

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:** Chron File, 1989-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13755  
**Folder ID Number:** 13755-009

---

**Folder Title:**  
Princeton University 5/10/91 [OA 8322] [6]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>

---

PRE-TS version

(Hinchliffe//Blymire)  
May 4, 1991 1 p.m.  
PRINCETON Draft One

**PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY**  
May 10, 1991

Thank you, President Shapiro. I'm delighted to be here to help in the dedication of this impressive complex. Though I must say I'm glad this is May, and not the first snowfall. I don't think Barbara would let me take part in your Olympics.

I'm very proud to receive your Honorary Degree. But I'm going to have to disappoint you. Yale's threatened to revoke my degree if I swim in the Woody Woo. However, I will take pleasure in having my motorcade drive out through Nassau Gate.

As I stand here, I remember a day when a young Yale first-baseman and his team met Princeton on the field of battle. I see that site is now home to your Third World Center. I guess that's appropriate -- the Third World would have been the only place I could have gotten a pro ball contract. Wish just once I could have played on a team that had a year like Pete Carril's.

Seriously, I'm honored to receive a degree from Princeton. After all, Washington said "no college has turned out better scholars or more estimable characters." Certainly it's the only school that can claim as alumni the last two Secretaries of State. Both have been outstanding public servants. And both of them love this school. But only one has the tattoo to prove it.

I'll always remember the first time I saw the globe inside the Wilson School lobby. Anywhere you touch it, you set off vibrations across the rest of its surface. Makes us realize that

whatever we do affects the rest of the world. A pretty powerful responsibility. One I know this country is ready to accept.

Sometimes people call me an idealist. Well, that's the way I know I'm an American. When I see the yellow-ribbon spirit that bound us to our sons and daughters in the Gulf I feel such pride. Optimism. And possibilities. When we see American soldiers greet Iraqi pows with genuine compassion -- then we know what rich resources we have to help each other here at home. We will make the 21st century another American century of success and pride. All we need to do is join our caring, our talents, and our hands.

One hot July day last year, I stood at a podium on the South Lawn. The sight in front of me was unforgettable: 5,000 Americans of every faith, region, social group, and age. Brought together for a day of rejoicing. Together we signed into law the Americans with Disabilities Act: tremendously important and inspiring legislation that's reshaping this country. It was one of the proudest moments of my Presidency: because it was a moment when our government was working exactly the way our Founding Fathers envisioned it could. Exactly the way we want it to. We were able to make that bill a reality because the President, the Congress, and the American people worked together: each carrying out their roles the way the Constitution planned it 200 years ago.

That's the way we can bring about a new America. And that's the way we **must** bring about a new America -- heading ahead into our future by looking back into our past.

By picturing 40 men at a meeting. 40 men earnestly trying

to transform the most perfect idea of a democracy into a reality. 40 men of strong convictions and high reason thinking beyond them-selves -- thinking of posterity and of the future. Crafting an exhilarating document of philosophy as well as politics -- the Constitution of the United States of America. Putting into concrete words the visionary genius of Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence. Leaving us a legacy that is as real and important in our 20th century lives as two centuries ago.

But the Constitution's brilliant, original balance is being threatened. The first thing we must do before we can move forward as a nation is to rediscover this document's purpose -- and recommit ourselves to its preservation. And, above all, to the preservation of its bedrock principle of separation of powers. As Alexander Hamilton said: no branch should be allowed "to possess, directly or indirectly, an overruling influence over the others, in the administration of their powers." Yet in the America of 1991, this is exactly what has happened.

When people ask me what this government should be I send them right back to the Constitution. Right back to the place where they can read about the brilliant concept of a legislative branch created as a collective, deliberative body. I tell them that in the Constitution they can also read about a new kind of unified executive branch that can act decisively, quickly, energetically. One created with expansive prerogatives to enact legislation.

The Constitution framers designed these branches with co-equal but different powers and talents. They conceived them as

pieces of a puzzle that fit together best when each does the work it does best. Unfortunately there are now 535 would-be executives who need to go back and read their Constitution. Because what we have is a House Out of Order. And a fettered presidency. For the sake of American democracy at the dawn of the 21st century we must declare this situation intolerable and return to our roots.

Congress is eroding the mortar of our Constitution by usurping Presidential power. By imposing endless and arbitrary shackles on the executive's ability to function, Congress is draining the energy of the Constitution and lifeblood of this nation.

As Commander-in-Chief I was constitutionally able to execute powers in the Gulf -- to execute them quickly, decisively, knowing that full responsibility rested on me. But here at home, I am frustrated and impeded by a Congress obsessed with control.

Let me make sure you understand something. I have the greatest respect for the legitimate role of Congress in our system -- and for the wisdom of deferring to its Members in the appropriate ways. And I have the greatest loyalty for Congress as an institution -- after all, 24 years ago, it was there I first raised my hand to be sworn into public life. But 2 years ago I took a more important oath. And that means I must speak out when I see that by invading the Presidential prerogative, Congress has neglected what it was established to do. When instead, it has distorted and unbalanced the separation of powers. We cannot stay silent when attempts are made to exercise the Office of the President from the wrong end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

To keep America strong and fair and true to Jefferson's vision, we must act to restore the original rule of law of our Constitution. All branches have to work well in order for our government to work at all. As President, I am obligated to issue this call for action: for I am the only person charged by the Constitution to swear I will "preserve, protect, and defend" it. I cannot ignore that it further charges me to "faithfully execute the Office of President." If the President does not resist Congressional encroachment upon the prerogatives of his office -- then it is an abdication of his constitutional responsibilities. And that is something I will not do. This charge to restore Congress to its Constitutional definition is a non-partisan crusade. For the sake of America, I urge all Americans to join.

What do I mean by saying Congress is eroding Presidential power? I mean a Congress that positions itself to act in a way wholly contrary to the allocation of powers in the Constitution.

I mean a Congress that tries to encroach on the Presidency with unprecedented incursions into its ability to perform.

I mean a Congress which has sacrificed its historical role in reasoned debate on issues of broad policy: choosing instead to focus on the detailed management of executive branch authority.

I mean a Congress created to deal in broad strokes which is instead mired down in a petty realm where no detail of executive administration is too small. Where congressmen have been transformed from national legislators to narrowly focused ombudsmen consumed with micromanaging details of departments. As Teddy

Roosevelt warned: The President cannot do his work "if Congress is permitted to undertake the task of making up his mind for him as to how he shall perform what is clearly his sole duty."

Let me tell you about the invasive micromanagement -- or, rather, micromismanagement -- we have to live with every day. You see, Congress prefers to control the details of executive branch departments and agencies through riders to appropriations bills. It uses the power of the purse to control who does what. It conducts "oversight" hearings that have no relation to legislative work; and are simply a political way of controlling executive branch work. Undermining that branch's ability to discharge its Constitutional duties. Simply put, micromanagement is how Congress forces the executive branch to run the government its way. Not what the Founders wanted. Not what the American people want.

Look how it's hamstrung the Defense Department. Its budget's a micromanaging free-for-all. 30 years ago, 2 committees in each chamber dealt with this executive department. Now, when its percentage of the GNP is only 1/2 half as much as then, it has to answer to 107 committees and subcommittees. Each day of every session senior Defense officials spend more than 80 hours preparing and testifying at committee hearings. Deputy Sec. Atwood spends 1/3 of his time responding to committees. At times, former Sec. Carlucci testified 4 days a week on the Hill -- asked the same questions and giving the same answers to one committee after another. Last year it took 500 man years and over \$50 million just to write reports responding to Congressional queries

on such items as plans for manning tugboats, and accounting for the number of military bands. And Defense staff has to respond yearly to more than 3/4 million Congressional staff inquiries.

Then there's Veterans Affairs. It must notify Congress 6 months in advance of staffing changes affecting as few as 3 of nearly 1/4 million employees. And Justice, where a rider was added preventing the closing of a 2-person FBI bureau on Montana that would have saved \$1.9 million. And Commerce, where Congress overruled the Secretary's decision that five pork-barrel public-works projects costing \$11 million were ineligible and unlawful.

And foreign policy. There has to be a better way to share the power. Over the last 20 years we have witnessed a disturbing departure, as Congress has more boldly asserted an ever-increasing and influential role in day-to-day micromanagement of foreign policy operations. The founding fathers did not intend that our foreign policy should be conducted or reviewed by grand juries. They fought to focus the conduct of foreign policy in one man. The President. That was so as a nation we could act quickly, decisively, secretly. The role envisioned for Congress was political, not regulatory, and certainly not obstructionist.

Yet last year, when I asked for \$800 million in aid for developing democracies in Panama and Nicaragua, look at the restrictions tacked on. A provision for D.C. to use federal funds for abortion. A hold-up on aid until a child care bill was passed. A \$185m correctional facility for West Virginia.

And this is all supposed to be kept secret. Buried in the

119-page Interior Department appropriations bill, for instance, was a clause prohibiting employees of that executive department from making any record of who contacted them from the Hill, and what information they were asked to provide. That's been called a "perfect illustration of congressional micromanagement."

How did this ever get so far. How did we get to the point where Congress has strayed from its historical role of helping to set overall direction for the nation. Where it wastes its talents and our energies in the petty details of policy execution.

Well, I'll tell you some of the things I learned in my years on the Hill. Congress has become paralyzed by committees. We now have as many subcommittees -- over 300 -- as we had staff members after the war. Committees are fiefdoms. run by power brokers. But are they fields of specialization? Well, the average Congressman belongs to 7 -- the average senator 11. Some hearings are scheduled simultaneously. But the system continues because it allows members to better intervene in the daily details of executive and independent agencies. That means more and more work is done not by the elected representatives, but by a kind of unelected "shadow government." Congressional staff.

These surrogate legislators run the offices while their bosses juggle committee meetings and interview executive agency employees about line item expenditures. These anonymous faces hold the power of legislation -- often creating, drafting, and negotiating bills. They are near-tenured -- hold unaccountable, undemocratic powers -- and have mushroomed in size the past 20

years. They make up the equivalent of a small city -- nearly 40,000 strong. And they cost the taxpayers \$1/3 billion yearly -- \$600,000 average per member for staff and administration. Some earn \$100,000. This explosion in staff has facilitated the parallel growth of committees, the establishment of subcommittee fiefdoms, and therefore of micromanagement.

But the most troubling aspect of the Hill staff is that Congress has exempted them from the watchdog laws it strictly imposes on executive branch staff. Although Congressional personnel are intricately involved with every aspect of executive agency operations, they aren't covered by the laws that restrict executive employees. The Freedom of Information Act. Government in the Sunshine Act. Privacy Act. Civil Rights statute. Special Prosecutors. Inspector Generals. Congress has freed itself from such constraints -- while at the same time awarding itself and its staff entitlements it denies to all others. A Congressional leader explained: "We can't subject congressional staff to criminal exposure for conflict of interest -- it's an infringement on their right to represent special interests."

When those who make laws don't have to live under them, they lose the incentives that make reform and improvement possible.

Then, of course, there is the biggest incentive of all. Re-election. We need to ask ourselves how much this is at the root of what goes on behind the closed, and open, doors on the Hill.

Re-election. There's more turnover in the Supreme Soviet than in the U.S. House. This body was supposed to be the "chamber

of the people," rotating every two years to reflect changes in the American tide. Instead, it's become the "chamber of the incumbents," virtually handing out lifetime contracts.

The stacked deck election process grossly favors incumbents. But what's most disturbing is that it makes voters increasingly impotent and irrelevant. 33% turnout for midterm elections proves the impotence voters feel toward this unresponsive, troubled institution. And a largely voter-proof Congress has, in turn, led to further arrogance of power. By tenuring incumbents, the legislative process itself has become arbitrary and undemocratic.

In turn, as voter influence over Congress shrinks, it is increasingly dominated by special interest groups. That is the shame -- and the sham -- of American elections today. Congressional staffs have become unofficial, taxpayer-financed campaign staffs. 44% are based in home districts; the Hill-based ones churn out mass mailings of unsolicited "newsletters" that are essentially campaign literature. Each year, over \$100 million in tax dollars goes into the franking process to send 3/4 billion pieces of mail. Less than 5% answers constituent questions.

In election years, the House sends 100 million more pieces of mail than in off-years. The year before his re-election, one senator sent 11 million pieces. Another sent an average of 10 pieces per household. How can challengers compete with that? Or compete with gerrymandering -- the politicians' self-preserving contribution to modern art. Or compete with PACs -- the biggest power in campaign financing. 93% of which went to House incum-

bents in 1988. One incumbent senator alone received \$4 million.

The fact is: a 97% re-election rate is not about legislative leadership. It's about the recent phenomenon of constituent service. An unfair incumbent advantage. A bottom-line distortion that's turned the institution that was the genius of American political creation into a bloated machine. A machine that despite its resources, can't do its appointed work in a timely manner.

That's why we have to move now. American government is being gridlocked by an adversarial Congress where constituent work busywork have replaced governing. A Congress where special interests stifle innovation. Where there is paralysis, not policy. Where, as Princetonian James Madison wrote: "The legislative department is everywhere extending the sphere of its activity, and drawing all power into its impetuous vortex."

America has to realize that Congress does not best live up to its constitutional trust by serving as a combination of bureaucrats and pseudo-Presidents. We must ensure that Congress realizes the brilliant genius of its design and talent. After all, it is defined in the first article. It is the power closest to the people. And -- most importantly of all -- we are a nation of laws. And it is Congress that must make them.

We can become the place envisioned by the founding fathers. The place where branches work together, not in opposition, each in its best way. Where we rely on historically proven political checks and balances; not inappropriate legal ones. We can restore respect to government by restoring coherence to government.

We have the best government in the world. Today in Poland and Hungary, the demand for copies of the Federalist Papers is insatiable. And Václav Havel says that the Constitution "inspires us to be citizens." We've been deeded an invaluable treasure by our ancestors. It is our obligation to them -- and to those who follow us -- to restore it to its original purpose and purity.

So I propose we take steps to reinvigorate our government -- starting by pledging loyalty to our Constitution. First, Congress must distance itself from micromanagement. Oversight should be based on mutual trust, not complicated regulations that frustrate development of trust. Congress must return to its planning role and focus on the big picture, so executive departments can make their own decisions within general guidelines. In return, the executive branch promises to improve the consultative process.

The President must have access to the line-item veto, as most Governors do. This doesn't give the office all-omnipotent power. It merely provides a detailed exposure of hidden agenda items -- and makes Congress accountable for personal votes.

On the Hill, the committee system should be consolidated. Then, as members acquire specific in-depth responsibilities, staff could be cut back and put back in their appropriate place.

We must make the Congress more responsive to, and reflective of, the country. That means election reform that will level the playing field between incumbents and challengers. No longer should Congress be able to be above the law just because its work is no longer meaningfully reviewed by the voters.

Instead of gerrymandering, we need a nationwide standard for redistricting based on population, not politics. And the Atty General must attack in court all gerrymanders that bring undue advantage to controlling state parties -- regardless of political affiliation. This will make voter choice possible again.

The paramount need for competitive elections compels bold action. So we must have real, significant PAC reform and public financing of Congressional candidates, without any spending caps. While we're at it, we must eliminate the "soft money" loophole which allows corporations and unions to use their own funds without limitation to establish and administer PAC operations.

We must enact strict restrictions against Congressional staff being used in campaigns. We all know there are ways to circumvent the law and campaign on tax dollars. Let's make all campaigns equal by having all workers paid from campaign funds.

We can do this. We will enter the 21st century with unity of purpose if we become reformist supporters of the greatest political document conceived: our night watchman of democracy.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you at the "Fountain of Freedom." I hope these thoughts have lived up to the goals Woodrow Wilson set for himself when he made speeches as President of Princeton. "If I have the privilege of coming into your life ... then fire calls to fire and real life begins, the life that generates life, the life that generates power."

Together, as Americans, we can rediscover that power -- and recommit ourselves to that fire. God bless you all.

May 4, 1991

**TO:** TONY  
**FROM:** BETH  
**SUBJECT:** PRINCETON

Hi. Here's the speech. I hope you like it and that it's what you wanted -- you said to make it an "attack dog" speech, so I tried. (And, let's say I put my whole heart into it!)

Also, here are all of my notes, listed under each source I used for research. Length: I noticed most commencement speeches are 12 pages of text (i.e., not including jokes) -- that's just what this came out to. There were so many parts to it, I couldn't figure out how to make it shorter.

I hope everything goes well. It's not everything I wanted it to be -- I wish I could have written it in the office, feeling well. I'll talk to you on Monday.

Hope Michigan went well --

Hinchliffe/Blymire  
May 7, 1991 1 p.m.  
A:P3 Draft Two

**PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY**  
May 10, 1991

[[Thank you, President Shapiro. Governor Florio; Members of Congress; Mrs. Shapiro; Board of Trustees Chairman Henderson; Dean Williamson; Associate Dean Morrow.]] I'm delighted to be here to help in the dedication of this impressive complex. Though I must say I'm glad this is May, and not the first snowfall. I don't think Barbara would let me take part in your Olympics. //

Seriously, I'm honored to receive an honorary degree from Princeton. After all, Washington said "no college has turned out better scholars or more estimable characters." Certainly, it's the only school that can claim as alumni the last two Secretaries of State. Both have been outstanding public servants. And both of them love this school. But only one has the tattoo to prove it.///

I'll always remember the first time I saw the globe inside the Woodrow Wilson School lobby. Anywhere you touch it, you set off vibrations across the rest of its surface. I can't think of a more appropriate symbol for this nation's role in the world. When we act, we really can set off tremors across the globe. We have become accustomed to that responsibility as a nation. We see it as our special burden and our special blessing.

I would like to talk today about the source of America's greatness, its Constitution. More to the point, I will discuss

the way in which our separation of powers doctrine gives our people a government that preserves for this and future generations the promise and blessings of liberty.

Most politicians today must confront an unpleasant fact: People have lost faith in government because government has become incomprehensible to them. The Washington of the civics textbook seems to bear little resemblance to the Washington we read about in newspapers or magazines, or see on the television screen. What in theory is a nicely orchestrated system of government, looks more like a three-ring mud-wrestling match, in which behemoths struggle for superiority. The concept of separated powers has given way to the view that politicians and judges in Washington struggle over a single, amorphous power.

Let me suggest that we can restore faith in government by making our government more faithful to the design our founders laid out. I'm not asking that we don powdered wigs and restore the institutions as they were two centuries ago. I'm really calling for us to honor the doctrine of the separation of powers.

Let's start by discussing Congress. The founders never envisioned a Congress that would churn out hundreds of thousands of pages worth of reports, hearings, documents, laws, rules and regulations each year. They saw Congress as a rather modest branch of government, charged with doing the nation's business deliberately. They thought that state governments would assume far greater importance in the scheme of things -- and for 150 years, they were right.

Although the founders took great pains to ensure that the President could not become an elected monarch, they were most wary of Congress. James Madison, a Princeton graduate, warned that "The legislative department is everywhere extending the sphere of its activity, and drawing all power into its impetuous vortex... It is against the enterprising ambition of this department that the people ought to indulge all their jealousy and exhaust all of their precautions."

Madison did not mean to disparage Congress with this comment, any more than I wish to do so today. He merely wanted to acknowledge a fact of human nature: Politicians strive naturally to accumulate power, and will stop only when prevented from doing so by law or force.

Consider a few ways in which Congress has tried to weaken or usurp executive authority within the realm of domestic politics:

Start with the excessive exercise of oversight powers. Thirty years ago, we devoted nearly 9.5 percent of our gross national product to Pentagon expenditures. Today, Pentagon spending accounts for only 5 percent of our GNP. But Congressional oversight has metastasized. One hundred seven committees and subcommittees oversee Defense programs and spending. For FY-1989, the Pentagon devoted 500 man-years and over \$50 million just to write reports responding to Congressional queries on such items as plans for manning tugboats, and accounting for the number of military bands. Defense staff has to respond yearly to more than 750,000

Congressional staff inquiries.

Cabinet agencies can offer equally chilling accounts of the ways in which Congress, ostensibly exercising its powers of oversight, binds an executive.

Ironically, it also ties up the legislative branch. What our founders saw as a deliberative body sometimes behaves like a legislative Tower of Babel. Congress now includes many committees, subcommittees, task forces and panels -- over 300. The average member of the House belongs to seven committees or subcommittees; the average senator, eleven. One wag around Washington says that anyone who forgets the name of a member of the House or Senate always can get by simply by addressing the politician as "Mr. Chairman or Madame Chairman." But think about it: more than half the members of Congress now have that title.

Congressional staffs, which not too long ago included only two to three assistants per representative, formulate policy, draft laws, determine votes. Now, this band of more than 37,000 costs taxpayers more than \$300 million each year -- and each Congressional office spends an average of \$600,000 on staff.

As staffs proliferate, they must find things to do. They spend a great deal of time pursuing re-election, through the special privilege of franked mail.

But congressional "service" distorts government in other ways. It has become common practice, for instance, for members of Congress to attach regulations or appropriations to bills that deal with entirely different issues.

Last year, when I asked for \$800 million in aid for developing democracies in Panama and Nicaragua, some Senators tacked on a provision that would enable the District of Columbia government to use federal funds for abortions. Another Senator demanded child-care legislation. The final measure included \$185 million for a correctional facility.

Congress has become so adept at bundling many different bills under a single title that members often have no idea exactly what they are voting for -- and many later find themselves unable to explain such peculiarities as a federal grant to study cow belches, or a Lawrence Welk Museum.

In short, the more adroit Congress becomes at performing favors or micromanaging the executive branch, the less competent it becomes with regard to its own duties.

At the same time, Congress has fallen victim to perceptions of arrogance. It has rendered itself exempt from the many rules and regulations it writes for the executive branch -- and for everyone else. Congressional personnel, for instance, are not covered by the laws that restrict -- or protect -- executive branch employees. These laws include the Freedom of Information Act. Government in the Sunshine Act. Privacy Act. Civil Rights statutes. Congress does not have to respond to queries from special prosecutors or inspectors general. In short, it has freed itself from a wide range of restraints, while awarding itself and its staff special perks.

A Congressional leader once told a member of our

administration: "To impose criminal liability on our staff for conflicts of interest would be an unconstitutional infringement on our Constitutional duty to represent the special interests." He was not joking!

A president faces a tough challenge in trying to "preserve, protect and defend" a constitution plagued by such chaos. Fortunately, our system provides powers suited to the task.

The president's most powerful tool for preserving, protecting and defending the Constitution is the veto.

Nelson Six times in my presidency, I have vetoed bills that weaken the presidential powers. In each case, I wanted to preserve presidential powers, in accordance with my oath of office. Over a year from now, Congress will vote on whether to reauthorize the independent counsel statute -- a law that has done a great deal to discourage good people from executive branch service. The debate over that bill should prove interesting from the standpoint of defining and preserving presidential powers.

Vetoes serve another purpose. They provide a tool for forcing the legislature to legislate wisely and deliberately, rather than with reckless haste. According to this theory, when Congress bundles up a series of unrelated measures and calls it a "bill," a president has the authority to veto separate measures, as if they were separate bills. Several times in my presidency, we have exercised a power much like this by refusing to honor provisions of a law that seem to violate the Constitution.

While the notion of the inherent veto remains controversial,

I have sought -- and will continue to seek -- a line-item veto, even though I believe such a power already rests within the Constitution. The line-item veto can protect the American people from injudicious Congressional legislation and appropriation.

The second presidential power is the power to propose legislation. Every president makes regular use of this power. We recently have challenged Congress, for instance, to pass our crime and transportation packages by June 14. Such bills address national problems. They reflect a special presidential power, which Thomas Jefferson noted in his first inaugural. He described the president as the only government officer who "commands a view of the whole ground."

Ironically, the legislative power may offer a means for confining Congressional aspirations and restoring the balance of powers. The military base-closing exercise demonstrated that in many ways Congress simply cannot reform itself without outside help. Many members will admit -- off the record, of course -- that we need to restore competition in Congressional elections. We will do our best to challenge gerrymanders, regardless of which party benefits from improperly drawn congressional boundaries.

We also will try to reform campaign financing. In the past we have proposed eliminating political action committees supported by corporations, unions or trade organizations; and preventing those organizations from paying for the overhead of administrative costs of independent PACs. We have tried to

strengthen political parties by increasing the amounts of money they may contribute to political campaigns. We would like to reduce the power of incumbency by prohibiting the use of excess campaign funds, paring down the franking privilege, and prohibiting politicians from building up big campaign chests by rolling campaign contributions from one cycle to another. And candidates also ought to disclose all "soft money" contributions and their sources.

Finally, we ought to restore faith in Congressional intentions by applying to Congress the statutes it applies to everyone else.

Now, we will achieve none of these reforms without making use of another, emerging power of the presidency -- a tool one constitutional scholar calls the rhetorical presidency and many commentators call the bully pulpit.

A president often must lead by example, and propose reforms that don't involve new legislation or new demands on taxpayers' earnings. Our America 2000 education strategy, for instance, does not create lots of new programs or impose new burdens on American taxpayers. It draws on people's common frustration with an educational system that must do better. It encourages people to use their common sense in creating better schools. It won't help build a new office building in Washington, but it very well may inspire people to build a better future for themselves.

This approach motivates other parts of our legislative and economic program. We have proposed, for instance, returning a

number of programs to the states, where people understand their needs and know how best to fulfill them.

For too long, pundits and special interests have equated vision with bureaucracy. This is irresponsible not only in terms of public policy, but also in terms of constitutional theory. The more a president defines his or her powers strictly in terms of legislation, the more likely it will be that Congressional and presidential responsibilities merge and our system of checks and balances will exist only in theory, not in practice.

Although I have talked a great deal about the founders today, the presidency changes constantly. Presidents define themselves by the ways in which they use their constitutional powers. They may use the veto power to shape policy, protect the Constitution, and encourage Congress to think carefully about its actions. They may exercise their foreign policy powers -- not just in matters of war, but also -- as we did during the Persian Gulf crisis -- through such actions as seizing assets, maintaining diplomatic contacts, promoting free and fair trade.

Finally, and perhaps most important -- a president must serve not merely as the unitary executive, but as a unifying executive. As President, I feel a special duty to promote the values, goals, and purposes that bind us as Americans.

As President, I feel honor-bound to strengthen the marvelous system of government bequeathed to us, so that we may remain the freest, most moral, most prosperous land in history.

Thank you, and may God bless the United States of America.

The pre-TS draft

(Hinchliffe//Blymire)  
May 4, 1991 1 p.m.  
PRINCETON Draft One

**PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY**  
May 10, 1991

Thank you, President Shapiro. I'm delighted to be here to help in the dedication of this impressive complex. Though I must say I'm glad this is May, and not the first snowfall. I don't think Barbara would let me take part in your Olympics.

As I stand here, I remember a day when a young Yale first-baseman and his team met Princeton on the field of battle. I see that site is now home to your Third World Center. I guess that's appropriate -- the Third World would have been the only place I could have gotten a pro ball contract. Wish just once I could have played on a team that had a year like Pete Carril's.

Seriously, I'm honored to receive a degree from Princeton. After all, Washington said "no college has turned out better scholars or more estimable characters." Certainly it's the only school that can claim as alumni the last two Secretaries of State. Both have been outstanding public servants. And both of them love this school. But only one has the tattoo to prove it.

I'll always remember the first time I saw the globe inside the Wilson School lobby. Anywhere you touch it, you set off vibrations across the rest of its surface. I can't think of a more appropriate symbol for this nation's role in the world. When we act, we really can set off tremors across the globe. We have become accustomed to that responsibility as a nation. We see it as our special burden and our special blessing.

I would like to talk today about the source of America's greatness, its Constitution. More to the point, I would like to discuss the doctrine of the separation of powers, and how it plays a critical role in giving our people a government that preserves for this and future generations the promise and blessings of liberty.

Our Constitution has endured for two centuries because it, unlike many constitutional documents, appreciates human nature -- in all its grit and glory. Our founders understood that men and women in positions of power will do their best to extend their powers and usurp others'. They understood that legislatures naturally fall prey to ugly disputes -- "faction," Madison called it. They understood that an effective government required an energetic president, an ambitious Congress, and a restrained, impartial judiciary. In short, the founders were not Pollyannas when it came to writing and thinking about human nature. They understood the power of ambition -- and tried to harness it for the good of the people.

The general order of the Constitution really is rather simple: A president would lead and serve the entire nation. Congress would serve the people, district-by-district, state-by-state, and it would function as a deliberative body. The founders never envisioned a Congress that would churn out hundreds of thousands of pages worth of reports, hearings, documents, laws, rules and regulations each year. They thought Congress would be constrained to act with "deliberate speed" in

matters of national import. They also saw the president as the one significant brake on the natural tendency of politicians to accumulate power. They gave him powers of appointment and veto, and they made him the one and only official charged officially with protecting and defending the Constitution.

It is impossible for me to emphasize too strongly this responsibility for upholding the Constitution. Our founders knew that Congress would try to overstep its constitutional authorities, and they knew that presidents who failed to defend their powers would lose them. Thus, American political history contains an unchanging subplot: the constant battle between the president and the Congress in matters of governance.

We all know that politicians don't enjoy the best of reputations these days (poll data). I would like to argue that our problems stem in part from a breakdown of the separation of powers. Congress, behaving quite naturally, has pursued -- and in some cases acquired -- powers that properly belong to the executive.

You undoubtedly are familiar with many of the ways in which Congress tries to micromanage the executive branch, but I will list a few of them for illustrative purposes.

The Department of Defense: Thirty years ago, we devoted nearly 5 percent of our gross national product to Pentagon expenditures. Two committees in each house of Congress reviewed that spending -- and did a pretty good job.

Today, Pentagon spending accounts for only half as much of

our GNP as it did during the early days of the Kennedy presidency. But Congressional oversight has metastasized. During the budget process, 107 committees and subcommittees look over Defense programs and spending. Look how it's hamstringing the Defense Department.

Each day of every session senior Defense officials spend more than 80 hours preparing and testifying at committee hearings. Deputy Secretary xxx Atwood spends 1/3 of his time responding to committees. At times, former Secretary Frank Carlucci testified 4 days a week on the Hill -- asked the same questions and giving the same answers to one committee after another. Last year the Pentagon devoted 500 man years and over \$50 million just to write reports responding to Congressional queries on such items as plans for manning tugboats, and accounting for the number of military bands. Defense staff has to respond yearly to more than 750,000 Congressional staff inquiries.

Then there's Veterans Affairs. It must notify Congress 6 months in advance of staffing changes affecting as few as 3 of the department's nearly 250,000 employees. And Justice, where a rider was added preventing the closing of a 2-person FBI bureau on Montana that would have saved \$1.9 million. And Commerce, where Congress overruled the Secretary's decision that five pork-barrel public-works projects costing \$11 million were ineligible and unlawful.

What our founders saw as a deliberative body sometimes

degenerates into a legislative Tower of Babel. Different committees speak with different voices, and carry different amounts of political weight. Some committees snatch power from others. Some demand entirely different kinds of information about the very same programs or issues. As a result, the legislative branch dissipates its time and energy by micromanaging another branch of government -- and it also makes it very difficult for the executive branch to execute the law.

Congress now includes as many subcommittees -- over 300 -- as it had staff members after World War II. The average member of the House belongs to seven committees or subcommittees; the average senator, eleven. One wag around Washington says that anyone who forgets the name of a member of the House or Senate always can get by simply by addressing the politician as "Mr. Chairman or Madame Chairman." But think about it: more than half the members of Congress now have that title.

The proliferation of committees has produced another explosion on Capitol Hill. Congressional staffs, which not too long ago included only two to three assistants per representative, have grown more rapidly than any other branch of government. They formulate policy, draft laws, determine votes. This band of 40,000 costs taxpayers more than \$300 million each year -- and each Congressional office spends an average of \$600,000 on staff.

Members of Congress make full use of this resource -- the the benefit of politicians and occasional detriment to the

constitution.

As committees and staffs proliferate, Congress digs ever more deeply into executive branch affairs -- and ironically, surrenders its ability to fulfill its own basic responsibilities. Congressional offices expend great effort serving special interests from back home -- rather than the supposedly unspecial constituent. In some cases, as in the Keating Five, members attempt to help out people who live outside the district, but contribute to the politicians' campaign chests.

Often, in order not to be seen performing such favors, Congress resorts to sleights of hand. Last year, when I asked for \$800 million in aid for developing democracies in Panama and Nicaragua, for instance, one member tacked on a provision that would enable the District of Columbia government to use federal funds for abortions. Another demanded child-care legislation. And the final measure included \$185 million for a correctional facility in West Virginia.

Buried in the 119-page Interior Department appropriations bill was a clause prohibiting employees of that executive department from making any record of who contacted them from the Hill, and what information they were asked to provide. That's been called a "perfect illustration of congressional micromanagement."

Since the reform of Congress in 1974, Congress has passed a balanced budget only once. It has met its deadlines for passing budgets only xx times. Scandals involving members of both

parties have sprung up with depressing regularity.

Nevertheless, Congress has rendered itself exempt from the many rules and regulations it writes for the executive branch -- and for everyone else. Congressional personnel, for instance, are not covered by the laws that restrict -- or protect -- executive branch employees. These laws include the Freedom of Information Act. Government in the Sunshine Act. Privacy Act. Civil Rights statutes. Congress does not have to respond to queries from special prosecutors or inspectors general. In short, it has freed itself from a wide range of restraints, while awarding itself and its staff special perks. A Congressional leader once told a member of our administration: "We can't subject congressional staff to criminal exposure for conflict of interest -- it's an infringement on their right to represent special interests." And he was not joking!

But I come to praise Congress and our constitution, not to bury them. I have the greatest respect for the legitimate role of Congress in our system -- and for the wisdom of deferring to its Members in the appropriate ways. And I have the greatest loyalty for Congress as an institution -- after all, 24 years ago, it was there I first raised my hand to be sworn into public life.

But presidents, as I have noted, also have special responsibilities to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution. They do so through judicious use of the veto power, for instance. Six times in my presidency, I have vetoed

bills that weaken the presidential powers. (examples)

Presidents also may use the power to propose legislation in hopes of preserving and clarifying the separation of powers. (legislative proposals: campaign finance reform, line-item veto, etc.)

Then, of course, there is the biggest incentive of all. Re-election. We need to ask ourselves how much this is at the root of what goes on behind the closed, and open, doors on the Hill.

Re-election. There's more turnover in the Supreme Soviet than in the U.S. House. This body was supposed to be the "chamber of the people," rotating every two years to reflect changes in the American tide. Instead, it's become the "chamber of the incumbents," virtually handing out lifetime contracts.

The stacked deck election process grossly favors incumbents. But what's most disturbing is that it makes voters increasingly impotent and irrelevant. 33% turnout for midterm elections proves the impotence voters feel toward this unresponsive, troubled institution. And a largely voter-proof Congress has, in turn, led to further arrogance of power. By tenuring incumbents, the legislative process itself has become arbitrary and undemocratic.

In turn, as voter influence over Congress shrinks, it is increasingly dominated by special interest groups. That is the shame -- and the sham -- of American elections today. Congressional staffs have become unofficial, taxpayer-financed campaign staffs. 44% are based in home districts; the Hill-based ones churn out mass mailings of unsolicited "newsletters" that are

essentially campaign literature. Each year, over \$100 million in tax dollars goes into the franking process to send 3/4 billion pieces of mail. Less than 5% answers constituent questions.

In election years, the House sends 100 million more pieces of mail than in off-years. The year before his re-election, one senator sent 11 million pieces. Another sent an average of 10 pieces per household. How can challengers compete with that? Or compete with gerrymandering -- the politicians' self-preserving contribution to modern art. Or compete with PACs -- the biggest power in campaign financing. 93% of which went to House incumbents in 1988. One incumbent senator alone received \$4 million.

The fact is: a 97% re-election rate is not about legislative leadership. It's about the recent phenomenon of constituent service. An unfair incumbent advantage. A bottom-line distortion that's turned the institution that was the genius of American political creation into a bloated machine. A machine that despite its resources, can't do its appointed work in a timely manner.

That's why we have to move now. American government is being gridlocked by an adversarial Congress where constituent work busywork have replaced governing. A Congress where special interests stifle innovation. Where there is paralysis, not policy. Where, as Princetonian James Madison wrote: "The legislative department is everywhere extending the sphere of its activity, and drawing all power into its impetuous vortex."

America has to realize that Congress does not best live up to its constitutional trust by serving as a combination of

bureaucrats and pseudo-Presidents. We must ensure that Congress realizes the brilliant genius of its design and talent.

We have the best government in the world. Today in Poland and Hungary, the demand for copies of the Federalist Papers is insatiable. And Vaclev Havel says that the Constitution "inspires us to be citizens." We've been deeded an invaluable treasure by our ancestors. It is our obligation to them -- and to those who follow us -- to restore it to its original purpose and purity.

So I propose we take steps to reinvigorate our government -- starting by pledging loyalty to our Constitution. First, Congress must distance itself from micromanagement. Oversight should be based on mutual trust, not complicated regulations that frustrate development of trust. Congress must return to its planning role and focus on the big picture, so executive departments can make their own decisions within general guidelines. In return, the executive branch promises to improve the consultative process.

The President must have access to the line-item veto, as most Governors do. This doesn't give the office all-omnipotent power. It merely provides a detailed exposure of hidden agenda items -- and makes Congress accountable for personal votes.

On the Hill, the committee system should be consolidated. Then, as members acquire specific in-depth responsibilities, staff could be cut back and put back in their appropriate place.

We must make the Congress more responsive to, and reflective of, the country. That means election reform that will level the

playing field between incumbents and challengers. No longer should Congress be able to be above the law just because its work is no longer meaningfully reviewed by the voters.

Instead of gerrymandering, we need a nationwide standard for redistricting based on population, not politics. And the Atty General must attack in court all gerrymanders that bring undue advantage to controlling state parties -- regardless of political affiliation. This will make voter choice possible again.

The paramount need for competitive elections compels bold action. So we must have real, significant PAC reform and public financing of Congressional candidates, without any spending caps. While we're at it, we must eliminate the "soft money" loophole which allows corporations and unions to use their own funds without limitation to establish and administer PAC operations.

We must enact strict restrictions against Congressional staff being used in campaigns. We all know there are ways to circumvent the law and campaign on tax dollars. Let's make all campaigns equal by having all workers paid from campaign funds.

We can do this. We will enter the 21st century with unity of purpose if we become reformist supporters of the greatest political document conceived: our night watchman of democracy.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you at the "Fountain of Freedom." I hope these thoughts have lived up to the goals Woodrow Wilson set for himself when he made speeches as President of Princeton. "If I have the privilege of coming into your life ... then fire calls to fire and real life begins, the

life that generates life, the life that generates power."

Together, as Americans, we can rediscover that power -- and recommit ourselves to that fire. God bless you all.

Info for speech's p. 1

Carol -  
Both has the  
file -  
Peggy

April 29, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR BETH HINCHLIFFE  
CAROL BLYMIRE

FROM: PEGGY DOOLEY

SUBJECT: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY -- BUILDING DEDICATION

I know you've already received a fair amount of information from Bob Durkee. He gave me a lot of additional material. The only other tidbits I can offer are:

- o Famous Princeton grads (many, many others listed in books attached): Woodrow Wilson and James A. Baker III
- o In front of the first President's house (a beautiful old yellow house that you pass on your way into the campus -- it now houses the Alumni Council) are two sycamore trees planted to commemorate the Boston Tea Party.
- o The event is to dedicate Bendheim Hall, Fisher Hall, Scudder Plaza, and Jacoby Library. I have attached a map of the speech site.
- o The Fountain of Freedom -- to the left of the podium -- was dedicated when President Johnson dedicated the Robertson Building (a.k.a. the Woodrow Wilson School) in 1966. It is called the Fountain of Freedom in keeping with the goals of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public Policy: world harmony and the spreading of democracy. (see map) Also: in the lobby of the Woodrow Wilson School there is a sculpture of a globe, and anywhere you touch it, it sets off vibrations over the rest of the surface -- analogous to whatever happens in one spot of the world affects the rest of it.
- o The Princeton fight song is "Crash Through the Line of Blue" (Yale joke?)

# # #

FRICK LABORATORY

CORWIN HALL

(Politics) ~~Center~~  
~~for Intl. Studies~~

Fountain of Freedom

BENDHEIM HALL

(Center for Intl. Studies)

[across the street, but in line of sight, School of Architecture]

PODIUM

FISHER HALL

(Economics)

Scudder Plaza

ROBERTSON HALL  
Woodrow Wilson School of Public & Intl. Affairs

Also being dedicated: Jacoby Library

greatest of all, I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of a perfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him near it. Without pretensions to that high confidence reposed in me by the first and great revolutionary character, whose preeminent services had placed him in the first place in his country's love and destined for him the page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only to give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall not be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will not be intentional; and your support against the errors of others, who may not mean what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a consolation to me for the past; and my future pride will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it. I desire, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all. I am, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much a better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe, lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

## FIRST ANNUAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

December 8, 1801

MY FELLOW CITIZENS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: It is a circumstance of sincere gratification to me that on meeting the great council of the Nation, I am able to announce to them, on the grounds of reasonable expectation, that the wars and troubles which have for so many years afflicted our nations have at length come to an end,<sup>1</sup> and that the communications of peace and commerce are once more opening among them. While we are permitted to return thanks to the beneficent Being who has been pleased to send us into them the spirit of conciliation and forgiveness, we are bound to express our peculiar gratitude to be thankful to him that our own peace has been preserved through so perilous a season, and ourselves permitted quietly to cultivate the earth and to practice and improve those arts which tend to increase our comforts. The assurances, indeed, of friendly disposition, received from all the powers with whom we have principal relations, had not given us the confidence that our peace with them would not have been dis-

<sup>1</sup> In January, 1801, Napoleon made peace with Austria, in March with Naples, in July with Prussia, and in October with Russia.