

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

2011-2184-F

# 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 Draft Files  
**Subseries:** Chron File, 1989-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13493  
**Folder ID Number:** 13493-004

---

**Folder Title:**  
Library of Congress 6/29/89 [1]

---

Stack:

Row:

Section:

Shelf:

Position:

---

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

June 29, 1989

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
TO CONGRESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATION INTERNS

The Library of Congress  
Washington, D.C.

2:06 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very very much. I can understand that warmth of the welcome. Look at it this way, the longer you are here, the longer you don't have to be there in the office working. (Laughter and applause.)

I expect I speak for all of you when I turn to thank the Marines for that warm welcome. They are magnificent -- always have been and always will be. (Applause.) Apologies to Mr. Billington, the head of the Library of Congress. I have to admit -- I feel a little awkward giving a speech at this particular place after all those years of being told not to speak out loud in the library. (Laughter.)

But the Library of Congress has indeed been called the diary of the American people. In truth, it's a diary of the human race, and in the million stories of achievement it has to tell, one truth is revealed above all others -- that for all its blemishes, government of the people is the greatest achievement of all. And as I look around me, I see what I am told are the best and the brightest of the new generation, and for you this summer of independence is just a sweet taste of adulthood of what lies ahead. And, trust me, freedom is not as far off as it seems.

Whatever you do in Washington, page or intern, you are apprentices in what I steadfastly feel is a noble profession -- public service. And we exhalt public service because we do not exhalt the primacy of our government. We keep government close -- close to the people it's meant to serve.

And there is another fundamental concept in our way of governing -- reform. Ours is not a perfect government. It's a government constantly perfected -- a steadily improving government is the result of our open political system, and in this system elections are more than the deadlines of democracy; they are the marketplace of ideas. They're not just contests between individuals; they are contests between philosophies, and when this sharp edge of competition is dulled, democracy loses -- democracy is the loser.

In April, I proposed comprehensive ethics legislation for all branches of government, and today I call on the United States Congress to pass that package. But I also want to address other problems -- how to free our electoral system from the grip of special interests, how to spur the free competition of ideas.

You've often heard me speak of the necessity of bipartisanship. And I do strongly believe that we must work together when dealing with the most difficult challenges facing our country, not as partisans, but as Americans. But we will not and should not cease to be Republicans and Democrats. True, the Founding Fathers envisioned no role for parties and yet 200 years of political experiences have shown their value. Political parties clarify and sharpen the debate. And they shape coalitions of like-minded people,

MORE

giving millions of Americans an effective way to support their beliefs and advance their candidates.

Parties are the indispensable organizers of democracy. And yet, times have changed. And today's special interest political action committees and their \$160 million war chests overshadow the great parties of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. And as the strength of our parties erodes, so does the strength of our political system.

Distinctions between candidates get all mixed up -- they become muddled. And congressional debate lacks coherence and lacks discipline. By necessity, members of Congress engage in time-consuming and often degrading appeals for money, outside the party structure. As vigorous competition between candidates and between ideas wanes, the clear winner in the race for PAC dollars is incumbency.

Some believe public or taxpayer financing is the best answer. I do not. If we exclude individuals, you see -- if we exclude them from the process, we exclude the public. And this is the ironic result of taxpayer financing. It would force taxpayers to support extremist candidates they abhor. It would be a siphon from the U.S. Treasury, already in deficit, to campaign coffers. Taxpayer financing would do nothing to strengthen the parties. If anything, it would strengthen the status quo. And what the voters really need is more choice.

Spending limits are not the answer either. If we're to encourage individuals to participate in the electoral process, if we are to encourage candidates to bring their message to as many voters as possible, we should not have absolute limits on spending. The answer is reform. We need reforms that curtail the role of special interests, enhance the role of the individual and strengthen the parties.

So today, I propose just that -- a sweeping system of reform for our system. More than 90 percent of all PACs contributions come from PACs sponsored by corporations, unions and trade associations. So the cornerstone of this reform -- of our reform -- is the elimination of those political action committees. I propose to curtail the proliferation of leadership PACs by limiting all candidates for federal office to one fundraising committee, and by also barring transfers between fundraising committees, we will further reduce the influence of special interest money in the electoral process.

I propose to end a practice that's known as bundling, where business and unions encourage or coerce contributions from employees or members and then give these contributions as one single donation. And as these reforms curtail special interest money, we must encourage the role of the parties -- encourage it. And I propose to more than double the amount of monies parties may donate to congressional campaigns.

Increasing party donations to federal candidates will allow legislators to spend more time legislating and less time raising money. And it will give challengers the means to compete with incumbents. And it will allow all candidates to avoid having to raise money from special interests. And still, some PACs must remain because they are protected under our Constitution by the First Amendment. And these independent PACs account for about 10 percent of all contributions. But even these I would limit by having their allowable contributions to federal candidates from \$5,000 to \$2,500 -- reduce it from \$5,000 to \$2,500. And new laws must keep such PACs unaffiliated and independent, so a business or labor group could not use them as a back-door means of influencing the process.

I also propose to strengthen the Supreme Court's Beck decision, which held that union members can't be forced to have their dues go to political causes or organizations they do not support. No

American -- no American -- not one should be compelled to give money to a candidate against his or her will. We must do more to truly clean up the system. The basic strength of today's system is disclosure -- being honest with the American people. Yet most money spent in American elections is not disclosed. This little-known area of campaign finance laws called "soft money" concerns dollars spent on voter turnout and registration efforts. And so I call on the United States Congress today to join me in mandating full disclosure of all soft money contributions by the political parties as well as corporations, unions and trade associations.

Other laws govern now independent expenditure groups -- you know, which can spend any amount of money to elect or defeat a candidate so long as their activities are not coordinated with those of a particular candidate. Now look, some of these groups perform a public service, but too often they mask the hidden -- the motives of hidden contributors acting as mercenary character assassins. Often they deceive the public into thinking that they are a candidate's campaign, and yet all independent expenditure groups -- the good and the bad alike -- are protected by the Constitution.

In order to provide more information to the public, I propose that such groups be required to more clearly identify the person or organization behind them. Disclosure -- full disclosure -- that's the answer here.

The third and final area of reform directly concerns the powers of incumbency. Jefferson envisioned a Congress of citizen politicians who suspended their careers in law, in medicine, in agriculture to serve the nation. Now how far we've come from that simple vision.

Today incumbents stay in office for decades amassing huge war chests to scare off strong challenges in election after election. This is not democracy in the spirit of Madison and Jefferson. This is not the spirit of democracy at all. And so I propose to end the rollover of campaign war chests, requiring any excess campaign funds to be donated to the parties, to a fund to retire the national debt or to be given back to the contributors. And this would apply to all unspent campaign funds, whether it's a race for Congress or a race for the presidency.

Under our current law, 190 House members in office in 1980 can also use that leftover campaign money as a personal retirement fund, pocketing hundreds of thousands -- even millions of dollars when they leave office.

Senators are allowed to convert these funds for official use. This practice must end. And this same principle should apply to presidential candidates as well. Another advantage of incumbency arises from the way in which members of Congress use the public frank to pay for mass mailings that amount to political advertising. The cost to the taxpayers, literally, runs into hundreds of millions of dollars. And the cost to our democracy is also very, very steep. I propose to prohibit the use of the frank for unsolicited mass mailings.

And yet another area in need of reform is redistricting. The way in which parties empower, ignore community boundaries and draw district lines favorable to their candidates. No single factor is more basic to restoring competitive elections than ensuring fair redistricting. I propose a new criteria for redistricting without favor to party. To respect established community boundaries, we must draw district lines that respect the needs of the people, not tailor them to the political needs of either party.

And finally, in the next few days I will also send up legislation to ban honoraria and to address certain aspects of compensation for federal officials. This package will include a 25 percent pay increase for judges -- which I've previously recommended -- and an increase for a limited number of specialized professionals, such as scientists and surgeons or the Executive Branch, is not competitive. And I'll also work with the Congress on the development

of details for increasing the pay of those in the Congress, as well as other senior employees of the Executive Branch.

This year, as Congress observes it's 200th anniversary, 11,000 Americans have served in the House and Senate in the history of our Republic. And I'm proud to have been one of them. And most have served in the great tradition, Russell and Rayburn, Dirksen and Mansfield, Dole and Mitchell, Foley and Michel. And someday, who knows, you may elect, after your experience here this summer, to follow this path. The path to greatness and achievement through public service. And if you do, I hope the laws that govern our campaigns and our Congress, as well as our Executive Branch, are as just and honest as the majority of those who serve the public. You know, this vast and honest majority in Congress live the words of George Washington who said, "The noblest title in the world isn't President, Senator or Congressman, but honest man." Whatever you do in life, you can have no higher title than that. Thank you all for listening. God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

END

2:23 P.M. EDT

To Steph

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

### WHILE YOU WERE OUT

M Christina

of at Library of Congress

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Area Code	Number	Extension
TELEPHONED		PLEASE CALL
CALLED TO SEE YOU		WILL CALL AGAIN
WANTS TO SEE YOU		URGENT

RETURNED YOUR CALL

Message \_\_\_\_\_

# 549

Operator cg



Davis/Martin  
June 28, 1989  
Draft: Six  
Title: Campaign

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
JUNE 29, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. ~~((Acknowledgements))~~

((I have to admit, I feel a little awkward giving a speech at this particular place . . . all those years of being told not to speak out-loud in a library.))

The Library of Congress has been called the diary of the American people. In truth, it is a diary of the human race. And in the million stories of achievement it has to tell, one truth is revealed above all others: That for all its blemishes, government of the people is the greatest achievement of all.

As I look around me, I see the best and the brightest of a new generation. For you, this summer of independence is just a sweet taste of adulthood. Trust me, freedom is not as far-off as it seems. Whatever you do in Washington -- page or intern -- you are apprentices in a noble profession -- public service.

We exalt public service because we do not exalt our government. We keep government close, close to the people it is meant to serve. And there is another fundamental concept in our

way of governing -- reform. Ours is not a perfect government. It is a government constantly perfected.

A steadily improving government is the result of our open political system. And in this system, elections are more than the deadlines of democracy; they are the marketplace of ideas. They are not just contests between individuals -- they are contests between philosophies. When this sharp edge of competition is dulled, democracy loses.

#### **STRENGTHENING THE ROLE OF THE PARTIES**

In April, I proposed comprehensive ethics legislation for all branches of government. Today, I call on Congress to pass that package. But I also want to address other problems -- how to free our electoral system from the grip of special interests, how to spur the free competition of ideas.

You have often heard me speak of the necessity of bipartisanship. And I do strongly believe we must work together when dealing with the most difficult challenges facing our country -- **not as partisans -- but as Americans.**

But we will not -- and should not -- cease to be Republicans and Democrats. True, the Founding Fathers envisioned no role for parties. Yet 200 years of political experience has shown their value. Political parties clarify and sharpen debate. They shape

coalitions of like-minded people, giving millions of working Americans an effective way to support their beliefs and advance their candidates. **Parties are the indispensable organizers of democracy.**

Yet times have changed. Today's special-interest Political Action Committees and their \$160 million war chest overshadow the great parties of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. As the strength of our parties erodes, so does the strength of our political system. Distinctions between candidates become muddled, and Congressional debate lacks coherence and discipline. By necessity, Members of Congress engage in time-consuming and often degrading appeals for money outside the party structure. As vigorous competition between candidates, and between ideas, wanes, the clear winner in the race for PAC dollars is incumbency.

Some believe public -- or taxpayer -- financing is the best answer. I do not. If we exclude individuals from the process, we exclude the public. This is the ironic result of taxpayer financing. It would force taxpayers to support extremist candidates they abhor. It would be a siphon from the U.S. Treasury, already in deficit, to campaign coffers. Taxpayer financing would do nothing to strengthen the parties; if anything, it would strengthen the status quo. What the voters really need is more choice.

Spending limits are not the answer either. If candidates have equal resources, incumbents will hold a tremendous advantage. Spending limits amount to an incumbent protection plan.

The answer is reform. We need reforms that curtail the role of special interests, enhance the role of the individual and strengthen the parties. So today, I propose just that -- a sweeping reform of our system. More than 90 percent of all PAC contributions come from PACs sponsored by corporations, unions and trade associations. So the cornerstone of our reform is **the elimination of all special-interest Political Action Committees.**

\*\*\* I propose the elimination of Congressional leadership PACs, through which Members of Congress bid for the loyalty of their colleagues.

\*\*\* I propose to end a practice known as "bundling," where business and unions encourage or coerce contributions from employees or members, and then give these contributions as a single donation.

As these reforms curtail special-interest money, we must encourage the role of the parties. I propose to more than double the amount of money parties may donate to Congressional

campaigns. Increasing party donations to federal candidates will allow legislators to spend more time legislating and less time raising money. It will give challengers the means to compete with incumbents. And it will allow all candidates to avoid having to raise money from special interests.

Still, some PACs should remain because they are protected by the First Amendment. These independent PACs account for about ten percent of all contributions. But even these I would limit, by halving their allowable contributions to federal candidates from \$5,000 to \$2,500. And new laws must keep such PACs unaffiliated and independent, so a business or labor group could not use them as a backdoor means of influencing the process.

I also propose to strengthen the Supreme Court's Beck decision, so that no member of a union can be forced to contribute dues to political activities he or she doesn't support. **To coerce political donations from working men and women is unfair and un-American. This practice must stop.**

#### **CLEANING UP THE SYSTEM**

We must do more to truly clean up the system. The basic strength of today's system is disclosure. Yet most money spent in American elections is **not** disclosed. This little known area of campaign finance law called "soft money" concerns dollars spent on voter turnout and registration efforts. I call on

Congress to join me in mandating full disclosure of all soft money contributions by the political parties, as well as corporations, unions and trade associations.

Other laws govern independent expenditure groups, which can spend any amount of money to elect or defeat a candidate so long as their activities are not coordinated with those of a particular candidate. While some of these groups perform a public service, too often they mask the motives of hidden contributors, acting as mercenary character assassins. Often, they deceive the public into thinking that they are a candidate's campaign. Yet all independent expenditure groups -- the good and the bad alike -- are protected by the Constitution. In order to provide more information to the public, I propose that such groups be required to more clearly identify the person or organization behind them.

#### **REDRESSING THE INCUMBENCY ADVANTAGE**

The third, and final area of reform directly concerns the powers of incumbency. Jefferson envisioned a Congress of citizen-politicians, who suspended their careers in law, medicine and agriculture to serve the nation. How far we've come from that simple vision. Today, incumbents stay in office for decades, amassing huge war chests to scare off strong challenges in election after election.

This is not democracy in the spirit of Madison and Jefferson. This is not the spirit of democracy at all. I propose to end the "rollover" of campaign warchests, requiring any excess campaign funds to be donated to the parties, to a fund to retire the national debt or be given back to the contributors. This would apply to all unspent campaign funds -- whether it is a race for Congress or the Presidency.

Under our current law, 190 House Members in office in 1980 can also use their leftover campaign money as a personal retirement fund -- pocketing hundreds of thousands -- even millions -- of dollars when they leave office. Senators are allowed to convert these funds for official use. **This practice must end . . .** And this same principle should apply to Presidential candidates as well.

Another advantage of incumbency arises from the way in which Members of Congress use the public frank to pay for ~~mailings~~ mailings that amount to political advertising. The cost to the taxpayers runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. The cost to our democracy is also steep. I propose to prohibit the use of the frank for unsolicited <sup>MASS</sup> mailings.

Yet another area in need of reform is redistricting -- the way in which parties in power ignore community boundaries and draw district lines favorable to their candidates. No single

factor is more basic to restoring competitive elections than ensuring fair redistricting in 1991. I propose a new criteria for redistricting, without favor to party, to respect established community boundaries. **We must draw district lines that respect the needs of the people, not tailor them to the political needs of either party.**

Finally, in the next few days I will also send up legislation to ban honoraria and to address certain aspects of compensation for federal officials. This package will include a 25 percent pay increase for judges, which I have previously recommended, <sup>AND AN</sup> ~~a 25 percent increase for the Senior Executive Service and senior level Presidential appointees, and a~~ substantial increase for a limited number of specialized professionals -- such as ~~nuclear~~ scientists and surgeons -- where the Executive Branch is not competitive. I will also work with Congress on the development of details for increasing the pay of those in the Congress, as well as <sup>OTHER SENIOR EMPLOYEES OF</sup> ~~the remainder of the Executive~~ <sup>THE EXEC. BRANCH.</sup> ~~Branch.~~

## CONCLUSION

This year, as Congress observes its 200th anniversary, eleven thousand Americans have served in the House and Senate in the history of our Republic. Most have served in the great tradition of Russell and Rayburn, Dirksen and Mansfield, Dole and Mitchell. Some day, you may follow this path, the path to

greatness and achievement through public service. And if you do, I hope the laws that govern our campaigns and our Congress -- as well as our Executive Branch -- are as just and honest as the majority of those who serve the public.

This vast and honest majority in Congress live the words of George Washington, who said the noblest title in the world isn't President, or Senator, or Congressman -- but "Honest Man."

Whatever you do in life, you can have no higher title than that. Thank you, God bless you and God bless America.

#

#

#

Davis/Martin  
June 28, 1989  
Draft: Four  
Title: Campaign

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
JUNE 29, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. ~~((Acknowledgements))~~

((I have to admit, I feel a little awkward giving a speech at this particular place . . . all those years of being told not to speak out-loud in a library.))

The Library of Congress has been called the diary of the American people. In truth, it is a diary of the human race. And in the million stories of achievement it has to tell, one truth is revealed above all others: That for all its blemishes, government of the people is the greatest achievement of all.

As I look around me, I see the best and the brightest of a new generation. For you, this summer of independence is just a sweet taste of adulthood. Trust me, freedom is not as far-off as it seems. Whatever you do in Washington -- page or intern -- you are apprentices in a noble profession -- public service.

We exalt public service because we do not exalt our government. We keep government close, close to the people it is meant to serve. And there is another fundamental concept in our

way of governing -- reform. Ours is not a perfect government. It is a government constantly perfected.

A steadily improving government is the result of our open political system. And in this system, elections are more than the deadlines of democracy; they are the marketplace of ideas. They are not just contests between individuals -- they are contests between philosophies. When this sharp edge of competition is dulled, democracy loses.

#### **STRENGTHENING THE ROLE OF THE PARTIES**

In April, I proposed comprehensive ethics legislation for all branches of government. Today, I call on Congress to pass that package. But I also want to address other problems -- how to free our electoral system from the grip of special interests, how to spur the free competition of ideas.

You have often heard me speak of the necessity of bipartisanship. And I do strongly believe we must work together when dealing with the most difficult challenges facing our country -- **not as partisans -- but as Americans.**

But we will not -- and should not -- cease to be Republicans and Democrats. True, the Founding Fathers envisioned no role for parties. Yet 200 years of political experience has shown their value. Political parties clarify and sharpen debate. They shape

coalitions of like-minded people, giving millions of working Americans an effective way to support their beliefs and advance their candidates. **Parties are the indispensable organizers of democracy.**

Yet times have changed. Today's special-interest Political Action Committees and their \$160 million war chest overshadow the great parties of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. As the strength of our parties erodes, so does the strength of our political system. Distinctions between candidates become muddled, and Congressional debate lacks coherence and discipline. By necessity, Members of Congress engage in time-consuming and often degrading appeals for money outside the party structure. As vigorous competition between candidates, and between ideas, wanes, the clear winner in the race for PAC dollars is incumbency.

Some believe public financing is the best answer. I do not. If we exclude individuals from the process, we exclude the public. Ironically, this is the end result of public financing. It also would force taxpayers to support extremist candidates they abhor. It would be a siphon from the U.S. Treasury, already in deficit, to campaign coffers. Public financing would do nothing to strengthen the parties; if anything, it would strengthen the status quo. We don't need more money in the system. We need to offer the voters more choice.

*-heaps-*

4 If we are to ensure ind. to part. in the electoral process, ~~which we must~~ IF WE ARE TO ENCOUR. CANDID TO BRING THEIR MRS Spending limits are not the answer either.  Spending limits to AS

~~are nothing but incumbent protection plans. If candidates have votes AS possible, equal resources, incumbents will hold a tremendous advantage.~~  
~~WE SHOULD HAVE ABS. LIMIT ON SPENDING~~  
~~WE SHOULD HAVE ABS. LIMIT ON SPENDING~~

The answer is reform. We need reforms that curtail the role of special interests, enhance the role of the individual and strengthen the parties. So today, I propose just that -- a sweeping reform of our system. More than 90 percent of all PAC contributions come from PACs sponsored by corporations, unions and trade associations. So the cornerstone of our reform is the <sup>THOSE</sup> elimination of all special-interest Political Action Committees.

\*\*\* I propose to curtail the proliferation of leadership PACs by limiting all candidates for fed. office to one PAC, through which Members of Congress bid for the loyalty of their colleagues. AND, by also ~~prohibiting~~ barring transfers between fundraising committees, we will further reduce the influence of S. I. money in the process, etc.

\*\*\* I propose to end a practice known as "bundling," where business and unions encourage or coerce contributions from employees or members, and then give these contributions as a single donation.

As these reforms curtail special-interest money, we must increase the role of the parties. I propose to more than double the amount of money parties may donate to congressional campaigns. Increasing party donations to federal candidates will

allow legislators to spend more time legislating and less time raising money. It will give challengers the means to compete with incumbents. And it will allow all candidates to avoid having to raise money from special interests.

Still, some PACs <sup>MUST</sup> ~~should~~ remain because they are protected by the First Amendment. These independent PACs account for about ten percent of all contributions. But even these I would limit, by reducing their allowable contributions to federal candidates from \$5,000 to the same as individuals -- \$1,000. And new laws must keep such PACs unaffiliated and independent, so a business or labor group could not use them as a backdoor means of influencing the process.

#### **CLEANING UP THE SYSTEM**

We must do more to truly clean up the system. The basic strength of today's system is disclosure. Yet most money spent in American elections is **not** disclosed. This little known area of campaign finance law called "soft money" concerns dollars spent on voter turnout efforts.

I call on Congress to join me in mandating full disclosure of all soft money contributions by the political parties, as well as corporations, unions and trade associations.

Other laws govern independent expenditure groups, which can spend any amount of money to elect or defeat a candidate so long as their activities are not coordinated with those of a particular candidate. While some of these groups perform a public service, too often they mask the motives of hidden contributors, acting as mercenary character assassins. Often, they deceive the public into thinking that they are a candidate's campaign. Yet all independent expenditure groups -- the good and the bad alike -- are protected by the Constitution. In order to provide more information to the public, I propose that such groups should be required to more clearly identify the person or organization behind them.

I also propose to strengthen the Supreme Court's Beck decision, <sup>which held that UNION MEMBERS CAN'T BE FORCED</sup> ~~so that no member of a union can be forced to~~ <sup>TO HAVE THEIR DUES GO TO POL. CAUSES OR ORGAN. THEY DO NOT</sup> ~~contribute dues to political activities he or she doesn't~~ <sup>SUPPORT,</sup> ~~support.~~ <sup>No Amer. should be compelled to give money</sup> ~~To coerce political donations from working men and~~ <sup>to a CAND. AGAINST HIS WILL.</sup> ~~women is unfair and un-American. This practice must stop.~~ ) **BOLD**

### REDRESSING THE INCUMBENCY ADVANTAGE

The third, and final area of reform directly concerns Congressional conduct. Jefferson envisioned a Congress of citizen-politicians, who suspended their careers in law, medicine and agriculture to serve the nation. How far we've come from that simple vision. Today, incumbents stay in office for

decades, amassing huge warchests to scare off strong challenges in election after election.

This is not democracy in the spirit of Madison and Jefferson. This is not the spirit of democracy at all. I renew my proposal to end the "rollover" of campaign warchests, requiring all excess campaign funds to be donated to the parties, to a fund to retire the national debt or be given back to the contributors.

Under our current law, 190 House Members in office in 1980 can also use their leftover campaign money as a personal retirement fund -- pocketing hundreds of thousands -- even millions -- of dollars when they leave office. Senators are allowed to convert these funds for official use. **Congress should pack up this golden parachute.**

Another area in need of reform is redistricting -- the way in which parties in power ignore community boundaries and draw district lines favorable to their candidates. This gerrymandering is why many Congressional Districts look like creatures my youngest grandchildren would draw.

The permanent majority that results from non-competitive elections is rock solid. Despite the stark differences between the two national parties, of the 435 seats in the House, 387 --

or 90 percent -- have not switched parties since 1982. Perhaps California provides the best example, where only one seat in 135 elections changed parties in the 1980s.

No single factor is more basic to restoring competitive elections than ensuring fair redistricting in 1990. I propose a new criteria for redistricting, without favor to party, to respect community and traditional lines. **We must draw district lines that respect the needs of the people, not tailor them to the political needs of the parties.**

Finally, I propose to go a step further to solve the most egregious wrong in American public life. As it stands, members of Congress can supplement their incomes by as much as 40 percent by making speeches before special-interest groups. This is wrong. That's why I said on April 12 I would support a ban on honoraria. I continue to oppose this practice.

Furthermore, I will send to the Congress next week a separate proposal outlining an orderly process for phasing out honoraria and addressing the thorny problem of compensation. I have already stated my support for a 25 percent increase for judges and look forward to productive work with the congressional leadership regarding Congressional and Executive pay.

**CONCLUSION**

This year, as Congress observes its 200th anniversary. ((Number)) thousand Americans have served in the House and Senate in the history of our Republic. A few names on this roster are infamous, associated with scandal or remembered as demagogues. But the Bilbos and the McCarthys are few. Most have served in the greater tradition of Russell and Rayburn, Dirksen and Mansfield, Dole and Mitchell. Some day, you may follow this path, the path to greatness and achievement through public service. And if you do, I hope the laws that govern our campaigns and our Congress are as just and honest as the majority of those who serve the public.

This vast and honest majority in Congress live the words of George Washington, who said the noblest title in the world isn't President, or Senator, or Congressman -- but "Honest Man."

Whatever you do in life, you can have no higher title than that. Thank you, God bless you and God bless America.

#

#

#

greatness and achievement through public service. And if you do, I hope the laws that govern our campaigns and our Congress -- as well as our Executive Branch -- are as just and honest as the majority of those who serve the public.

This vast and honest majority in Congress live the words of George Washington, who said the noblest title in the world isn't President, or Senator, or Congressman -- but "Honest Man."

Whatever you do in life, you can have no higher title than that. Thank you, God bless you and God bless America.

#

#

#

Back up copy

Davis/Martin  
June 28, 1989  
Draft: Six  
Title: Campaign

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
JUNE 29, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. ((Acknowledgements))

((I have to admit, I feel a little awkward giving a speech at this particular place . . . all those years of being told not to speak out-loud in a library.))

The Library of Congress has been called the diary of the American people. In truth, it is a diary of the human race. And in the million stories of achievement it has to tell, one truth is revealed above all others: That for all its blemishes, government of the people is the greatest achievement of all.

As I look around me, I see the best and the brightest of a new generation. For you, this summer of independence is just a sweet taste of adulthood. Trust me, freedom is not as far-off as it seems. Whatever you do in Washington -- page or intern -- you are apprentices in a noble profession -- public service.

We exalt public service because we do not exalt our government. We keep government close, close to the people it is meant to serve. And there is another fundamental concept in our

way of governing -- reform. Ours is not a perfect government. It is a government constantly perfected.

A steadily improving government is the result of our open political system. And in this system, elections are more than the deadlines of democracy; they are the marketplace of ideas. They are not just contests between individuals -- they are contests between philosophies. When this sharp edge of competition is dulled, democracy loses.

#### **STRENGTHENING THE ROLE OF THE PARTIES**

In April, I proposed comprehensive ethics legislation for all branches of government. Today, I call on Congress to pass that package. But I also want to address other problems -- how to free our electoral system from the grip of special interests, how to spur the free competition of ideas.

You have often heard me speak of the necessity of bipartisanship. And I do strongly believe we must work together when dealing with the most difficult challenges facing our country -- not as partisans -- but as Americans.

But we will not -- and should not -- cease to be Republicans and Democrats. True, the Founding Fathers envisioned no role for parties. Yet 200 years of political experience has shown their value. Political parties clarify and sharpen debate. They shape

coalitions of like-minded people, giving millions of working Americans an effective way to support their beliefs and advance their candidates. **Parties are the indispensable organizers of democracy.**

Yet times have changed. Today's special-interest Political Action Committees and their \$160 million war chest overshadow the great parties of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. As the strength of our parties erodes, so does the strength of our political system. Distinctions between candidates become muddled, and Congressional debate lacks coherence and discipline. By necessity, Members of Congress engage in time-consuming and often degrading appeals for money outside the party structure. As vigorous competition between candidates, and between ideas, wanes, the clear winner in the race for PAC dollars is incumbency.

Some believe public -- or taxpayer -- financing is the best answer. I do not. If we exclude individuals from the process, we exclude the public. This is the ironic result of taxpayer financing. It would force taxpayers to support extremist candidates they abhor. It would be a siphon from the U.S. Treasury, already in deficit, to campaign coffers. Taxpayer financing would do nothing to strengthen the parties; if anything, it would strengthen the status quo. What the voters really need is more choice.



we will

~~that takes a further step~~

reducing the influence of

specific interest groups in the electoral process.

And by barring transfers between jurisdictions  
also  
committees

campaigns. Increasing party donations to federal candidates will allow legislators to spend more time legislating and less time raising money. It will give challengers the means to compete with incumbents. And it will allow all candidates to avoid having to raise money from special interests.

Still, some PACs <sup>must</sup> ~~should~~ remain because they are protected by the First Amendment. These independent PACs account for about ten percent of all contributions. But even these I would limit, by halving their allowable contributions to federal candidates from \$5,000 to \$2,500. And new laws must keep such PACs unaffiliated and independent, so a business or labor group could not use them as a backdoor means of influencing the process.

I also propose to strengthen the Supreme Court's Beck decision, ~~we should which held that union dues members~~ ~~so that no member of a union can be forced to~~ ~~contribute dues to political activities he or she doesn't~~ ~~support.~~ ~~To coerce political donations from working men and women is unfair and un-American.~~ ~~This practice must stop.~~ ~~against his will~~ <sup>can't be forced to have their dues go to political causes or</sup> <sup>organizations they</sup> <sup>do not</sup> <sup>support.</sup> <sup>No American should be compelled to</sup> <sup>give money to a cand. he or she</sup> <sup>doesn't support</sup>

**CLEANING UP THE SYSTEM**

We must do more to truly clean up the system. The basic strength of today's system is disclosure. Yet most money spent in American elections is not disclosed. This little known area of campaign finance law called "soft money" concerns dollars spent on voter turnout and registration efforts. I call on

Congress to join me in mandating full disclosure of all soft money contributions by the political parties, as well as corporations, unions and trade associations.

Other laws govern independent expenditure groups, which can spend any amount of money to elect or defeat a candidate so long as their activities are not coordinated with those of a particular candidate. While some of these groups perform a public service, too often they mask the motives of hidden contributors, acting as mercenary character assassins. Often, they deceive the public into thinking that they are a candidate's campaign. Yet all independent expenditure groups -- the good and the bad alike -- are protected by the Constitution. In order to provide more information to the public, I propose that such groups be required to more clearly identify the person or organization behind them.

*Additional Full and total disclosure of a donor's name and occupation in the answer key.*

#### REDRESSING THE INCUMBENCY ADVANTAGE

The third, and final area of reform directly concerns the powers of incumbency. Jefferson envisioned a Congress of citizen-politicians, who suspended their careers in law, medicine and agriculture to serve the nation. How far we've come from that simple vision. Today, incumbents stay in office for decades, amassing huge war chests to scare off strong challenges in election after election.

This is not democracy in the spirit of Madison and Jefferson. This is not the spirit of democracy at all. I propose to end the "rollover" of campaign warchests, requiring any excess campaign funds to be donated to the parties, to a fund to retire the national debt or be given back to the contributors. This would apply to all unspent campaign funds -- whether it is a race for Congress or the Presidency.

Under our current law, 190 House Members in office in 1980 can also use their leftover campaign money as a personal retirement fund -- pocketing hundreds of thousands -- even millions -- of dollars when they leave office. Senators are allowed to convert these funds for official use. This practice must end . . . And this same principle should apply to Presidential candidates as well.

Another advantage of incumbency arises from the way in which Members of Congress use the public frank to pay for mass mailings that amount to political advertising. The cost to the taxpayers runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. The cost to our democracy is also steep. I propose to prohibit the use of the frank for ~~unsolicited~~ <sup>unsolicited</sup> mass mailings.

Yet another area in need of reform is redistricting -- the way in which parties in power ignore community boundaries and draw district lines favorable to their candidates. No single

Postal Patron mass mailings  
 → tighten, clarify (birthday? - should be able to take int)

factor is more basic to restoring competitive elections than ensuring fair redistricting in 1991. I propose a new criteria for redistricting, without favor to party, to respect established community boundaries. We must draw district lines that respect the needs of the people, not tailor them to the political needs of either party.

Finally, in the next few days I will also send up legislation to ban honoraria and to address certain aspects of compensation for federal officials. This package will include a 25 percent pay increase for judges, which I have previously recommended, <sup>judicial independence branch</sup> ~~and a 25 percent increase for the Senior Executive Service and senior level Presidential appointees, and a~~ substantial increase for a limited number of specialized professionals -- such as ~~other~~ scientists and surgeons -- where the Executive Branch is not competitive. I will also work with Congress on the development of details for increasing the pay of those in the Congress, as well as <sup>other members of the Federal</sup> ~~the remainder of the Executive~~ Branch. Government

*Sarena*

*Executive Branch*

**CONCLUSION**

This year, as Congress observes its 200th anniversary, eleven thousand Americans have served in the House and Senate in the history of our Republic. Most have served in the great tradition of Russell and Rayburn, Dirksen and Mansfield, Dole and Mitchell. Some day, you may follow this path, the path to

greatness and achievement through public service. And if you do, I hope the laws that govern our campaigns and our Congress -- as well as our Executive Branch -- are as just and honest as the majority of those who serve the public.

This vast and honest majority in Congress live the words of George Washington, who said the noblest title in the world isn't President, or Senator, or Congressman -- but "Honest Man."

Whatever you do in life, you can have no higher title than that. Thank you, God bless you and God bless America.

#

#

#

**CONCLUSION**

THIS YEAR, AS CONGRESS OBSERVES ITS 200TH ANNIVERSARY, ELEVEN THOUSAND AMERICANS HAVE SERVED IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE IN THE HISTORY OF OUR REPUBLIC. MOST HAVE SERVED IN THE GREAT TRADITION OF RUSSELL AND RAYBURN, DIRKSEN AND MANSFIELD, DOLE AND MITCHELL, FOLEY AND MICHEL. SOME DAY, YOU MAY FOLLOW THIS PATH, THE PATH TO GREATNESS AND ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH PUBLIC SERVICE. AND IF YOU DO, I HOPE THE LAWS THAT GOVERN OUR CAMPAIGNS AND OUR CONGRESS -- AS WELL AS OUR EXECUTIVE BRANCH -- ARE AS JUST AND HONEST AS THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO SERVE THE PUBLIC.

THIS VAST AND HONEST MAJORITY IN CONGRESS LIVE THE WORDS OF GEORGE WASHINGTON, WHO SAID THE NOBLEST TITLE IN THE WORLD ISN'T PRESIDENT, OR SENATOR, OR CONGRESSMAN -- BUT "HONEST MAN."

WHATEVER YOU DO IN LIFE, YOU CAN HAVE NO HIGHER TITLE THAN THAT. THANK YOU, GOD BLESS YOU AND GOD BLESS AMERICA.

#

#

#

**PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
JUNE 29, 1989/2 P.M.**

**THANK YOU.**

**((I HAVE TO ADMIT, I FEEL A LITTLE AWKWARD GIVING A  
SPEECH AT THIS PARTICULAR PLACE . . . ALL THOSE YEARS  
OF BEING TOLD NOT TO SPEAK OUT-LOUD IN A LIBRARY.))**

**THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS HAS BEEN CALLED THE DIARY  
OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.**


**- 2 -**

**IN TRUTH, IT IS A DIARY OF THE HUMAN RACE. AND IN THE  
MILLION STORIES OF ACHIEVEMENT IT HAS TO TELL, ONE  
TRUTH IS REVEALED ABOVE ALL OTHERS: THAT FOR ALL ITS  
BLEMISHES, GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE IS THE GREATEST  
ACHIEVEMENT OF ALL.**

**AS I LOOK AROUND ME, I SEE THE BEST AND THE  
BRIGHTEST OF A NEW GENERATION. FOR YOU, THIS SUMMER OF  
INDEPENDENCE IS JUST A SWEET TASTE OF ADULTHOOD. TRUST  
ME, FREEDOM IS NOT AS FAR-OFF AS IT SEEMS.**

WHATEVER YOU DO IN WASHINGTON -- PAGE OR INTERN -- YOU ARE APPRENTICES IN A NOBLE PROFESSION -- PUBLIC SERVICE.

WE EXALT PUBLIC SERVICE BECAUSE WE DO NOT EXALT OUR GOVERNMENT. WE KEEP GOVERNMENT CLOSE, CLOSE TO THE PEOPLE IT IS MEANT TO SERVE. AND THERE IS ANOTHER FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPT IN OUR WAY OF GOVERNING -- REFORM. OURS IS NOT A PERFECT GOVERNMENT. IT IS A GOVERNMENT CONSTANTLY PERFECTED.



A STEADILY IMPROVING GOVERNMENT IS THE RESULT OF OUR OPEN POLITICAL SYSTEM. AND IN THIS SYSTEM, ELECTIONS ARE MORE THAN THE DEADLINES OF DEMOCRACY; THEY ARE THE MARKETPLACE OF IDEAS. THEY ARE NOT JUST CONTESTS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS -- THEY ARE CONTESTS BETWEEN PHILOSOPHIES. WHEN THIS SHARP EDGE OF COMPETITION IS DULLED, DEMOCRACY LOSES.

## **STRENGTHENING THE ROLE OF THE PARTIES**

**IN APRIL, I PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE ETHICS LEGISLATION FOR ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT. TODAY, I CALL ON CONGRESS TO PASS THAT PACKAGE. BUT I ALSO WANT TO ADDRESS OTHER PROBLEMS -- HOW TO FREE OUR ELECTORAL SYSTEM FROM THE GRIP OF SPECIAL INTERESTS, HOW TO SPUR THE FREE COMPETITION OF IDEAS.**

**YOU HAVE OFTEN HEARD ME SPEAK OF THE NECESSITY OF BIPARTISANSHIP. AND I DO STRONGLY BELIEVE WE MUST WORK TOGETHER WHEN DEALING WITH THE MOST DIFFICULT CHALLENGES FACING OUR COUNTRY -- NOT AS PARTISANS -- BUT AS AMERICANS.**

**BUT WE WILL NOT -- AND SHOULD NOT -- CEASE TO BE REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS. TRUE, THE FOUNDING FATHERS ENVISIONED NO ROLE FOR PARTIES. YET 200 YEARS OF POLITICAL EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN THEIR VALUE.**

**POLITICAL PARTIES CLARIFY AND SHARPEN DEBATE. THEY SHAPE COALITIONS OF LIKE-MINDED PEOPLE, GIVING MILLIONS OF WORKING AMERICANS AN EFFECTIVE WAY TO SUPPORT THEIR BELIEFS AND ADVANCE THEIR CANDIDATES. PARTIES ARE THE INDISPENSABLE ORGANIZERS OF DEMOCRACY.**

**YET TIMES HAVE CHANGED. TODAY'S SPECIAL-INTEREST POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES AND THEIR \$160 MILLION WARCHEST OVERSHADOW THE GREAT PARTIES OF THOMAS JEFFERSON AND ABRAHAM LINCOLN.**

**AS THE STRENGTH OF OUR PARTIES ERODES, SO DOES THE STRENGTH OF OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM. DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN CANDIDATES BECOME MUDDLED, AND CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE LACKS COHERENCE AND DISCIPLINE. BY NECESSITY, MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ENGAGE IN TIME-CONSUMING AND OFTEN DEGRADING APPEALS FOR MONEY OUTSIDE THE PARTY STRUCTURE. AS VIGOROUS COMPETITION BETWEEN CANDIDATES, AND BETWEEN IDEAS, WANES, THE CLEAR WINNER IN THE RACE FOR PAC DOLLARS IS INCUMBENCY.**

SOME BELIEVE PUBLIC -- OR TAXPAYER -- FINANCING IS THE BEST ANSWER. I DO NOT. IF WE EXCLUDE INDIVIDUALS FROM THE PROCESS, WE EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC. THIS IS THE IRONIC RESULT OF TAXPAYER FINANCING. IT WOULD FORCE TAXPAYERS TO SUPPORT EXTREMIST CANDIDATES THEY ABHOR. IT WOULD BE A SIPHON FROM THE U.S. TREASURY, ALREADY IN DEFICIT, TO CAMPAIGN COFFERS.

TAXPAYER FINANCING WOULD DO NOTHING TO STRENGTHEN THE PARTIES; IF ANYTHING, IT WOULD STRENGTHEN THE STATUS QUO. WHAT THE VOTERS REALLY NEED IS MORE CHOICE.

SPENDING LIMITS ARE NOT THE ANSWER EITHER. IF WE ARE TO ENCOURAGE INDIVIDUALS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ELECTORAL PROCESS, IF WE ARE TO ENCOURAGE CANDIDATES TO BRING THEIR MESSAGE TO AS MANY VOTERS AS POSSIBLE, WE SHOULD NOT HAVE ABSOLUTE LIMITS ON SPENDING.

THE ANSWER IS REFORM. WE NEED REFORMS THAT CURTAIL THE ROLE OF SPECIAL INTERESTS, ENHANCE THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND STRENGTHEN THE PARTIES. SO TODAY, I PROPOSE JUST THAT -- A SWEEPING REFORM OF OUR SYSTEM. MORE THAN 90 PERCENT OF ALL PAC CONTRIBUTIONS COME FROM PACS SPONSORED BY CORPORATIONS, UNIONS AND TRADE ASSOCIATIONS. SO THE CORNERSTONE OF OUR REFORM IS THE ELIMINATION OF THOSE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES.

\*\*\* I PROPOSE TO CURTAIL THE PROLIFERATION OF LEADERSHIP PACS BY LIMITING ALL CANDIDATES FOR FEDERAL OFFICE TO ONE FUNDRAISING COMMITTEE. AND, BY ALSO BARRING TRANSFERS BETWEEN FUNDRAISING COMMITTEES, WE WILL FURTHER REDUCE THE INFLUENCE OF SPECIAL-INTEREST MONEY IN THE ELECTORAL PROCESS.

**\*\*\* I PROPOSE TO END A PRACTICE KNOWN AS "BUNDLING," WHERE BUSINESS AND UNIONS ENCOURAGE OR COERCE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM EMPLOYEES OR MEMBERS, AND THEN GIVE THESE CONTRIBUTIONS AS A SINGLE DONATION.**

**AS THESE REFORMS CURTAIL SPECIAL-INTEREST MONEY, WE MUST ENCOURAGE THE ROLE OF THE PARTIES. I PROPOSE TO MORE THAN DOUBLE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY PARTIES MAY DONATE TO CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS.**

**INCREASING PARTY DONATIONS TO FEDERAL CANDIDATES WILL ALLOW LEGISLATORS TO SPEND MORE TIME LEGISLATING AND LESS TIME RAISING MONEY. IT WILL GIVE CHALLENGERS THE MEANS TO COMPETE WITH INCUMBENTS. AND IT WILL ALLOW ALL CANDIDATES TO AVOID HAVING TO RAISE MONEY FROM SPECIAL INTERESTS.**

**STILL, SOME PACS MUST REMAIN BECAUSE THEY ARE PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT.**

THESE INDEPENDENT PACS ACCOUNT FOR ABOUT TEN PERCENT OF ALL CONTRIBUTIONS. BUT EVEN THESE I WOULD LIMIT, BY HALVING THEIR ALLOWABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL CANDIDATES FROM \$5,000 TO \$2,500. AND NEW LAWS MUST KEEP SUCH PACS UNAFFILIATED AND INDEPENDENT, SO A BUSINESS OR LABOR GROUP COULD NOT USE THEM AS A BACKDOOR MEANS OF INFLUENCING THE PROCESS.

I ALSO PROPOSE TO STRENGTHEN THE SUPREME COURT'S BECK DECISION, WHICH HELD THAT UNION MEMBERS CAN'T BE FORCED TO HAVE THEIR DUES GO TO POLITICAL CAUSES OR ORGANIZATIONS THEY DO NOT SUPPORT. NO AMERICAN SHOULD BE COMPELLED TO GIVE MONEY TO A CANDIDATE AGAINST HIS OR HER WILL.

#### **CLEANING UP THE SYSTEM**

WE MUST DO MORE TO TRULY CLEAN UP THE SYSTEM. THE BASIC STRENGTH OF TODAY'S SYSTEM IS DISCLOSURE.

YET MOST MONEY SPENT IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS IS NOT DISCLOSED. THIS LITTLE KNOWN AREA OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW CALLED "SOFT MONEY" CONCERNS DOLLARS SPENT ON VOTER TURNOUT AND REGISTRATION EFFORTS. I CALL ON CONGRESS TO JOIN ME IN MANDATING FULL DISCLOSURE OF ALL SOFT MONEY CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE POLITICAL PARTIES, AS WELL AS CORPORATIONS, UNIONS AND TRADE ASSOCIATIONS.

OTHER LAWS GOVERN INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE GROUPS, WHICH CAN SPEND ANY AMOUNT OF MONEY TO ELECT OR DEFEAT A CANDIDATE SO LONG AS THEIR ACTIVITIES ARE NOT COORDINATED WITH THOSE OF A PARTICULAR CANDIDATE. WHILE SOME OF THESE GROUPS PERFORM A PUBLIC SERVICE, TOO OFTEN THEY MASK THE MOTIVES OF HIDDEN CONTRIBUTORS, ACTING AS MERCENARY CHARACTER ASSASSINS. OFTEN, THEY DECEIVE THE PUBLIC INTO THINKING THAT THEY ARE A CANDIDATE'S CAMPAIGN.

**YET ALL INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE GROUPS -- THE GOOD AND THE BAD ALIKE -- ARE PROTECTED BY THE CONSTITUTION. IN ORDER TO PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC, I PROPOSE THAT SUCH GROUPS BE REQUIRED TO MORE CLEARLY IDENTIFY THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION BEHIND THEM.**

**REDRESSING THE INCUMBENCY ADVANTAGE**

**THE THIRD, AND FINAL AREA OF REFORM DIRECTLY CONCERNS THE POWERS OF INCUMBENCY.**

**JEFFERSON ENVISIONED A CONGRESS OF CITIZEN-POLITICIANS, WHO SUSPENDED THEIR CAREERS IN LAW, MEDICINE AND AGRICULTURE TO SERVE THE NATION. HOW FAR WE'VE COME FROM THAT SIMPLE VISION. TODAY, INCUMBENTS STAY IN OFFICE FOR DECADES, AMASSING HUGE WARCHESTS TO SCARE OFF STRONG CHALLENGES IN ELECTION AFTER ELECTION.**

**THIS IS NOT DEMOCRACY IN THE SPIRIT OF MADISON AND JEFFERSON. THIS IS NOT THE SPIRIT OF DEMOCRACY AT ALL.**

I PROPOSE TO END THE "ROLLOVER" OF CAMPAIGN WARCHESTS, REQUIRING ANY EXCESS CAMPAIGN FUNDS TO BE DONATED TO THE PARTIES, TO A FUND TO RETIRE THE NATIONAL DEBT OR BE GIVEN BACK TO THE CONTRIBUTORS. THIS WOULD APPLY TO ALL UNSPENT CAMPAIGN FUNDS -- WHETHER IT IS A RACE FOR CONGRESS OR THE PRESIDENCY.



UNDER OUR CURRENT LAW, 190 HOUSE MEMBERS IN OFFICE IN 1980 CAN ALSO USE THEIR LEFTOVER CAMPAIGN MONEY AS A PERSONAL RETIREMENT FUND -- POCKETING HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS -- EVEN MILLIONS -- OF DOLLARS WHEN THEY LEAVE OFFICE. SENATORS ARE ALLOWED TO CONVERT THESE FUNDS FOR OFFICIAL USE. THIS PRACTICE MUST END . . . AND THIS SAME PRINCIPLE SHOULD APPLY TO PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AS WELL.

ANOTHER ADVANTAGE OF INCUMBENCY ARISES FROM THE WAY IN WHICH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS USE THE PUBLIC FRANK TO PAY FOR MASS MAILINGS THAT AMOUNT TO POLITICAL ADVERTISING. THE COST TO THE TAXPAYERS RUNS INTO THE HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS. THE COST TO OUR DEMOCRACY IS ALSO STEEP. I PROPOSE TO PROHIBIT THE USE OF THE FRANK FOR UNSOLICITED MASS MAILINGS.

YET ANOTHER AREA IN NEED OF REFORM IS REDISTRICTING -- THE WAY IN WHICH PARTIES IN POWER IGNORE COMMUNITY BOUNDARIES AND DRAW DISTRICT LINES FAVORABLE TO THEIR CANDIDATES. NO SINGLE FACTOR IS MORE BASIC TO RESTORING COMPETITIVE ELECTIONS THAN ENSURING FAIR REDISTRICTING IN 1991. I PROPOSE A NEW CRITERIA FOR REDISTRICTING, WITHOUT FAVOR TO PARTY, TO RESPECT ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY BOUNDARIES.

**WE MUST DRAW DISTRICT LINES THAT RESPECT THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE, NOT TAILOR THEM TO THE POLITICAL NEEDS OF EITHER PARTY.**

**FINALLY, IN THE NEXT FEW DAYS I WILL ALSO SEND UP LEGISLATION TO BAN HONORARIA AND TO ADDRESS CERTAIN ASPECTS OF COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL OFFICIALS.**

**THIS PACKAGE WILL INCLUDE A 25 PERCENT PAY INCREASE FOR JUDGES, WHICH I HAVE PREVIOUSLY RECOMMENDED, AND AN INCREASE FOR A LIMITED NUMBER OF SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONALS -- SUCH AS SCIENTISTS AND SURGEONS -- WHERE THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH IS NOT COMPETITIVE. I WILL ALSO WORK WITH CONGRESS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF DETAILS FOR INCREASING THE PAY OF THOSE IN THE CONGRESS, AS WELL AS OTHER SENIOR EMPLOYEES OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.**

## CONCLUSION

THIS YEAR, AS CONGRESS OBSERVES ITS 200TH ANNIVERSARY, ELEVEN THOUSAND AMERICANS HAVE SERVED IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE IN THE HISTORY OF OUR REPUBLIC. MOST HAVE SERVED IN THE GREAT TRADITION OF RUSSELL AND RAYBURN, DIRKSEN AND MANSFIELD, DOLE AND MITCHELL, FOLEY AND MICHEL. SOME DAY, YOU MAY FOLLOW THIS PATH, THE PATH TO GREATNESS AND ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH PUBLIC SERVICE.

---

- 28 -

AND IF YOU DO, I HOPE THE LAWS THAT GOVERN OUR CAMPAIGNS AND OUR CONGRESS -- AS WELL AS OUR EXECUTIVE BRANCH -- ARE AS JUST AND HONEST AS THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO SERVE THE PUBLIC.

THIS VAST AND HONEST MAJORITY IN CONGRESS LIVE THE WORDS OF GEORGE WASHINGTON, WHO SAID THE NOBLEST TITLE IN THE WORLD ISN'T PRESIDENT, OR SENATOR, OR CONGRESSMAN -- BUT "HONEST MAN."

---

- 29 -

WHATEVER YOU DO IN LIFE, YOU CAN HAVE NO HIGHER TITLE THAN THAT. THANK YOU, GOD BLESS YOU AND GOD BLESS AMERICA.

#

#

#