than economic warfare. We will look south to forge a real economic compact with Mexico that is sensitive to the special needs and concerns of its people. At the same time we will continue to evolve the program for sustained growth -- based on the American model of low taxes, deregulation, and entrepreneurship -- the one realistic approach for helping debtor nations restructure their economies to be receptive to long-term investment.

Seventh, and finally, any successful U.S. foreign policy must grow from the roots of domestic support, economic and political. Our prosperous nation can do better. We can have a new era of achievement -- fostered, not dictated, by government -- through low taxes, opportunities for entrepreneurs and the small businessperson with the big idea, decentralized government that encourages experimentation, a good broad-based educational system, and reliance on markets.

I believe the political support for a new American internationalism for the 1990's is also present, though latent. It needs to be drawn out by a blend of experienced and creative leadership. It requires a genuine partnership with the Congress. It requires also a commitment to the bipartisan principles of strength, realism, dialogue, and global engagement that Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy and Scoop Jackson embraced. I think all generations of Americans want an active, positive foreign policy. I think most Americans want to return to the days when politics stopped at the water's edge. They are all sympathetic to fostering American values abroad, but they want to be realistic about the cost. They want America's pride to be pro-U.S., not anti-foreign. They want America's hand to be steady, not overbearing or shaky.

The American Century has not drawn to a close. We are not in decline. America has set in motion the major changes underway in the world today -- the growth of democracy, the spread of free enterprise, the creation of a world market in goods and ideas. For the foreseeable future, no other nation, or group of nations, will step forward to assume leadership. And as the 20th Century gives way to the 21st, the American republic will continue to represent mankind's last, best hope, the leader among nations seeking a more open and peaceful world.

Thank you all very much and God bless you.

#

THE VICE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Thursday, August 4, 1988

CONTACT: 202/456-6772

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS FOR
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH
THE G.I. FORUM
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS
THURSDAY, AUGUST 4, 1988

Let me begin by quoting two former presidents: "It must be the policy of the United States to support free people being challenged by communist threats both from within and without." That was Harry Truman, enunciating what would become known as the Truman Doctrine.

And: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we will bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty." That was John F. Kennedy in his famous Inaugural Address.

Those words -- those ringing affirmations of America's mission -- make all Americans justly proud. They are also the words of two Democratic presidents, and I quote them today to make a point.

When they were spoken, they represented not a minority view, or the view of one single party, but a bipartisan consensus, the commonly held belief that it was America, and only America, that could lead the world to freedom and peace.

It was a consensus that grew out of the post-war world, when our allies reeled from the devastation of war, and the dark shadow of communism spread across Eastern Europe and Asia -- reaching even to the Western Hemisphere. That consensus recognized that America would have to take the lead in organizing the defense of the free world and rebuilding the war-torn economies.

That we would have to be economically strong, and militarily powerful. That we would have to build an effective deterrent, based on unsurpassed military force and the demonstrated will to use it. And that our commitment to deterring war would be matched by our determination to pursue peace through negotiations -- but that we would always negotiate from strength and with our eyes wide open.

-more-

These assumptions formed, as I said, the post-war, bipartisan consensus, the mainstream principles held by most Americans and the basis of policy for Presidents of both parties, Republican and Democrat. They are the foundations of policy which helped build in Europe over 40 years of peace and a level of prosperity unrivaled in human history; which held back the communist advance and kept the light of freedom burning brightly around the world -- and which now gives us the opportunity to build a safer and freer world for our children.

They are the policies and principles in which I firmly believe, and they are the policies and principles I will follow as President of the United States.

It concerns me, however, that the Democratic nominee seems to have veered far outside that mainstream. His positions, if taken together, add up to a major departure from the post-war, bipartisan consensus on foreign policy. In my judgment, they amount to a rejection of America's role as a world leader and a repudiation of the Truman Doctrine and the vision of John Kennedy.

I believe they would seriously cripple deterrence and put us in a weak negotiating position with the Soviets -- one in which we would have only two choices: sign a bad treaty -- or sign no treaty at all. All my experience tells me that his views, if implemented, would make the world not a safer place, but more dangerous.

Am I being too harsh? Well, let's examine the record. The nuclear triad is the very foundation of our deterrence, the basis of U.S. policy, supported by every President and every administration since Eisenhower. What is the Governor's position?

When it comes to the land-based leg of our triad, his three positions -- no new MX, no Midgetman, no flight testing of new missiles -- add up to no modernization, and no modernization amounts to unilateral disarmament. Make no mistake about it, the Soviets continue to modernize their land-based leg -- and their other two legs as well.

He would limit Trident and Stealth to the development stage and scuttle plans to build two new aircraft carriers. And he would bind us to an overly restrictive interpretation of the ABM treaty which the Soviets are openly violating.

This is not just rhetoric either. As Governor of Massachusetts, my opponent prevented the building in his state what's known as the Ground Wave Emergency Network, an advanced communication system that is the nerve system of our deterrent capability. The Governor's opposition is so far afield of the bipartisan consensus on deterrence, that James Schlesinger, a

Democrat who has served in Republican and Democratic administrations alike, raised the question of whether the Governor of Massachusetts understands the principle of deterrence at all.

I agree with James Schlesinger that the best way to deter war is to be prepared for it. American strength cannot be built on the basis of slogans. It is not enough to say you are for a strong defense and at the same time pledge to eliminate nearly every new weapons system that would give those words substance. It is not enough to say that you acknowledge the need for force as a last resort, but nearly always oppose it when it is resorted to. The Governor opposed our efforts to protect shipping and counter Iranian threats in the Persian Gulf -- an area that 8 American Presidents, starting with Harry Truman, agreed is vital to our national security. If my Democratic opponent is not prepared to protect American interests in the vital Persian Gulf, where will he protect them?

I believe in keeping America's commitments around the world, I believe that keeping America strong is the best way to keep the peace. Despite the reservations of our opponents, we didn't back down in the Persian Gulf, we maintained our presence, faced down the Ayatollah's aggression, and kept the vital sea lanes open. I went to the United Nations Security Council and told the Iranians what they would have to do to end their international isolation. Now, for the first time in this decade, we're seeing progress and the possible end to that horrible war between Iran and Iraq. Let us hope a cease fire can be achieved and peace restored.

The measure of our commitment is not words, but the willingness to live up to them when faced with a challenge. Harry Truman did that when the Soviets blockaded Berlin in 1948. John Kennedy did that when ballistic missiles were installed in Cuba in 1962. Do today's liberal leaders understand what it means to stand up to a challenge and meet our commitments? I guarantee, I will.

And let's look at another part of the world. Can we be any more confident that they will pursue negotiations with the Soviets realistically? Some of our liberal critics told us we could never get the Soviets to give up their INF missiles in Europe, never get them to accept intrusive verification or 50 percent reductions in strategic arms.

Here again, the Governor has a record. He supported a nuclear "freeze" that would have doomed the negotiations to utter futility and locked in the Soviet advantage -- over a thousand of their warheads on hundreds of missiles pointed at the capitals of Europe, zero on our side.

While my opponent was actively supporting the freeze movement in this country, I was in Europe, reassuring our allies

and helping them beat back the misinformation put out by the Soviets and the European Left. The Greens in Germany, the Labor Party in England, and various other left-wing parties throughout Europe were fighting our deployment tooth and nail. It seemed that hardly a day went by without a major demonstration by the freeze movement in some European capital. In fact, on one of my trips, the car I was riding in with Chancellor Kohl was attacked by a mob, and the van carrying our staff pelted with rocks.

It was a time when American weakness and lack of resolve not only would have doomed negotiations but seriously strained the trust and confidence of our allies. But we didn't waffle, we stood firm, we stood by our principles, and now the United States and the Soviet Union have begun dismantling their INF missiles, for the first time in history eliminating an entire class of nuclear weapons.

Does my opponent still think the freeze was a good idea? His campaign literature still boasts of his support for it. Does he believe it's a good idea today? I'd certainly like to know, and I think he owes the American people an answer.

I've tried to be as accurate as possible about my opponent's foreign policy positions, but the fact is, they change so fast, it's getting hard to keep up. First he was against the B1, but now his staff says he's "accepted it." He said that the Monroe Doctrine, a basic principle of United States foreign policy for almost 200 years, has been, quote, "superseded"; then he "clarified" his position, saying that it had been "expanded on," whatever that means. He said the defense budget would have to be cut. Then he said it was about right. Then he backed away from both positions, saying he refused to make a commitment either way.

A President has to be able to make up his mind. Last year, in a speech in Miami -- this is according to the Washington Post -- he again criticized our rescue mission in Grenada, but then said he didn't have enough information -- after four years and truck-loads of documentation -- to say whether it was right or not.

Most of the doubters came around when they saw our American soldiers greeted by the local population with flowers and prayers of thanks -- and when they saw those medical students kiss United States soil when they returned home, freed by a great U.S. President unafraid to act. Grenada was the right thing to do. It was a proud moment for America. And if I'm President, I won't hesitate to support freedom and rescue American lives when they're in danger.

In trying to decipher where the Governor stands on the issues, the Democratic platform is no help. On the subject of the freeze, the Democratic Platform has no comment. On Grenada.

-- no comment. On Trident missiles and ASAT weapons -- no comment. On the air strike on Libya that put a damper on Qadhafi's terrorism -- no comment. On aid to the Afghan freedom fighters who are forcing the Soviet tanks to turn around and go home -- no comment.

The Democratic platform is the Black Hole of American politics -- issues get sucked into it and lost, never to reappear again.

I was surprised that even some of our opponents boasted of the finesse with which their platform skirted the issues. Why are they so afraid to tell the American people what they really think? Is it because the last two times they did so -- in 1980 and 1984 -- they lost by two of the biggest landslides in history?

I'm proud of my policies. I'm not afraid to level with the American people. Two days ago, I spelled out my foreign policy program for the future. It set forth a framework with 7 elements to shape our approach to a world that presents new possibilities but also new dangers. Where is my opponent's framework for the future? He ought to lay out his agenda and let the people judge. Don't deny them that fundamental right.

We're going to have a platform with issues and substance, not just rhetoric. And I'll run proudly on that platform. I want the American people to understand the fundamental distinctions between us. On the issue of SDI, for instance, my opponent would gut our program.

Is he unaware of the growing threat posed by the spread of ballistic missiles to countries in the Third World like Syria, Iran, Iraq, and Libya? Those missiles already threaten Israel. That's why we are developing an ATBM system -- an outgrowth of SDI research -- to protect that nation from ballistic missile attack.

The Governor can't have it both ways. Is he against protecting Israel with an ATBM system? Or is he for an anti-missile defense for Israel and against it for his own country?

The fact is that right now this city, Corpus Christi, just like every other city in the United States, has absolutely no defense against a nuclear missile attack. If even one missile were launched accidentally, or by some terrorist Third World regime, the President could do nothing to defend our country as the terror hurtled toward millions of American lives. As President I will build a strategic defense system as it becomes feasible. I will make America safer.

I will also support those around the world struggling for their freedom. I will support the Angolan freedom fighters who are forcing the Cuban mercenary troops out of their country. My opponent would cut them off. I will support the Nicaraguan freedom fighters who are battling to bring democracy to their country and prevent Nicaragua from becoming a permanent Soviet-base camp on the American mainland. My opponent would cut off all aid to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters.

Let me read you another quote of my opponent's: "...who gives [the United States] the authority -- moral or otherwise -- to seek to impose our will on other nations and other peoples without genuine discussion and collective judgment in a forum like the UN?" That comes from a Boston Globe report on a speech he delivered on Vietnam in 1971. But the Globe goes on to say that those quotes "could easily be exchanged with his 1988 remarks on Central America."

Harry Truman and John Kennedy never questioned the moral authority of freedom. And neither do I. They never would have subordinated the conduct of U.S. foreign policy -- and the protection of vital U.S. interests -- to the United Nations -- and neither will I. The U.N. can be very useful at times, but we must set our policy -- then lead.

I believe that it is America, and only America, that has the commitment to take the lead for freedom in this troubled world. It is America, and only America, that has the strength to lead the world to democracy and peace.

The world is changing rapidly, offering new opportunities, new possibilities, and sometimes new dangers -- but I am convinced that the one thing that will never change is the need for American leadership.

The veterans and heroes of the GI Forum know the awful sacrifice that has sometimes entailed, but you also know that the only way to preserve the peace is to have the will and the courage to defend it.

A month ago, on July 4th, I had the pleasure to stand with a group of new Americans who had just moments before been sworn in as U.S. citizens and say the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. There were people from all over the world: Poles, Thais, Vietnamese, Lithuanians, and Mexicans, saying the pledge for the first time as Americans.

It was a thrilling moment, and I'm sure there was no doubt in anyone's mind at that moment about America's place in the world. We are still the best hope of mankind, the refuge to the tired, hungry and oppressed. We are still, and must always continue to be, a bastion of democracy and a beacon of freedom shining around the world.

Thank you all very much and God bless you.

#

((Grady))

STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM HEARINGS

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

AUGUST 8, 1988

DRAFT

Good morning. I am happy to be in New Orleans this morning to help you kick off these proceedings; to begin the process of outlining a Republican vision for the future of America.

This process will continue throughout the fall; but it will be highlighted during these next two weeks, as we gather here in New Orleans not only to nominate a candidate for President but to make our case to the American people.

For these next two weeks, the eyes of America will be upon us; and I'm proud to say that we welcome the attention, we welcome the scrutiny, and we welcome the chance to state in clear terms -- without hiding behind rhetoric or disguising in false words -- what we as Republicans believe.

I have to confess: I had originally intended to come before you to make a presentation about drugs -- because I believe that drugs are an urgent domestic priority, an insidious danger, lurking in our schools and neighborhoods, that threaten to snuff out the candle of opportunity which

President Reagan and I have worked so hard to re-light during these last eight years.

I have put forward several specific proposals to staunch the flow of drugs into this country, and to curb demand here at home. I've proposed tougher sentences for pushers, including the death penalty for kingpins who deal drugs. I've proposed involving the military in the drug eradication effort abroad, and beefing up the Coast Guard's ability to patrol our waters.

I have unveiled ideas to increase available prison space to make our tougher sentences possible, and I've proposed education and rehabilitation programs to prevent users from ever getting started, and to cure those unfortunate ones who do.

But as I thought about the problem in depth, I realized that at its core the drug problem is a problem of values. More planes, boats, and helicopters will help us stop the drug problem, and better education and tougher sentences will contribute as well. But the most important weapons in the war on drugs are the least tangible: self-discipline, courage, character, support from one's family, faith in God and in one's self.

The answer, in a word, is values. If we want to stop our kids from putting drugs in their veins, we must first put good ideas in their heads and moral character in their hearts.

All of us in society must help in changing and building values. "Zero tolerance" is more than a tactic -- it's an attitude.

As I prepared for this appearance, something else happened as well. The Democratic Party met in Atlanta. There, they declared that "this election is about competence, not ideology."

They tried to convince America that ideas don't matter. And they showed America that the values of honesty, conviction, and trust don't rate high for them.

For four days, the Democrats worked hard to disown their past and disguise their future. They spoke in glittering generalities and comfortable code words, but said nothing specific about how they would govern.

They couldn't. Their true intentions -- to raise taxes, to weaken our defenses, to unleash a flood of budget busting spending -- not only don't make good television, they don't make good government. America's been down that

road, and the result was double digit inflation, interest rates over 20%, and a decline of American influence around the world.

Now that America is back -- churning out jobs at twice the rate of any industrialized power -- who would want to risk a reckless reversal of course? The answer, of course, is no one.

So the Democrats had no choice. They had to wrap their liberalism in more conservative clothing.

But don't be fooled. These are the same wolves who've devoured every tax dollar in sight.

The New York Times reported that 67% of the delegates to the Democratic convention wanted a tax increase, but that 65% thought the platform should not mention it. This is the smoking gun on the Democrat's campaign of concealment.

The Democratic platform was the centerpiece of that campaign. Time magazine labelled it "a model of vagueness." A better name might have been "document of deceit."

The true Democratic platform was revealed last month not in Atlanta, but in Boston. There, in response to an increasingly severe budget crunch, the Governor signed a tax

increase of \$180 million. In time of crisis, the Governor once again turned to raising taxes as a first resort. Vague rhetoric to the contrary notwithstanding, taxes are the addiction of the ^{national} Democratic party. They suffer from chronic spending abuse and taxpayer dependency.

*McGovern
Mondell*

Harry Truman was reported to have once said: "If you can't convince them, confuse them."

As the Democrats in Atlanta continued their long march away from Truman's policies, at least they adopted his words. While sympathetic onlookers applauded, they tried to make a virtue out of public deception.

My own values are different: I believe that misleading the public is nothing to cheer; that political manipulation is no crowning achievement.

I have come before you this morning because I believe we should pursue a completely different course with our platform, and with our convention.

I have come before you because we Republicans are proud, and not ashamed, of what we stand for. I believe we should make our principles, and our policies, crystal clear to the American people.

Our campaign will be different -- because ideas do matter. We are poised at the edge of a new era, and the American people deserve to know where we will lead them. I ask you to make the platform -- and I will make my campaign -- a plan for the future, a statement of solutions, not an exercise in evasion.

In 1980 and again in 1984, we promised to reduce taxes, to cut interest rates and inflation, to promote economic growth, to slow the increase of Federal spending, and to restore America's place in the world.

That is exactly what we Republicans have delivered.

Our vision of hope was based on a simple premise, stated best in the 1984 platform: "From freedom comes opportunity; from opportunity comes growth; from growth comes progress."

This morning, I ask you to join me in laying out a new blueprint for freedom, a new roadmap for opportunity in the 1990s.

This election represents a very clear choice about what that blueprint will look like. It is a choice not only

between two candidates, but between two Parties, two philosophies, two entire sets of values.

The Democrats have tried to blur that distinction; our task is to make it clear. Our values in the Republican Party are traditional American values: not only faith, family and community; not only respect for the flag and the pride to salute it in our schools; but values like freedom from excessive taxation; not spending more than you take in; and keeping America strong.

Our Republican policies have ignited a record breaking explosion of economic growth. Over 17 million jobs have created in just the last six years, the largest expansion in peacetime history, and today, more people are at work -- at higher average real incomes -- than at any time in American history. The Republican legacy in these last eight years had been -- literally -- "good jobs at good wages."

But that was yesterday and ^{now?} our concern ~~this~~ morning is tomorrow. The past is useful as a guide to the future, so this morning it is fair to ask: do we want to build on the foundation that Ronald Reagan's policies have laid, or do we want to risk our renewed growth and strength ~~on a new and untried leader with some very old ideas?~~ ^{by returning to the failed and forgotten ideas of the Great Society} Does America ^{have} really want to tempt recession at home and aggression abroad ^{war}

by re-opening the door to the monster of liberalism that smothered our economy and frightened our allies?

We now have the chance to write the next chapter in the continuing story of American economic leadership by pursuing the low-tax and high opportunity policies that have spurred our growth. Let's seize it.

When the voters go to the polls this November, they should have as clear a picture of the candidates, of the Parties, and of the philosophies behind them as possible.

Over the course of the past year, I've travelled all over America. I've spent time in the kitchens of New Hampshire, on the farms of Illinois, in the classrooms of Los Angeles. As I've met with Americans, I've laid out some specific policy proposals for how I would lead this country as President.

So this morning, let me tell you what I'm for.

I'm for economic opportunity. The tax cuts we enacted in 1981 have unleashed 68 months of economic growth. My ~~opponent~~ ^{opponent} ~~thinks they were a disaster; I don't.~~ ^{doesn't understand that} So at every stop, I have made an iron clad commitment that I will repeat here now: I will not raise your taxes, period.

In Atlanta, I proposed to create jobs by cutting them further. I proposed to cut the maximum rate on capital gains to 15% -- not to help the rich, but to help launch the new small businesses that are the source of most of America's new jobs.

I believe that the way to cut the Federal deficit is by reining in spending, not by rounding up more taxes. So in , I proposed a flexible budget freeze that combines the ability to address our priorities with the discipline to meet our obligation to future generations.

America's workforce is changing. In Albuquerque, I proposed to help low income families balance the demands of work and family by proposing a comprehensive child care plan. The plan includes a Children's Tax Credit for America's families -- one that does not discriminate against families which choose a neighbor, relative, church or synagogue to help care for their kids, and one which doesn't discriminate against families where one parent cares for children at home.

Two years ago, I went to Canada to help negotiate the Free Trade agreement with Prime Minister Mulroney. This reflects the approach I've outlined on trade: let's knock

down barriers, not build them up. And as we pursue free trade, let's pursue fair trade as well.

In Hackensack, New Jersey, I detailed my approach to combatting the problem of drugs, one that combines tougher enforcement, prevention, interdiction, and perhaps the most important ingredient of all: leadership.

In Seattle, I outlined my approach to the problems that confront our environment -- an approach that includes faster action to clean up toxic waste, expanded parks and greenways, and international cooperation to stop problems like acid rain and ozone depletion.

On the ^{New} Jersey shore, I proposed an end to the ocean dumping of sewage sludge; and more aggressive enforcement of laws to prevent the illegal dumping of medical wastes in the ocean.

And back in Washington, D.C. I unveiled a plan to help us compete in this changing world by investing in the minds of our children.

All of these proposals spring from a fundamental set of beliefs about what can make this country great. Yes, they're Republican beliefs. But it runs deeper than that. Above all, they're American values.

highest ethical standards.
House, the agencies, or the Congress -- are held to the
government employees -- whether they work in the White
spelled out in detail my plan for making sure that all
I'm for an America where honesty counts -- and I've

Young people.
death penalty for drug kingpins who peddle poison to our
death penalty for awful violent crimes. And I'm for the
fear. So I'm for a tough approach to crime. I'm for the
alike can walk the streets of their neighborhood without
I'm for a safe America -- one where the young and old

day.
to say a voluntary prayer at the beginning of the school
are honored -- and where every child should have the right
I'm for an America where values like faith and respect

Bonds to help families save for college.
That's why I've proposed to create tax-free college savings
I'm for an America with its eyes fixed on the future.

go as far as that god-given ability will take them.
I'm for an America where every person has the chance to

You see, I'm for a strong and growing America.

I suppose there is no area in which the kind of America I'm for and the kind the Democrats would deliver is more different than one they're afraid to talk about. Their nominee spoke for 50 minutes in Atlanta and failed to mention the most important issue of our time: how to make the world a safer place in the 1990's.

In Chicago and Corpus Christi last week, I laid out my vision for meeting the challenges presented by a changing and complex world. I outlined a realistic approach to relations with the Soviets, and proposed to combine modernization of our forces with real progress toward strategic arms reductions.

I proposed to develop and deploy a strategic defense system as soon as possible. I called for new steps to halt the spread of chemical and nuclear weapons -- and the ballistic missiles that deliver these weapons of terror -- to unstable regimes, I suggested a framework for approaching some of the world's more troublesome hotspots, and proposed an international war on drugs. Perhaps most importantly, I stated clearly that we should support those brave men and women who are carrying on the struggle for freedom around the world.

My opponent has been silent at best and unsteady at worst on all of these issues. At first, he favored a

*was
then and
now he's
for reduction*

nuclear freeze that would have made our arms reduction progress with the Soviets impossible. Last week, he said ^{that} he now opposed it. Such vacillation may be riskless in a campaign, but in a dangerous world, it could prove to be disastrous.

Except for opposition to virtually every weapons system that would ensure our security, my opponent's policies are invisible. The candidate who opposes the stealth bomber favors instead stealth policies -- they can be neither seen nor heard.

The Governor of Massachusetts has trumpeted in his campaign the fact that he has never been to continental Europe. But I believe that ignorance in the defense of liberty is unacceptable for the potential leader of the free world. America needs steady, experienced leadership for the 1990s.

My fellow Republicans, ^{all} ~~that~~ is the difference between the two candidates, and between the two Parties. On the one hand, you have a solid record and a clear plan. On the other, you have a retreat from past responsibility and a hope that no one will ask what the future may hold.

Four years ago, we declared ourselves the Party of Hope and promised a new dawn of the American spirit.

Today, with that hope in full flower, we can see the American spirit rising and exercising its contagious influence all over the world.

Now is not the time for full retreat; it is the time for renewed optimism and bold, forceful action. Your task this week is to lay out our vision for a future of hope and opportunity for all the world to see.

Let's be proud of the ideas we have, of the values we hold, and of the country we love.

Thank you very much.

#