

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 Draft Files
Subseries: Chron File, 1989-1993

OA/ID Number: 13586
Folder ID Number: 13586-004

Folder Title:
Public Administration Groups 10/24/91 [OA 6038] [1]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	17	4	1

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

October 24, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ADDRESS TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS

The National Museum of American History
Washington, D.C.

11:52 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very, very much for being here. I know it's nice to get off of work. (Laughter.) But I'm talking about getting people this interested in public service to come together. I'm particularly pleased to see Tim Clark, who is president of the National Capital Area Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration; Ray Kline, over here, the president of the National Association of Public Administrators; and then my old friend, Dave Maxwell, Vice-chairman of the Council for Excellence in Government -- all interested in public service.

I am delighted to join you this morning. I come here, I hope, in a constructive vein to discuss two issues that we all care about deeply: public service and then -- Tim touched on it -- public faith in government.

Like many of you, I have devoted much of my adult life to public service. And I, too, cherish public service really as a special honor -- and a personal obligation. And I always have. Long ago, my dad served for years as the moderator of the town meeting, the Connecticut town meeting in our town of Greenwich. It convened once a month, and people came there and talked about whatever concerned them, as they always do at town meetings. It could be rowdy or boring; the meetings always, though, gave people a special sense that their opinions made a difference, and that they shared something special with their neighbors and friends. Those meetings taught me just what we mean when we talk of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The notion of public service has always motivated Americans to be Americans. More than 150 years ago, de Tocqueville noted with some astonishment that "When an American needs the assistance of his fellows, it is very rare for that to be refused, and I have often seen it given spontaneously and eagerly." He did not mistake us for saints. He understood that freedom demands such service to others.

It also demands that public servants lead by example. Americans will not tolerate hypocrisy. People in other countries wonder why we make such a fuss when our leaders violate our standards of behavior. The reason is simple: As Americans, we feel that we have a destiny to lead, to show the way by ideals -- not just to ourselves, but to the entire world.

Yet while our government rests upon unchanging principle, it cannot rest upon past achievements. Government, like everything else, must evolve. Our long and sturdy tradition of tolerance enables us to test new ideas through public debate. When Congress considers issues, no one minds a tough and honest discussion. We expect it. By the same token, we want and expect our free press to look beneath events, take account of people's motives, and ask tough questions rather than numbly repeating partisan

MORE

propaganda or baseless rumor. We demand integrity in public behavior and discourse, and when we don't get it, we react.

The recent hearings on Judge Thomas stirred a kind of anger. The American people saw some of the seamier sides of Washington life. They saw proceedings that degenerated into target practice against good men and women. Ronnie Perry of Brunswick, Georgia, wrote me a letter -- I don't know him. Here's what it said: "It is my fear that good, honest, moral men and women in this country will no longer subject themselves to the ridicule that Judge Thomas had to face." Likewise, Anita Hill's backers might wonder how anyone might be expected to come forward in the future if public officials cannot maintain proper confidentiality -- such as the confidentiality promised to Professor Hill.

I want to digress, though, in fairness, to read from page three of the hearings on the committee in the Judiciary, because Senator Biden, in my judgment, tried. Here's what he said at the very opening of these hearings: "Second, while I have less discretion than a judge in a trial to bar inappropriate or embarrassing questions, all of the witnesses should know that they have a right to ask that the committee go into closed session." He cites a rule here, Rule 26.5 -- "to go into a closed session if a question requires an answer that is a clear invasion to the right to privacy.

"The committee will take very seriously the request of any witness to answer particularly embarrassing questions as they view whether or not it is embarrassing to answer those questions in private." So I think -- I salute the Chairman for those words that went unheeded as the process unfolded.

The bruising hearings showed what happens when political factions let agendas overwhelm personal decency. Some people have tried to drag public debate to a new low, searching openly for dirt -- any dirt -- without regard to people's rights to privacy, sometimes without concern for the facts. While crusading pressure groups talk about their favorite issues, they forget that human beings sit there beneath the glare of the spotlight, vulnerable to assault from all quarters. The piranha tactics of smearing the individual and ignoring the issue serve no public purpose. They aim to destroy lives and wreck reputations.

The dramatic hearings and the theatrics outside the hearing rooms captivated the attention of the American public, all right. Millions upon millions of Americans watched the hearings with a combination of curiosity, suspense, and I submit to you all, disgust. The nation was stunned and repulsed by the spectacle. The scenes from the Senate bore little resemblance to the tidy legislative process that we all studied in school and that we describe to our children -- now, maybe to our grandchildren. X-rated statements, cross-examinations pushed aside the soaps and Saturday cartoons. And the process seemed unreal -- more like a satire than like the government in which all of you, in which I, take so much pride; more like a burlesque show than a civics class.

The hearings also showed that politicians must contend with a host of different forces and influences. The public saw the congressional staffers everywhere; saw outside pressure groups exhorting and twisting -- and the staffs ever-present, everywhere.

I worry that the hearings sent our people this kind of false message: If you want to make a difference, don't enter public service. Join a special interest group. That way, whether it's the right or the left, join a special interest group, and that way you can fight as hard as you want, or as dirty as you want, without any responsibility for the results.

I served in Congress. I have great respect for Congress. I know the incredible pressure and difficulty of working there. But public faith in Congress is absolutely vital for our form of government. I think we can all work together to help strengthen its image and build greater public support.

Members of Congress criticize the Executive Branch all the time. That's fine -- often constructively. And I offer these suggestions, then, in a spirit of constructive criticism.

First, given the outrageous nature of the leaks and the Senate's announced intention of going after them, the Senate must determine who leaked the information -- and turned what should have been a confidential investigation into what many people who wrote me described as "a circus" and "a travesty."

Here's a proposal that I support: The Senate should appoint immediately a special counsel to find out who leaked what and for what reasons. The public cares very much about this case, and in my view, they will for a long, long time. And the investigation ought to focus just on this case. And the special counsel should receive unfettered access to all relevant records and witnesses, and should have subpoena power to get to the truth. The Senate ought to set a clear goal for finishing up the investigation. I suggest January 3rd, when it returns for a new session. Frankly, the American people just will not understand it if the Senate fails to bring the leaker or leakers to justice.

Second, we must promote more tolerant, less viciously partisan debate. I've heard complaints that the White House does not consult sufficiently with Congress in matters of these nominations. Frankly, I have tried to consult with Congress on many issues and we have worked hard to cooperate with Congress and we welcome closer consultation. Let me just get that out on the table. I don't want to put any nominee through a public meat grinder. And I always welcome advice, especially in cases that might prove controversial.

Much of what I have to say today has been sharpened by discussion with members of Congress. But let me make it clear: I will not give a group of senators veto power over a nominee before the Senate has conducted hearings and held a confirmation vote. I will not surrender presidential authority or powers any more than Congress will surrender its power.

In any event, no one ought to accept the charge of insufficient consultation as an excuse for this unforgivable leak.

Third, the hearings focused attention on the problem of sexual harassment in the workplace. We have taken additional steps at the White House as recently as yesterday to address the problem. We will ensure that employees of the Executive Office of the President are aware of the problem and appreciate fully our strong commitment to building a workplace free of harassment. And on March 1st, our administration submitted a civil rights bill that contains specific provisions to strengthen penalties against sexual harassment and encourage compliance with the law. That was back on March 1st. Congress will act soon -- I hope by passing my civil rights bill. And at the very least, I hope Congress will pass the portions on which we have reached agreement.

But legislation alone can't solve the problem of sexual harassment in the workplace. Sexual harassment is ugly behavior. Together, we must eradicate prejudices -- not just through laws, but through simple respect for other human beings. In the end, laws can punish prejudice, but they cannot, alone anyway, produce enlightenment. Only we can do that -- by acting on our convictions.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. And let me offer several specific recommendations for reforming the process:

First, shorten the time lapse between nominations and confirmation -- shorten it to six weeks. It takes four times as long to secure a vote today -- four times as long as it did just 30 years ago, during the presidency of John Kennedy. It took the Senate an average of 63 days to confirm our appointments sent up in 1989; 65 days for the group nominated in 1990. We now have a large group of people waiting for the Senate to vote on their nominations, and they have been waiting an average of 80 days.

At the beginning of this week, more than 190 nominations remained pending before the Senate. A few examples: I nominated Bob Clarke -- Robert Clarke for appointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23rd, more than nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February 28th. In times of economic concern, we need the service of these people. And if members of the Senate don't like my nominees, then they should vote against them. But they should not stall progress by resorting to the old -- and in my view, obsolete -- technique of placing a hold on nominations. Once again, this isn't Republican or Democrat; it is institutional.

We in the White House certainly must do our part. We will redouble our efforts to ensure that nominees complete all their required paperwork promptly, and will respond promptly to requests for further important information. I've asked our Office of the White House Counsel and Office of Government Ethics to see that our regulations and clearance procedures do not, however, discourage public service. I am committed to an ethical administration, but we must ensure that our rules have not become so detailed and so onerous as to scare good, honest people away from public service.

And second, we will work with committees in Congress to ensure the confidentiality of information. I have ordered that the FBI reports be carried directly to committee chairmen and any members designated by the chairmen. The members will read the reports immediately, in the presence of the agent, and then return them. No FBI reports will stay on Capitol Hill. And furthermore, members only will have access to these reports. Staffs will not have access to these reports.

This preserves confidentiality. In my view, it protects nominees. It protects potential witnesses against the nominees. And it protects the members of Congress.

Third, Congress should establish a mechanism for investigating congressional leaks thoroughly, professionally, promptly. And I've met this week with several leaders from the Senate from both parties, and they agree that we must prevent future leaks and establish a suitable mechanism for investigating them swiftly, bringing culprits to justice. (Applause.)

There is no excuse for leaks that wreck lives and needlessly destroy reputations. The law already prohibits such leaks from the Executive Branch. And again, we intend to enforce that law rigorously. I know it's not easy. I've been there. I saw it when I was Director of Central Intelligence when we dealt with national security. I've seen frustrating leaks in the White House that have nothing to do with character assassination or national security, that simply relate to policy matters. I know it's not a simple matter here. But we've got to do better, both the Executive and the Legislative Branch.

And fourth, Congress ought to follow the same laws that it imposes on everyone else. (Applause.) More than a dozen laws

apply to the Executive Branch, but not the Congress. Most of these laws apply to everyone in America except members of Congress. Congress does not have to comply with the Equal Pay Act of 1963. It does not have to follow Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- a title that prohibits sexual harassment and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It doesn't have to obey the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 -- the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

I would wager that the American people do not know that Congress has exempted itself from the sexual harassment laws private employers and the Executive Branch must obey. And they have. We've heard choruses of criticism against the evils of sexual harassment. And we've received good suggestions about how to become more vigilant about this insidious crime.

But these lessons should not be wasted on the men and women who drafted the law. (Applause.) For, you see, when Congress exempts itself from the very laws that it writes for others, it strikes at its own reputation and shatters public confidence in government.

These exemptions encourage special interest groups to press, then, for reckless regulations, knowing that Congress might adopt such laws if it won't feel the sting of these laws. This practice creates the appearance and reality of a privileged class of rulers who stand above the law. Our founders thought it proposterous to suggest that such behavior would ever take place in America.

We did a little research. Federalist Paper, Number 57, asserts that elected officials -- and here's the exact language: "can make no law which will not have in full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society." The writer of that paper also noted ominously, "If this spirit shall ever be so far debased as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty."

The people have begun to speak now. And today I call upon the Congress to take a simple step toward increasing public confidence: submit to the laws it imposes on others, including strict enforcement provisions -- not just Ethics Committee jurisdiction -- and do so by the year's end. (Applause.)

There's a lot of just plain people up there on the Hill trying to make a living. And people who work for Congress ought to have the same rights and legal remedies as those who work for anyone else.

But Congress also must submit to the laws that is imposed on the Executive Branch. And this includes the Privacy Act, which prohibits inappropriate leaks by executive agencies -- Title VI of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Independent Counsel Law.

And all of us should demonstrate our commitment to clean and effective government. From the very start of my administration, I made it absolutely clear that I expect my appointees to follow strict standards of propriety so the American people would have full and increasing confidence in our ability and integrity.

I established a Commission on Federal Ethics Law Reform in January of 1989. I pushed for initiatives that resulted in the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. I signed an Executive Order in April '89, setting forth the principles of ethical government service. And I charged the Office of Government Ethics with issuing a single, comprehensive and clear set of objective, reasonable and enforceable standards. Those standards will be ready soon. They're out now for review.

In the executive departments and the White House we do strive to set and meet high standards of public service. I'll never be happy. We can always do better in the Executive Branch, in the departments and in the White House. And I pledge to the American people that I'm not here to point fingers; I will continue to see that we do a better job of all of this in the Executive Branch of the government. I'm going to keep on trying. But all I'm doing here is inviting the Congress to do the same. Sometimes we protest too much, and we reform too little. And so now is the time to act.

And finally -- going on too long here, but I'm wound up on this. (Laughter.) I really feel strongly about this. Finally, we all must remember that our business is to do the public's business. That becomes increasingly different for a Congress that contains more than 300 committees and subcommittees, and makes use of nearly 40,000 workers.

It becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that answers to no one with respect to its budget, its staff, its perks, even the enforcement of its own rules.

The business of doing the people's business gets even more difficult when committees make broad and unfocused demands. For example, the Judiciary Committee asked Clarence Thomas to submit more than 32,000 pages of documentation prior to his hearings. I'd hate to give a quiz to the Senators to see how many people read the 32,000 documents that they asked for. (Laughter and applause.) A defense bill routinely runs a gamut of committees and subcommittees.

I support the bipartisan effort of Senators Boren and Domenici, Representatives Hamilton and Gradison to trim this overgrown thicket of committees and subcommittees. These four are out front for congressional reform, and I salute them. Senator Boren framed the matter when he said this: "No one doubts that Congress is in trouble as an institution. In poll after poll, Americans describe Congress" -- these are his words -- "as inefficient, unresponsive, wasteful and compromised by the way it finances its campaigns." "It's time for Congress to take another look at itself," these four suggest. "It's time to go beyond piecemeal efforts and to enact comprehensive, bicameral reforms."

I support the efforts of the congressional reformers. A system originally designed to help Congress do the public's business has turned into a machine so complex and bewildering that the public doesn't understand it. Many members of Congress do not fully understand it. Only specialists and lobbyists can pick their way through the labyrinth.

The American people want more. They want a government that will foster economic growth and fight crime and drugs and work to improve schools and build better roads and answer the concerns of the people. And they want a government that listens, not one that commands.

And in the end, taxpayers won't be impressed with reforms if members of Congress pay greater heed to the Beltway lobbyists and pressure groups than to constituents. If people feel powerless, they will find ways to recover their just powers.

Our founders handed down to us the finest system of government in history, one in which the legislature and the executive do battle as part of our system of checks and balances. But we must remember who is servant and who is master. Noah Webster asked in 1802, "If all officers of government are the servants of the people, how can it be expected that the masters should not, at times, take the government out of the hands of the servants."

The reforms I've proposed today will help us do the people's business. They will rein in a government that seems remote

-- seems distant and complex; they will bring it back to the people, and give citizens the feeling of power that we felt at those town meetings some 60 years ago. We must remember: We come here to serve. A few simple reforms can go a long way toward building the public faith upon which our entire democracy depends.

Thank you not only for your interest, but for all you do in elevating public service. It's worthwhile. Don't give up your work.

Thank you very, very much, indeed. (Applause.)

END

12:25 P.M. EDT

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. _____

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 10/23/91 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: ---

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991 - 11:45 a.m.

SUBJECT: _____

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>MCBRIDE</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>SNOW</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

The attached has been forwarded to the President.

RESPONSE:

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary
Ext. 2702

31 OCT 23 P 6: 04

Snow/Aarhus
PROCESS.TS
OCTOBER 23, 1991
DRAFT TWO

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AM. HISTORY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
11:45 A.M.

I am delighted to join you this morning. I would like to discuss two issues we all care about deeply: Public service and public faith in government.

Like many of you, I have devoted much of my adult life to public service. I, too, cherish public service as a special honor -- and personal obligation. My father served for years as moderator of a Connecticut town meeting, for instance. It convened once a month, and people talked about whatever concerned them -- as they always do at town meetings. It could be rowdy, or boring, but the meetings always gave the people a special sense that their opinions made a difference, and that they shared something special with their neighbors and friends. Those meetings impressed upon me what we mean when we talk of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The notion of public service always has motivated Americans to be -- Americans. More than 150 years ago De Tocqueville noted with some astonishment more that "When an American needs the assistance of his fellows, it is very rare for that to be refused, and I have often seen it given spontaneously and eagerly." He did not mistake us for saints. He understood that freedom demands such service to others.

It also demands that public servants must lead by example. Americans will not tolerate hypocrisy. People in other countries wonder why we make such a fuss when our leaders violate our normal standards of behavior. The reason is simple: As Americans, we feel that we have a destiny to lead, to show the way by ideals -- not just to ourselves, but to the entire world.

Yet while our government rests upon unchanging principle, it cannot rest upon past achievements. Government, like everything else, must evolve. Our long and sturdy tradition of tolerance enables us to test new ideas through public debate. When Congress considers issues, no one minds a tough, honest discussion. We expect it. By the same token, we want and expect our free press to look beneath events, take account of people's motives, and to ask tough questions rather than numbly repeating partisan propaganda or baseless rumor. We demand integrity in public behavior and discourse, and when we don't get it, we react angrily.

The recent hearings on Justice Thomas stirred that kind of anger. The American people saw some of the seamier sides of Washington life, and I'm not talking about the testimony. I'm talking about proceedings that degenerated into target practice against good men and women. Ronnie Perry of Brunswick, Georgia wrote me to say, "It is my fear that good, honest moral men and women in this country will no longer subject themselves to the ridicule that Judge Thomas had to face." Likewise, Anita Hill's backers might wonder how anyone might be expected to come forward

in the future if public officials cannot maintain proper confidentiality -- such as the confidentiality promised to Professor Hill.

The bruising hearings showed what happens when political factions let agendas overwhelm a sense of personal decency. Some people have tried to drag public debate to a new low, searching openly for dirt -- any dirt -- without regard to people's rights to privacy, sometimes with less concern for the facts. While crusading pressure groups talk about their favorite issues, they forget that human beings sit beneath the glare of the spotlight, vulnerable to assault from all quarters. The pirhanna tactics of smearing the individual and ignoring the issue have no aim but to destroy lives and wreck reputations.

Many Americans, frankly, were stunned and repulsed when they saw the recent hearings. The scenes from the Senate bore little resemblance to the tidy legislative process we studied in school, and that we describe to our children. X-rated statements and cross-examinations pushed aside the soaps and Saturday cartoons. On television, the process seemed unreal -- more like a satire than like the government in which they take great pride; more like a burlesque show than civics class.

The hearings also showed that politicians must contend with a host of different forces and influences. The public saw outside pressure groups exhorting and twisting arms. The public saw Congressional staffs -- everywhere.

I worry that the hearings sent our children this false message: If you want to make a difference, don't enter public service. Join a special interest group. That way, you can fight as hard as you want, without any responsibility for the results.

Now, I served in Congress and I know the incredible pressure and difficulty of working there. But public faith in Congress is absolutely vital for our form of government. I think we can all work to help Congress strengthen its image and build greater public support. Let me suggest several steps.

First, given the outrageous nature of the leaks and the Senate's announced intention of going after them, the Senate must determine who leaked the information -- and turned what should have been a confidential investigation into what many people who wrote me described as "a circus" and "a travesty."

Here's a proposal that I support: The Senate should appoint an investigator to find out who leaked what, and for what reasons. The public cares very much about this case, and the investigator should receive unfettered access to all relevant records and witnesses, and the Senate ought to set a clear goal for finishing up the investigation. I suggest January 3, when it returns for a new session.

Second, we must promote more tolerant, less viciously partisan debate. I have heard complaints that the White House does not consult sufficiently with Congress in matters of nominations.

Frankly, we have worked hard to cooperate with Congress and we welcome closer consultation. Much of what I have to say today has been sharpened by discussions with members of Congress. But I will not surrender Presidential authority or powers any more than Congress will surrender its power. For instance, the Senate has a duty to advise and consent in Presidential nominations, but it has no right to select members of an administration. [[In any event, no one ought to accept the charge of insufficient consultation as an excuse for this unforgiveable leak.]]

Third, the hearings made it clear that we must redouble our efforts to combat sexual harassment. On March 1 our Administration submitted a civil rights bill that contains language to strengthen penalties against sexual harassment. Congress will act soon on a bill -- I hope by passing the administration version. At the very least, I hope Congress will pass the portions on which we have reached agreement.

But legislation alone can't solve the problem of sexual harassment in the workplace. Sexual harassment is ugly, ridiculous behavior. Together, we must eradicate prejudices -- not just through laws, but through simple respect for other human beings. In the end, laws can punish prejudice, but they cannot produce enlightenment. Only we can do that -- by acting on our convictions.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. Let me offer several specific recommendations for reforming that process.

First, shorten the time lapse between nominations and confirmation votes to six weeks. It takes four times as long to secure a vote today as it did just 30 years ago, during the presidency of John Kennedy. It took the Senate an average of 63 days to confirm our appointees sent up in 1989; 65 days for the group nominated in 1990. We now have a large group of people waiting for the Senate to vote on their nominations, and they have been waiting an average of 80 days.

At the beginning of this week, more than 150 nominations remained pending before the Senate. A few examples: I nominated Robert Clarke for reappointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23 -- more than nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February 28. In times of economic concern, we need the service of these men. If members of the Senate don't like my nominees, they should vote against them. But they should not stall progress by resorting to the old -- and obsolete -- technique of placing a hold on nominations.

We in the White House will do our part. We will redouble our efforts to ensure that nominees complete all their required paperwork promptly, and will respond promptly to requests for further important information.

Second, we will work with committees in Congress to ensure the confidentiality of information. I suggest, for instance, that FBI agents carry FBI reports directly to committee chairmen and any members designated by the chairman, that the members of

Congress examine the documents in the presence of the agents, and that the agents return the information to FBI headquarters immediately after the elected officials have reviewed the documents. Committees ought to have access to summaries of investigations, but only on the grounds that staff members not see them. FBI reports and summaries should go only to members of Congress, not to staffs.

This preserves confidentiality. It protects nominees. It protects potential witnesses against the nominees. And it protects members of Congress.

Third, Congress should establish a mechanism for investigating congressional leaks thoroughly, professionally and promptly. I have met this weeks with Senate leaders from both parties. They agree that we must prevent future leaks, and establish a suitable mechanism for investigating them swiftly, and bringing culprits to justice.

Fourth, Congress ought to follow the same laws it imposes upon everyone else. At least 14 major laws apply to everyone -- the White House, the public, everyone -- except Congress. This includes the Equal Pay act of 1963. It includes Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- a title that prohibits sexual harassment, and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It includes the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Fair Labor Standards Act. The Criminal Conflict of Interest provisions of supreme court statutes. Title Six of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 --

the special counsel law. The Freedom of Information Act. The Privacy Act.

Congress should not exempt itself from the very laws it writes for the nation. This practice shakes public confidence in government. It encourages special interest groups to press for reckless regulations, knowing that Congress might adopt them for everyone else. It creates the appearance and reality of a privileged class of rulers who stand above the law.

This violates our most cherished assumptions about our government. In the Federalist Papers, number 57, our founders asserted that elected officials "can make no law which will not have in full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society." The writer of that paper also noted ominously, "If this spirit shall ever be so far debased as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the Legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty."

Well, the people have begun to speak. They hear about bounced checks; they watch saucy hearings -- and they get angry. Americans expect better of themselves and their leaders.

Today I call upon Congress to take a simple step toward increasing public confidence: submit to each and every law it has imposed upon everyone else, and do so by the year's end. Sen. Charles Grassley has insisted that any new civil rights bill apply to Congress, and I support that move. But Congress also

must submit to the laws that it has imposed upon the executive and judicial branches of government.

And all of us should demonstrate our commitment to clean and effective government. From the very start of my Administration, I made it absolutely clear that I expect my appointees to follow strict standards of propriety, so the American people would have full confidence in our ability and integrity.

I established a Commission on Federal Ethics Law Reform in January, 1989. I pushed for initiatives that resulted in the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. I signed an Executive Order in April 1989 setting forth the principles of ethical government service. I charged the Office of Government Ethics with issuing a "single, comprehensive and clear set" of "objective, reasonable and enforceable" standards. Those standards will be ready soon.

In the Executive departments and the White House we strive to set and meet high standards of public service, and we invite Congress to do the same. Sometimes we protest too much, and reform too little. Now is the time to act.

Finally, we all must remember that our business is to do the public's business. That becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that contains more than 300 committees and subcommittees, and makes use of nearly 40,000 workers.

It becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that answers to no one with respect to its budget, its staff, its perks, even the enforcement of its own rules.

The business of doing the people's business gets even more difficult when committees make broad and unfocused demands. For example, the Judiciary Committee asked Clarence Thomas to submit more than 32,000 pages of documentation prior to his hearings. A defense bill routinely runs a gamut of committees and subcommittees.

I support the efforts of Sens. Boren and DeConcini, and Representatives Hamilton and Gradison to trim this overgrown thicket of committees and subcommittees. Senator Boren framed the matter when he said, "No one doubts that Congress is in trouble as an institution. In poll after poll, Americans describe Congress as inefficient, unresponsive, wasteful and compromised by the way it finances its campaigns. It's time for Congress to take another look at itself. It's time to go beyond piecemeal efforts and to enact comprehensive, bicameral reforms."

I support the efforts of the Congressional reformers. A system originally designed to help Congress do the public's business has turned into a machine so complex and bewildering that the public doesn't understand it. Many members of Congress do not fully understand it. Only specialists and lobbyists can pick their way through the labyrinth.

The American people want more. They want a government that will foster economic growth, fight crime and drugs, work to improve schools, build better roads, and answer to the people's concerns. They want a government that listens, not one that commands.

In the end, taxpayers won't be impressed with reforms if members of Congress pay greater heed to Beltway lobbyists and pressure groups than to constituents. If people feel powerless, they will find ways to recover their just powers.

Our founders handed down to us the finest system of government in history, one in which the legislature and executive do battle as part of our system of checks and balances. But we must remember who is servant and who is master. Noah Webster asked in 1802: "If all officers of government are the servants of the people, how can it be expected that the masters should not, at times, take the government out of the hands of the servants."

The reforms I've proposed today will help us do the people's business. They will rein in a government that seems distant and complex; they will bring it back to the people, and give citizens the feeling of power that we felt at those town meetings long ago. We must remember: We come here to serve. A few simple reforms can go a long way toward building the public faith upon which our entire democracy depends.

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

#

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

91 OCT 28 P2:36

October 28, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY SNOW
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR
COMMUNICATIONS AND DIRECTOR OF SPEECHWRITING

FROM: GENE C. SCHAEFFER *CS/cm*
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Presidential address: Public Administration
Groups; the Museum of American History

Counsel's office has reviewed the matter, and has no legal objection to the final draft. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

cc: PHILLIP D. BRADY
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

91 OCT 23 12:23

DATE: 10/22/91 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: NOON, WED., OCT. 23

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY

SUBJECT: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991 11:45AM

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McBRIDE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide comments/edits on the attached directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, with a copy to this office NO LATER THAN NOON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary Ext. 2702

Comments by Gregg Petersmeyer

I believe that the focus of this address should be the value system more than the Congressional system. That should drive the recommendations for reforming the Congressional system. I do not think that is clear in the current structure of the address. Therefore, I would structure the address in the following way:

The Congressional system in operation today reflects a value system within the Congress or the political system.

Therefore, the first and most critical issue is exactly what value system should be determine the congressional system? The second issue is how should that value system be woven into a reformed congressional system so that the congressional system accurately reflects the right values?

America has always stood for certain values.... We have moved away from many of those values, particularly here in Washington and especially within the political system in the Congress....

The Thomas hearings demonstrated just how far we have moved....

In order to regain America's confidence in the value system of the Congress, it is necessary to reform the Congressional system in such a way as to clearly reflect the values that are important to the country. I would recommend that the Congress reflect our nation's value system by making the following reforms in the Congressional system:...

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

91 OCT 23 A 8:30

DATE: 10/22/91 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: NOON, WED., OCT. 23

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY

SUBJECT: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991 11:45AM

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE <i>Acid Rain</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH <i>Mc</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McBRIDE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY <i>Silver 2607</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide comments/edits on the attached directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, with a copy to this office NO LATER THAN NOON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary Ext. 2702

31 OCT 22 P 6: 20

Snow/Aarhus
PROCESS.TS
OCTOBER 22, 1991
DRAFT ONE

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
11:45 A.M.

[Introductory acknowledgments, warm-up jokes, etc.]

I am delighted to join you this morning. I would like to discuss two issues we all care about deeply: Public service and public faith in government.

I have devoted much of my adult life to public service, and my family has cherished public service as a special honor -- and obligation. My father for years served as moderator of a Connecticut town meeting that convened once a month. He ran for the U.S. Senate at what now seems the tender age of 55. \\ He ran because he cared about the government, and wanted to make a difference. He lost by 1,000 votes out of more than 862,000, but entered the Senate two years later. He served in the Senate for a full decade.

I too have enjoyed the privilege of public service, and it has given me an incredibly rich and rewarding variety of experiences. In public service, you wrestle with the real issues: education and health care; jobs and economic growth; crime and punishment; war and security. Every one in this room has experience the surge of pride you feel when you help someone solve a problem -- or when you help build new hope and pride within your community.

The notion of public service lies at the heart of our system of government. Our founding fathers sought to build a citizen government -- one that would represent all walks of life and respond to the needs and concerns of everyone, not just a privileged elite.

Our founders wanted to build a commonwealth of freedom and prosperity, and they took special care to craft a system of government of the people, by the people and for the people.

The notion of public service always has motivated Americans to be -- Americans. More than 150 years ago De Tocqueville noted with some astonishment more that "When an American needs the assistance of his fellows, it is very rare for that to be refused, and I have often seen it given spontaneously and eagerly." He did not mistake us for saints, however. He understood that freedom demands such service to others.

Good government depends on effective public service -- selfless, efficient, judicious. Our nation has the unique distinction of growing out of a set of ideals, not from the ruins of war or the chain of royal inheritance. Our system of government depends upon the constant defense and refreshment of the values we hold dear.

As public servants, we must lead by example. Americans will not tolerate hypocrisy. This distinguishes the United States from lands in which people accept corruption as a fact of life. People elsewhere wonder why Americans make such a fuss when our leaders violate our normal standards of behavior. The reason is

simple: We have a government of, by and for the people. We demands that our leaders honor our shared values.

We also know that government must change with the times. Our long and sturdy tradition of tolerance and honesty enables government to adapt. When Congress debates issues, no one minds a tough, honest debate. We expect it. By the same token, we expect our free press to peer beneath events, to take account of people's motives, to understand the histories of events, and to have the courage to ask tough questions rather than numbly repeating partisan propaganda. As a nation, we demand integrity in public behavior and discourse. When we don't get it, we react angrily.

The recent Thomas hearings stirred that kind of anger. In the process they highlighted the difficulty of persuading people to enter public service. Ronnie Perry of Brunswick, Georgia wrote me to say, "It is my fear that good, honest moral men and women in this country will no longer subject themselves to the ridicule that Judge Thomas had to face."

Mr. Perry was right: The bruising and personal hearings showed what happens when political factions allow their agendas to overwhelm their personal sense of decency. They ignore the fact that human beings sit beneath the glare of the spotlight and lay themselves vulnerable to assault from all quarters. They forget that vicious political campaigns can -- and do -- destroy lives.

Americans distrust such power deeply, especially when it is not balanced by any obligation to set things right when rumors prove false and indictments fail to produce results. We always have prided ourselves on fairness and decency.

Many Americans, frankly, were stunned when they saw the Thomas hearings. The scenes from the Senate bore little resemblance to the tidy legislative process we studied in school, and that we describe to our children. The process seemed unreal -- more like a satire than like the government in which they take great pride; more like Saturday Night Live than like civics class.

The hearings also showed that politicians do not always act independently. Outside pressure groups exert enormous influence, and Congressional staffs -- which grow more rapidly than kudzu -- increasingly shape policy. Who can forget the scenes of aides handing senators scraps of paper, containing the questions the senators should ask or the arguments they ought to make?

In some ways, the hearings told our children: If you want to make a difference, don't enter public service. Join a special interest group. That way, you can fight as hard as you want, and you don't have to accept any responsibility for the results.

Now, I served in Congress and I know the incredible pressure and difficulty of working there. But I also think we can all work to help Congress strengthen its image and improve its performance.

First, we must complete some unfinished business from the hearings. We must determine who leaked the information -- who turned what should have been a confidential investigation into what many people who wrote me described as "a circus" and "a travesty." [seymour amendment language]

We must combat sexual harassment. From the start our Administration's civil rights bill has contained language to strengthen penalties against sexual harassment. Congress will act soon on the matter -- I hope by considering and passing the administration civil rights bill. That alone can't solve the problem, however. Each of us shares an obligation to eradicate this menace, not just through laws, but through simple respect for other human beings. In the end, laws can punish prejudice, but they cannot produce enlightenment. We alone can do that through word and example.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. Let me offer several specific recommendations for reforming that process.

First, shorten the time lapse between nominations and confirmation votes to 30 working days. It takes four times as long to secure a vote today as it did just 30 years ago, during the presidency of John Kennedy. It took the Senate an average of 63 days to confirm our appointees sent up in 1989; 65 days for the group nominated in 1990. Right now, the average waiting period for those we have nominated this year without receiving Congressional review comes to 80 days.

At the beginning of this week, we still had 154 nominations pending. I nominated Robert Clarke for reappointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23 -- more than nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February 28. I nominated Bob Gates to serve as Director of the CIA more than five months ago. These are not trivial appointments, and yet they have dragged on far too long. Sen. Biden has suggested that we can do better, and I agree. My proposal can help Congress keep things moving. In return, we will redouble our efforts to ensure that nominees complete all their required paperwork promptly.

Second, I propose that we treat FBI reports to the Judiciary Committee the same way we handle FBI reports for every other committee. We will give the committee with a summary of FBI investigations, with the understanding that and only Senators -- no staff -- will have authority to review those documents. We will show the full FBI reports to interested Senators, but the committee itself will keep no copies of the reports. Sen. Nunn has suggested similar reforms.

Third, I suggest that Congress establish a mechanism for investigating congressional leaks thoroughly, professionally and promptly. The Senate's treatment of the leak in the Thomas hearings ought to establish a noble precedent -- not a reason for discouragement. [seymour amendment stuff]

Fourth, Congress ought to follow the same laws it imposes upon everyone else. At least 14 major laws apply to everyone --

the White House, the public, everyone -- except Congress. This includes the Equal Pay act of 1963. It includes Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- a title that prohibits sexual harassment, and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It includes the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Fair Labor Standards Act. The Criminal Conflict of Interest provisions of supreme court statutes. Title Six of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 -- the special counsel law. The Freedom of Information Act. The Privacy Act.

This special status hurts Congress and shakes public confidence in government. It encourages special interest groups to press for reckless regulations, knowing that Congress might adopt them for everyone else. This keeps the pressure groups happy -- and makes life uncomfortable for everyone else. It creates the appearance and reality of a privileged class of rulers who stand above the law.

This violates our most cherished assumptions about our government. In the Federalist Papers, number 57, our founders asserted that elected officials "can make no law which will not have in full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society." The writer of that paper also noted ominously, "If this spirit shall ever be so far debased as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the Legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty."

Well, the people have begun to speak. They see scandals about checks and hearings and so on, and they get angry. They become contemptuous of Congress, and perhaps even of the law. Some embrace the notion of term limitations. This disrespect just isn't healthy. So today I call upon Congress to take a simple step toward increasing public confidence. I call upon it to accept for itself each and every law it has imposed upon everyone else. It shouldn't dawdle. It should do so before the end of this year.

I promise you this: I will not sign any civil rights bill that does not hold Congress to the same standard applied to the people in this room -- to the rest of the federal government.

Finally, we all must remember that our business is to do the public's business. That becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that contains more than 300 committees and subcommittees, and benefits from the services of nearly 40,000 workers. Things get even worse when committees make broad and unfocused demands. For example, the Judiciary Committee asked Clarence Thomas to submit 30,000 pages of documentation prior to his hearings. Individual senators asked for other documents as well. Similarly, a defense bill routinely goes through 38 different committees and untold subcommittees. Each demands time and documents -- and each demand slows the public's business.

I support the efforts of Sen. Boren and others to wrestle with this complicated problem. A system originally designed to help Congress do the public's business has turned into a machine

so complex and bewildering that the public doesn't understand it. Many members of Congress do not fully understand it. Only specialists and lobbyists can pick their way through the dense thickets.

The American people want more. They want a government that will foster economic growth, that will fight crime and drugs, that will work to improve schools, that will build better roads, and that will answer to their concerns first and foremost.

In the end, the public shouldn't have to care about process; it needs better and more responsive government. The people won't be impressed with reforms if members of Congress pay greater heed to lobbyists who live far from the district than they do to the men and women who work and vote in the district.

Our founders handed down to us the finest system of government in American history, one in which the executive and legislative branches constantly tug and pull at one another, and one that lets the people rise up and call for more and better. But we must remember who is servant and who is master. Noah Webster noted this in 1802, when he noted, "If all officers of government are the servants of the people, how can it be expected that the masters should not, at times, take the government out of the hands of the servants."

The reforms I've proposed today can help us do the people's business. They can help us honor the promise of our own Constitution and the values of the people we serve. They can

help us restore pride in public service -- and earn the public
faith vital for everything we hold dear.

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

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

91 OCT 23 P4:06

DATE: 10/22/91 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: NOON, WED., OCT. 23

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991

SUBJECT: 11:45AM

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McBRIDE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide comments/edits on the attached directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, with a copy to this office NO LATER THAN NOON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23. Thank you.

Called

RESPONSE:

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary Ext. 2702

Snow/Aarhus
PROCESS.TS
OCTOBER 22, 1991
DRAFT ONE

01 OCT 22 P 6:20

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
11:45 A.M.

[Introductory acknowledgments, warm-up jokes, etc.]

I am delighted to join you this morning. I would like to discuss two issues we all care about deeply: Public service and public faith in government.

I have devoted much of my adult life to public service, and my family has cherished public service as a special honor -- and obligation. My father for years served as moderator of a Connecticut town meeting that convened once a month. He ran for the U.S. Senate at what now seems the tender age of 55. \\ He ran because he cared about the government, and wanted to make a difference. He lost by 1,000 votes out of more than 862,000, but entered the Senate two years later. He served in the Senate for a full decade.

I too have enjoyed the privilege of public service, and it has given me an incredibly rich and rewarding variety of experiences. In public service, you wrestle with the real issues: education and health care; jobs and economic growth; crime and punishment; war and security. Every one in this room has experienced the surge of pride you feel when you help someone solve a problem -- or when you help build new hope and pride within your community.

The notion of public service lies at the heart of our system of government. Our founding fathers sought to build a citizen government -- one that would represent all walks of life and respond to the needs and concerns of everyone, not just a privileged elite.

Our founders wanted to build a commonwealth of freedom and prosperity, and they took special care to craft a system of government of the people, by the people and for the people.

The notion of public service always has motivated Americans to be -- Americans. More than 150 years ago De Tocqueville noted with some astonishment ~~more~~ that "When an American needs the assistance of his fellows, it is very rare for that to be refused, and I have often seen it given spontaneously and eagerly." He did not mistake us for saints, however. He understood that freedom demands such service to others.

Good government depends on effective public service -- selfless, efficient, judicious. Our nation has the unique distinction of growing out of a set of ideals, not from the ruins of war or the chain of royal inheritance. Our system of government depends upon the constant defense and refreshment of the values we hold dear.

As public servants, we must lead by example. Americans will not tolerate hypocrisy. This distinguishes the United States from lands in which people accept corruption as a fact of life. People elsewhere wonder why Americans make such a fuss when our leaders violate our normal standards of behavior. The reason is

simple: We have a government of, by and for the people. We demands that our leaders honor our shared values.

We also know that government must change with the times. Our long and sturdy tradition of tolerance and honesty enables government to adapt. When Congress debates issues, no one minds a tough, honest debate. We expect it. By the same token, we expect our free press to peer beneath events, to take account of people's motives, to understand the histories of events, and to have the courage to ask tough questions rather than numbly repeating partisan propaganda. As a nation, we demand integrity in public behavior and discourse. When we don't get it, we react angrily.

The recent Thomas hearings stirred that kind of anger. In the process they highlighted the difficulty of persuading people to enter public service. Ronnie Perry of Brunswick, Georgia wrote me to say, "It is my fear that good, honest moral men and women in this country will no longer subject themselves to the ridicule that Judge Thomas had to face."

Mr. Perry was right: The bruising and personal hearings showed what happens when political factions allow their agendas to overwhelm their personal sense of decency. They ignore the fact that human beings sit beneath the glare of the spotlight and lay themselves vulnerable to assault from all quarters. They forget that vicious political campaigns can -- and do -- destroy lives.

Americans distrust such power deeply, especially when it is not balanced by any obligation to set things right when rumors prove false and indictments fail to produce results. We always have prided ourselves on fairness and decency.

Many Americans, frankly, were stunned when they saw the Thomas hearings. The scenes from the Senate bore little resemblance to the tidy legislative process we studied in school, and that we describe to our children. The process seemed unreal -- more like a satire than like the government in which they take great pride; more like Saturday Night Live than like civics class.

The hearings also showed that politicians do not always act independently. Outside pressure groups exert enormous influence, and Congressional staffs -- which grow more rapidly than kudzu - - increasingly shape policy. Who can forget the scenes of aides handing senators scraps of paper, containing the questions the senators should ask or the arguments they ought to make?

In some ways, the hearings told our children: If you want to make a difference, don't enter public service. Join a special interest group. That way, you can fight as hard as you want, and you don't have to accept any responsibility for the results.

Now, I served in Congress and I know the incredible pressure and difficulty of working there. But I also think we can all work to help Congress strengthen its image and improve its performance.

First, we must complete some unfinished business from the hearings. We must determine who leaked the information -- who turned what should have been a confidential investigation into what many people who wrote me described as "a circus" and "a travesty." [seymour amendment language]

We must combat sexual harassment. From the start our Administration's civil rights bill has contained language to strengthen penalties against sexual harassment. Congress will act soon on the matter -- I hope by considering and passing the administration civil rights bill. That alone can't solve the problem, however. Each of us shares an obligation to eradicate this menace, not just through laws, but through simple respect for other human beings. In the end, laws can punish prejudice, but they cannot produce enlightenment. We alone can do that through word and example.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. Let me offer several specific recommendations for reforming that process.

First, shorten the time lapse between nominations and confirmation votes to 30 working days. It takes four times as long to secure a vote today as it did just 30 years ago, during the presidency of John Kennedy. It took the Senate an average of 63 days to confirm our appointees sent up in 1989; 65 days for the group nominated in 1990. Right now, the average waiting period for those we have nominated this year without receiving Congressional review comes to 80 days.

At the beginning of this week, we still had 154 nominations pending. I nominated Robert Clarke for reappointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23 -- more than nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February 28. I nominated Bob Gates to serve as Director of the CIA more than five months ago. These are not trivial appointments, and yet they have dragged on far too long. Sen. Biden has suggested that we can do better, and I agree. My proposal can help Congress keep things moving. In return, we will redouble our efforts to ensure that nominees complete all their required paperwork promptly.

Second, I propose that we treat FBI reports to the Judiciary Committee the same way we handle FBI reports for every other committee. We will give the committee with a summary of FBI investigations, with the understanding that and only Senators -- no staff -- will have authority to review those documents. We will show the full FBI reports to interested Senators, but the committee itself will keep no copies of the reports. Sen. Nunn has suggested similar reforms.

Third, I suggest that Congress establish a mechanism for investigating congressional leaks thoroughly, professionally and promptly. The Senate's treatment of the leak in the Thomas hearings ought to establish a noble precedent -- not a reason for discouragement. [seymour amendment stuff]

Fourth, Congress ought to follow the same laws it imposes upon everyone else. At least 14 major laws apply to everyone --

the White House, the public, everyone -- except Congress. This includes the Equal Pay act of 1963. It includes Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- a title that prohibits sexual harassment, and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It includes the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Fair Labor Standards Act. The Criminal Conflict of Interest provisions of ^{various} ~~supreme court~~ statutes. Title Six of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 -- the special counsel law. The Freedom of Information Act. The Privacy Act.

This special status hurts Congress and shakes public confidence in government. It encourages special interest groups to press for reckless regulations, knowing that Congress might adopt them for everyone else. This keeps the pressure groups happy -- and makes life uncomfortable for everyone else. It creates the appearance and reality of a privileged class of rulers who stand above the law.

This violates our most cherished assumptions about our government. In the Federalist Papers, number 57, our founders asserted that elected officials "can make no law which will not have ~~in~~ full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society." The writer of that paper also noted ominously, "If this spirit shall ever be so far debased as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the Legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty."

Well, the people have begun to speak. They see scandals about checks and hearings and so on, and they get angry. They become contemptuous of Congress, and perhaps even of the law. Some embrace the notion of term limitations. This disrespect just isn't healthy. So today I call upon Congress to take a simple step toward increasing public confidence. I call upon it to accept for itself each and every law it has imposed upon everyone else. It shouldn't dawdle. It should do so before the end of this year.

I promise you this: I will not sign any civil rights bill that does not hold Congress to the same standard applied to the people in this room -- to the rest of the federal government.

Finally, we all must remember that our business is to do the public's business. That becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that contains more than 300 committees and subcommittees, and ~~benefits from the services of~~ ^{has} nearly 40,000 ~~workers.~~ ^{employees.} Things get even worse when committees make broad and unfocused demands. For example, the Judiciary Committee asked Clarence Thomas to submit 30,000 pages of documentation prior to his hearings. Individual senators asked for other documents as well. Similarly, a defense bill routinely goes through 38 different committees and untold subcommittees. Each demands time and documents -- and each demand slows the public's business.

I support the efforts of Sen. Boren and others to wrestle with this complicated problem. A system originally designed to help Congress do the public's business has turned into a machine

so complex and bewildering that the public doesn't understand it. Many members of Congress do not fully understand it. Only specialists and lobbyists can pick their way through the dense thickets.

The American people want more. They want a government that will foster economic growth, that will fight crime and drugs, that will work to improve schools, that will build better roads, and that will answer to their concerns first and foremost.

In the end, the public shouldn't have to care about process; it needs better and more responsive government. The people won't be impressed with reforms if members of Congress pay greater heed to lobbyists who live far from ^{the} the district than they do to the men and women who work and vote in the district.

Our founders handed down to us the finest system of government in American history, one in which the executive and legislative branches constantly tug and pull at one another, and one that lets the people rise up and call for more and better. But we must remember who is servant and who is master. Noah Webster noted this in 1802, when he noted, "If all officers of government are the servants of the people, how can it be expected that the masters should not, at times, take the government out of the hands of the servants."

The reforms I've proposed today can help us do the people's business. They can help us honor the promise of our own Constitution and the values of the people we serve. They can

help us restore pride in public service -- and earn the public faith vital for everything we hold dear.

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

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS


WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

91 OCT 23 P2:45

DATE: 10/22/91 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: NOON, WED., OCT. 23

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY

SUBJECT: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991 11:45AM

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McBRIDE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide comments/edits on the attached directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, with a copy to this office NO LATER THAN NOON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

Handwritten signature in blue ink.

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary Ext. 2702

Snow/Aarhus
PROCESS.TS
OCTOBER 22, 1991
DRAFT ONE

31 OCT 22 P6:20

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
11:45 A.M.

[Introductory acknowledgments, warm-up jokes, etc.]

I am delighted to join you this morning. I would like to discuss two issues we all care about deeply: Public service and public faith in government.

I have devoted much of my adult life to public service, and my family has cherished public service as a special honor -- and obligation. My father for years served as moderator of a Connecticut town meeting that convened once a month. He ran for the U.S. Senate at what now seems the tender age of 55. \ He ran because he cared about the government, and wanted to make a difference. He lost by 1,000 votes out of more than 862,000, but entered the Senate two years later. He served in the Senate for a full decade.

I too have enjoyed the privilege of public service, and it has given me an incredibly rich and rewarding variety of experiences. In public service, you wrestle with the real issues: education and health care; jobs and economic growth; crime and punishment; war and security. Every one in this room has experience the surge of pride you feel when you help someone solve a problem -- or when you help build new hope and pride within your community.

The notion of public service lies at the heart of our system of government. Our founding fathers sought to build a citizen government -- one that would represent all walks of life and respond to the needs and concerns of everyone, not just a privileged elite.

Our founders wanted to build a commonwealth of freedom and prosperity, and they took special care to craft a system of government of the people, by the people and for the people.

The notion of public service always has motivated Americans to be -- Americans. More than 150 years ago De Tocqueville noted with some astonishment more that "When an American needs the assistance of his fellows, it is very rare for that to be refused, and I have often seen it given spontaneously and eagerly." He did not mistake us for saints, however. He understood that freedom demands such service to others.

Good government depends on effective public service -- selfless, efficient, judicious. Our nation has the unique distinction of growing out of a set of ideals, not from the ruins of war or the chain of royal inheritance. Our system of government depends upon the constant defense and refreshment of the values we hold dear.

As public servants, we must lead by example. Americans will not tolerate hypocrisy. This distinguishes the United States from lands in which people accept corruption as a fact of life. People elsewhere wonder why Americans make such a fuss when our leaders violate our normal standards of behavior. The reason is

simple: We have a government of, by and for the people. We demands that our leaders honor our shared values.

We also know that government must change with the times. Our long and sturdy tradition of tolerance and honesty enables government to adapt. When Congress debates issues, no one minds a tough, honest debate. We expect it. By the same token, we expect our free press to peer beneath events, to take account of people's motives, to understand the histories of events, and to have the courage to ask tough questions rather than numbly repeating partisan propaganda. As a nation, we demand integrity in public behavior and discourse. When we don't get it, we react angrily.

The recent Thomas hearings stirred that kind of anger. In the process they highlighted the difficulty of persuading people to enter public service. Ronnie Perry of Brunswick, Georgia wrote me to say, "It is my fear that good, honest moral men and women in this country will no longer subject themselves to the ridicule that Judge Thomas had to face."

Mr. Perry was right: The bruising and personal hearings showed what happens when political factions allow their agendas to overwhelm their personal sense of decency. They ignore the fact that human beings sit beneath the glare of the spotlight and lay themselves vulnerable to assault from all quarters. They forget that vicious political campaigns can -- and do -- destroy lives.

Americans distrust such power deeply, especially when it is not balanced by any obligation to set things right when rumors prove false and indictments fail to produce results. We always have prided ourselves on fairness and decency.

Many Americans, frankly, were stunned when they saw the Thomas hearings. The scenes from the Senate bore little resemblance to the tidy legislative process we studied in school, and that we describe to our children. The process seemed unreal -- more like a satire than like the government in which they take great pride; more like Saturday Night Live than like civics class.

The hearings also showed that politicians do not always act independently. Outside pressure groups exert enormous influence, and Congressional staffs -- which grow more rapidly than kudzu -- increasingly shape policy. Who can forget the scenes of aides handing senators scraps of paper, containing the questions the senators should ask or the arguments they ought to make?

In some ways, the hearings told our children: If you want to make a difference, don't enter public service. Join a special interest group. That way, you can fight as hard as you want, and you don't have to accept any responsibility for the results.

Now, I served in Congress and I know the incredible pressure and difficulty of working there. But I also think we can all work to help Congress strengthen its image and improve its performance.

First, we must complete some unfinished business from the hearings. We must determine who leaked the information -- who turned what should have been a confidential investigation into what many people who wrote me described as "a circus" and "a travesty." [seymour amendment language]

We must combat sexual harassment. From the start our Administration's civil rights bill has contained language to strengthen penalties against sexual harassment. Congress will act soon on the matter -- I hope by considering and passing the administration civil rights bill. That alone can't solve the problem, however. Each of us shares an obligation to eradicate this menace, not just through laws, but through simple respect for other human beings. In the end, laws can punish prejudice, but they cannot produce enlightenment. We alone can do that through word and example.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. Let me offer several specific recommendations for reforming that process.

First, shorten the time lapse between nominations and confirmation votes to 30 working days. It takes four times as long to secure a vote today as it did just 30 years ago, during the presidency of John Kennedy. It took the Senate an average of 63 days to confirm our appointees sent up in 1989; 65 days for the group nominated in 1990. Right now, the average waiting period for those we have nominated this year without receiving Congressional review comes to 80 days.

At the beginning of this week, we still had 154 nominations pending. I nominated Robert Clarke for reappointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23 -- more than nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February 28. I nominated Bob Gates to serve as Director of the CIA more than five months ago. These are not trivial appointments, and yet they have dragged on far too long. Sen. Biden has suggested that we can do better, and I agree. My proposal can help Congress keep things moving. In return, we will redouble our efforts to ensure that nominees complete all their required paperwork promptly.

Second, I propose that we treat FBI reports to the Judiciary Committee the same way we handle FBI reports for every other committee. We will give the committee with a summary of FBI investigations, with the understanding that and only Senators -- no staff -- will have authority to review those documents. We will show the full FBI reports to interested Senators, but the committee itself will keep no copies of the reports. Sen. Nunn has suggested similar reforms.

Third, I suggest that Congress establish a mechanism for investigating congressional leaks thoroughly, professionally and promptly. The Senate's treatment of the leak in the Thomas hearings ought to establish a noble precedent -- not a reason for discouragement. [seymour amendment stuff]

Fourth, Congress ought to follow the same laws it imposes upon everyone else. At least 14 major laws apply to everyone --

the White House, the public, everyone -- except Congress. This includes the Equal Pay act of 1963. It includes Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- a title that prohibits sexual harassment, and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It includes the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Fair Labor Standards Act. The Criminal Conflict of Interest provisions of supreme court statutes. Title Six of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 -- the special counsel law. The Freedom of Information Act. The Privacy Act.

This special status hurts Congress and shakes public confidence in government. It encourages special interest groups to press for reckless regulations, knowing that Congress might adopt them for everyone else. This keeps the pressure groups happy -- and makes life uncomfortable for everyone else. It creates the appearance and reality of a privileged class of rulers who stand above the law.

This violates our most cherished assumptions about our government. In the Federalist Papers, number 57, our founders asserted that elected officials "can make no law which will not have in full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society." The writer of that paper also noted ominously, "If this spirit shall ever be so far debased as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the Legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty."

Well, the people have begun to speak. They see scandals about checks and hearings and so on, and they get angry. They become contemptuous of Congress, and perhaps even of the law. Some embrace the notion of term limitations. This disrespect just isn't healthy. So today I call upon Congress to take a simple step toward increasing public confidence. I call upon it to accept for itself each and every law it has imposed upon everyone else. It shouldn't dawdle. It should do so before the end of this year.

I promise you this: I will not sign any civil rights bill that does not hold Congress to the same standard applied to the people in this room -- to the rest of the federal government.

Finally, we all must remember that our business is to do the public's business. That becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that contains more than 300 committees and subcommittees, and benefits from the services of nearly 40,000 workers. Things get even worse when committees make broad and unfocused demands. For example, the Judiciary Committee asked Clarence Thomas to submit 30,000 pages of documentation prior to his hearings. Individual senators asked for other documents as well. Similarly, a defense bill routinely goes through 38 different committees and untold subcommittees. Each demands time and documents -- and each demand slows the public's business.

I support the efforts of Sen. Boren and others to wrestle with this complicated problem. A system originally designed to help Congress do the public's business has turned into a machine

so complex and bewildering that the public doesn't understand it. Many members of Congress do not fully understand it. Only specialists and lobbyists can pick their way through the dense thickets.

The American people want more. They want a government that will foster economic growth, that will fight crime and drugs, that will work to improve schools, that will build better roads, and that will answer to their concerns first and foremost.

In the end, the public shouldn't have to care about process; it needs better and more responsive government. The people won't be impressed with reforms if members of Congress pay greater heed to lobbyists who live far from the district than they do to the men and women who work and vote in the district.

Our founders handed down to us the finest system of government in American history, one in which the executive and legislative branches constantly tug and pull at one another, and one that lets the people rise up and call for more and better. But we must remember who is servant and who is master. Noah Webster noted this in 1802, when he noted, "If all officers of government are the servants of the people, how can it be expected that the masters should not, at times, take the government out of the hands of the servants."

The reforms I've proposed today can help us do the people's business. They can help us honor the promise of our own Constitution and the values of the people we serve. They can

help us restore pride in public service -- and earn the public faith vital for everything we hold dear.

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

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS



WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

91 OCT 23 P2:39

DATE: 10/22/91 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: NOON, WED., OCT. 23
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
SUBJECT: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
11:45AM

Table with columns for names and checkboxes for ACTION and FYI. Includes names like VICE PRESIDENT, SUNUNU, SCOWCROFT, DARMAN, BRADY, BROMLEY, CARD, DEMAREST, FITZWATER, GRAY, HOLIDAY, HORNER, MCCLURE, PETERSMEYER, PORTER, ROGICH, SMITH, McBRIDE, SNOW.

REMARKS:

Please provide comments/edits on the attached directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, with a copy to this office NO LATER THAN NOON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY SNOW

October 23, 1991

The NSC staff has reviewed the draft presidential address and concurs as amended.

Tony - I've deleted the reference to me on p.6. because we are close to agreement on a final date and I don't want to rock the boat. Brent Scowcroft

PHILLIP D. BRADY Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary Ext. 2702

cc: Phillip D. Brady

Snow/Aarhus
PROCESS.TS
OCTOBER 22, 1991
DRAFT ONE

31 OCT 22 P6:20

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
11:45 A.M.

[Introductory acknowledgments, warm-up jokes, etc.]

I am delighted to join you this morning. I would like to discuss two issues we all care about deeply: Public service and public faith in government.

I have devoted much of my adult life to public service, and my family has cherished public service as a special honor -- and obligation. My father for years served as moderator of a Connecticut town meeting that convened once a month. He ran for the U.S. Senate at what now seems the tender age of 55. \\ He ran because he cared about the government, and wanted to make a difference. He lost by 1,000 votes out of more than 862,000, but entered the Senate two years later. He served in the Senate for a full decade.

I too have enjoyed the privilege of public service, ~~and it has given me an incredibly rich and rewarding variety of experiences.~~ ^{As a} In public service, ^{ant,} you wrestle with the real issues: education and health care; jobs and economic growth; crime and punishment; ^{international peace} ~~war~~ and ^(the nation's) security. Every one in this room has experience the surge of pride you feel when you help someone solve a problem -- or when you help build new hope and pride within your community.

The notion of public service lies at the heart of our system of government. Our founding fathers sought to build a citizen government -- one that would represent all walks of life and respond to the needs and concerns of everyone, not just a privileged elite.

Our founders wanted to build a commonwealth of freedom and prosperity, and they took special care to craft a system of government of the people, by the people and for the people.

The notion of public service always has motivated Americans to be -- Americans. More than 150 years ago ~~De~~ Tocqueville noted with some astonishment more that "When an American needs the assistance of his fellows, it is very rare for that to be refused, and I have often seen it given spontaneously and eagerly." He did not mistake us for saints, however. He understood that freedom demands such service to others.

Good government depends on effective public service -- selfless, efficient, judicious. Our nation has the unique distinction of growing out of a set of ideals, not from the ruins of war or the chain of royal inheritance. Our system of government depends upon the constant defense and refreshment of the values we hold dear.

As public servants, we must lead by example. Americans will not tolerate hypocrisy. This distinguishes the United States from lands in which people accept corruption as a fact of life. People elsewhere wonder why Americans make such a fuss when our leaders violate our normal standards of behavior. The reason is

simple: We have a government of, by and for the people. We demands that our leaders honor our shared values.

We also know that government must change with the times. Our long and sturdy tradition of tolerance and honesty enables government to adapt. When Congress debates issues, no one minds a tough, honest debate. We expect it. By the same token, we expect our free press to peer beneath events, to take account of people's motives, to understand the histories of events, and to have the courage to ask tough questions rather than numbly repeating partisan propoganda. As a nation, we demand integrity in public behavior and discourse. When we don't get it, we react angrily.

The recent Thomas hearings stirred that kind of anger. In the process they highlighted the difficulty of persuading people to enter public service. Ronnie Perry of Brunswick, Georgia wrote me to say, "It is my fear that good, honest moral men and women in this country will no longer subject themselves to the ridicule that Judge Thomas had to face."

Mr. Perry was right: The bruising and personal hearings showed what happens when political factions allow their agendas to overwhelm their personal sense of decency. They ignore the fact that human beings sit beneath the glare of the spotlight and lay themselves vulnerable to assault from all quarters. They forget that vicious political campaigns can -- and do -- destroy lives. ? reputations

Americans distrust such power deeply, especially when it is not balanced by any obligation to set things right when rumors prove false and indictments fail to produce results. We always have prided ourselves on fairness and decency.

Many Americans, frankly, were stunned when they saw the Thomas hearings. The scenes from the Senate bore little resemblance to the ~~tidy~~ legislative process we studied in school, and that we describe to our children. The process seemed unreal -- more like a satire than like the government in which they take great pride; more like Saturday Night Live than like civics class.

The hearings also showed that politicians do not always act independently. Outside pressure groups exert enormous influence, and Congressional staffs -- which grow more rapidly than kudzu - - increasingly shape policy. Who can forget the scenes of aides handing senators scraps of paper, containing the questions the senators should ask or the arguments they ought to make?

In some ways, the hearings told our children: If you want to make a difference, don't enter public service. Join a special interest group. That way, you can fight as hard as you want, and you don't have to accept any responsibility for the results.

Now, I served in Congress and I know the incredible pressure and difficulty of working there. But I also think we can all work to help Congress strengthen its image and improve its performance.

First, we must complete some unfinished business from the hearings. We must determine who leaked the information -- who turned what should have been a confidential investigation into what many people who wrote me described as "a circus" and "a travesty." [seymour amendment language]

We must combat sexual harassment. From the start our Administration's civil rights bill has contained language to strengthen penalties against sexual harassment. Congress will act soon on the matter -- I hope by considering and passing the Administration civil rights bill. That alone can't solve the problem, however. Each of us shares an obligation to eradicate this menace, not just through laws, but through simple respect for other human beings. In the end, laws can punish prejudice, but they cannot produce enlightenment. We alone can do that through word and example.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. Let me offer several specific recommendations for reforming that process.

First, shorten the time lapse between nominations and confirmation votes to 30 working days. It takes four times as long to secure a vote today as it did just 30 years ago, during the presidency of John Kennedy. It took the Senate an average of 63 days to confirm our appointees sent up in 1989; 65 days for the group nominated in 1990. Right now, the average waiting period for those we have nominated this year without receiving Congressional review comes to 80 days.

The confirmation process has

At the beginning of this week, we still had 154 nominations pending. I nominated Robert Clarke for reappointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23 -- more than nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February 28. ~~[I nominated Bob Gates to serve as Director of the CIA more than five months ago.]~~ These are not trivial appointments, and yet ~~they have~~ dragged on far too long. Sen. Biden has suggested that we can do better, and I agree. My proposal can help Congress keep things moving. In return, we will redouble our efforts to ensure that nominees complete all their required paperwork promptly.

Second, I propose that we treat FBI reports to the Judiciary Committee the same way we handle FBI reports for every other committee. We will give the committee ~~with~~ a summary of FBI investigations, with the understanding that ~~and~~ only Senators -- no staff -- will have authority to review those documents. We will show the full FBI reports to interested Senators, but the committee itself will keep no copies of the reports. Sen. Nunn has suggested similar reforms.

Third, I suggest that Congress establish a mechanism for investigating congressional leaks thoroughly, professionally and promptly. The Senate's treatment of the leak in the Thomas hearings ought to establish a noble precedent -- not a reason for discouragement. [seymour amendment stuff]

Fourth, Congress ought to follow the same laws it imposes upon everyone else. At least 14 major laws apply to everyone --

the White House, the public, everyone -- except Congress. This includes the Equal Pay act of 1963. It includes Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- a title that prohibits sexual harassment, and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It includes the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Fair Labor Standards Act. The Criminal Conflict of Interest provisions of supreme court statutes. Title Six of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 -- the special counsel law. The Freedom of Information Act. The Privacy Act.

This special status hurts Congress and shakes public confidence in government. It encourages special interest groups to press for reckless regulations, knowing that Congress might adopt them for everyone else. This keeps the pressure groups happy -- and makes life uncomfortable for everyone else. It creates the appearance and reality of a privileged class of rulers who stand above the law.

This violates our most cherished assumptions about our government. In the Federalist Papers, number 57, our founders asserted that elected officials "can make no law which will not have in full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society." The writer ~~of that paper~~ also noted ominously, "If this spirit shall ever be so far debased as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the Legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty."

Well, the people have begun to speak. They see scandals about checks and hearings and so on, and they get angry. They become contemptuous of Congress, and perhaps even of the law. Some embrace the notion of term limitations. This disrespect just isn't healthy. So today I call upon Congress to take a simple step toward increasing public confidence. I call upon it to accept for itself each and every law it has imposed upon everyone else. It shouldn't dawdle. It should do so before the end of this year.

I promise you this: I will not sign any civil rights bill that does not hold Congress to the same standard applied to the people in this room -- to the rest of the federal government.

Finally, we all must remember that our business is to do the public's business. That becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that contains more than 300 committees and subcommittees, and benefits from the services of nearly 40,000 workers. Things get even worse when committees make broad and unfocused demands. For example, the Judiciary Committee asked Clarence Thomas to submit 30,000 pages of documentation prior to his hearings. Individual senators asked for other documents as well. Similarly, a defense bill routinely goes through 38 different committees and untold subcommittees. Each demands time and documents -- and each demand slows the public's business.

I support the efforts of Sen. Boren and others to wrestle with this complicated problem. A system originally designed to help Congress do the public's business has turned into a machine

so complex and bewildering that the public doesn't understand it. Many members of Congress do not fully understand it. Only specialists and lobbyists can pick their way through the dense thickets.

The American people want more. They want a government that will foster economic growth, that will fight crime and drugs, that will work to improve schools, that will build better roads, and that will answer to their concerns first and foremost.

In the end, the public shouldn't have to care about process; it needs better and more responsive government. The people won't be impressed with reforms if members of Congress pay greater heed to lobbyists who live far from the district than they do to the men and women who work and vote in the district.

Our founders handed down to us the finest system of government in American history, one in which the executive and legislative branches constantly tug and pull at one another, and one that lets the people rise up and call for more and better. But we must remember who is servant and who is master. Noah Webster noted this in 1802, when he ~~noted~~^{said}, "If all officers of government are the servants of the people, how can it be expected that the masters should not, at times, take the government out of the hands of the servants."

The reforms I've proposed today can help us do the people's business. They can help us honor the promise of our own Constitution and the values of the people we serve. They can

help us restore pride in public service -- and earn the public faith vital for everything we hold dear.

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

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS

AC HAS SEEN

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

91 OCT 23 P2:30

DATE: 10/22/91 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: NOON, WED., OCT. 23

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY

SUBJECT: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991 11:45AM

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McBRIDE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide comments/edits on the attached directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, with a copy to this office NO LATER THAN NOON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary Ext. 2702

Snow/Aarhus
PROCESS.TS
OCTOBER 22, 1991
DRAFT ONE

31 OCT 22 P6: 20

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
11:45 A.M.

[Introductory acknowledgments, warm-up jokes, etc.]

I am delighted to join you this morning. I would like to discuss two issues we all care about deeply: Public service and public faith in government.

I have devoted much of my adult life to public service, and my family has cherished public service as a special honor -- and obligation. My father for years served as moderator of a Connecticut town meeting that convened once a month. He ran for the U.S. Senate at what now seems the tender age of 55. \\ He ran because he cared about the government, and wanted to make a difference. He lost by 1,000 votes out of more than 862,000, but entered the Senate two years later. He served in the Senate for a full decade.

I too have enjoyed the privilege of public service, and it has given me an incredibly rich and rewarding variety of experiences. In public service, you wrestle with the real issues: education and health care; jobs and economic growth; crime and punishment; war and security. Every one in this room has experience the surge of pride you feel when you help someone solve a problem -- or when you help build new hope and pride within your community.

The notion of public service lies at the heart of our system of government. Our founding fathers sought to build a citizen government -- one that would represent all walks of life and respond to the needs and concerns of everyone, not just a privileged elite.

Our founders wanted to build a commonwealth of freedom and prosperity, and they took special care to craft a system of government of the people, by the people and for the people.

The notion of public service always has motivated Americans to be -- Americans. More than 150 years ago De Tocqueville noted with some astonishment more that "When an American needs the assistance of his fellows, it is very rare for that to be refused, and I have often seen it given spontaneously and eagerly." He did not mistake us for saints, however. He understood that freedom demands such service to others.

Good government depends on effective public service -- selfless, efficient, judicious. Our nation has the unique distinction of growing out of a set of ideals, not from the ruins of war or the chain of royal inheritance. Our system of government depends upon the constant defense and refreshment of the values we hold dear.

As public servants we must lead by example. Americans will not tolerate hypocrisy. This distinguishes the United States from lands in which people accept corruption as a fact of life. People elsewhere wonder why Americans make such a fuss when our leaders violate our normal standards of behavior. The reason is

simple: We have a government of, by and for the people. We demands that our leaders honor our shared values.

We also know that government must change with the times. Our long and sturdy tradition of tolerance and honesty enables government to adapt. When Congress debates issues, no one minds a tough, honest debate. We expect it. By the same token, we expect our free press to peer beneath events, to take account of people's motives, to understand the histories of events, and to have the courage to ask tough questions rather than numbly repeating partisan propaganda. As a nation, we demand integrity in public behavior and discourse. When we don't get it, we react angrily.

The recent Thomas hearings stirred that kind of anger. In the process they highlighted the difficulty of persuading people to enter public service. Ronnie Perry of Brunswick, Georgia wrote me to say, "It is my fear that good, honest moral men and women in this country will no longer subject themselves to the ridicule that Judge Thomas had to face."

Mr. Perry was right: The bruising and personal hearings showed what happens when political factions allow their agendas to overwhelm their personal sense of decency. They ignore the fact that human beings sit beneath the glare of the spotlight and lay themselves vulnerable to assault from all quarters. They forget that vicious political campaigns can -- and do -- destroy lives.

Americans distrust such power deeply, especially when it is not balanced by any obligation to set things right when rumors prove false and indictments fail to produce results. We always have prided ourselves on fairness and decency.

Many Americans, frankly, were stunned when they saw the Thomas hearings. The scenes from the Senate bore little resemblance to the tidy legislative process we studied in school, and that we describe to our children. The process seemed unreal -- more like a satire than like the government in which they take great pride; more like Saturday Night Live than like civics class.

The hearings also showed that politicians do not always act independently. Outside pressure groups exert enormous influence, and Congressional staffs -- which grow more rapidly than kudzu -- increasingly shape policy. Who can forget the scenes of aides handing senators scraps of paper, containing the questions the senators should ask or the arguments they ought to make?

In some ways, the hearings told our children: If you want to make a difference, don't enter public service. Join a special interest group. That way, you can fight as hard as you want, and you don't have to accept any responsibility for the results.

Now, I served in Congress and I know the incredible pressure and difficulty of working there. But I also think we can all work to help Congress strengthen its image and improve its performance.

2.
transitions

First, we must complete some unfinished business from the hearings. We must determine who leaked the information -- who turned what should have been a confidential investigation into what many people who wrote me described as "a circus" and "a travesty." [seymour amendment language]

We must combat sexual harassment. From the start our Administration's civil rights bill has contained language to strengthen penalties against sexual harassment. Congress will act soon on the matter -- I hope by considering and passing the administration civil rights bill. That alone can't solve the problem, however. Each of us shares an obligation to eradicate this menace, not just through laws, but through simple respect for other human beings. In the end, laws can punish prejudice, but they cannot produce enlightenment. We alone can do that through word and example.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. Let me offer several specific recommendations for reforming that process.

60

First, shorten the time lapse between nominations and confirmation votes to 30 working days. It takes four times as long to secure a vote today as it did just 30 years ago, during the presidency of John Kennedy. It took the Senate an average of 63 days to confirm our appointees sent up in 1989; 65 days for the group nominated in 1990. Right now, the average waiting period for those we have nominated this year without receiving Congressional review comes to 80 days.

At the beginning of this week, we still had 154 nominations pending. I nominated Robert Clarke for reappointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23 -- more than nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February 28. I nominated Bob Gates to serve as Director of the CIA more than five months ago. These are not trivial appointments, and yet they have dragged on far too long. Sen. Biden has suggested that we can do better, and I agree. My proposal can help Congress keep things moving. In return, we will redouble our efforts to ensure that nominees complete all their required paperwork promptly.

Second, I propose that we treat FBI reports to the Judiciary Committee the same way we handle FBI reports for every other committee. We will give the committee ~~with~~ a summary of FBI investigations, with the understanding that ~~and~~ only Senators -- no staff -- will have authority to review those documents. We will show the full FBI reports to interested Senators, but the committee itself will keep no copies of the reports. Sen. Nunn has suggested similar reforms.

Third, I suggest that Congress establish a mechanism for investigating congressional leaks thoroughly, professionally and promptly. The Senate's treatment of the leak in the Thomas hearings ought to establish a noble precedent -- not a reason for discouragement. [seymour amendment stuff]

Fourth, Congress ought to follow the same laws it imposes upon everyone else. At least 14 major laws apply to everyone --

copy

the White House, the public, everyone -- except Congress. This includes the Equal Pay act of 1963. It includes Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- a title that prohibits sexual harassment, and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It includes the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Fair Labor Standards Act. The Criminal Conflict of Interest provisions of supreme court statutes. Title Six of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 -- the special counsel law. The Freedom of Information Act. The Privacy Act.

This special status hurts Congress and shakes public confidence in government. It encourages special interest groups to press for reckless regulations, knowing that Congress might adopt them for everyone else. This keeps the pressure groups happy -- and makes life uncomfortable for everyone else. It creates the appearance and reality of a privileged class of rulers who stand above the law.

This violates our most cherished assumptions about our government. In the Federalist Papers, number 57, our founders asserted that elected officials "can make no law which will not have in full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society." The writer of that paper also noted ominously, "If this spirit shall ever be so far debased as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the Legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty."

awkward sentence

Well, the people have begun to speak. They see scandals about checks and hearings and so on, and they get angry. They become contemptuous of Congress, and perhaps even of the law. Some embrace the notion of term limitations. This disrespect just isn't healthy. So today I call upon Congress to take a simple step toward increasing public confidence. ~~I call upon it~~ *Congress should* to accept *we try* for itself each and every law it has imposed upon everyone else. It shouldn't dawdle. It should do so before the end of this year. *I want to sign a CR bill but*

Sound bite

I promise you this: I will not sign any civil rights bill that does not hold Congress to the same standard applied to the people in this room -- to the rest of the federal government.

Finally, we all must remember that our business is to do the public's business. That becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that contains more than 300 committees and subcommittees, and benefits from the services of nearly 40,000 workers. Things get even worse when committees make broad and unfocused demands. For example, the Judiciary Committee asked Clarence Thomas to submit 30,000 pages of documentation prior to his hearings. Individual senators asked for other documents as well. Similarly, a defense bill routinely goes through 38 different committees and untold subcommittees. Each demands time and documents -- and each demand slows the public's business.

I support the efforts of Sen. Boren and others to wrestle with this complicated problem. A system originally designed to help Congress do the public's business has turned into a machine

so complex and bewildering that the public doesn't understand it. Many members of Congress do not fully understand it. Only specialists and lobbyists can pick their way through the dense thickets.

The American people want more. They want a government that will foster economic growth, that will fight crime and drugs, that will work to improve schools, that will build better roads, and that will answer to their concerns first and foremost.

In the end, the public shouldn't have to care about process; it needs better and more responsive government. The people won't be impressed with reforms if members of Congress pay greater heed to lobbyists who live far from the district than they do to the men and women who work and vote in the district.

Our founders handed down to us the finest system of government in American history, one in which the executive and legislative branches constantly tug and pull at one another, and one that lets the people rise up and call for more and better. But we must remember who is servant and who is master. Noah Webster noted this in 1802, when he ^{said} noted, "If all officers of government are the servants of the people, how can it be expected that the masters should not, at times, take the government out of the hands of the servants."

The reforms I've proposed today can help us do the people's business. They can help us honor the promise of our own Constitution and the values of the people we serve. They can

help us restore pride in public service -- and earn the public
faith vital for everything we hold dear.

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

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

91 OCT 23 P1:46

DATE: 10/22/91 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: NOON, WED., OCT. 23

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY

SUBJECT: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991 11:45AM

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McBRIDE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide comments/edits on the attached directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, with a copy to this office NO LATER THAN NOON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

See comments

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary Ext. 2702

Snow/Aarhus
PROCESS.TS
OCTOBER 22, 1991
DRAFT ONE

31 OCT 22 P6:20

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
11:45 A.M.

[Introductory acknowledgments, warm-up jokes, etc.]

I am delighted to join you this morning. I would like to discuss two issues we all care about deeply: Public service and public faith in government.

I have devoted much of my adult life to public service, and my family has cherished public service as a special honor -- and obligation. My father for years served as moderator of a Connecticut town meeting that convened once a month. He ran for the U.S. Senate at what now seems the tender age of 55. \\ He ran because he cared about the government, and wanted to make a difference. He lost by 1,000 votes out of more than 862,000, but entered the Senate two years later. He served in the Senate for a full decade.

I too have enjoyed the privilege of public service, and it has given me an incredibly rich and rewarding variety of experiences. In public service, you wrestle with the real issues: education and health care; jobs and economic growth; crime and punishment; war and security. Every one in this room has experienced the surge of pride you feel when you help someone solve a problem -- or when you help build new hope and pride within your community.

Scully
10/27/8

The notion of public service lies at the heart of our system of government. Our founding fathers sought to build a citizen government -- one that would represent all walks of life and respond to the needs and concerns of everyone, not just a privileged elite.

Our founders wanted to build a commonwealth of freedom and prosperity, and they took special care to craft a system of government of the people, by the people and for the people.

The notion of public service always has motivated Americans to be -- Americans. More than 150 years ago De Tocqueville noted with some astonishment ~~more~~ that "When an American needs the assistance of his fellows, it is very rare for that to be refused, and I have often seen it given spontaneously and eagerly." He did not mistake us for saints, however. He understood that freedom demands such service to others.

Good government depends on effective public service -- selfless, efficient, judicious. Our nation has the unique distinction of growing out of a set of ideals, not from the ruins of war or the chain of royal inheritance. Our system of government depends upon the constant defense and refreshment of the values we hold dear.

As public servants, we must lead by example. Americans will not tolerate hypocrisy. This distinguishes the United States from lands in which people accept corruption as a fact of life. People elsewhere wonder why Americans make such a fuss when our leaders violate our normal standards of behavior. The reason is

✓ Scully
R5178

simple: We have a government of, by and for the people. We demands that our leaders honor our shared values. ✓

We also know that government must change with the times. Our long and sturdy tradition of tolerance and honesty enables government to adapt. When Congress debates issues, no one minds a tough, honest debate. We expect it. By the same token, we expect our free press to peer beneath events, to take account of people's motives, to understand the histories of events, and to have the courage to ask tough questions rather than numbly repeating partisan propaganda. As a nation, we demand integrity in public behavior and discourse. When we don't get it, we react angrily.

The recent Thomas hearings stirred that kind of anger. In the process they highlighted the difficulty of persuading people to enter public service. Ronnie Perry of Brunswick, Georgia wrote me to say, "It is my fear that good, honest moral men and women in this country will no longer subject themselves to the ridicule that Judge Thomas had to face."

Mr. Perry was right: The bruising and personal hearings showed what happens when political factions allow their agendas to overwhelm their personal sense of decency. They ignore the fact that human beings sit beneath the glare of the spotlight and lay themselves vulnerable to assault from all quarters. They forget that vicious political campaigns can -- and do -- destroy lives.

Americans distrust such power deeply, especially when it is not balanced by any obligation to set things right when rumors prove false and indictments fail to produce results. We always have prided ourselves on fairness and decency.

Many Americans, frankly, were stunned when they saw the Thomas hearings. The scenes from the Senate bore little resemblance to the tidy legislative process we studied in school, and that we describe to our children. The process seemed unreal -- more like a satire than like the government in which they take great pride; more like Saturday Night Live than like civics class.

The hearings also showed that politicians do not always act independently. Outside pressure groups exert enormous influence, and Congressional staffs -- which grow more rapidly than kudzu - - increasingly shape policy. Who can forget the scenes of aides handing senators scraps of paper, containing the questions the senators should ask or the arguments they ought to make?

In some ways, the hearings told our children: If you want to make a difference, don't enter public service. Join a special interest group. That way, you can fight as hard as you want, and you don't have to accept any responsibility for the results.

Now, I served in Congress and I know the incredible pressure and difficulty of working there. But I also think we can all work to help Congress strengthen its image and improve its performance.

First, we must complete some unfinished business from the hearings. We must determine who leaked the information -- who turned what should have been a confidential investigation into what many people who wrote me described as "a circus" and "a travesty." [seymour amendment language]

We must combat sexual harassment. From the start our Administration's civil rights bill has contained language to strengthen penalties against sexual harassment. Congress will act soon on the matter -- I hope by considering and passing the administration civil rights bill. That alone can't solve the problem, however. Each of us shares an obligation to eradicate this menace, not just through laws, but through simple respect for other human beings. In the end, laws can punish prejudice, but they cannot produce enlightenment. We alone can do that through word and example.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. Let me offer several specific recommendations for reforming that process.

First, shorten the time lapse between nominations and confirmation votes to 30 working days. It takes four times as long to secure a vote today as it did just 30 years ago, during the presidency of John Kennedy. It took the Senate an average of 63 days to confirm our appointees sent up in 1989; 65 days for the group nominated in 1990. Right now, the average waiting period for those we have nominated this year without receiving Congressional review comes to 80 days.

At the beginning of this week, we still had 154 nominations pending. I nominated Robert Clarke for reappointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23 -- more than nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February 28. I nominated Bob Gates to serve as Director of the CIA more than five months ago. These are not trivial appointments, and yet they have dragged on far too long. Sen. Biden has suggested that we can do better, and I agree. My proposal can help Congress keep things moving. In return, we will redouble our efforts to ensure that nominees complete all their required paperwork promptly.

Second, I propose that we treat FBI reports to the Judiciary Committee the same way we handle FBI reports for every other committee. We will give the committee ~~with~~ a summary of FBI investigations, with the understanding ^{that} ~~that~~ and only Senators -- no staff -- will have authority to review those documents. We will show the full FBI reports to interested Senators, but the committee itself will keep no copies of the reports. Sen. Nunn has suggested similar reforms.

Third, I suggest that Congress establish a mechanism for investigating congressional leaks thoroughly, professionally and promptly. The Senate's treatment of the leak in the Thomas hearings ought to establish a noble precedent -- not a reason for discouragement. [seymour amendment stuff]

Fourth, Congress ought to follow the same laws it imposes upon everyone else. At least 14 major laws apply to everyone --

✓
Halp
7/3/2

the White House, the public, everyone -- except Congress. This includes the Equal Pay ~~Act~~ of 1963. It includes Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- a title that prohibits sexual harassment, and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It includes the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Fair Labor Standards Act. The Criminal Conflict of Interest provisions of supreme court statutes. Title Six of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 -- the special counsel law. The Freedom of Information Act. The Privacy Act.

?
Dennis
5044

This special status hurts Congress and shakes public confidence in government. It encourages special interest groups to press for reckless regulations, knowing that Congress might adopt them for everyone else. This keeps the pressure groups happy -- and makes life uncomfortable for everyone else. It creates the appearance and reality of a privileged class of rulers who stand above the law.

This violates our most cherished assumptions about our government. In the Federalist Papers, number 57, our founders asserted that elected officials "can make no law which will not have in full operation on themselves and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society." The writer of that paper also noted ominously, "If this spirit shall ever be so far debased as to tolerate a law not obligatory on the Legislature as well as on the people, the people will be prepared to tolerate anything but liberty."

Well, the people have begun to speak. They see scandals about checks and hearings and so on, and they get angry. They become contemptuous of Congress, and perhaps even of the law. Some embrace the notion of term limitations. This disrespect just isn't healthy. So today I call upon Congress to take a simple step toward increasing public confidence. I call upon it to accept for itself each and every law it has imposed upon everyone else. It shouldn't dawdle. It should do so before the end of this year.

I promise you this: I will not sign any civil rights bill that does not hold Congress to the same standard applied to the people in this room -- to the rest of the federal government.

Finally, we all must remember that our business is to do the public's business. That becomes increasingly difficult for a Congress that contains more than 300 committees and subcommittees, and benefits from the services of nearly 40,000 workers. Things get even worse when committees make broad and unfocused demands. For example, the Judiciary Committee asked Clarence Thomas to submit 30,000 pages of documentation prior to his hearings. Individual senators asked for other documents as well. Similarly, ^{there are 38 different committees and subcommittees} a defense bill routinely goes through 38 ^{which claim jurisdiction over National Security legislation.} different committees and untold subcommittees. Each demands time and documents -- and each demand slows the public's business.

I support the efforts of Sen. Boren and others to wrestle with this complicated problem. A system originally designed to help Congress do the public's business has turned into a machine

*This sounds
too high-
break*

*Daniel
45044*

*Taylor
43192*

so complex and bewildering that the public doesn't understand it. Many ~~Members~~ of Congress do not fully understand it. Only specialists and lobbyists can pick their way through the dense thickets.

✓ Scully
F5178

The American people want more. They want a government that will foster economic growth, that will fight crime and drugs, that will work to improve schools, that will build better roads, and that will answer to their concerns first and foremost.

In the end, the public shouldn't have to care about process; it needs better and more responsive government. The people won't be impressed with reforms if ~~Members~~ of Congress pay greater heed to lobbyists who live far from the district than they do to the men and women who work and vote in the district.

✓ Scully
F5178

Our founders handed down to us the finest system of government in American history, one in which the executive and legislative branches constantly tug and pull at one another, and one that lets the people rise up and call for more and better. But we must remember who is servant and who is master. Noah Webster noted this in 1802, when he noted, "If all officers of government are the servants of the people, how can it be expected that the masters should not, at times, take the government out of the hands of the servants."

the founders started American history.
Dames
F 5044

The reforms I've proposed today can help us do the people's business. They can help us honor the promise of our own Constitution and the values of the people we serve. They can

help us restore pride in public service -- and earn the public faith vital for everything we hold dear.

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

#