

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 13, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR VICE PRESIDENT MONDALE

FROM: MICHAEL WALDMAN 
Deputy Assistant to the President and
Director of Speechwriting

SUBJECT: INFORMATION ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Again, we're delighted that you will be taking on this challenge -- I have worked on this issue for nearly 15 years, and I truly believe that your participation and that of Sen. Kassebaum will help break the cynicism that surrounds this issue. We will do whatever we can to bring you up to speed.

Attached is some initial information on current campaign finance reform proposals:

- A summary of the McCain-Feingold bill, from Sen. Feingold's office. (This describes the Senate bill. The House version, introduced by Reps. Chris Shays and Marty Meehan, is slightly different; in particular, it limits PAC contributions but does not ban them. We have urged that the Senate version also give up the absolute PAC ban, which, among other things, is unconstitutional.)
- A transcript of the President's speech on political reform that he delivered to the Paul Taylor/Walter Cronkite "free TV" group.
- A summary of the "free TV time" proposal that the President made the other day.
- A brief history some recent political reform measures that have passed the Congress.

As Rahm Emanuel probably mentioned, we are working with the longstanding coalition that is pushing for reform (Common Cause, Public Citizen, religious groups, AARP), as well as with a new group founded by investor Jerry Kohlberg that seeks to involve businesspeople to support reform. They are mobilizing to call on Congress to meet the President's challenge, which he issued in the State-of-the-Union Address, to pass legislation by July 4. One of the main challenges for this effort is to broaden the coalition beyond the "usual suspects" who have supported reform but who have not succeeded in passing it.

I'll send more material to you tomorrow, as well as some suggested remarks. I can be reached at the White House at (202)456-2272; at home, at (202)364-4283; or I can be paged through the White House operator (202)456-1414.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR VICE PRESIDENT MONDALE

FROM: LAURA CAPPS
Office of Speechwriting

RE: Tomorrow's event

Per your conversation with Michael Waldman, I have attached a series of questions and answers about the campaign finance reform effort. Please contact Michael if you have further questions.

Tomorrow's schedule is as follows:

Please arrive at the Northwest gate by 8:15 and proceed to the Blue Room. If you will be accompanied by staff, please have them contact me this evening (h: 202.332.0263).

At 8:30 there will be a briefing with the Senator Kassebaum Baker and White House staff. At 8:45 you will meet briefly with the Vice President.

At 9:00 the announcement will be made in the foyer of the State Dining Room. The Vice President will speak first and introduce Senator Kassebaum Baker, who will introduce you. The press will be there, but no questions will be taken. After the Vice-President departs, the press will be escorted out and you and Senator Kassebaum Baker are encouraged to meet informally with the members of the audience. The audience will consist of the co-sponsors of the legislation, reform coalition members, and foundation representatives.

At 9:45 you and Senator Kassebaum Baker will meet with the President in the Residence for 15 minutes or so. Afterwards, subsequent meetings (with the audience and other staff) may follow, depending on your time and interest.

We're looking forward to it.

Thank you,



Laura Capps

OP- ED ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Walter F. Mondale and Nancy Kassebaum Baker

After a combined half century in public office, we thought we had retired from public service. But we agreed wholeheartedly when President Clinton asked us to co-chair a campaign finance reform education and awareness project. We accepted the challenge to make the case for campaign reform because we adamantly believe there is no issue of greater importance for our nation's future.

It is easy to be cynical, to assume that this year, as before, ultimately nothing will happen. But if people of goodwill in and out of public life speak up for reform now, with one voice, this year can be the year we break the debilitating cycle of fundraising that continues to afflict our politics.

Two decades since significant reform of the campaign finance laws passed through Congress, those laws have been overwhelmed by a flood of money -- \$2 billion in the last election. With every election, the problem has grown worse and worse. These laws are now riddled with loopholes and legal mumbo jumbo that average Americans rightly consider outrageous.

The cost to our democracy is real; it is found in many areas. Candidates and officeholders spend far too much time simply raising the funds needed to run for office. Far too many good people decline to seek office altogether because of the high hurdle of fundraising. Most important, the rising rivers of money that flow into campaigns are an assault on public trust.

Lincoln said, “with public trust everything is possible; without it, nothing is possible.” We have no more important cause than the restoration of public confidence in the integrity and responsiveness of their public officers.

Much attention is being focused on campaign contributions in the last election, and rightly so. Our plea for basic reform is not intended to silence the debate, and our effort should not be viewed as a diversion. Where legitimate questions exist, they should be investigated and resolved. We are not trying to change the subject, we are adding a subject, namely, how to reform campaign finance.

The continuing controversy cannot become an excuse for inaction. We must move forward on legislation to make constructive, vitally needed changes in the existing system.

The best chance for reform is the bipartisan legislation introduced in the Senate by John McCain and Russell Feingold, and in the House by Christopher Shays and Martin Meehan.

This measure will achieve significant reforms. It will curb the role of money in elections and reduce the role of special interests. It will offer free television time to candidates who limit their spending. It will end bundling and all contributions from people who are not citizens. And it will end the so called “soft money” loophole through which more than a quarter billion dollars escaped legal restrictions in the last campaign.

Can we really expect reform to succeed? Perhaps the greatest obstacle is the loss of faith among voters that anything constructive can come from new laws and new standards. Two decades ago, citizens expected that public action could be effective. These reforms worked for a while, but the aggressive chase for money opened new loopholes and dismantled the public protections against the abuse of money in campaigns. In turn, this feeds the very cynicism which undermines the needed public urgency for action.

The existing campaign finance system dismays people from all walks of life, from all political perspectives. Citizens know that our government cannot work in their interest if it is constantly in thrall to narrow interests. Our mission must be to connect the dots -- to show that reform is possible, and why it is needed, if we are to renew our democracy.

This critical window of opportunity will close unless the American people believe in the importance and urgency of reform. It is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. This year we have an opportunity to light that candle.

ENDING BUSINESS AS USUAL IN WASHINGTON

"The fact is, organized interests have too much power in the halls of government. These influence groups too often promote their own interest at the expense of the public interest. Too often they operate in secret. Too often they have special privileges ordinary Americans don't even know exist.... We have an historic opportunity to renew our democracy and strengthen our country. If we truly believe in a government that puts ordinary Americans ahead of the powerful and privileged, then we must act and act now."

President Bill Clinton
February 17, 1996

A Record of Accomplishment:

Over the past four years, working with both parties in Congress, President Clinton achieved a significant number of reforms to make our government respond to ordinary citizens.

- The President made voting easier for more than 11 million Americans by creating more accessible voter registration locations by enacting the **National Voter Registration Act** ("Motor-Voter"). The Motor-Voter law has already created the greatest expansion in the voter registration rolls since the 19th century.
- The President fought for and signed into law the **Lobbying Disclosure Act**. The Act is the first overhaul of lobbying rules in 50 years and requires lobbyists to disclose whom they work for and eliminates loopholes that allow lobbying organizations to avoid.
- In the 1995 State of the Union Address, President Clinton challenged the Congress to ban gifts, meals, travel and entertainment from lobbyists. The Congress subsequently passed the **gift ban** on November 16th, 1995.
- The President supported and signed the **Congressional Accountability Act** to ensure that the same laws apply to Congress as to the rest of America.
- In 1993, President Clinton proposed, and Congress passed, legislation ending the tax-deductibility of lobbying expenses, the "**lobbyist loophole**" which had allowed corporations and others to deduct the cost of their lobbying.
- The President imposed the **strictest Administration ethics guidelines** ever, including a five-year ban on top officials lobbying their former agencies and a lifetime ban against

lobbying for foreign governments.

- The President pushed for and signed the **line-item veto** legislation, which significantly enhances the presidential authority to eliminate wasteful spending by allowing the President to cancel wasteful special interest projects that benefit narrow interests. The line-item veto can help the President close the door on business as usual in Washington by cutting pet projects that sneak into the budget year after year. With this line-item veto, the President will have a valuable new tool to ensure that our public resources are being put to the best possible uses.
- The President enacted the **Unfunded Mandates Reform Act** to restrict Congress from passing on new mandates to state and local governments without paying for them.
- President Clinton has stood up to special interests, such as the National Rifle Association and the tobacco industry, loosening their tight hold on our legislative process. The President broke six years of congressional gridlock on anti-crime legislation and defeated the gun lobby by enacting a **ban on assault weapons** and the **Brady Law**.
- The President signed the **Presidential Executive Office Accountability Act (PEOAA)**, which ensures that the Executive Office of the President lives under the same laws as the rest of the country -- this is the White House analog to the Congressional Accountability Act.

A History Of Fighting For Real Campaign Finance Reform

There is one major reform that still must be enacted: campaign finance reform.

- 1992** **Campaign Finance Reform Proposal.** In the 1992 campaign, Governor Clinton proposed spending limits, free TV time, PAC limits and a ban on soft money. The current McCain-Feingold and Shays-Meehan legislation mirrors this proposal.
- 1993-1994** **Campaign Finance Reform Plan.** The President and the congressional Democratic leadership proposed a reform plan that also included partial public funding for congressional candidates.
- 1995** **Bipartisan CFR Commission.** In June of 1995, the President agreed with Speaker Gingrich to create a bipartisan political reform commission. The President named John Gardner and Doris Kearns Goodwin to launch the commission, but the proposed commission was rebuffed by the Speaker.
- 1996 - 1997** **McCain-Feingold/Shays-Meehan.** In his 1996 State of the Union Address, the President announced his support of the bipartisan campaign finance reform bill. He repeated his support throughout 1996. In the 1997 State of the Union Address the President challenged Congress to pass this legislation by July 4, 1997.

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 11, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ADDRESS TO THE CONFERENCE ON FREE TV AND POLITICAL REFORM

The National Press Club

11:12 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. What a gift. (Laughter.) Thank you, Walter Cronkite. Thank you, Paul Taylor, for your passion and your commitment. Thank you, Senator McCain, Chairman Hundt, Ann McBride, Becky Cain. And thank you, Barry Diller, for what you have said about this important issue.

I am delighted to have the chance to come here today, and I thank the sponsors of this event.

Again, let me say that I participated in the last election in the free television offered by the networks, thanks to the efforts of Paul Taylor and Walter Cronkite and the members of the Straight Talk Coalition. Senator Dole and I were given a unique opportunity to talk directly to the voters -- no gimmicks, no flashy graphics, a full minute or two at a time. And I really enjoyed it. I put a lot of effort into those opportunities, and I'm sure that Senator Dole did as well. I felt that they were a great gift.

And Walter and I had a talk backstage before we came out about how it might even be done better in the next round of elections. Maybe my opinions will carry more weight on such matters since I never expect to run again for anything. And I do believe that the free television was a very important thing. I think if it could be done, as we were discussing, at the same time every evening on a given network, and back to back so that the candidates can be seen in a comparative context, I think it would be even more valuable.

We have to do some things to improve the way our political system works at election time and the way it communicates, or its leaders communicate, to people all year round. This should not be surprising to anyone. The Founding Fathers understood that we were an experiment. We're still around after all of these years because we have relished the idea that we are an experiment, that America is a work in progress, that we're constantly in the making. We always have to change.

A lot of good things have happened to expand participation in the political system from the time we were a new nation, when only white male property owners could vote, and we have to make some more changes now. But if you look at the changes which have been made in the last 200 years, we should be hopeful.

Television has the power to expand the franchise or to shrink the franchise. Indeed, that is true of all means of communications and all media. We know that television is a profound and powerful force; we know that we don't fully understand all of its implications -- even what you said, Walter, we don't really know what the connection is between television and a diminished voter turnout. It could be because there is a poll on television every night that tells people about the election, so some people think that there's no point in their voting, because the person they're for is going to win anyway, or the person they're for can't win anyway.

We need to think about that, and that's not the subject of this meeting, but we need to -- we really need -- all of us need more information, more research, about why people vote and why they don't vote. There was a very -- I've only seen one survey, done I believe for the Democratic Leadership Council, of the nonvoters. It's a poll that doesn't pay off. You know, it was done, after the election, of the nonvoters. But it was very interesting, and some of the findings were quite counterintuitive about why people did or didn't vote. But I would urge those of you who are interested in it to get that, look at it, and think about what new work could be done to look into that.

Today, we want to talk about whether the medium of free television could be used to diminish the impact of excessive money in politics and about whether it could still be used, therefore, to reform our system in a way that makes it better, and ultimately that leads to better decisions for the American people. It is now commonplace -- everybody will tell you -- that campaigns cost too much and it takes too much time to raise the money, and the more money you raise from a larger number of people, the more questions will be raised about that.

Major party committees spent over three times as much in this last election cycle as four years before. And that doesn't count the third party expenditures, both the genuinely independent third party committees and those that weren't really independent although they claim to be. Spending in Congressional campaigns has risen six-fold in the last two decades. That's over three times the rate of inflation.

The biggest reason for this is the rise in the cost of television. But, of course, there is also now more money being spent on mail, on telephoning, on radio and other print advertising as well.

In 1972, candidates spent \$25 million for political ads; in 1996, \$400 million. Presidential campaigns now routinely spend two-thirds or more of their money on paid ads; Senate candidates, 42 percent of their money on television; House races, about a third.

Interestingly enough, that's often because there is no single television market which just overlaps a House district and often the cost is prohibitive, particularly in the urban districts. But you get the drift, it's the same everywhere.

We are the only major democracy in the world where candidates have to raise larger and larger sums of money simply to communicate with voters through the medium that matters most. Every other major democracy offers candidates or parties free air time to speak to voters, and we can plainly do better, building on the big first step urged by this group in 1996. We have an obligation to restore our campaign finance system to a system that has the broad confidence of the American people but also of the American press that comments on it. In order to do that, television has to be part of the solution. I have said before and I will say again, everybody who has been involved in this system has to take responsibility for it and for changing it.

Those of us in public life know better than anybody else what the demands of prevailing in the present system are, and those who control the airwaves understand it well also. First and most fundamentally, I came here to support Senator McCain. We have to take advantage of this year to pass campaign finance reform. The campaign finance laws are two decades out of date. They have been overtaken by events, by dramatic changes in the nature and cost of campaigns and the flood of money that has followed them. The money has been raised and spent in ways that simply could not have been imagined when the people who fashioned the last campaign finance law in Congress did it.

They did the best they could, and I will say again, I believe that they did a good thing and that that law did improve the financing of our campaigns and restored a level of confidence to our politics and made things better. It is simply that time has changed and we need new changes to reflect the things that have happened in the last 20 years.

It will not be easy to do this, but the situation is far from hopeless. After all, the first thing I want to say is, the American people do care about this, and our politics, I think, in terms of traditional honesty, is getting better, not worse. I have asked over a dozen people just in the last two years who have been living in Washington for the last 30 years, who have been in politics -- the most recent person I asked was Senator Dole -- whether politics was more or less honest today than it was 30 years ago, and all 12 or 15 -- however many I asked -- all gave the same answer. They said it's more honest today than it was 30 years ago. I think that's where we have to start.

It is important to put this in the proper perspective if you want people in Congress to vote to change it. They cannot be asked to admit that they are doing something that they're not, or that they are participating in dragging the country down the drain, because anybody who knows what went on 30 years ago and what goes on today would have to say that the system is still better than it was then.

On the other hand, anybody who denied that, at an exponential pace, changes are

occurring which imperil the integrity of the electoral process and the financing of campaigns would also be badly amiss.

The second thing I'd like to say is, we should be hopeful because we have seen over the last four years in other contexts real bipartisan processes to improve the way politics works -- not in campaign finance reform, but there was bipartisan support for the motor voter law, for the lobby disclosure overhaul that was the first one in 50 years, in which Congress banned meals and gifts from lobbyists to lawmakers but also required much more disclosure. And that's the most important thing. When you get 100 percent disclosure of an area where there hasn't been any before, then that offers all of you in the press the opportunity to communicate to the American people what the activities of lobbyists are and to let them and you draw your own conclusions in terms of the results produced by decision-makers. We've required Congress to live under the same that they impose upon the private sector.

Every single one of these things has happened in the last four years with broad, bipartisan support. So I think it is very, very important that we recognize this will not happen unless there is bipartisan support. But there is evidence that if the environment is right, if the support is deep enough, if the calls are strong enough and positive enough, we can get this kind of change.

Now, let me also say that I think it's important to make this point, because I see all these surveys that say that campaign finance reform is important to people, but if you rank it on a list of 10 things, it will always rank 10th behind balancing the budget, education and all this. That can be used by politicians as an excuse, if you will, not to deal with it. They say, well, look at all these surveys. Campaign finance reform -- sure, people like it -- but it's not as important to them as whether we'll have national standards for reading and math, for example -- one of my passions.

What we have to do is to make a connection between the two for the American people. What we have to argue is, yes, we really need to be up here doing the public's business. We need to be balancing the budget, improving education, reforming welfare, expanding health care coverage to children who don't have it, passing a juvenile justice reform -- the kinds of things that I'm passionately interested in.

But having the right kind of campaign finance reform system and having the right kind of straight talk on television and having issues be more -- elections be more issue-oriented and having the debates of both sides heard clearly by all people and increasing voter interest and voter turnout -- all these things will increase the likelihood that this laundry list of good things will be done and will be done in better fashion than would otherwise be the case. I think it is very important that those of you who care about this make this connection because that's how to build broad and deep support for this endeavor.

It seems to me that we do have an historic opportunity to pass campaign finance reform.

And I think the public owes a lot of gratitude to Senator McCain and Senator Feingold and Congressman Shays and Congressman Meehan and all of their supporters for the legislation they have offered. It is real and tough. It would level the playing field and reduce the role of big money in politics. It would set voluntary limits on campaign spending and ban soft money, all corporate contributions, and the very large individual ones. It would restrict the role of political action committees and lobbyists and make needed reforms within the confines of the constitution as defined by existing Supreme Court case law.

In all these ways, it would set ceilings on money in politics and, just as important, it would also provide a floor. And I think that is very important -- it would also provide a floor. You actually have some members in Congress who come from districts where there's a very low per capita income, for example, who are very afraid of campaign finance reform because they're afraid, among their own constituents, they'll never be able to raise enough money in their district to compete the first time a multi-millionaire runs against them.

So the law has to give a floor. And McCain-Feingold does that by giving candidates free air time to talk directly to the voters if they observe the spending limits of the law. And we need to emphasize that any ceiling law should have a floor to guarantee that people have their say and are heard. It gives candidates deeply discounted rates for the purchase of time if they observe the limits of the law.

In all these ways, it will level the playing field, giving new voices a chance to be heard and being fair to both parties.

I have supported the idea of free TV time for many years. When the Vice President was in Congress, he actually introduced legislation to require it. It was first proposed by President Kennedy in 1962. It has been around long enough. We now tried it in the last election more than ever before, and we know that it advances the public interest.

In my State of the Union address, I asked Congress to pass the McCain-Feingold bill by July the 4th, the day we celebrate the birth of our democracy. I pledge to you that I will continue to work with members of both parties to do this. I will be mustering more support out in the country, and that will be announced over the next few weeks, for this endeavor.

We have to use the present intense interest in this, as well as the controversy over fundraising in the last election and all the publicity on it, as a spur to action. We cannot let it become what it is in danger of becoming, which is an excuse for inaction.

And that again is something that I challenge all of you on. Do not let the controversies become an excuse to do nothing and to wallow around in it. Use it as a spur to changing the system, because until you change the system, you will continue to have controversies over the amount -- the sheer amount -- of money that is raised in these elections.

The second thing I'd like to discuss is what Walter talked about in some detail, and that is how broadcasters can meet their public interest obligations in this era. Ever since the FCC was created, broadcasters have had a compact with the public: in return for the public airwaves, they must meet public interest obligations. The bargain has been good for the industry and good for the public.

Now, startling new technologies are shaking and remaking the world of telecommunications. They've opened wider opportunities for broadcasters than ever before, but they also offer us the chance to open wider vistas for our democracy as well.

The move from analog signals to digital ones will give each broadcaster much more signal capacity than they have today. The broadcasters asked Congress to be given this new access to the public airwaves without charge. I believe, therefore, it is time to update the broadcasters' public interest obligations to meet the demands of the new times and the new technological realities. I believe broadcasters who receive digital licenses should provide free air time for candidates, and I believe the FCC should act to require free air time for candidates.

The telecommunications revolution can help to transform our system so that once again voters have the loudest voice in our democracy. Free time for candidates can help free our democracy from the grip of big money. I hope all of you will support that. There are many ways that this could be done. Many of you here have put forward innovative plans. I believe the free time should be available to all qualified federal candidates. I believe it should give candidates a chance to talk directly to the voters without gimmicks or intermediaries. Because campaign finance reform is so important, I believe it should be available especially to candidates who limit their own spending. It is clear under the Supreme Court decision that this can be done, and I believe that is how it should be done.

Candidates should be able to talk to voters based on the strength of their ideas, not the size of their pocketbooks, and all voters should know that no candidate is kept from running simply because he or she cannot raise enormous amounts of funds.

Last month, the Vice President announced that we would create an independent advisory committee of experts, industry representatives, public interest advocates, and others to recommend what steps to take. Before I came over here today, I signed an executive order creating that committee. The balanced panel I will appoint will advise me on ways we can move forward and make a judgment as to what the new public interest obligations of broadcasters might be. But today, let us simply agree on the basic premise. In 1997, for broadcasters, serving the public should mean enhancing our democracy.

Finally, let me challenge the broadcasters as well. Broadcasters are not the problem, but broadcasting must be the solution. The step the broadcasters took in this last election, as I have said over and over again in other forums, with the encouragement of Straight Talk for TV, was a real breakthrough. Now I ask broadcasters to follow up on this experiment in democracy, and

I'm especially pleased that a leader in the industry, Barry Diller, has challenged his colleagues to open up the airwaves to candidates. He has made clear -- forcefully and very publicly -- that he and all of his colleagues have an obligation to society. And his presence here today makes it clear that he is willing to assume the mantle of leadership. But surely there are others -- I know there are -- who will gladly join in and take up this cause as well.

There are many questions about political reform. Many skeptics will look at all proposed reform measures and ask whether they'll work and whether there will be unintended consequences. The truth is that they will work and there will be unintended consequences.

But if we use that for an excuse not to change, no good change in this country would ever have come about. There will always be something we cannot foresee -- that's what makes life interesting and keeps us all humble -- but that must not be an excuse for our refusing to act in this area. We know -- we know -- when we work to expand our democracy, when you give people a greater voice and advocates of all political views a firm platform upon which to stand, we are moving forward as a nation. By passing campaign finance reform, by renewing the compact between broadcasters and the public to better serve in this new era, we can do that again.

And I will say again, I will do all I can on both these fronts -- on campaign finance reform legislation and on requiring free availability of the airwaves to public candidates. We need your support for both, and we need broader and more intense public support. And again I say, that has to be built by demonstrating to the public that this is not an inside-the-beltway exercise and both parties trying to find ways to undermine each other, but a necessary way of opening our democracy so that we can better, more quickly, and more profoundly address the real challenges facing the American people in their everyday lives.

These two steps will help, and together I hope we can make them this year. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Hello, Sarah.

Q I want to know -- you said that you would not have been reelected --

THE PRESIDENT: -- I think -- probably I might have been, because I'm the President and a President has unusual access to the public. And you have the presidential debates, which are unique in terms of their viewership and their potential impact. But I believe that if you just look at the races for Congress and the number of votes that changed just in the last five days, and how the votes were counted when the votes changed and the movement changed, there is no question that the amount of money deployed in an intelligent way can have a profound impact on the outcome of these elections. And what you want to do is to make sure that everybody has the

same fair chance at the voters and nobody has an excessive chance. And given the Supreme Court cases, the way the McCain-Feingold bill is drawn up, plus the effort to get more free air time, are the best responses to overcome the undue influence of excessive money.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

11:35 A.M.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF SPEECHWRITING

Phone number (202) 456-2777
Fax number (202) 456-5709

TO: Vice President Mondale

FROM: Michael Waldman

RECEIVER FAX AND PHONE NUMBER: 612 340 2044

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING COVER SHEET): 19

COMMENTS: _____

*****WARNING*****

**UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THESE MATERIALS IS SUBJECT TO FEDERAL
PROSECUTION**

To: Jan Volevich
From: Laura Capps
re: Concord Event

Attached is information regarding a Concord Campaign Finance Reform event being planned by Representative Martin Meehan. It is intended to be a launching of the "Scholars for Campaign Reform" committee.

The scholars would like to be affiliated with the effort that Senator Kassebaum Baker and Ambassador Mondale are leading.

I know the term affiliation is loose and would have to be defined more specifically. However, would Senator Kassebaum Baker agree to this affiliation in principle?

Please let me know. I can put you in touch with Dan Manatt of Congressman Meehan's office if you would like to be.

Thanks,

Laura Capps
456-2554

To: Ross Corson
From: Laura Capps
re: Concord Event

Attached is information regarding a Concord Campaign Finance Reform event being planned by Representative Martin Meehan. It is intended to be a launching of the "Scholars for Campaign Reform" committee.

The scholars would like to be affiliated with the effort that Senator Kassebaum Baker and Vice President Mondale are leading.

I know the term affiliation is loose and would have to be defined more specifically. However, would Vice President Mondale agree to this affiliation in principle?

Please let me know. I can put you in touch with Dan Manatt of Congressman Meehan's office if you would like to be.

Thanks,

Laura Capps
456-2554

Jan: 508-3402

Ross 612-340 2644

Rx#

**APRIL 18 CAMPAIGN REFORM EVENT
CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS
PROPOSAL OUTLINE**

Event: Concord Town Meeting
Professors for Campaign Reform Committee Rollout
(Subcommittee of Kassebaum/Mondale Committee)

Location: Concord, Massachusetts

Date: Patriots Day, April 18, 1997 (Anniversary of Battle of Lexington and Concord)

Organizers: Office of Rep. Marty Meehan
Project Independence
Kennedy School of Government/Derek Bok/Archibald Cox (???)

Theme: "Campaign Reform and the Reform Tradition in American History"

PROGRAM

Town Meeting: Moderated by Rep. Marty Meehan, Chris Shays

Announcement: Professors for Campaign Reform Committee Formation
(Subcommittee of Kassebaum/Mondale Committee)

Brief Remarks by Committee Members (Possible Members listed below):

Doris Kearns Goodwin, Historian

David McCullough, Historian

Arthur Schlesinger, Professor of History, Harvard University

Derek Bok, fm. President, Harvard University

Professor, Kennedy School of Government

Sen. Alan Simpson (R-WY), adjunct Professor, Kennedy School of Government

Rep. Mickey Edwards (R-OK), adjunct Professor, Kennedy School of Government

Address: President Clinton, Vice President Gore ?

Special Event: Reenactment of the Battle of Lexington and Concord

Message: The Concord Town Meeting will bring together citizens to participate in the great tradition of New England town meetings to discuss the state of American democracy and the need for campaign reform.

The Scholars for Reform Kickoff will add a historical perspective, and tap the credibility and good will these professors bring to the subject. They might also recall episodes from U.S. History -- including the Revolutionary War, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitutional Convention, the Progressive Era, and the Voting Rights movement -- and draw lessons for reformers from those episodes.

(Note: Attendees have not yet been invited or confirmed)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Peter Jacoby, Special Assistant to the President
FROM: Daniel Manatt, Legislative Counsel, Rep. Marty Meehan
RE: Concord Campaign Reform Event
DATE: March 19, 1997

Per our discussions, Rep. Meehan and Rep. Shays are considering a campaign reform event in Concord, MA (which is in Rep. Meehan's district) on April 18, the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord.

After discussing possible themes with you, Common Cause, and others, we propose to capitalize on the historical symbolism of the President's July 4 challenge, and the time and place of the event.

Specifically, we propose that the event serve as a kickoff for a "Scholars for Campaign Reform" committee. The Committee could comprise of high profile scholars, such as Arthur Schlesinger, David McCullough, Derek Bok, and Doris Kearns Goodwin (who has previously served on Administration campaign reform efforts).

The Committee might also be established as an affiliate of the Kassebaum-Baker/Mondale committee.

These Professors command real respect among opinion-makers, and their turning out to lend their name to the bipartisan campaign reform effort would be newsworthy. Moreover, these luminaries might link the current bipartisan campaign reform effort to other episodes from U.S. history, such as the Revolution, the Declaration, and the Constitution. Such a message would play well with the elite media, such as the News Hour (where Dr. Goodwin is a regular). It would also play well with USAToday and local media, which would seize on the patriotic symbolism of the event.

I have been in touch with Bok, Common Cause, and others, all of whom have been receptive to the idea. In addition, Rep. Meehan is a personal friend of Professor Goodwin's, and is hopeful that he could bring her into the effort.

The event could also be supplemented with good visuals -- for instance, the reenactment of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, which is already scheduled for April 18 as part of the annual Massachusetts Patriots Day ceremonies which commemorate the battle.

Our office is continuing to develop plans. (As you can see from the attached clips, Rep. Meehan held a town hall event in Concord last year with the participation of Paul Tsongas and Ross Perot; with help from outside groups, we could build an even bigger and better event). White House participation, needless to say, could make the event all the more successful.

We look forward to speaking with you about this opportunity.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF SPEECHWRITING

Phone number (202) 456-2777
Fax number (202) 456-5709

TO: ROSS CORSON

FROM: MICHAEL WALDMAN

RECEIVER FAX AND PHONE NUMBER: (612) 340-6306

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING COVER SHEET): 5

COMMENTS: _____

*****WARNING*****

**UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THESE MATERIALS IS SUBJECT TO FEDERAL
PROSECUTION**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF SPEECHWRITING

Phone number (202) 456-2777
Fax number (202) 456-5709

TO: JAN VOLEVICH

FROM: MICHAEL WALDMAN

RECEIVER FAX AND PHONE NUMBER: (202) 508-3402

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING COVER SHEET): 5

COMMENTS: _____

*****WARNING*****

**UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THESE MATERIALS IS SUBJECT TO FEDERAL
PROSECUTION**