

# News from Senator

# BOB DOLE



(R - Kansas)

SH 141 Hart Building, Washington, D.C. 20510

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
MAY 11, 1990

CONTACT: WALT RIKER  
(202) 224-5358

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

MR. PRESIDENT, THIS PAST WEDNESDAY, SENATE REPUBLICANS FORMALLY INTRODUCED THE COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1990.

MY REPUBLICAN COLLEAGUES HAVE ALREADY DESCRIBED MOST OF THE BILL'S PROVISIONS -- AT OUR PRESS CONFERENCE LAST WEEK AND WHEN WE INTRODUCED THE BILL ON WEDNESDAY.

SO I WON'T BELABOR MY COLLEAGUES WITH YET ANOTHER DETAILED EXPOSITION OF THE BILL'S MAJOR POINTS.

HOWEVER, I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE JUST A FEW MOMENTS TO HIGHLIGHT THE THREE MAIN GOALS MOTIVATING THE REPUBLICAN APPROACH TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM.

### GOAL ONE: REDUCE SPECIAL INTEREST INFLUENCE

OUR FIRST GOAL IS TO REDUCE THE INFLUENCE OF SPECIAL INTERESTS IN POLITICS.

SIMPLY STATED, THE SPECIAL INTERESTS ARE THE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES, THE CORPORATIONS, THE LABOR UNIONS, THE UNREGULATED SOFT-MONEY OPERATORS, THE TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THAT HIDE BEHIND THE TAX CODE WHILE ENGAGING IN PARTISAN POLITICAL ACTIVITY, THE CHARLES KEATINGS OF THE WORLD -- ALL THOSE INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS, IN OTHER WORDS, WHOM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BELIEVE SOMEHOW HAVE SPECIAL ACCESS TO THE HEARTS AND MINDS OF THEIR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES.

THE REPUBLICAN BILL TAKES A BIG WHACK AT THE SPECIAL INTERESTS BY REMOVING PACS ALTOGETHER FROM THE FEDERAL ELECTION PROCESS. THE REPUBLICAN BILL BANS SOFT MONEY. IT CODIFIES THE SUPREME COURT'S BECK DECISION. IT RESTRICTS THE PRACTICE OF BUNDLING CONTRIBUTIONS BY ETBY regisrby registered ESIDENTS BY A FULL 50% -- FROM \$1,000 TO \$500.

I'VE DONE A LITTLE CHECKING ON MY OWN, AND IT APPEARS THAT -- ON THE "SPECIAL INTEREST ISSUE," AT LEAST --THE DEMOCRAT BILL FAILS THE TRUTH-IN-ADVERTISING TEST.

ALTHOUGH THE DEMOCRAT BILL WOULD BAN PAC CONTRIBUTIONS TO SENATE CANDIDATES, IT WOULD STILL ALLOW PACS TO CONTINUE TO CONTRIBUTE \$15,000 ANNUALLY TO THE NATIONAL AND STATE PARTY COMMITTEES.

IT WOULD ALSO ALLOW THE NATIONAL PARTY COMMITTEES TO ACCEPT FROM PACS AN AMOUNT -- IN THE AGGREGATE -- EQUAL TO 2 CENTS TIMES THE U.S. VOTING AGE POPULATION. IN 1988, THE U.S. VOTING AGE POPULATION WAS 174,550,000. MULTIPLY THAT NUMBER BY 2 CENTS AND YOU GET A PRETTY HEFTY SUM -- \$3.5 MILLION, TO BE EXACT.

THE DEMOCRAT BILL WOULD ALSO ALLOW PACS TO CONTRIBUTE BIG DOLLARS TO THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL COMMITTEES -- AS MUCH AS \$3.8 MILLION EACH, ACCORDING TO MY CALCULATIONS.

AND THE DEMOCRAT BILL WOULD STILL ALLOW PACS TO CONTRIBUTE TO HOUSE CANDIDATES.

SO, ON THE SPECIAL INTEREST FRONT, THE REPUBLICAN BILL --IN MY VIEW -- IS MUCH, MUCH STRONGER.

### GOAL TWO: INCREASE COMPETITION IN POLITICS

THE SECOND GOAL OF THE REPUBLICAN APPROACH IS TO INCREASE COMPETITION IN POLITICS.

TWO YEARS AGO, PRESIDENT REAGAN SADLY OBSERVED THAT THERE WAS MORE TURNOVER IN THE SUPREME SOVIET THAN IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS.

(more)



PRESIDENT REAGAN WAS RIGHT THEN, AND HE WOULD BE RIGHT TODAY. THE SAD TRUTH IS THAT A CHALLENGER IN LENINGRAD'S SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT HAS A BETTER CHANCE OF SUCCESS IN 1990 THAN A CHALLENGER IN THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, OR IN THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA, OR IN ANY NUMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS THROUGHOUT THIS COUNTRY.

THE HORRIFYING FACTS OF INCUMBENCY SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES.

IN 1988, THE RE-ELECTION RATE WAS 98% IN THE HOUSE AND 84% IN THE SENATE.

IN 1988, 80 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS RAN FOR RE-ELECTION WITHOUT ANY MAJOR-PARTY OPPONENT.

OF THE 1,305 HOUSE ELECTIONS IN 1984, 1986, AND 1988, ONLY 4% RESULTED IN A CHANGE OF PARTY.

AND OF THE 1,206 HOUSE RACES INVOLVING INCUMBENTS SINCE 1984, INCUMBENTS WON ALL BUT 28.

WITH THESE NUMBERS, IT'S NO WONDER THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE CYNICAL ABOUT CONGRESS, AND IT'S NO WONDER THAT THE "MY VOTE DOESN'T MATTER" PHILOSOPHY SEEMS TO BE GAINING GROUND IN POPULARITY.

THE REPUBLICAN INITIATIVE TRIES TO BREAK INCUMBENCY GRIDLOCK WITH A SEED MONEY MECHANISM THAT WILL GIVE HOUSE AND SENATE CHALLENGERS A WELL-DESERVED AND MUCH-NEEDED JUMP-START IN THEIR CAMPAIGNS.

THE REPUBLICAN INITIATIVE ALSO TRIES TO INCREASE COMPETITION IN POLITICS BY RAISING THE CONTRIBUTION LIMITS FOR THE CHALLENGERS OF THOSE CANDIDATES WHO INTEND TO FINANCE THEIR CAMPAIGNS WITH PERSONAL FUNDS IN EXCESS OF \$250,000. AND THE INITIATIVE REDUCES THE POWER OF THE FRANK BY PROHIBITING "FRANKED" MASS MAILINGS BY A MEMBER OF CONGRESS DURING ANY ELECTION YEAR.

#### GOAL THREE: REDUCE THE COST OF CAMPAIGNS

THE THIRD GOAL OF THE REPUBLICAN INITIATIVE IS TO REDUCE THE COST OF CAMPAIGNS.

NO DOUBT ABOUT IT, THE "MONEY CHASE" IS AN ACTIVITY THAT DOMINATES CONGRESSIONAL LIFE AND GETS IN THE WAY OF THE REAL BUSINESS OF CONGRESS -- LEGISLATION.

THE REPUBLICAN BILL WOULD PUT A BIG DENT IN CAMPAIGN COSTS BY ALLOWING CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES TO PURCHASE NON-PREEMPTIBLE TIME AT THE CHEAPEST PRICE A TELEVISION STATION OFFERS FOR PREEMPTIBLE TIME. THIS PROVISION IS PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT SINCE TELEVISION ADVERTISING EATS UP MORE THAN 50% OF ALL CAMPAIGN SPENDING.

#### "DE FACTO" SPENDING LIMITS

LAST WEDNESDAY, MY DISTINGUISHED COLLEAGUE FROM OREGON, SENATOR PACKWOOD, MADE A VERY GOOD POINT THAT OUGHT TO BE REPEATED AGAIN TODAY.

THE REPUBLICAN INITIATIVE HAS BEEN CRITICIZED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO INCORPORATE SOMETHING CALLED "SPENDING LIMITS."

BUT THE TRUTH IS THAT THE REPUBLICAN INITIATIVE WILL, IN FACT, LIMIT CAMPAIGN SPENDING -- AND LIMIT IT SUBSTANTIALLY. BY BANNING PACS -- BY REDUCING THE CONTRIBUTION LIMITS FOR INDIVIDUALS RESIDING OUTSIDE OF A CANDIDATE'S STATE -- AND BY RESTRICTING THE PRACTICE OF BUNDLING -- THE REPUBLICAN BILL IMPOSES DE FACTO LIMITS ON THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT CAN BE SPENT IN A CAMPAIGN. IF THE REPUBLICAN BILL IS EVER PASSED, CAMPAIGN SPENDING WILL -- INEVITABLY -- DECREASE. I CAN ASSURE YOU.

UNFORTUNATELY, THE DEMOCRAT BILL ONCE AGAIN EMBRACES THE ALMOST CLINICAL FIXATION ON ARBITRARILY DETERMINED SPENDING LIMITS.

THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE EXPERTS ARE VIRTUALLY UNIFIED IN THIER VIEW THAT SPENDING LIMITS REDUCE COMPETITION IN POLITICS. THAT'S A GIVEN. AND IT'S A GIVEN THAT SPENDING LIMITS -- PARTICULARLY OF THE SORT PROPOSED BY THE DEMOCRAT BILL -- WILL KEEP EVERY LAWYER IN WASHINGTON EMPLOYED FOR YEARS TO COME.

REPUBLICANS HAVE ALWAYS ARGUED THAT RIGID SPENDING LIMITS ARE A FORM OF INCUMBENCY PROTECTION.

APPARENTLY, THE NEW YORK TIMES MAY AGREE. AN ARTICLE PUBLISHED TODAY SUGGESTS THAT THE SPENDING LIMITS IN THE DEMOCRAT BILL WERE INTENTIONALLY "SOFTENED" FOR INCUMBENTS. THE ARTICLE CITES ONE PROVISION IN PARTICULAR THAT OFFERS A 15% EXEMPTION FROM THE SPENDING LIMIT FOR NECESSARY EXPENSES INCURRED BY A SENATOR AS PART OF HIS OFFICIAL DUTIES.

NEEDLESS TO SAY, WE ALL KNOW HOW FLEXIBLE THAT STANDARD CAN BE IN PRACTICE.



MR. PRESIDENT, I ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT THAT THE FULL TEXT OF THE ARTICLE BE INSERTED IN THE RECORD IMMEDIATELY AFTER MY REMARKS.

**CONCLUSION**

MR. PRESIDENT, THE REPUBLICAN BILL IS STRAIGHTFORWARD. IT'S COMPREHENSIVE. IT'S SERIOUS. AND IF ENACTED, IT WILL GO A LONG WAY TOWARDS CLEANING UP THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MESS.

MORE IMPORTANTLY, THE REPUBLICAN BILL WILL GO A LONG WAY TOWARDS HELPING CONGRESS REGAIN THE TRUST OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

I URGE MY COLLEAGUES TO REVIEW THE BILL AND JOIN ME AS A CO-SPONSOR.

###