

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:** 13641  
**Folder ID Number:** 13641-008

---

**Folder Title:**  
AARP Video Tape 9/14/92 [OA 5812]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>

---

AARP VIDEO  
TO BE TAPED SEPTEMBER 16, 1992  
10:30 A.M.

strait  
4040

QUESTION ONE: DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE  
COMPREHENSIVE REFORM TO PROVIDE HEALTH SERVICES TO ALL  
AMERICANS, HOLD DOWN THE INCREASING COSTS OF CARE, AND  
PROVIDE LONG-TERM CARE TO THE CHRONICALLY ILL AND  
DISABLED? HOW HIGH A PRIORITY ARE HEALTH-CARE ISSUES,  
AND HOW WOULD YOU FINANCE THE STEPS YOU BELIEVE NEED TO  
OCCUR?

WELL, HORACE, THE QUICK ANSWER IS YES, I SUPPORT  
COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH-CARE REFORM, AND IN FACT I'VE  
ADVANCED A MAJOR PLAN TO ACCOMPLISH IT. AMERICA HAS  
THE BEST-QUALITY MEDICAL CARE IN THE WORLD, BUT IT  
COSTS TOO MUCH, AND NOT EVERYONE CAN GET IT. THAT'S  
WRONG. AND BECAUSE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE MADE IT  
PLAIN THAT THIS IS A REAL CONCERN, NO MATTER WHO WINS  
THIS ELECTION -- SOMETHING'S GOING TO CHANGE. THE  
DIFFERENCE IS WHAT WILL CHANGE... AND HOW.

MY OPPONENT KEEPS CHANGING HIS PLAN -- AND WHAT HE'S GOT IS A FOUR-PAGE OUTLINE -- SO IT'S HARD TO TELL EXACTLY WHAT HE'S FOR. BUT HE'S CONSISTENTLY WANTED THE GOVERNMENT TO CONTROL THE HEALTH-CARE SYSTEM, AND PAY FOR IT WITH HIGHER TAXES. THE PROBLEM WITH THAT, I THINK, IS PRETTY OBVIOUS: IF BIG GOVERNMENT CAN'T EVEN BALANCE THE NATIONAL CHECKBOOK, HOW CAN WE EXPECT AN EVEN-BIGGER GOVERNMENT TO RUN A BALANCED HEALTH-CARE SYSTEM?

THE BIG-GOVERNMENT APPROACH WOULD EVENTUALLY MEAN RATIONED HEALTH CARE... AND A NO-WIN CHOICE BETWEEN BENEFIT CUTS OR PREMIUM HIKES FOR OLDER AMERICANS ON A FIXED INCOME. IT WOULD ALSO MEAN PRICE CONTROLS... NEW BURDENS ON SMALL BUSINESSES THAT WOULD COST JOBS... AND OF COURSE, MASSIVE TAX INCREASES MASQUERADING AS THE "PAY OR PLAY" IDEA.


DOESN'T SOUND LIKE A SOLUTION TO ME. SOUNDS LIKE A NATIONAL NIGHTMARE... A CURE THAT'S WORSE THAN THE DISEASE.

SO MY APPROACH IS TO LET MARKET FORCES GUIDE THE WAY. AND THIS IS HOW WE DO IT.

FIRST, WE DON'T THROW THE BABY OUT WITH THE BATHWATER. REMEMBER, OUR SYSTEM, IN A LOT OF WAYS, IS THE ENVY OF THE WORLD. SO WE NEED TO RECOGNIZE OUR STRENGTHS, AND KEEP THEM STRONG. THAT INCLUDES ALWAYS DEVELOPING NEW TECHNIQUES AND TOOLS.

THEN WE SEE WHAT DOESN'T WORK -- WHAT'S KEEPING ALL AMERICANS FROM BEING COVERED, FAIR AND SQUARE -- AND WE REFORM IT. WE DO THAT BY BUILDING INCENTIVES INTO THE SYSTEM FOR CHOICE... QUALITY... AND INNOVATION. WITH ONE SIMPLE GOAL: TO MAKE WORLD-CLASS HEALTH-CARE AVAILABLE, AND AFFORDABLE... TO EVERYONE.

RIGHT NOW, CONGRESS HAS BEFORE IT FIVE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO ENACT MY REFORM PLAN. REAL QUICKLY, HERE'S WHAT THEY'D DO.

- 0 GIVE FINANCIAL HELP TO ALMOST 100 MILLION LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME AMERICANS, SO THEY CAN BUY HEALTH-INSURANCE COVERAGE;
  
- 0 SLASH THE NUMBER OF AMERICAN WORKERS WITHOUT HEALTH INSURANCE BY ALMOST 90 PERCENT -- FROM MORE THAN 34 MILLION NOW, DOWN TO LESS THAN 5 MILLION, FOR STARTERS;
  
- 0 MAKE INSURANCE AVAILABLE TO THOSE WITH SO-CALLED 'PRE-EXISTING HEALTH CONDITIONS' 
  
- 0 END THE FEAR OF 'JOB-LOCK,' WHERE WORKERS CAN'T MOVE TO A NEW JOB WITHOUT RISKING THEIR COVERAGE;
  
- 0 AND GIVE SELF-EMPLOYED WORKERS A FULL, 100-PERCENT TAX DEDUCTION FOR THE COST OF THEIR HEALTH INSURANCE;

MY PLAN WOULD GIVE ENOUGH TAX CREDIT TO PAY FOR A SOLID HEALTH PACKAGE -- TO THOSE FOLKS TOO POOR TO FILE INCOME TAX. NOW, THAT'S A TAX CREDIT -- NOT JUST A TAX DEDUCTION. IT'S \$3750 WORTH OF REAL INSURANCE, STRAIGHT INTO THE HANDS THAT NEED IT THE MOST. FOR FAMILIES THAT MAKE MORE MONEY, BUT STILL FIND IT TOUGH TO AFFORD INSURANCE, I'M PROPOSING AN EQUAL-SIZED TAX DEDUCTION.

MY PLAN INCLUDES WAYS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESSES BUY COVERAGE, BY POOLING THEM WITH OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES TO GET BETTER RATES AND SERVICES.

IT INCLUDES MEDICAL-MALPRACTICE REFORMS TO END CRAZY LAWSUITS THAT DRIVE COSTS UP -- AND DOCTORS OUT OF PRACTICE.

IT INCLUDES REDUCING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS BY AROUND 25 PERCENT, SIMPLY BY USING AUTOMATION TO CUT PAPERWORK.

IT STRESSES GIVING CONSUMERS BETTER INFORMATION SO THEY CAN COMPARE OPTIONS AND GET THE BEST TREATMENT FOR THE BEST COST.

IT PUTS MAJOR FUNDS TO WORK ON PREVENTING HEALTH PROBLEMS, WHICH IS A LOT CHEAPER THAN FIXING HEALTH PROBLEMS.

AND IT CONTAINS INCENTIVES FOR INDIVIDUAL STATES TO COORDINATE THEIR MEDICAID PROGRAMS. THAT WAY, POOR AMERICANS CAN GET THEIR HEALTH CARE MORE EFFICIENTLY.

NOW... MY PLAN CAN WORK WITHOUT RAISING TAXES. WE CAN PAY FOR IT THROUGH A SERIES OF EFFICIENCIES I'VE SUGGESTED, WHICH MEANS WE CAN CUT OUT CERTAIN PAYMENTS WE ALREADY MAKE ON BEHALF OF FOLKS WITHOUT INSURANCE. AND WE CAN ALSO USE THE FUNDS WE SPEND ON INDIGENT CARE TO HELP THE UNINSURED BUY THE QUALITY CARE THEY NEED. ALSO, THE CREDITS AND DEDUCTIONS I MENTIONED WOULD BE PHASED IN, SO START-UP COSTS WOULDN'T BE SO HIGH.

THOSE ARE THE HIGHLIGHTS. IT'S A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN... IT'LL CONTROL COSTS... EXTEND COVERAGE TO ALL WORKING AMERICANS... AND IMPROVE ACCESS TO QUALITY CARE FOR EVERYONE -- WITHOUT RAISING TAXES. I URGE CONGRESS TO ACT QUICKLY ON THESE PROPOSALS, SO WE CAN GET ON WITH THIS CRITICAL REFORM.

QUESTION TWO: WHAT IS YOUR POSITION ON CONTINUED BUILD-UP OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND AND REMOVING THE LIMITS ON EARNINGS WHICH BENEFICIARIES CAN EARN BEFORE THEIR BENEFIT IS REDUCED? AND WHAT MEASURES WOULD YOU SUPPORT TO ASSURE BETTER PROTECTION FOR EMPLOYEES' PENSION BENEFITS AND ANNUITIES?

YOU KNOW THE OLD SAYING, "IF IT AIN'T BROKE, DON'T FIX IT"? WELL, SOCIAL SECURITY FUNDING WAS DEFINITELY BROKEN BEFORE 1983, BUT NOW IT'S FIXED, AND I CAN'T SEE ANY GOOD REASON TO GO MESSING WITH IT NOW. I'M COMMITTED TO THE INTEGRITY OF ITS FUNDING, NOT JUST FOR US WHO QUALIFY FOR BENEFITS TODAY... BUT FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. THAT WAS THE WHOLE POINT OF RESCUING THE SYSTEM IN '83.

THUS OFF →

SO NO, I'M NOT GOING TO TOUCH SOCIAL SECURITY OR THE TRUST FUND THAT KEEPS IT SOLVENT. ACCORDING TO THE LATEST REPORTS FROM THE TRUSTEES, THE FUND THAT PAYS BENEFITS TO SENIORS IS FINANCIALLY SOUND... AND THEY EXPECT IT TO STAY SOUND, WELL INTO THE NEXT CENTURY. I FULLY INTEND TO KEEP IT THAT WAY.

REGARDING LIMITS ON HOW MUCH YOU CAN EARN BEFORE YOUR BENEFITS START GETTING CUT... I'M IN FAVOR OF ACCELERATING THE RETIREMENT EARNINGS TEST CEILING FASTER THAN THE CURRENT LAW ALLOWS. I WROTE MY 1992 BUDGET SO THE AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE MONEY YOU CAN EARN WITHOUT LOSING BENEFITS WILL JUMP FROM A LITTLE OVER \$10,000 THIS YEAR TO \$11,400 NEXT YEAR. TOO BAD CONGRESS IS SITTING ON THE MEASURE -- BUT I'LL FIGHT TO GET IT PASSED.

AND IF I'M RE-ELECTED, I'LL CONTINUE TO PUSH THE CONGRESS TO MAKE RESPONSIBLE REFORMS OF THE EARNINGS TEST.

AS FAR AS BETTER PROTECTION FOR PENSION BENEFITS AND ANNUITIES ARE CONCERNED, I'VE MADE SURE THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION IS FINANCIALLY STRONG, SO EVERY PLAN CAN COVER ALL ITS OBLIGATIONS. AND I'VE MADE SURE THE CORPORATION CAN PROTECT PENSIONERS IF SOMEHOW THEIR PLAN GETS INTO FINANCIAL TROUBLE. THE BOTTOM LINE IS, I'LL CONTINUE TO MAKE SURE THAT PENSION HOLDERS IN THIS COUNTRY ARE BACKED BY THE FULL WEIGHT OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT.

IF THAT MEANS LEGAL ACTION AGAINST IRRESPONSIBLE PENSION TRUSTEES, SO BE IT. I BELIEVE IN AGGRESSIVE ACTION WHEN TRUSTEES VIOLATE THEIR OBLIGATION TO BUY THE SAFEST ANNUITIES AVAILABLE. SEVEN CASES LIKE THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN BROUGHT FORWARD, AND WE FULLY INTEND TO PROSECUTE THE PEOPLE WHO'VE VIOLATED THE IMPLICIT TRUST THEIR PENSIONERS HAVE PLACED IN THEM.

QUESTION THREE: DO YOU SUPPORT OR OPPOSE REFORMING THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS AND IF SO, HOW? WHAT OTHER STEPS WOULD YOU TAKE TO RESTORE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE INTEGRITY OF GOVERNMENT AND ELECTED OFFICIALS?

I THINK YOUR QUESTION, HORACE... REFLECTS A DEEPER CONCERN THAN JUST CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM. YOU'RE IMPLYING A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE IN ELECTED OFFICIALS, AND I THINK YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT.

THE MOST IMPORTANT THING A CITIZEN CAN DO IS STUDY THE CANDIDATES AND VOTE FOR THOSE WHO MAKE THE STRONGEST CASE FOR THEIR OWN TRUSTWORTHINESS.

OF COURSE, SOMETIMES YOU CAN'T TELL. AND POWER HAS A WAY OF CHANGING PEOPLE, OR BRINGING OUT THEIR WORST - - ESPECIALLY IF THEY BECOME PART OF AN ENTRENCHED POWER STRUCTURE.

THAT'S WHY THERE'S A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PREVENTING PRESIDENTS FROM MAKING A CAREER OF THE PRESIDENCY, AND I THINK THE CONGRESS SHOULD HAVE A SIMILAR LAW. WE NEED A CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLE... NOT A CONGRESS OF PROFESSIONAL POLITICIANS.

SO I SUPPORT LIMITED TERMS FOR CONGRESS. I THINK A LOT OF THE UNSAVORY THINGS THAT GO ON IN WASHINGTON WOULD DISAPPEAR IF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CAME TO WASHINGTON TO SERVE THEIR CONSTITUENTS' INTERESTS... AND NOT TO PROTECT THEIR OWN.

NOW, I'M NOT SAYING THERE AREN'T FINE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS. THERE ARE SOME OUTSTANDING SENATORS AND HOUSE MEMBERS OF BOTH PARTIES WHO'VE BEEN IN OFFICE A LONG TIME. BUT I THINK THE COUNTRY WOULD BE BEST SERVED IF WE ESTABLISHED A TWELVE-YEAR CEILING, FOR BOTH THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE. THAT'S SIX TERMS IN THE HOUSE, TWO IN THE SENATE. AFTER THAT, YOU'RE ONE OF THE GOOD OLD BOYS OR GOOD OLD GALS, AND YOU TEND TO SPEND TOO MUCH TIME BROKERING YOUR POWER.

YOU RAISED THE QUESTION OF CAMPAIGN-FINANCE REFORM. WE NEED IT; NO QUESTION ABOUT IT. THE WAY THE SYSTEM WORKS NOW IS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF THE PROBLEMS I'M TALKING ABOUT. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES STACK THE DECK IN FAVOR OF INCUMBENTS, AND CHALLENGERS HAVE AN UPHILL BATTLE TRYING TO WIN A SEAT.

SO YOU GET THE KIND OF MESS WE HAVE TODAY, WITH SPECIAL INTERESTS RUNNING A CONGRESS THAT SEEMS TO THINK IT'S UNACCOUNTABLE TO ANYBODY ELSE, ESPECIALLY PRIVATE CITIZENS.

I'VE CALLED, TIME AND AGAIN, FOR COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM, INCLUDING GETTING RID OF SPECIAL-INTEREST PAC'S... LIMITING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM SO-CALLED "LEADERSHIP PAC'S"... REQUIRING FULL DISCLOSURE OF ALL EXPENDITURES... AND LETTING POLITICAL PARTIES SPEND MORE ON CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES. THAT WOULD LOWER THE TIME CANDIDATES THEMSELVES HAVE TO SPEND RAISING MONEY -- WHICH THEY LARGELY DO, UNFORTUNATELY, BY KOWTOWING TO SPECIAL INTERESTS. SO THESE REFORMS, IF CONGRESS WOULD PASS THEM, WOULD RESTORE ACCOUNTABILITY TO AN ELECTORAL SYSTEM THAT HAS CLEARLY GONE 'WAY WRONG.

I ALSO THINK THE COUNTRY WOULD BE IN A LOT BETTER SHAPE IF THE PRESIDENT HAD A LINE-ITEM VETO, SO THAT OTHERWISE-GOOD PROPOSALS FROM CONGRESS DON'T GET REJECTED WHOLESALE... JUST BECAUSE SOME SPECIAL- INTEREST GROUP IN CONGRESS TACKS A RIDICULOUS ITEM TO THE BILL. I'M TALKING ABOUT GRANTS TO STUDY BLUEBERRIES TACKED ON TO A MAJOR AGRICULTURAL BILL, FOR EXAMPLE.

TAKEN TOGETHER, ALL THESE REFORMS WOULD COUNTER SOME OF THE ALARMING UNDERCURRENTS IN NATIONAL POLITICS TODAY, AND MAKE THE GOVERNMENT MORE ACCOUNTABLE TO THE VOTERS. WHICH OF COURSE... IS THE WHOLE POINT... OF DEMOCRACY.

# # #

Please

Make a

speech file

for

A.A.R.P.

(Ken A. Gandy)

& put this  
in.

14  
Scully comments

8:00 AM 9/16

Steve Gary  
(Askew/Gershowitz)  
September 14, 1992  
4:00 p.m.  
AARPVIDEO

PRESIDENTIAL TALKING POINTS: AARP VIDEO  
TO BE TAPED SEPTEMBER 16, 1992  
12:15 P.M.

[Question one: Do you support or oppose comprehensive reform to provide health services to all Americans, hold down the increasing costs of care, and provide long-term care to the chronically ill and disabled? How high a priority are health-care issues, and how would you finance the steps you believe need to occur?]

Well, Horace, the quick answer is yes, I support comprehensive health-care reform, and in fact I've advanced a major plan to accomplish it. America has the best-quality medical care in the world, but it costs too much, and not everyone can get it. That's wrong. And because the American people have made it plain that this is a real concern, no matter who wins this election -- something's going to change. The difference is what will change... and how.

a strong comprehensive

My opponent ~~wants~~ the government to control the health-care system, and pay for it through higher taxes. The problem with that, I think, is pretty obvious: If big government can't even balance the national checkbook, how can we expect an even-bigger government to run a balanced health-care system?

Keeps changing his plan - - so it's hard to tell what he's for. But he's consistently wanted  
and what he has is a vague outline



The big-government approach would eventually mean rationed health care... the no-win choice between benefit cuts or premium hikes for older Americans on fixed income. It would also mean price controls... new burdens on small businesses that will cost jobs... and of course, massive tax increases masquerading as the "pay or play" idea.

Doesn't sound like a solution to me. Sounds like a national nightmare... a cure that's worse than the disease.

So my approach is to let market forces guide the way. And this is how we do it.

First, we don't throw the baby out with the bathwater. Remember, our system is in many ways the envy of the world. So we need to recognize our strengths, and keep them strong. That includes always developing new techniques and tools.

Then we see what doesn't work -- what's keeping all Americans from being covered, fair and square -- and we reform it. We do that by building incentives into the system for choice, quality and innovation. And the goal is simple: To make world-class health-care available, and affordable... to everyone.

Right now, Congress has before it five legislative proposals to enact my reform plan. Real quickly, here's what they'd do.

- o Give financial help to almost 100 million low- and moderate-income Americans so they can buy health-insurance coverage;
- o Slash the number of American workers without health insurance by almost 90 percent -- from more than 34 million now, down to less than 5 million, for starters;

- o Make insurance available to those with so-called 'pre-existing health conditions';
- o End the fear of 'job-lock,' where workers can't move to a new job without risking being uncovered;
- o And give self-employed workers a full, 100-percent tax deduction for the cost of their health insurance;

My plan would give enough tax credit to pay for a ~~basic~~<sup>solid</sup> health package -- to those folks too poor to file income tax.

That's a tax credit -- not just a tax deduction. It's \$3750 ~~of that~~<sup>of that</sup> ~~insurance straight into the hands~~<sup>can be paid directly to an insurance company for coverage for those</sup> that need it the most. For

families that make more money, but still find it tough to afford insurance, I'm proposing a ~~tax deduction of equal size~~<sup>significant tax deductions and credits to</sup> ~~lower~~<sup>lower</sup> their costs.

My plan includes ways to help small businesses buy coverage, by pooling them with other small businesses to get <sup>much</sup> better rates <sup>and better</sup> services.

It includes medical-malpractice reforms to end crazy lawsuits that drive costs up and drive doctors out of practice.

It includes reducing administrative costs by around 25 percent, simply by using automation to cut paperwork.

It stresses giving consumers <sup>and employers</sup> better information <sup>on doctors and hospitals</sup> so they can compare options and get the best treatment for the best cost.

It puts major funds to work on preventing health problems, which is a lot cheaper than fixing health problems.

And it contains incentives for individual States to coordinate their Medicaid programs so that poor Americans get their health care more efficiently.

also transfer the major subsidies that we pay for indigent care

to instead by ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~uninsured~~ <sup>quality</sup> health care ~~insurance~~ <sup>insurance</sup> for the ~~uninsured~~

Now, my plan can work without raising taxes. We can pay for it through efficiencies I've suggested, which means we can cut out some payments we already make to people without insurance. And we can ~~also cut costs~~ in our federal health programs. And the credits and deductions I mentioned would be phased in, so start-up costs wouldn't be very high.

Those are the highlights. It's a <sup>very</sup> comprehensive plan... it'll control costs... extend coverage to all working Americans... and improve access to quality care for everyone -- without raising taxes. I urge Congress to act quickly on my proposals, so we can get on with this much-needed reform.

**[Question two: What is your position on continued build-up of the Social Security Trust Fund and removing the limits on earning which beneficiaries can earn before their benefit is reduced? And what measures would you support to assure better protection for employees' pension benefits and annuities?]**

You know the old saying, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it"? Well, Social Security funding was definitely broken before 1983, but now it's fixed, and I can't see any good reason to go messing with it now. I'm committed to the integrity of its funding, not just for us who qualify for benefits today... but for future generations. That was whole point of rescuing the system in '83.

So no, I'm not going to touch Social Security or the Trust Fund that keeps it solvent. According to the latest reports from

the Trustees, the Fund that pays benefits to seniors is sound... and it's projected to remain sound well into the next century. I fully intend to keep it that way.

Regarding limits on how much you can earn before your benefits start getting cut... I'm in favor of accelerating the Retirement Earnings Test ceiling faster than the current law allows. I wrote my 1992 budget so the amount of outside money you can earn without losing benefits will jump from a little over \$10,000 this year to \$11,400 next year. Too bad Congress is sitting on the measure -- but I'll fight to get it passed.

And if I'm re-elected, I'll continue to push the Congress to make responsible reforms of the earnings test.

As far as better protection for pension benefits and annuities are concerned, I've made sure the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is financially strong, so every plan has enough to cover all its obligations. And I've made sure the Corporation can protect pensioners if somehow their plan got into financial trouble. The bottom line is, I'll continue to make sure that pension holders in this country are backed up by the full weight of the U.S. Government.

If that means legal action against irresponsible pension planners, so be it. I believe in aggressive action when trustees violate their obligation to buy the safest annuities available. Seven such cases have already been brought forward, and we fully intend to prosecute those who have violated the implicit trust their pensioners have placed in them.

*[Question three: Do you support or oppose reforming the campaign finance laws and if so, how? What other steps would you take to restore public confidence in the integrity of government and elected officials?]*

I think your question reflects a deeper concern than just campaign finance reform, Horace. You're implying a crisis of confidence in elected officials, and I think you're right.

The most important thing a citizen can do is study the candidates and vote for those who make the strongest case for their own trustworthiness.

Of course, sometimes you can't tell. And power has a way of changing people, or bringing out their worst -- especially if they become part of an entrenched power structure.

That's why there's a Constitutional amendment preventing Presidents from making a career of the Presidency, and I think the Congress should have a similar law. We need a Congress of the people... not a Congress of professional politicians.

So I support limited terms for the Congress. I think a lot of the unsavory things that go on in Washington would disappear if members of Congress came to Washington to serve their constituents' interests... and not their own.

Now, I'm not saying there aren't fine Members of Congress. There are some outstanding Senators and House Members who have been in office a long time. But I think the country would be

best served if we established a twelve-year ceiling, for both the House and the Senate. That's six terms in the House, two in the Senate. After that, you're one of the good old boys, and you tend to spend too much time brokering your power.

You raised the question of campaign-finance reform. We need it; no question about it. The way the system works now is a perfect example of the problems I'm talking about. With all its Political Action Committees, the system stacks the deck in favor of incumbents, and challengers have an uphill battle trying to win a seat.

So you get the kind of mess we have today, with special interests running a Congress that seems to think it's unaccountable to anybody else, especially the voters.

I've repeatedly called for comprehensive campaign finance reform, including getting rid of special-interest PACs... limiting contributions from so-called "leadership PACs"... requiring full disclosure of all expenditures... and allowing political parties to spend more of their funds on Congressional candidates, which lowers the time candidates themselves have to spend raising money -- which they do by kowtowing to special interests. These reforms, if Congress would pass them, would restore accountability to an electoral system that has clearly gone wrong.

I also think the country would be in a lot better shape if the President had a line-item veto, so that otherwise-good proposals from Congress don't get rejected wholesale because some

special-interest group in Congress tacks a ridiculous item to the bill. I'm talking about grants to study blueberries tacked on to a major agricultural bill, for example.

Taken together, all these reforms would counter some of the alarming undercurrents in national politics today, and make the Government more accountable to the voters. Which is the whole point of democracy.

Scully's

(Askew/Gershowitz)  
September 14, 1992  
5:30 p.m.  
AARPVIDEO

PRESIDENTIAL TALKING POINTS: AARP VIDEO  
TO BE TAPED SEPTEMBER 16, 1992  
~~12:15 P.M.~~

[Question one: Do you support or oppose comprehensive reform to provide health services to all Americans, hold down the increasing costs of care, and provide long-term care to the chronically ill and disabled? How high a priority are health-care issues, and how would you finance the steps you believe need to occur?]

Well, Horace, the quick answer is yes, I support comprehensive health-care reform, and in fact I've advanced a ~~major~~ <sup>STEP</sup> major plan to accomplish it. America has the best-quality medical care in the world, but it costs too much, and not everyone can get it. That's wrong. And because the American people have made it plain that this is a real concern, no matter who wins this election -- something's going to change. The difference is what will change... and how.

My opponent <sup>9</sup> ~~wants~~ the government to control the health-care system, and pay for it with higher taxes. The problem with that, I think, is pretty obvious: If big government can't even balance the national checkbook, how can we expect an even-bigger government to run a balanced health-care system?

→ Keeps changing his plans - & what he's got is a <sup>40'</sup> 4-page outline - <sup>1</sup> so it's hard to tell exactly what he's for. But he's consistently wanted

The big-government approach would eventually mean rationed health care... and a no-win choice between benefit cuts or premium hikes for older Americans on a fixed income. It would also mean price controls... new burdens on small businesses that would cost jobs... and of course, massive tax increases masquerading as the "pay or play" idea.

Doesn't sound like a solution to me. Sounds like a national nightmare... a cure that's worse than the disease.

So my approach is to let market forces guide the way. And this is how we do it.

First, we don't throw the baby out with the bathwater. Remember, our system, in a lot of ways, is the envy of the world. So we need to recognize our strengths, and keep them strong. That includes always developing new techniques and tools.

Then we see what doesn't work -- what's keeping all Americans from being covered, fair and square -- and we reform it. We do that by building incentives into the system for choice... quality... and innovation. With one simple goal: To make world-class health-care available, and affordable... to everyone.

Right now, Congress has before it five legislative proposals to enact my reform plan. Real quickly, here's what they'd do.

- o Give financial help to almost 100 million low- and moderate-income Americans, so they can buy health-insurance coverage;

- o Slash the number of American workers without health insurance by almost 90 percent -- from more than 34 million now, down to less than 5 million, for starters;
  - o Make insurance available to those with so-called 'pre-existing health conditions';
  - o End the fear of 'job-lock,' where workers can't move to a new job without risking their coverage;
  - o And give self-employed workers a full, 100-percent tax deduction for the cost of their health insurance;
- My plan would give enough tax credit to pay for a ~~basic~~ <sup>solid</sup> health package -- to those folks too poor to file income tax.

Now, that's a tax credit -- not just a tax deduction. It's \$3750 worth of real insurance, straight into the hands that need it the most. For families that make more money, but still find it tough to afford insurance, I'm proposing an equal-sized tax deduction.

My plan includes ways to help small businesses buy coverage, by pooling them with other small businesses to get better rates.

It includes medical-malpractice reforms to end crazy lawsuits that drive costs up -- and doctors out of practice.

It includes reducing administrative costs by around 25 percent, simply by using automation to cut paperwork.

It stresses giving consumers better information so they can compare options and get the best treatment for the best cost.

It puts major funds to work on preventing health problems, which is a lot cheaper than fixing health problems.

And it contains incentives for individual States to coordinate their Medicaid programs. That way, poor Americans can get their health care more efficiently.

Now... my plan can work without raising taxes. We can pay for it through a series of efficiencies I've suggested, which means we can cut out certain payments we already make on behalf of folks without insurance. And we can also ~~cut costs~~ <sup>use the funds</sup> in our federal health programs. <sup>we spend on indigent care to help the uninsured</sup> Also, the credits and deductions I mentioned would be phased in, so start-up costs wouldn't be so high. <sup>avoid "cut costs" here</sup>

Those are the highlights. It's a comprehensive plan... it'll control costs... extend coverage to all working Americans... and improve access to quality care for everyone -- without raising taxes. I urge Congress to act quickly on these proposals, so we can get on with this critical reform.

*[Question two: What is your position on continued build-up of the Social Security Trust Fund and removing the limits on earnings which beneficiaries can earn before their benefit is reduced? And what measures would you support to assure better protection for employees' pension benefits and annuities?]*

You know the old saying, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it"? Well, Social Security funding was definitely broken before 1983, but now it's fixed, and I can't see any good reason to go messing with it now. I'm committed to the integrity of its funding, not

just for us who qualify for benefits today... but for future generations. That was the whole point of rescuing the system in '83.

So no, I'm not going to touch Social Security or the Trust Fund that keeps it solvent. According to the latest reports from the Trustees, the Fund that pays benefits to seniors is financially sound... and they expect it to stay sound, well into the next century. I fully intend to keep it that way.

Regarding limits on how much you can earn before your benefits start getting cut... I'm in favor of accelerating the Retirement Earnings Test ceiling faster than the current law allows. I wrote my 1992 budget so the amount of outside money you can earn without losing benefits will jump from a little over \$10,000 this year to \$11,400 next year. Too bad Congress is sitting on the measure -- but I'll fight to get it passed.

And if I'm re-elected, I'll continue to push the Congress to make responsible reforms of the earnings test.

As far as better protection for pension benefits and annuities are concerned, I've made sure the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is financially strong, so every plan can cover all its obligations. And I've made sure the Corporation can protect pensioners if somehow their plan gets into financial trouble. The bottom line is, I'll continue to make sure that pension holders in this country are backed by the full weight of the U.S. Government.

If that means legal action against irresponsible pension trustees, so be it. I believe in aggressive action when trustees violate their obligation to buy the safest annuities available. Seven cases like that have already been brought forward, and we fully intend to prosecute the people who've violated the implicit trust their pensioners have placed in them.

*[Question three: Do you support or oppose reforming the campaign finance laws and if so, how? What other steps would you take to restore public confidence in the integrity of government and elected officials?]*

I think your question, Horace... reflects a deeper concern than just campaign finance reform. You're implying a crisis of confidence in elected officials, and I think you're absolutely right.

The most important thing a citizen can do is study the candidates and vote for those who make the strongest case for their own trustworthiness.

Of course, sometimes you can't tell. And power has a way of changing people, or bringing out their worst -- especially if they become part of an entrenched power structure.

That's why there's a Constitutional amendment preventing Presidents from making a career of the Presidency, and I think the Congress should have a similar law. We need a Congress of the people... not a Congress of professional politicians.

So I support limited terms for Congress. I think a lot of the unsavory things that go on in Washington would disappear if members of Congress came to Washington to serve their constituents' interests... and not to protect their own.

Now, I'm not saying there aren't fine Members of Congress. There are some outstanding Senators and House Members of both parties who've been in office a long time. But I think the country would be best served if we established a twelve-year ceiling, for both the House and the Senate. That's six terms in the House, two in the Senate. After that, you're one of the good old boys or good old gals, and you tend to spend too much time brokering your power.

You raised the question of campaign-finance reform. We need it; no question about it. The way the system works now is a perfect example of the problems I'm talking about. Political Action Committees stack the deck in favor of incumbents, and challengers have an uphill battle trying to win a seat.

So you get the kind of mess we have today, with special interests running a Congress that seems to think it's unaccountable to anybody else, especially private citizens.

I've called, time and again, for comprehensive campaign finance reform, including getting rid of special-interest PACs... limiting contributions from so-called "leadership PACs"... requiring full disclosure of all expenditures... and letting political parties spend more on Congressional candidates. That would lower the time candidates themselves have to spend raising

money -- which they largely do, unfortunately, by kowtowing to special interests. So these reforms, if Congress would pass them, would restore accountability to an electoral system that has clearly gone 'way wrong.

I also think the country would be in a lot better shape if the President had a line-item veto, so that otherwise-good proposals from Congress don't get rejected wholesale... just because some special-interest group in Congress tacks a ridiculous item to the bill. I'm talking about grants to study blueberries tacked on to a major agricultural bill, for example.

Taken together, all these reforms would counter some of the alarming undercurrents in national politics today, and make the Government more accountable to the voters. Which of course... is the whole point... of democracy.