Mr. Speaker, more than 200 years ago the writers of our Constitution established this House of Representatives to be "chosen...by the people of the several states." This was to be 'The People's House' where the will of the voting electorate was to be reflected in the measures passed by this body.

Representatives were to be chosen by the people in each district around the nation, not anointed by 'kingmakers' in the Capitol. Congressmen were expected to participate in competitive elections without a virtual guarantee of re-election. Thus, the House of Representatives was expected to faithfully carry out the will of the people.

How far we have come from that tradition by 1992!

The American people ask for a balanced budget and a Constitutional amendment to guarantee it, but the majority of Democrats in this House will not pass a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution.

The American people today want a halt to the ever increasing burden of taxation to fund wasteful spending programs. The Democrats in this House continually seek to evade their own budget rules to fund a growing parade of programs that benefit those who control the process.

The American people ask that we get tough on crime, but the Democrats in this House will not pass crime provisions that law enforcement officials at the local level say are vital to restoring safe streets in our communities.

The American people want Congress to break its ties to Washington special interests and come home to campaign among the voters to whom Members of Congress are supposed to be accountable. But the dominance of Washington PAC's in the fundraising process of the Democrats in this House continues.

Why doesn't Congress listen to the American people?

Recent polls show that 40% of the voters are ready to vote against ALL incumbents. Yet over 60% seem ready to vote for their OWN incumbent.

Why this disparity?
Why were over 96% of all incumbents re-elected in 1990 and over 98%
re-elected in 1988?

Why were over 70% of all incumbents re-elected with more than 60%
of the vote?

The answer to a significant degree is the truly embarrassing campaign
finance incumbent protection system enacted by the very Congress that is
supposed to be responsive to the people's will.

By no coincidence, this system works very well to do exactly what the
Democrats in the House WANT it to do: Ensure the re-election of the
incumbent majority of Democrats that have controlled this House since 1954.

Since November 1954, when the Democrats won a majority in the
House that endures to this day, there has been a steady increase in the
amount of resources available to Members to spend on their office, mail, and
salaries.

The growth in those resources soared in the years following 1974, when
a large class of freshman Democrats elected as a result of Watergate sought to
use the perks of Congress to ensure their re-election.

To give just one example, the amount of taxpayer dollars spend on
franked mail by the House of Representatives in the 1973-74 election cycle was
about $40 million. But that amount has grown to over $130 million in the
1989-90 election cycle.

To put these numbers in perspective, the amount of direct
CAMPAIGN funds spent by incumbents in 1989-1990 was $163 million. The
amount of campaign funds spent by challengers in 1989-90 was $38 million.
(See chart number 1.)

Thus the total amount of funds spent from the people's tax dollars to
promote the interests of incumbents was almost 80% of the total amount of
money incumbents raised from contributors and nearly 3 times the TOTAL
amount spent by every challenger combined in America.

Because of Republican pressure in the past two years, a fixed limit has
finally been imposed on franking expenditures by individual incumbents and
the amount of taxpayer dollars used for franking by each Member of Congress
has been disclosed to the public.

But the law continues to allow incumbents to send taxpayer financed
unsolicited mail in mass quantities to people who are not even a Member's
constituents, but who could be voters in the incumbent's next election. This
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Election Cycle
All House General Election Candidates
PAC vs. Individual Contributions

Percent of Total Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Cycle</th>
<th>PACs</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'77-'78</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>61.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'79-'80</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>57.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'81-'82</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>53.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'83-'84</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'85-'86</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'87-'88</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'89-'90</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data from FEC.
House Democratic General Election Candidates
PAC vs. Individual Contributions

Percent of Total Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Cycle</th>
<th>PACs</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'77-'78</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'79-'80</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'81-'82</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'83-'84</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'85-'86</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'87-'88</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'89-'90</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data from FEC.
# REQUIRE LOCAL FUNDING OF CAMPAIGNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Require &quot;bulk&quot; of campaign funds to come from district or state?</th>
<th>Good Idea</th>
<th>Bad Idea</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Require 75% of campaign funds to come from district of state?</th>
<th>Good Idea</th>
<th>Bad Idea</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GREENBERG-LAKE Survey of March 3, 1990
mail has nothing to do with representing the constituents who elected the Member to serve at the last election. It has everything to do with aiding the Member's reelection.

It is no wonder that challengers, with none of these taxpayer-financed advantages, cannot compete in most races.

It is no wonder that incumbent Democrats would like to limit spending by both challengers and incumbents, but insist on excluding from those limits the millions spent ONLY by incumbents on franked mail paid for by the people's taxes.

It is no wonder that Democrats, who have for so long maintained control of the House of Representatives, using the people's tax dollars to promote their re-election, are so excited about new schemes to funnel more tax dollars into subsidies for political campaigns.

And just to be sure that incumbents get the bulk of those tax dollars, they would only be available, under the Democrat's plan to candidates who agree to abide by the very limits that ignore franking and guarantee that incumbents will be able to outspend any challenger in that race.

And let's look at another example of incumbent protection, the unrestrained influence of Political Action Committees.

PAC's represent every conceivable special interest in Washington. And they contribute overwhelmingly to incumbents.

Of the $110 million given by PAC's to candidates for the House in 1990, 80% went to incumbents. Only $8 million or 7.7% went to challengers against incumbents. That is a more than 10:1 ratio in favor of incumbents.

And PAC influence has been growing to the point where PAC contributions to candidates may soon outstrip contributions by individuals. (See chart number 2.)

Republicans have fought to reduce the maximum limit on PAC contributions but have been blocked from doing so by the Democrats in Congress who depend on PAC contributions as a reliable source of campaign cash.

Republicans have fought to require that a majority of a candidate's funds come from people back home in a candidate's own district, not from PAC's.
The American people support this concept by an overwhelming 5-1 margin. They understand that power needs to be shifted from Washington D.C. back to local district citizens. (See chart number 4 - Greenberg-Lake Poll.)

But the Democrats in Congress have blocked this crucial reform as well.

As a result of these and other stratagems, the will of the people has been frustrated. Most House Members do not face serious competition from challenger candidates every two years. Most voters do not even know who the challenger in their Congressional district is, much less anything about what issues that challenger believes justify replacing the incumbent.

What a different political situation we would find if every Member of Congress faced a real challenge in his or her home district every two years, and had to actually campaign in the district and ask constituents for real support and assistance.

Perhaps then the term 'Servants of the People' would have some real meaning when applied to Members of Congress.

Perhaps then, Members of Congress would listen when the American people demanded an end to wasteful government spending, a balanced budget, and a genuinely tough anti-crime program.

House Republicans are determined to transform the "Permanent Congress" into the "People's House" our forefathers intended.

If Republicans were a majority in Congress, here's how we would make it happen:

We would re-empower local volunteers and contributors and reduce the influence of Washington D.C. special interest, PAC, union, and lobbyist donors. Simply requiring that a majority of campaign funds come from people back home would go far toward achieving this goal.

We would end the use of taxpayer-funded incumbent perks such as out-of-district franking which serves no other purpose than to help re-elect incumbents.

We would re-invigorate and strengthen political parties. It is parties that are inclined to assist competitive challenger candidates, not just safe incumbents.
We would ensure full disclosure of aspects of the election financing process that remain hidden from the American public under today's Democrat-enacted election laws.

We would work to encourage more competitive Congressional districts, where the choices that voters make on election day can actually change the outcome of a race.

And we would oppose taxpayer subsidies to campaigns.

Those are our general goals.

Now here are 10 specific areas where a Republican Congress would work for reform to achieve those goals:

1. RESTORE LOCAL CONTROL OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Republicans would require that a majority of a candidate's campaign funds be raised from people in the candidate's district. More than any other reform this simple change in our election law would force incumbents to campaign at home, restore the importance of small donations and volunteers to the election process, and put challengers with a strong community base of support on a more equal footing with an incumbent's built-in base of support in Washington.

Under today's campaign laws the vast majority of funds are raised from PAC's and big donors who do not reside in the district of the candidate to whom they are contributing.

But when the amount a candidate can raise in Washington is limited by the amount that a candidate can raise from his own constituents, the vital importance of every $5, $10 and $25 contribution from the voters at home will be clear to all.

When incumbents must raise funds in their districts, they will spend more time in their districts.

The challenger who has carefully built a large district following of volunteers and many small contributors can no longer be defeated by a deluge of PAC and special interest money from Washington.

2. ELIMINATE ABUSE OF THE FRANK BY INCUMBENTS

Republicans would prohibit unsolicited taxpayer funded mail to anyone but constituents. We would impose tough limits on the total amount
of franking funds expended and crack down on large amounts of unsolicited mail sent out within 60 days of an election.

Current law allows incumbents to use tax dollars to mail in mass quantities to people those incumbents do not represent. In a year like 1992 when many incumbents are competing in newly drawn districts, there is a strong tendency to use taxpayer resources to send material to potential voters in these new areas who are not yet constituents.

The use of taxpayer resources to communicate with potential voters who are not constituents should NOT be allowed by law.

3. REDUCE THE INFLUENCE OF SPECIAL INTEREST PACS

A Republican Congress would cut PAC contributions by 80%, from $5,000 to $1,000 per election. A Republican Congress would ban transfers among PAC's that allow PAC's to hide the true source of their funds. A Republican Congress would ban "bundling" by PAC's so that limits on PAC contributions would not be circumvented.

PAC's can be an important part of our political system. They serve as a vehicle for united citizen action on issues that are important to a particular group. But they should not dominate the political process for the benefit of incumbents. By reducing the size of individual PAC contributions, a Republican Congress would reduce the danger that one or even a small group of such PAC's would exercise undue influence in the political process.

The role of the PAC should be to get people involved in the process of campaigns, not to insulate people from that process. When PAC's educate and involve people at the local level, urging them to get directly involved with the candidate of their choice, PAC's can perform a valuable service in the election process without playing the dominant role they so often play under the system perpetuated by the Democrats in Congress.

4. REINVIGORATE POLITICAL PARTIES

A Republican Congress would strengthen political parties by increasing the amount they may contribute to candidates. This would allow parties to at least match in-kind contributions they make to challengers the amount incumbents can spend on election year franking and the amount that incumbents carry over from money raised in previous elections.

Strong political parties are crucial to a competitive political process. Political parties exist to build and maintain a partisan majority. They can only do this by defeating candidates of the opposing party. The minority party, whichever one it happens to be at the time, can ONLY build a majority
by replacing incumbents. Both political parties aggressively seek out opportunities to defeat vulnerable incumbents.

Political parties build governing coalitions that are broader than any single special interest group. Loyalty to a philosophy of government, whether Democrat or Republican, serves the nation far better than loyalty to a special interest.

Parties are the most important way in which average citizens can shape the process, not only of electing, but of selecting the candidates. Influence in political parties can be built without the large-scale financial resources that are regularly poured into media and computer-mail driven campaigns.

Restoring the ability of parties, especially at the local level, to make major contributions to candidates strengthens the incentive for citizens to get involved and make a difference.

5. ELIMINATE LOOPHOLES IN PRESIDENTIAL FINANCING RULES

A Republican Congress would eliminate the loopholes which allow corporations and unions, for whom contributions to Federal campaigns are illegal, to assist those campaigns through special political party "Soft Money" accounts.

All funds that influence federal elections should be raised under the normal limits applicable to federal candidates. Under our proposal, strong political parties would learn to rely on contributions from individuals in small amounts, thus making them more effective as the vehicles for citizen participation that our nation needs.

6. PREVENT INCUMBENTS FROM FINANCING EACH OTHER'S CAMPAIGNS

A Republican Congress would ban all contributions by Members of Congress, including so-called "Leadership PACs" to other candidates. People, not fellow incumbents, should be the ones who contribute to elect representatives in Congress.

7. REQUIRE MEMBER CONSENT FOR UNION POLITICAL SPENDING

A Republican Congress would require unions to get a Member's permission to spend his or her dues on political campaigns. Let's restore the role of individual choice in this part of the campaign finance system.

8. REVEAL HIDDEN CAMPAIGN RELATED SPENDING
A Republican Congress would require full disclosure of all union, corporate, and nonprofit "soft money" expenditures on voter education, registration and turnout programs. Voters cannot make intelligent choices in competitive elections if they do not know the source of financial support for candidates and causes.

9. PROMOTE COMPETITION BY LIMITING REDISTRICTING GERRYMANDERS

A Republican Congress would enact Federal standards to guide redistricting so that local communities are not carved into fragments merely to provide a political advantage to one party or another. The result will be more competitive districts.

10. STOP TAXPAYER FINANCING FOR CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS

A Republican Congress would ensure that Congress does not appropriate tax dollars to subsidize political campaigns. Incumbents Democrats want to find a way to vote themselves a permanent campaign subsidy from the U.S. Treasury. They won't succeed in a Republican Congress.

The bottom line is that these Republican proposals will make Congress accountable to the American people. A Republican Congress will not become another "permanent Congress", re-electing incumbents who ignore the will of the people. A Republican Congress will enact campaign reform that gives the American people a real chance to choose a new Congress if our performance does not match our promise.

Our campaigns will strengthen challengers and make all incumbents accountable. Requiring that a majority of all candidates' funds come from the people of the district they represent ensures that all Congressmen will stay close to the needs and interests of their constituents back home, not to the special interests in Washington.

Ending the abuse of the frank will go far towards halting the tendency of incumbents to use their power over government resources to compete unfairly with challengers.

Reducing the influence of PAC's by cutting the contribution limit will strengthen the role of grassroots individuals who are more likely to support challengers.

Strengthening parties will provide a powerful avenue for concerned citizens to get involved and change both the outcome of elections and the composition of Congress.
Banning corporate, union, and large donor soft money in federal elections promotes control of parties and of the process from the bottom up, rather than from the incumbent-protecting special interests down.

When incumbents cannot give to each other, each must stand on his or her own feet with the voters.

When unions must go to their members before spending dues money on politics, there will be fewer cozy deals between incumbents and union officials that ignore the interests of members.

When the sources of campaign related money are revealed, it will be harder for incumbents to secretly use their influence to conduct voter registration drives, and to raise funds for other activities that affect the outcome of elections.

Fairer redistricting means that Members of both parties will have to work harder to stay in office. And a ban on taxpayer financing will ensure that incumbents never get their hands on the U.S. Treasury to re-elect themselves at taxpayer expense.

A Republican Congress comes with a guarantee: We will make elections for Congress competitive.

A Republican Congress will restore real meaning to those words in the Constitution: "Chosen... by the people."

Now isn't it time to go out and elected a Republican Congress?