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REMARKS OF SENATOR MAX BAUCUS

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE WINTER MEETING

FEBRUARY 21, 1987

INTRODUCTION

Thank you, Ed.

Ed comes from Boston. That's the home of the famous Boston Red Sox. You know what people were saying last fall, after the World Series, about the Boston Red Sox?

They said, "What do Michael Jackson and the Boston Red Sox have in common? They both wear a glove on one hand for no apparent reason."

But there is a very apparent reason Ed is here today. It's because he is one of the leading Democratic voices in the House. It's a real honor to be with him here today.

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMPETITIVENESS
Competition. It's the new buzzword in Washington. It means everything to everybody, and therefore it risks meaning nothing.

Today I'd like to tell you why I think it should mean a lot to all of us.

Last year, the productivity of the U.S. grew by only 0.8%. That's a disaster for a country that wants to compete.

The Soviet Union also had a 0.8% increase. Yet when First Secretary Gorbachev gave his state of the union address earlier this year, he said the Soviet Union faced an economic crisis.

President Reagan, in his state of the union address, said America was standing tall.

That difference reminds me of a Russian story involving a train carrying Stalin, Krushchev and Brezhnev, that became stalled by floods.

The engineer turned to Stalin to ask what to do. Stalin said, "Tell the local townspeople that
IF THEY DON’T GET THIS TRAIN MOVING IN ONE HOUR, THEY’LL ALL BE SHOT.”

They asked Krushchev what to do. He said, “This is a perfect opportunity to form a worker’s collective to figure out how to move the train.”

Then they asked Brezhnev what to do. He said, “Get twenty peasants, have them gently rock the train, and we’ll all think we’re moving.”

The United States is not Russia, and Reagan is not Brezhnev, but I’m afraid that in America we are gently rocking the train, without addressing the real problem.

The Democratic Opportunity

But the country knows we’re not addressing this competitiveness problem. U.S. News and World Report recently took a poll that I found fascinating.

Over ninety percent of those polled believed that the competitiveness of the U.S. either was
slipping or had already slipped. Ninety percent! Most felt the U.S. could regain its position, but only if it acted decisively.

There is strong public support behind this competitiveness issue. But there is a real vacuum of leadership. The President talks about competitiveness, but I get the sense he’s not really behind it.

In his State of the Union address, the President said he wanted to eliminate illiteracy in the U.S. by the year 2000. But in his budget, he would cut education funding by $5 billion.

That’s not leadership. When John Kennedy set a goal of landing a man on the moon, he backed it up with bucks. When President Reagan sets a goal in education, he backs it up with talk. There is a big vacuum in leadership in this area.

You put together a groundswell of public concern about competitiveness, plus a lack of Presidential leadership, and I think it spells one
THING: A GREAT, BIG OPPORTUNITY FOR THE
Democrats.

People in this country are looking for
leadership. They want to look up to their leader.
They want economic growth and they want direction.
They want someone, some party that can lead them
into the twenty-first century.

That is an opportunity that is being handed
to the Democrats on a silver platter. It's a big,
brass ring just hanging out there.

If we miss it, we've missed a golden oppor-
tunity. But I think we're ready to grab it.

DEMOCRATIC SENATORS MEETING

Let me tell you why I think that. In early
January, just before Congress started, Sen. Byrd
held a private meeting for all the Democratic
senators.
It was one of the most amazing meetings I've attended in my nine years in the Senate. I'd like to let you in on what we talked about.

Sen. Byrd began by recognizing that the Senate Democrats have about ninety days to prove themselves - to show the rest of the country that it made a difference to elect a Democratic Senate.

By far, most of the discussion focused on trade and competitiveness.

He said that he wanted a bill that addressed all aspects of competitiveness - education, worker retraining, capital formation - not just trade policy. That kind of approach would address the problem in a more comprehensive matter and dampen the charges of Democratic protectionism.

There is a feeling back in Washington that the President is emphasizing competitiveness only to divert attention from unfair foreign trade practices.
I'm here to tell you today that that kind of thinking got nowhere with this group. There was almost unanimous feeling that we had to address unfair trade practices and competitiveness.

We can be as competitive as the New York Giants, but it won't do any good if we can't get access to foreign markets.

Bentsen made that point, but also noted that we can't be viewed as protectionist.

Then everyone got into the act over competitiveness.

Clint Hollings said that his Commerce Committee would want to have jurisdiction over science and technology. Glenn said the Government Affairs Committee would look at a new Department of Trade. Proxmire in Banking will look at the debt crisis. Kennedy said he would work on education and worker issues.

With all those people involved, I'm really anxious to see the conference committee on this.
TRADE BILL. IT PROBABLY WILL INVOLVE 100 SENATORS!

There was some squabbling. Some senators are more protectionist. Some committees will fight over jurisdiction. There are some divisions that will have to be worked out. But what do you expect - we're Democrats! As George McGovern said, "We form a firing line in a circle."

But the point is that we're ready to move. I've never seen the Senate Democrats that excited. We know it's a golden opportunity. And we want to make the most of it.

Sen. Byrd said he'd like all the Senate Committees to report out their bills by May 1. The House probably will move even faster. So this bill is moving on a fast track. In the words of Boss Tweed, "We seen our opportunities and we 'tuck 'em."

1988 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN
If this is a big opening for the Senate Democrats, it's an even bigger opening for our Democratic presidential candidates.

This is a great issue for the Democrats. It's not Sixties liberalism. It's hard, cold economic growth - the kind of issue that built this party under FDR.

History shows that the party that stands for economic prosperity wins elections. That's what the competitiveness issue is all about.

In many ways, I think this upcoming election will be similar to the 1960 election. In that year, we had a two term Republican President. He was very popular, but people thought perhaps he was a little too relaxed. He played a little too much golf.

The same thing's true today. Especially in light of Iran, we sense that Reagan has delegated too much. He's let things slip.
THEY SAY THAT THIS WHOLE IRANGATE ISSUE HAS CAUSED A LOT OF SLEEPLESS AFTERNOONS IN THE WHITE HOUSE.

IN 1960, JOHN KENNEDY RESPONDED TO THAT DRIFT BY EXHORTING US TO "GET THIS COUNTRY MOVING AGAIN." TODAY, A DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE CAN USE THE SAME THEME.

BUT IN 1988, IT WILL BE COUCHED IN TERMS OF COMPETITIVENESS - BECAUSE THE COMPETITIVENESS INITIATIVES ARE WHAT IT WILL TAKE TO GET THIS COUNTRY MOVING AGAIN.

CONGRESSIONAL COMPETITIVENESS CAUCUS

IF WE'RE GOING TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE FULLY, WE NEED TO LOOK LONG-TERM - EVEN BEYOND 1988. LET ME TELL YOU ONE EFFORT I'VE INITIATED TO FIND LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS.

EARLIER THIS YEAR, I HELPED FORM THE CONGRESSIONAL COMPETITIVENESS CAUCUS. THE CAUCUS CONSISTS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS - BOTH HOUSE AND
Senate members. We have over 180 members - one of the largest Caucuses in the Congress.

I helped form the Caucus because it has become clear to me that we are not going to solve this competitiveness problem overnight.

The trade bill is important, but it is not the end of the story. Japan did not become a world economic power by passing an omnibus bill. If we want to solve our competitiveness problem, we must initiate a process that will last years, not months.

That's why I started the Caucus - to form a coalition of members of Congress that would work to enact long-term solutions.

As I see it, the Caucus will be the workhorse on this issue. It will research issues, draft legislation, then build a coalition that will see the legislation through to enactment.

It will try to include legislation in this year's trade bill. But it will also ensure that
THIS ISSUE DOESN'T DIE OUT ONCE THE HOOPLA OVER THE TRADE BILL IS FINISHED.

You can help in that effort. The Caucus will work closely with a new group set up by John Young, the President of Hewlett-Packard.

The Council consists of leaders in business, labor and education. It's being formed to ensure that the private sector plays an important role in this competitiveness debate.

The Council will set forth certain steps it feels the country should take to improve its competitiveness. The Congressional Caucus will work with the Council to enact many of those ideas into law.

In my judgment it's critical to have private sector input. We in Congress don't run businesses. We don't work on the production line. We don't confront foreign trade barriers.

It helps a lot to get the benefit of your hands-on experience. It's one way of being sure
WE’RE PASSING A COMPETITIVENESS POLICY THAT MAKES
GOOD SENSE.

I URGE ALL OF YOU TO WORK WITH BOTH THE
Congressional Caucus and the Council on
Competitiveness. I’LL BE AROUND HERE AFTER MY
REMARKS ARE OVER, AND I’D BE GLAD TO DISCUSS IT
WITH ANY OF YOU PERSONALLY.

CONCLUSION

THE COMPETITIVENESS CRISIS IS A GREAT ISSUE
FOR THE DEMOCRATS. BUT IT’S ALSO A TOUGH CHALLENGE
FOR ALL AMERICANS.

BUT IT IS NO GREATER THAN CHALLENGES
WE’VE OVERCOME IN THE PAST. THE GREAT DEPRESSION
LEFT ELEVEN MILLION AMERICANS WITHOUT JOBS. SINCE
1982, THE GROWING TRADE CRISIS HAS LEFT 3 MILLION
AMERICANS UNEMPLOYED.

IN THE 1930’S, THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY LED
COUNTRY OUT OF THE DEPRESSION. WE CAN PLAY THE
SAME ROLE TODAY.
I will help in that effort. You can help in that effort. And together, we can stop rocking the train, and instead get it rolling down the track once more.