

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: 13586-005

Folder Title:
Public Administration Groups 10/24/91 [OA 6038] [2]

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

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

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:

Comments from Cabinet Affairs are attached.

Thanks, CLOSE HOLD [Signature]

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

OFFICE OF CABINET AFFAIRS STAFFING MEMORANDUM

Date: 10-23

Due by: 10-23 Noon

Subject: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY

From: ELIZABETH LITIG

	ACTION	CONCUR	FYI		ACTION	CONCUR	FYI
HOLIDAY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	FITZHENRY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BLUMENTHAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MCMUNN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ADAIR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BUCHHOLZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHALL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CASSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SECHLER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EVANS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WETHINGTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FARRAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WILLIAMSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GUNN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>KUTCHINS</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEFKOWITZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>HILL</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
JACKSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>SHANNON</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: by noon today.

Shannon
clj

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 ^{political} corruption as a fact of ^{public} 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. *Because they are elected by the people, they must be accountable to the people.*

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 ^{deliberative} ~~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 ^{seek to} take great pride. ~~more like Saturday Night Live than like civics class.~~

NOK: this is not something that should be joked about.

NOK: There is nothing inherently wrong with the use of aides. POTUS does it. Most people distinguish between the Senate aides and the liberal interest groups. What they don't like is when aides act like leaders of interest groups.

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]

Need a better transition here -- how the process turned a serious problem like sexual harassment into a crude political debate.

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's 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 ^{proper} 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.

Include the date POTOS' bill was submitted to Congress and the fact that POTOS' original bill had a sexual harassment §.

The Thomas hearings also raised concerns about the confirmation process generally. ^{after speaking with congressional leaders, I have} ~~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 ^{who have not} ~~without~~ ^{ed} receiving Congressional review comes to 80 days.

How long did it take 30 years ago?

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 ^{provide} ~~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, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991 as ^{approved} ~~passed~~ by the Senate Committee.

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.

*Note: one
term limits
disrespectful?*

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

work!
Congress has
wasted time
on Nominations
when it could
have been
working on
the domestic
policy POTUS
has proposed

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.

#

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

*Office of Cabinet Affairs
Fax Transmission Cover*

TO: Ede Holiday

LOCATION: —

FAX NUMBER: 333 - 1463

FROM: Elizabeth Luttig

Number of pages to follow: 10

Office of Cabinet Affairs

Telephone: (202) 456-2800

Fax: (202) 456-2223

Comments:

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

91 OCT 23 All: 15

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:

Changes page 5 + 6

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 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 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 ^{full-time} 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 ⁷⁸80 days.

1. I cannot confirm this statement. Exec Clerk & NAPA pubs didn't have any data either.
2. Our statistics were based on full-time appointments only.

At the beginning of this week, we still had ¹⁹³ 154 nominations pending. I nominated Robert Clarke for reappointment as Comptroller of the Currency on January 23 -- ^{exactly} ~~more than~~ nine months ago. I nominated Larry Lindsey for a seat on the Federal Reserve Board on February ²⁷ 28. I nominated ⁶⁻²⁴⁻⁹¹ Bob Gates to serve as Director of the CIA ^{four months} ~~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 --

Bob Gates was announced 5-14-91 but the nomination was not submitted until 6-24-91.

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.

#

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: 10-23-91

TO: Tony —

FROM: DORRANCE SMITH
Assistant to the President for Media Affairs
West Wing, x1660

I WOULD LIKE TO SEE A PARAGRAPH
THAT HIGHLIGHTS HOW THE MEDIA'S RUSH
TO PUBLISH OR BROADCAST ~~PARLY~~
INNUEENDO AND RUMOR ONLY MAKES
THE PROCESS MORE DIFFICULT; MAKES IT
HARDER TO DETERMINE THE TRUTH.
THEIR STANDARDS OF DECENCY AND FAIR
PLAY NEED TO BE RAISED.

I DON'T EXPECT ANYTHING WILL COME
OF MAKING THIS POINT; BUT I THINK
WE NEED TO AT LEAST BE ON THE RECORD
AS SAYING THAT THE MEDIA HAVE
A RESPONSIBILITY TOO.

DS

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 280157SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

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. A red arrow points to SMITH's ACTION 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.~~

~~They forget that vicious political campaigns, can and do destroy lives.~~
~~They forget that vicious political campaigns, can and do destroy lives.~~
~~They forget that vicious political campaigns, can and do destroy lives.~~
As An Individual's Privacy Becomes
The A Television Spectacle For Millions Of Viewers.

~~THE~~ WOULD ANYONE WHO BELIEVES IN AMERICA'S INNATE
SENSE OF DECENCY AND FAIRNESS, CHOOSE TO LAY THEIR
LIVES OPEN TO SUCH AN ASSAULT. HOW CAN I, AS PRESIDENT,
ASK ANYONE TO BECOME THE SUBJECT OF THESE ATTACKS?

Americans distrust such power deeply, especially when it is
not balanced by any obligation to set things right when rumors,^{OR BAD}
prove false and indictments fail to produce results. We always ^{REPORTING}
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 ^{BAENMAN AND BAILEY} 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 --

Need A Sentence THAT SAYS FBI IS A PART OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH;
 THAT WE HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION TO PROTECT INFORMATION;
 THAT WE MUST CONGRESS HAS NO INDEPENDENT RIGHT TO THIS MATERIAL;
 GIVEN IN GOOD FAITH TO EXPEDITE THE PROCESS

THAT
 ITS

ARE WE CALLING FOR
 A SPECIAL INDEPENDENT COUNSEL?

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 ^{DESERVE} ~~want~~ ^{FAIRNESS. THE NOMINEES HAVE A RIGHT TO A FAIR CONFIRMATION PROCESS.} ~~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~~ ^{THE} care about ^A 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

FAITHLESS

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.

#

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

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GROUPS
THE MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1991
8:30 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 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.

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.

#

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

THANK YOU. IT'S NICE TO SEE TIM CLARK, PRESIDENT
OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN
SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION; RAY KLINE, PRESIDENT
OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS;
DAVID MAXWELL, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL FOR
EXCELLENCE IN GOVERNMENT.\\ 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. I ALWAYS HAVE. LONG AGO MY FATHER SERVED FOR YEARS AS MODERATOR OF A CONNECTICUT TOWN MEETING. 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 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 ALWAYS HAS MOTIVATED AMERICANS TO BE -- AMERICANS. MORE THAN 150 YEARS AGO, 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, 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 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 JUSTICE THOMAS STIRRED THAT 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 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 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 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 THEATRICALS OUTSIDE THE HEARING ROOMS -- CAPTIVATED THE ATTENTION OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC. MILLIONS UPON MILLIONS OF PEOPLE WATCHED THE HEARINGS WITH A COMBINATION OF CURIOSITY, SUSPENSE, AND DISGUST. THE NATION WAS STUNNED AND REPULSED BY THE SPECTACLE. 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. THE PROCESS SEEMED UNREAL -- MORE LIKE A SATIRE THAN LIKE THE GOVERNMENT IN WHICH WE TAKE 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 PEOPLE 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 OR AS DIRTY 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. MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CRITICIZE THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ALL THE TIME, OFTEN QUITE CONSTRUCTIVELY. I OFFER THESE SUGGESTIONS 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 THE INVESTIGATION OUGHT TO FOCUS JUST ON THIS CASE. 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 3, 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 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. I DON'T WANT TO PUT ANY NOMINEE THROUGH A PUBLIC MEATGRINDER, AND I ALWAYS WELCOME ADVICE, ESPECIALLY IN CASES THAT MIGHT PROVE CONTROVERSIAL. MUCH OF WHAT I HAVE TO SAY TODAY HAS BEEN SHARPENED BY DISCUSSIONS 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 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.

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 190 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 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 HAVE ASKED OUR OFFICE OF WHITE HOUSE COUNSEL AND OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS TO SEE THAT OUR REGULATIONS AND CLEARANCE PROCEDURES DO NOT DISCOURAGE PUBLIC SERVICE. I AM COMMITTED TO ETHICAL ADMINISTRATION, BUT WE MUST ENSURE THAT OUR RULES HAVE NOT BECOME SO DETAILED AND ONEROUS AS TO SCARE GOOD PEOPLE AWAY.

SECOND, WE WILL WORK WITH COMMITTEES IN CONGRESS TO ENSURE THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION. I HAVE ORDERED THAT FBI REPORTS BE CARRIED DIRECTLY TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND ANY MEMBERS DESIGNATED BY THE CHAIRMAN. THE MEMBERS WILL READ THEM IMMEDIATELY, AND THEN RETURN THEM. NO FBI REPORTS WILL STAY ON CAPITOL HILL. FURTHERMORE, MEMBERS ONLY WILL HAVE ACCESS TO THESE REPORTS. STAFF WILL NOT.

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 WEEK 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.

THERE IS NO EXCUSE FOR LEAKS THAT WRECK LIVES AND DESTROY REPUTATIONS. THE LAW ALREADY PROHIBITS SUCH LEAKS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, AND AGAIN, WE INTEND TO ENFORCE THAT LAW RIGOROUSLY.

FOURTH, CONGRESS OUGHT TO FOLLOW THE SAME LAWS IT IMPOSES UPON EVERYONE ELSE. MORE THAN A DOZEN LAWS APPLY TO THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, BUT NOT TO CONGRESS. MOST OF THESE LAWS APPLY TO EVERYONE IN AMERICA -- EXCEPT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS. CONGRESS DOESN'T HAVE TO COMPLY WITH THE EQUAL PAY ACT OF 1963. IT DOESN'T 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. WE HAVE HEARD CHORUSES OF CRITICISM AGAINST THE EVILS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT, AND WE HAVE RECEIVED GOOD SUGGESTIONS ABOUT HOW TO BECOME MORE VIGILANT ABOUT IT. BUT THESE LESSONS SHOULD NOT BE WASTED ON THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO DRAFTED THE LAW.

WHEN CONGRESS EXEMPTS ITSELF FROM THE VERY LAWS IT WRITES FOR OTHERS, IT STRIKES AT ITS OWN REPUTATION AND SHATTERS PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT. THESE EXEMPTIONS ENCOURAGE SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS TO PRESS FOR RECKLESS REGULATIONS, KNOWING THAT CONGRESS MIGHT ADOPT SUCH LAWS IF IT WON'T FEEL THEIR STING. THIS PRACTICE CREATES THE APPEARANCE AND REALITY OF A PRIVILEGED CLASS OF RULERS WHO STAND ABOVE THE LAW.

OUR FOUNDERS THOUGHT IT PREPOSTEROUS TO SUGGEST THAT SUCH BEHAVIOR WOULD EVER TAKE PLACE IN AMERICA. FEDERALIST PAPER NUMBER 57 ASSERTS 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. TODAY I CALL UPON CONGRESS TO TAKE A SIMPLE STEP TOWARD INCREASING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE: SUBMIT TO THE LAWS IT IMPOSES UPON OTHERS, INCLUDE STRICT ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS -- NOT JUST ETHICS COMMITTEE JURISDICTION -- AND DO SO BY THE YEAR'S END. PEOPLE WHO WORK FOR CONGRESS OUGHT TO HAVE THE SAME RIGHTS AND LEGAL REMEDIES AS THOSE WHO WORK FOR EVERYONE ELSE.

BUT CONGRESS ALSO MUST SUBMIT TO THE LAWS THAT IT HAS IMPOSED UPON THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. THIS INCLUDES THE PRIVACY ACT, WHICH PROHIBITS INAPPROPRIATE LEAKS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, AND TITLE SIX 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 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 SENATORS 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.

#