STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES ***Preliminary Transcript***
Unrevised and Unedited
Not for Quotation or
Duplication

HEARING ON REFORM TO THE PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY DONATION DISCLOSURE PROCESS

Wednesday, February 28, 2007

House of Representatives,

Committee on Oversight

and Government Reform,

Washington, D.C.

"This is a preliminary transcript of a Committee Hearing. It has not yet been subject to a review process to ensure that the statements within are appropriately attributed to the witness or member of Congress who made them, to determine whether there are any inconsistencies between the statements within and what was actually said at the proceeding, or to make any other corrections to ensure the accuracy of the record."

Committee Hearings

of the

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



```
1 | Court Reporting Services, Inc.
```

- 2 HG0059002
- 3 | HEARING ON REFORM TO THE PRESIDENTIAL
- 4 | LIBRARY DONATION DISCLOSURE PROCESS
- 5 | Wednesday, February 28, 2007
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 | Committee on Oversight
- 8 and Government Reform,
- 9 Washington, D.C.

- The committee met, pursuant to other business, at 10:20
- 11 a.m. in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, the
- 12 | Honorable Henry A. Waxman [chairman of the committee]
- 13 presiding.
- 14 Present: Representatives Waxman, Cummings, Kucinich,
- 15 | Clay, Braley, Norton, Hodes, Sarbanes, Welch, Davis of
- 16 | Virginia, Platts, Duncan, Issa, Westmoreland, Foxx, and
- 17 Bilbray.
- 18 | Staff Present: Phil Schiliro, Chief of Staff; Kristin
- 19 Amerling, General Counsel; Karen Lightfoot, Communications
- 20 Director and Senior Policy Advisor, Michelle Ash, Chief

Legislative Counsel; Anna Laitin, Professional Staff Member;
Earley Green, Chief Clerk; Teresa Coufal, Deputy Clerk; Roger
Sherman, Counsel; Tony Haywood, Staff Director, Information
Policy Subcommittee; Adam Bordes, Professional Staff Member,
Information Policy Subcommittee; David Marin, Minority Staff
Director; Larry Halloran, Minority Deputy Staff Director;
Jennifer Safavian, Minority Chief Counsel for Oversight and
Investigations; Keith Ausbrook, Minority General Counsel;
Ellen Brown, Minority Legislative Director and Senior Policy
Counsel; Mason Alinger, Minority Deputy Legislative Director;
Steve Castor, Minority Counsel; Charles Phillips, Minority
Counsel; Allyson Blandford, Minority Professional Staff
Member; Patrick Lyden, Minority Parliamentarian and Member
Services Coordinator; and Benjamin Chance, Minority Clerk.

Chairman WAXMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Today the Committee is holding a hearing on the need for public disclosure of donations to Presidential libraries.

Under current law, private organizations established for the purpose of building a Presidential library can raise unlimited amounts of money from undisclosed donors while the President remains in office. It takes nothing more than common sense to see the potential for abuse in this area and the need for basic reform.

Presidential libraries serve an important purpose as depositories of Presidential papers and centers for historical research. In 1939, President Franklin Roosevelt came up with the idea of a privately built but Federally maintained library to house his Presidential papers. This split of responsibilities between the public and the private sectors has continued and has since been codified into law. In 1955, the Presidential Libraries Act formally established a system under which Federally maintained libraries would be built using funds raised by private organizations. More recent amendments have required these private organizations to provide an operating endowment to the National Archives in addition to the library building.

Just as the funding requirements have grown, so have the libraries and their affiliated institutions. Now these libraries are much more than basic research facilities. They

include museums and conference centers, along with other tourist attractions, and they are getting more expensive all the time.

The George H.W. Bush library was reported to cost more than \$80 million to build. The Clinton Library and Museum cost about \$165 million to build. One extra term, doubled the money. News reports have indicated that the fund raising goal for President Bush's library is \$500 million, half a billion dollars, before this institution is completed.

The vast scale of these secret fund-raising efforts creates opportunities for abuse. Donors who do not need to be identified can give unlimited amounts of money to support these libraries while the President remains in office.

According to some accounts, some mega-donors being courted to fund the Bush Library are expected to contribute \$10 to \$20 million each, and they may make these contributions while there are nearly two years left in President Bush's term.

Later this week Representative Duncan and I will be introducing legislation to reform this system. This legislation would require that Presidential libraries disclose the identity of their donors to Congress and the National Archives during their period of most intense fund raising, which is while the President is in office and in the several years after the end of his or her term.

I expect the Committee to consider this legislation next

week. This legislation is one part of a larger effort by this Committee to restore honesty and accountability to the Federal Government. In fact, the Committee will soon be considering two additional open government bills, one to improve access in Presidential records and one to strengthen the Freedom of Information Act.

As we will learn at today's hearing and when we mark up the open government legislation, these bills are bipartisan initiatives with broad public support.

[Prepared statement of Chairman Waxman follows:]

******* INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. I would like to now recognize Mr. Davis for his opening statement.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing today.

Our Nation's Presidential libraries are a priceless resource for researchers, historians, and the public.

Attracting millions of visitors each year, they serve as legacies to our President, repositories of history, and a source of tremendous pride for local communities. At the same time, they have become elaborate institutions, housing official papers, museums, classrooms, conference facilities, and even gift shops. With this expansion, the cost of building and maintaining these facilities has grown dramatically.

Under current law, Presidential libraries are built with private funds, then turned over to the archivists for operation. Amendments to the Presidential Libraries Act mandated the establishment of an endowment to cover some of the costs of operating the library, which are usually met through the establishment of a charitable organization.

Funding for construction and the endowment comes from private sources, but under current law no duty to disclose the source of those contributions exists. Clearly, there is a great deal of interest in enhancing disclosures on both sides of the aisle.

121 Under our colleague Mr. Duncan's lead, we passed solid 122 bipartisan legislation to require the disclosure of contributions to organizations that raise funds for 123 Presidential libraries and related facilities. His bill, 124 125 which was H.R. 577 from the 107th Congress, passed this 126 Committee and the House with strong bipartisan support. 127 Regardless of what we do, I think it is of utmost 128 importance that we avoid any temptation to politicize the 129 issue. We need a sensible, even-handed approach to disclosure, one that applies equally to Republicans and 130 131 Democrats. Mr. Duncan had the right approach, one that was 132 supported by Chairman Waxman and many others in this Committee, and now the Committee will consider legislation on 133 134 this issue, too and I hope again will resist inserting 135 politics into a bill the House passed overwhelmingly last 136 year by a vote of 392 to 3. 137 With this legislation we are recognizing the perception 138 of impropriety that contributions to a Presidential library 139 can raise. We don't need to reopen old news or begin 140 inflicting new ones today. Presidents leave their mark on our rich history, and 141 those giving to Presidential libraries should be proud to 142 143 have their donations publicly disclosed. 144 Mr. Chairman, our goal should be unanimous vote in the 145 Committee and on the House floor. I look forward to working

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much for your opening statement.

Without objection, all members will have a week to submit opening statements for this hearing.

I will be pleased to recognize any member who wishes at this point to be called upon to give an opening statement at the hearing. Let me just see if any member seeks recognition. This side, Mr. Kucinich, opening statement? Mr. Duncan?

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. You and Ranking Member Davis have outlined the need for this legislation. It is correct that I introduced this bill in the 106th Congress under a Democratic President. It was not acted on in that Congress. I introduced it again in the 107th Congress under a Republican President. It was passed in the House by a vote of 392 to 3, with strong bipartisan support.

I first became interested in this after learning that even some people from foreign countries were making very large contributions to Presidential libraries while Presidents were still in office, obviously in an attempt to gain influence. I introduced this bill many months before any publicity occurred about Mark Rich, the man who President Clinton pardoned on his last day in office, who had fled the country to evade \$40 million in income taxes, and it turned

178 out that his wife had contributed \$450,000 to the Clinton 179 Presidential Library, and a close friend of Mr. Rich's had 180 contributed another million to the Clinton Library. 181 So this is not aimed at any Democrat or any Republican. It is a bipartisan bill. It simply does not seek to limit 182 183 contributions in any way, it just is a public disclosure 184 bill. This bill was introduced in the last Congress by our 185 186 current Speaker, Speaker Pelosi, so I can assure you that it 187 has strong support from both sides. 188 I appreciate, Mr. Waxman, your taking the lead on this bill at this time. I will be pleased to work with you in any 189 190 and every way possible. 191 Thank you very much. 192 [Prepared statement of Mr. Duncan follows:]

193

******* INSERT ******

194 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much for your statement. 195 Does any other member wish to be recognized? 196 [No response.] 197 Chairman WAXMAN. If not, we are pleased to have with us three distinguished witnesses. Let me indicate who they are. 198 Sharon Fawcett is the Assistant Archivist for 199 Presidential Libraries at the National Archives and Records 200 Administration; Celia Viggo Wexler is representing Common 201 202 Cause, an advocacy organization dedicated to improving public participation in government and reducing the influence of 203 204 special interests; Sheila Krumholz is the Executive Director 205 of the Center for Responsive Politics, a research 206 organization that tracks the role of money in politics. 207 It is the practice of this Committee to swear in all witnesses, so you are not being singled out, but I would like 208 209 you to rise and raise your hand and take an oath. 210 [Witnesses sworn.] Chairman WAXMAN. The record will indicate that each of 211 212 the witnesses answered in the affirmative. 213 We have your prepared statements. They will be made 214 part of the record in their entirety. We would like to ask, 215 if you would, to try and keep the oral delivery to around 216 five minutes.

Ms. Fawcett, why don't we start with you.

217

218 STATEMENTS OF SHARON FAWCETT, ASSISTANT ARCHIVIST FOR
219 PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS
220 ADMINISTRATION; CELIA VIGGO WEXLER, VICE PRESIDENT OF
221 ADVOCACY, COMMON CAUSE; SHEILA KRUMHOLZ, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
222 CENTER FOR RESPONSIVE POLITICS

STATEMENT OF SHARON FAWCETT

Ms. FAWCETT. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Davis, and members of the Committee, I want to begin by thanking you for holding this hearing today and for inviting me to testify.

Having spent a large portion of my professional life in the Presidential library system, I am delighted to be able to offer some background on the Presidential libraries and their multiple benefits to scholarship, public policy, education, and a more complete understanding of our democracy.

As I think the Chairman knows, this has been a most successful public/private partnership and we greatly appreciate the opportunity to explain why our relationship with our foundations has been a large part of our success for 66 years and 12 Presidential Administrations.

If you invite an archivist to testify, you have to start with a little history. Nearly 70 years ago, as the Chairman noted, Franklin Roosevelt proposed creating a Presidential

library that would be part of the National Archives.

Roosevelt suggested a novel approach: he would donate the land, himself, and build the library with private funding, and then give the library and his papers to the National Archives.

On June 30, 1941, the war in Europe threatened democracy. Roosevelt dedicated his library at Hyde Park.

President Truman, deploring the loss of Presidential papers in the past, stated such destruction should never again be permitted, because the truth behind a President's actions can be found only in his official papers, and every Presidential paper is official. Truman felt strongly that Presidential libraries were not to be monuments to a President, but centers for the study of the Presidency.

Over time, the venue for Presidential libraries shifted from the President's hometown to larger metropolitan areas or a university campus. The Kennedy, Johnson, Ford, Bush, and Clinton Libraries are affiliated with university sites.

As historian Michael Bechloss noted on the News Hour with Jim Lehrer just a week or two ago, there is a dynamism when a library is at a university.

In 1996 Congress passed various amendments to the previous act to reduce the cost to the public of operating Presidential libraries, one of which requires that a minimum endowment equal to 20 percent of the cost of the building to

be transferred to the Government be turned over to the National Archives. On the day the Bush Library was dedicated, the Bush Foundation presented a check for \$4 million. Likewise, the Clinton Foundation presented a check for \$7.2 million at its dedication. These endowments are used by the Government to offset such operational costs as security, utilities, and building services. The foundations, themselves, continue to provide ongoing support for exhibits and public programming at the libraries.

I should also note that in 2002 Congress raised the base endowment requirement to 40 percent of the cost of a library to take effect for the library built after the incumbent George W. Bush.

The materials in Presidential libraries are among the Nation's most important documents. Presidential records are often open for research long before the records of the departments and agencies of Government are even transferred to the National Archives. Government archivists and curators preserve, process, and provide access to the Presidential materials in their care.

In 1941 the Roosevelt Library cost \$369,000, or about \$4 million in today's dollars. Later expansions for added archival storage, education classrooms, and visitors' services bring the total cost of the Roosevelt Library to \$26 million in today's dollars. The Bush Library, at least the

portion transferred to the Government, cost a little over \$22 million, and likewise, the Clinton Library, \$36 million.

The Presidential Libraries Act requires NARA to certify a library meets our exacting standards for construction and archival presentation before we accept the library. We also encourage the foundations to build energy efficient buildings.

In 1973, James B. Rhoads, then the Archivist of the United States, noted the evolving role of the foundations when he told an education symposium at the Lyndon Johnson Library, 'Presidential libraries would be fulfilling their purpose if they did nothing more than preserve and provide access to the papers they contain, but their charters are broad and their possibilities for service are unlimited.''

However broad these charters may be, the libraries face limitations imposed by financial reality. Taxpayers are under no obligation to fund a temporary exhibit on World War II, a conference on civil rights, or education efforts aimed at high school students, admirable and useful as these undeniably are to the public. These efforts are funded by the library support organizations, which continue to raise money long after the library is built and transferred to the government.

Small foundations such as Hoover and Eisenhower contribute \$80,000 and \$130,000 respectively in a typical

year in support of library programs. Foundations with larger endowments and development staff plan to contribute from \$450,000 to \$1,750,000 this fiscal year in support of museum, education, and public programs.

The Reagan Foundation invested \$35 million in expanding the library by adding the Air Force I Pavilion and plans to invest another \$3.5 million to build a Discovery Center staffed by education specialists from the library.

The contributions of these support organizations to the libraries spell the difference between static repositories and lively, vital centers of scholarship and service to the public. Moreover, many of the foundations now contribute to the advancement of Presidential scholarship through joint library projects. The first ever joint conference of all the Presidential libraries happened in March, 2006, at the Kennedy Library, and provided a timely discussion by scholars, journalists, and policy makers on the lessons of Vietnam. In November of this year, we will hold our second joint conference on the Supreme Court at the Roosevelt Library. This will take place in the 70th year from Roosevelt's court-packing proposal.

The leadership and financial support of the Johnson Foundation enabled the creation of the Presidential time line, an interactive web-based resource that provides learning activities and a cornucopia of digitized assets from

all the libraries that is freely accessible to students and educators from around the world.

Directly appropriated funds, about \$58 million annually for the 12 libraries and the central office, pay for activities mandated by law as part of NARA's mission. These include accessioning, processing, reference, and preservation of materials held in the libraries.

As existing buildings became cramped and obsolete, many foundations have supported efforts to update and expand library buildings. Public funds to expand spaces in libraries have often been contingent on the ability of the foundations to raise additional funds to pay for portions of the construction and support the program functions in these expanded spaces.

In summary, the libraries and their support organizations have demonstrated an entrepreneurial willingness and a commitment to public service, their willingness to rely upon financial sources other than the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. I would be happy to answer any questions.

[Prepared statement of Ms. Fawcett follows:]

362 ******** INSERT *******

18

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Ms. Fawcett.

Ms. Wexler, we want to hear from you.

365 | STATEMENT OF CELIA WEXLER

Ms. WEXLER. Chairman Waxman, Ranking Minority Member
Davis, and members of the Committee, I am Celia Wexler, vice
president for advocacy for Common Cause.

Common Cause appreciates the opportunity to testify on this important matter. As our written testimony indicates, Common Cause strongly supports full, timely, and publicly accessible disclosure of donations to the non-profit groups that raise funds for Presidential libraries and their affiliated institutions. In 2001, we testified in support of Representative Duncan's library disclosure bill, and we look forward to supporting the Waxman-Duncan proposal.

Aside from getting re-elected, what means more to a President than his or her legacy? Given how invested Presidents have become in protecting and enhancing that legacy, and given the fact that gifts to Presidential libraries are undisclosed and unlimited, you can quickly perceive the potential for mischief. A special interest, a major corporation, wealthy individual, foreign government, or foreign national can give in secret millions of dollars to help build a Presidential library complex. And they can give these undisclosed donations while the President remains in office. They can use these donations to curry favor with a

sitting President, or to influence former Presidents who continue to occupy the world stage and who may even be related to current Presidents or members of Congress.

These large donations will only get bigger if the trend for ever-larger library complexes continues. And I think Chairman Waxman has talked about the dramatic escalation of costs for these complexes over the years: \$26 million for the Carter Library, \$57 million for the Reagan, \$83 million for the Bush complex, \$165 million for the Clinton complex, and now we are talking about half a billion for the George W. Bush complex.

Disclosure is always the indispensable first step towards comprehensive reform, and it will enable the public and Congress to truly understand the scope of giving to Presidential library complexes and the potential for conflicts of interest or perceived conflicts that this fund raising may present.

We hope that disclosure will help Congress ultimately grapple with other questions related to Presidential library fund raising.

As you know, these libraries are public/private partnerships, and we have gotten a very good tutorial about how those work. Even so, the Federal Government annually spends tens of millions of dollars for their upkeep and operation. Does this partnership work? Should the

414

415

416

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

413 Government directly take on the task of building modest repositories for Presidential records and papers and divorce itself from Presidents' increasingly ambitious plans to memorialize their achievements and to create a platform for 417 their post-Presidential careers? Should sitting Presidents be banned from soliciting or accepting contributions or pledges of contributions to their Presidential libraries? Should there be a limit on the size of contributions to the libraries of sitting Presidents? This is not an academic question. In the past, the public trust has been shaken after news reports about Presidential pardons granted at the request of library donors. Should there be restrictions on the donations that

foreign governments and foreign nationals may give to library complexes?

We present these as questions because Common Cause acknowledges that these are tough issues, issues that will take more debate, discussion, and deliberation, but we believe these questions are worth considering, and we applaud the Committee for examining this issue, and we look forward to working with you on getting this legislative proposal passed.

[Prepared statement of Ms. Wexler follows:]

437 | ******** INSERT *******

*8

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Ms. Wexler.

439 Ms. Krumholz?

(8)

440 | STATEMENT OF SHEILA KRUMHOLZ

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Sheila Krumholz. I am executive director of the Center for Responsive Politics, a non-partisan, non-profit research organization based here in Washington that analyzes Federal campaign contributions, as well as other forms of money, and a lead influence in U.S. politics.

I have been deeply involved in the research side of our organization's work for the better part of 15 years. Many know the Center for our award-winning web site,

OpenSecrets.org, where we make freely available our analysis of publicly disclosed information about the role of money in politics. We can do this because the financing of your campaigns is open to public scrutiny. But, as I will discuss today, the financing of Presidential libraries is not similarly transparent, although these campaign-like projects raise similar questions about potential influence buying.

I thank the Committee for this opportunity to speak.

My predecessor, Larry Noble, testified on this matter before this Committee in 2001, and my remarks today echo some of his from that hearing.

Contributions to Presidential libraries fall into a category all their own, in a sense. While it takes a

well-funded campaign to build a Presidential library, it is not a political campaign, per se. There is, however, a sort of candidate at the center of this campaign, someone in a position of public trust, both while he is in office and, to a lesser extent, once he has left office. Herein lies the central concern: that those who donate money to Presidential libraries will, in return, receive special access to and favors from the President and the Federal Government. To minimize the potential for that sort of payback and to build trust among a citizenry that already questions the ethics of elected officials, public disclosure of contributions to Presidential library projects seems both appropriate and wise.

As you know, contributions aggregating to more than \$200 are itemized and reported to the Federal Election Commission. The rules call for the disclosure of the amount and date of the donation, and the name, address, occupation, and employer of the donor. The FEC makes this information available on the internet to any interested citizen. The fact that the FEC deems the employment information, in particular, worthy of collection is an acknowledgment that donors sometimes, if not often, give to politicians with an economic self-interest in mind and a hope that their contribution will gain them access and influence over policy.

The law has long recognized that our system of elections

is strengthened when the public knows who is giving the money, and yet the public is still in the dark about several back door ways of buying influence in Washington, including the funding of Presidential libraries.

To a President, a library with its accompanying and usually far larger museum, is a way to frame and preserve his legacy. For the President there is great self interest, because the library will live on long after the President's time in office and on earth have passed. I am reminded of the Vietnamese emperor who spent nine years ruling but whose tomb took eleven years to build.

Presidents begin fund raising for their libraries well before they leave office. According to press reports, site selection for President George W. Bush's Presidential library has been going on for some time, and half a billion fund raising campaign is imminent, two years before he leaves office. Fund raising for President Bill Clinton's library began in 1998, less than halfway through his second term.

There is great potential here for corruption, apparent corruption, at least, and, even worse, real corruption. We know well how President Clinton's pardon of a six-figure contributor to his library fund, along with other political donations, has left the indelible impression with many that a Presidential pardon was purchased.

The potential for corruption may be greater in the fund

raising for Presidential libraries than in the campaign finance system. Donations to Presidential election campaigns are limited to a few thousand dollars. Those to Presidential libraries are not, and the checks can be written in the tens of millions of dollars.

Corporations, unions, and other institutional interest groups cannot directly contribute to Presidential candidates; they can contribute to Presidential libraries. Foreign governments, foreign individuals, and corporations are prohibited from giving money to Presidential campaigns, but donations to Presidential libraries are permissible, even while the President is still in office. And, of course, the identities of large donors to Presidential campaigns are disclosed to the public, while donors to Presidential libraries can remain anonymous.

As you are all aware, the public's perception of
Washington is that money at the very least opens doors here.
To agree that disclosure of contributions is appropriate as a
way to minimize corruption and build public trust only gets
us so far. There are many questions you will have to answer
before disclosure of Presidential library contributions will
become a reality. For example, what information must be
disclosed, and by whom; how often, and for how long will
disclosure be required; in what form must they disclose it;
ho will administer and enforce the disclosure. As history

has shown us, a law unenforced may be worse than no law at all, because it leaves you with the false comfort that you have done something even as a problem persists.

There are many questions to be addressed, and I merely raise some of them for you and the members of the Committee to consider. Presidential libraries are repositories of history and scholarship for all Americans to enjoy, and, while they are built to honor politicians, their construction and operation should not be political. As Americans visit our Nation's Presidential libraries, their awe for the Presidents who served our country, their confidence in those leaders, and their trust in that system that honors them should not be tarnished by any suspicion that the public places they are visiting have been sold for the benefit of private interests.

I have appreciated this opportunity to appear before you and will gladly answer any questions you have.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Ms. Krumholz follows:]

557 ******* INSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, all three of you, for your testimony. I think you have helped us a great deal with this subject.

Donations to Presidential library foundations are difficult to categorize. They are not campaign contributions or political contributions in the standard sense. They are not being used to help a candidate win an elected office, nor are they simply contributions to a standard charity. The Presidential library foundation often begins to raise money to honor a President while the President remains in office.

As we think about reforms in this area, we need to strike a balance. Through campaign finance reform, we have limited the amount of money individuals and corporations can provide to candidates and have dictated who can donate to campaigns. If we consider donations to these library foundations to be campaign contributions, we could set similar limits. On the other hand, if we look at the other end of the spectrum, foundations that raise money for museums and cultural centers are not required to disclose any information about their donors and, in fact, many of the largest donors often prefer to remain anonymous. If we consider donations to these foundations to be more like donations to a museum, we would allow the current system to remain unchanged.

It is clear that these foundations are different. The

draft legislation that the Committee will be considering soon calls for the disclosure of all contributions of \$200 or more that are given to the foundation through the period when the library is turned over to the Archives, but it does not limit contributions in any way.

Ms. Krumholz, from your perspective does this strike the right balance? Are there other requirements that you would recommend we put in place?

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. There is a whole host of questions that we came up with. I am sure you have come up with the same ones, and probably more. Those limits, in particular, seem logical to me, or basically sufficient. I was wondering if the limits that are used for political campaigns, for reporting to the Federal Election Commission, were considered, and why those limits were not adopted in this case.

Chairman WAXMAN. So you would recommend that we adopt those same limits?

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. No. Not necessarily. I was simply saying that that is a model, one model.

Chairman WAXMAN. Yes.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. I was wondering if that was considered and why it was rejected in favor of \$200 limits per quarter. I do agree--

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, \$200 is the limit for reporting it. It can exceed that \$200 limit.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. I am sorry, for disclosure of the contribution.

Chairman WAXMAN. Right.

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

632

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Yes. I do agree. I think it is important that it is easier to make the limit based on the contribution and not the aggregate contribution, as it is, as the rules are at the FEC. I think that causes a greater burden on all involved and allows for some confusion about what is required. For instance, the Federal Election Commission, filers do not have to disclose the full information of a donor until they have reached the aggregate of \$200 during the cycle. At that point it must be disclosed, but all contributions under that are not part of the Federal Election Commission computerized master data, and so there are questions about when does it get disclosed, when do you meet that aggregate limit, why aren't the contributions that are less than \$00 disclosed. So I think it is simpler and more intelligible to all involved when it is simply a matter of each contribution being disclosed when it hits a certain threshold.

Chairman WAXMAN. Ms. Wexler, what is your view on that same question? Does this proposal strike the right balance? Do you have any requirements you would recommend that we put in place in addition?

631

Ms. WEXLER. Well, I think that this is a very good first

ultimately I do think, for a sitting President, it would be important for Congress to seriously consider some limits.

And we do have the precedent, I believe of the limits on transitional funding, so that after the election but before a new Administration takes over, the in-kind contributions received or the money donated to make that transition a little smoother is--there are limits in disclosure requirements in place for that, and the reason you can impose limits, I believe, is conditioned on the fact that the GSA is giving this transition team some resources. In the same way, with the Presidential libraries there is that public/private partnership, and I think that it might be a reason that one could condition, at least for a sitting President, some limits.

I think the other question is about limits on contributions from foreign governments and foreign nationals. You know, there are some published accounts that say that the elder Bush's library was supported, at least initially, by 20 percent. Of that funding, 20 percent came from foreign sources, which, given the challenging environment, international environment we are in may be problematic. Those are things.

The other, I think, you didn't ask me about this, but I also think that ultimately you want to consider again whether

looking at contributions and disclosure of contributions just up to dedication, even though it is several years, is enough time, or whether you might want to go longer.

Again, I think of the elder Bush's 80th birthday party where he raised \$55 million. A portion of that money raised did, indeed, go to the Bush Library Foundation. The Embassy of Quatar was one of the donors. I think the Washington Times Foundation was another million dollar donor.

So those are some of the things that need to be considered ultimately, not necessarily in this first proposal.

Chairman WAXMAN. Where did the rest of the money go?
Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Various charities.

Chairman WAXMAN. Ms. Fawcett, what do you think about these ideas?

Ms. FAWCETT. Well, the Administration hasn't taken a position on the bill at this point in time, but, speaking for the Archives, we are appreciative of the work of the staff in narrowing the bill to cover a President before he leaves office and until the transfer of the library to the Government.

As the Chairman spoke, donors to foundations, as the foundations age the donations become very locally based, and many are interested in anonymity. Their donations are to run programs like the Presidential Learning Center at the Truman

Library, the Five Star Leaders Program at the Eisenhower
Library, the Cabinet Program at the Ford Library. So, you
know, the contributors to these foundations aren't interested
at that point in any political influence; they are interested
in promoting educational opportunities in their communities
and bringing specific discourse into the library system.

Chairman WAXMAN. You are assuming you know their motivations?

Ms. FAWCETT. Well, at least that is what they have given money to us for.

Chairman WAXMAN. That is what they say.

Ms. Krumholz, you worked as a researcher, and our draft legislation proposes that foundations disclose the date and amount of each contribution, the name of the contributor, and, if the contributor is an individual, the occupation of the contributor. The Archives is called on to post these quarterly reports on the Internet in a searchable, downloadable database. Would you find this information, as a researcher, to be adequate to examine the donations made to the Presidential library foundations? And, if you had access to such a database for an existing Presidential library foundation, what kind of searches would you perform and what would you hope to learn from them? And is there anything in particular that you would look out for?

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Yes. There is one. I would agree with

708 that list of requirements with one exception, and that is that employment should also be required, not just occupation. Some of the occupations we get in the Federal Election Commission data include maverick, entrepreneur, you know, domestic engineer. So employer is really key to letting us know--

Chairman WAXMAN. Opportunist could be one, too.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. I am sorry?

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

Chairman WAXMAN. They could say opportunist.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. They could. Freedom fighter is another So it is important that employer be included. the database downloadable is absolutely key. That provides anyone who wants to look into this data with the flexibility they need to find the patterns in the data that they might not otherwise see if they were simply using a limited search provided by the archives or by other entities. So making it downloadable I think is just a tremendous idea, would really help with allowing folks to be able to sort the data and see interesting dates, whether a contribution was given on a key date right before or right after policy decisions were made. Again, that is being able to slice and dice the data is how you find key information.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Davis?

732 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Let me just talk about former

Presidents at this point. Once they are out of office and can't, at that point, I think, do any favors or use their office, what is the chance of corruption in a case like that, for terms of disclosure? I can understand if you have a sitting President or somebody maybe within a couple of years, but if somebody were to give \$100,000 to a Jimmy Carter Library at this point and wanted to do it anonymously, what is the chance of corruption in a case like that?

Ms. WEXLER. Well, Representative Davis, I think our concern is this: right now we have three very active living Presidents. They are all on the world stage. They are all doing all kinds of things that have a policy implication. In two cases, you have one who is the father of a sitting President and in another case you have one who is the spouse of a sitting Senator and Presidential candidate. So I don't think just because they are former Presidents they are necessarily immune from being influenced or having influence.

I mean, President Carter just wrote a very controversial book that challenges current domestic mideast policy, so I think that those are the concerns that arise for us.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Ms. Krumholz?

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Thank you. In addition to that, I would like to add that, should we be concerned about potentially corrupting effect of donations to the library of a President who has left office long ago? Maybe so, if he is still

758 living, an ex-President still has prestige, influence, and even retains access to national intelligence as a courtesy. And, as I said earlier, foreign governments and interests can donate freely to Presidential libraries currently.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay. So the fact that they have access to foreign intelligence, I mean, intelligence nobody else does, it makes them corruptible?

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. No, no. But it does set them apart and I think provides another reason why disclosure should continue for some time beyond the point at which they leave office.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. At this point I think for some time or forever? I mean, as long as they are alive you would keep these? Do you understand what I am saying?

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Right.

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. You are not talking about doing this for Herbert Hoover?

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. I am not sure that I would say until they pass away, but clearly the current situation with President Bush's father having an active library fund raising and former President Bill Clinton actively fund raising while his wife is running for the President, the office, gives us a good indication of what can happen, and I would say we should consider it a good, long chunk of time beyond the point at which they leave office. Whether that should be until they pass away, I am not sure we would go that far.

783 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay.

784 Ms. KRUMHOLZ. I would like to clarify a point I made 785 earlier, if I may.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Sure.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. When I was talking about disclosure thresholds, we do not--I just want to make this point clear--we do not encourage limits on contributions necessarily. It is understandable that limits will--if we impose limits, particularly stringent limits, these buildings may never get built.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Right. That is a concern. A lot of people like to give these anonymously. They are just doing it with the right motive in mind. These Presidential libraries can be very important for researchers, for history, for everything else. If you make it too difficult, people just walk away from it, and then maybe the taxpayers get stuck with it. So I don't know what the balance is. You make a very good point. We could actually be in a period. It could be 28 years before you have nothing but Bushes and Clintons in the White House in theory, if you want to stretch this thing out. I mean, I guess I don't know what that does to poor Jimmy Carter.

Ms. Fawcett, do you have any estimate on the costs to the Archives for managing and making this information available?

Ms. FAWCETT. I am sorry, I didn't hear the question.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Do you have any cost estimates for managing and making this information available?

Ms. FAWCETT. No, we don't. In fact, the Archives has some concern about our ability to do this. We are not the Federal Election Commission and we have no experience in making available this type of information. We also are in a peculiar position of working to partner with an organization that we are then responsible for reporting to the public donations, so in a way it could create some conflicts of interest for us, so that is a concern. We will work around whatever the legislation requires, but we would like to express some concerns about whether the National Archives is the appropriate reporting body for these disclosures.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I know in Mr. Duncan's bill we set a threshold of \$5,000 for reporting once a President is out of office. The \$5,000, this threshold corresponds to a trigger for contributions that tax-exempt foundations would disclose to the IRS. What do you think the proper threshold is for disclosure? Ms. Wexler, I ask you and Ms. Krumholz.

Ms. WEXLER. You know, I think I believe in Mr. Duncan's bill the threshold was \$5,000, but the time limit was unlimited, right, for the disclosure? I think that that is not a bad thing to think about, because, again, disclosure at \$200 for a sitting President makes a lot of sense. It may

not be a bad idea to raise the threshold once the President is no longer a sitting President, given the fact that we are seeing donations that we know about in the millions and tons of millions.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. They get \$100,000 for a speech, more than that for a speech, I mean.

Ms. WEXLER. Absolutely, but usually that is somehow--you know, there is usually some disclosure about that. People generally know a President's going rate for speeches. But I think \$5,000 wouldn't necessarily be a terrible threshold post the time a President is in office. Are we happy with \$200 as a threshold beyond that time? Yes.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. You mean prior to that time, while they are still in office?

848 Ms. WEXLER. Yes.

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

852

854

855

856

857

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. I would concur with Celia's comments there, too.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. May I just interject?

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Yes, please.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Was the FEC considered as the receptacle for these reports as the agency collecting this information rather than the Archives? It seems like they have a system and it is working for them. I don't know if that would be an

appropriate place to--

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I don't know that it was. I mean, that is an interesting concept in terms of allocation of costs and having systems up and ready, so I think that is something we could give some consideration to. That is why we hold these hearings sometimes. We don't think everything as we go through.

How long should the disclosure take place now? Do you think it should just take place during the lifetime of a former President? I mean, if you are talking about a Nixon Library or an LBJ Library or something like that, should the disclosures continue?

Ms. WEXLER. I think certainly ideally it would be the lifetime of a President. And we have disclosure. If you pass a disclosure bill and you realize that, you know, giving just completely drops off after the first decade, then you may want to reconsider that, but I don't think there is any harm and perhaps a lot of good in extending that disclosure through the lifetime of a President.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. All right. You don't have any concern that we should ban foreign contributions outright, do you?

Ms. WEXLER. I don't think it is a bad thing to think about, but I think it would require an enormous amount of deliberation and, you know, it is not necessarily a path you

883 | want to take.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay. Ms. Krumholz, any thoughts?

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. I would be curious how much of the current makeup of donations to Presidential libraries comes from foreign governments.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I would be interested to know, too.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. And foreign nationals.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. And how much came while they were living and in office and how much afterwards. I think that is something we will ask the staff to look at.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Exactly.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. That would be interesting. I think, again, this is dollars the taxpayers don't have to pay, so any time we can get something out of foreign countries, that is probably a good thing.

I have got a couple minutes left. Let me yield to Mr. Issa.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I can summarize quickly, it sounds like the logical things for this Committee to consider are: one, moving this to the FEC; two, potentially harmonizing it with the FEC as though the President is still a candidate so that it would be consistent with the President's continued activity. If I

908 can, using Ronald Reagan as an example, certainly in the last 909 five years of his life nobody would say that Ronald Reagan 910 was still active, and thus, even though he was still alive, 911 reporting under the nod of heads I think I am seeing, could be suspended. Would that be pretty consistent with what I am 912 913 hearing each of you say you view as to this reporting 914 requirement? 915 Ms. KRUMHOLZ. Suspended during the last years of his 916 life? 917 Mr. ISSA. In other words, if we harmonize the reporting requirement to the candidate, as we do normally. In other 918 919 words, if we move this to the FEC, if I stop being a 920 candidate, you know, stop all activity, the FEC says, okay, 921 you have once a year, report us the balance, and that is it. 922 The participation of the individual or individuals of influence is what specifically I am hearing pretty 923 924 consistently triggers the question of whether or not money to 925 these otherwise just normal charities -- I mean, these 926 libraries are just basically 501(c)(3)s, as far as we are 927 concerned, if you take out the power of the President or 928 former President. They are pretty consistent with the way 929 you would like us to view regulatory law in this case, 930 including common cause, obviously? Ms. WEXLER. I think so. I think the sort of question is 931 932 when does a President not become active. It was pretty clear

in President Reagan's case, but, you know, it is a kind of delicate question, and a President might be a little offended if all of the sudden he was declared inactive, which is also something to think about.

Mr. ISSA. I don't expect Nancy would have declared him inactive, Nancy Reagan.

Ms. WEXLER. No, I don't mean that. I just mean, you know, what is the harm in the disclosure extending until something as final as death, because presumably it is not going to be terribly burdensome.

Mr. ISSA. I guess my question--

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Issa?

Mr. ISSA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

946 Chairman WAXMAN. The clock never turned red.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. I will finish in one follow-up on the same thing.

Chairman WAXMAN. One last question.

Mr. ISSA. If former Presidents were to say I no longer am doing anything whatsoever with my foundation, that declaration, whether he is living or not, would be substantially the same thing, wouldn't it? No one is ever going to disavow knowledge of their library, but hypothetically they can say I am out of it, as an alternative to death.

Ms. KRUMHOLZ. My concern would be the situation we have

958 here with President Bush and former President Clinton.

Somebody who wishes to influence a Candidate Clinton or the current sitting President might well give to their father or

961 their husband's Presidential library, regardless--

Mr. ISSA. I yield back the Ranking Member's unlimited time.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Issa.

Mr. Welch, I think you were here first. No questions?
Mr. Hodes?

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Presidential libraries and their facilities seem to be growing exponentially larger. The complexes now contain the Presidential library, research facilities. They also appear to include museums and event centers and conference centers and a host of other amenities. I read in one of the reports about an apartment in one of the libraries. There may be academic centers.

During the early phases of the planning and construction, the role of Presidential library foundations seems very clear. It raises the money, it ensures that the facility is built, and then, once the library is turned over to the National Archives, the relationship seems less clear. I am wondering if the panel could clarify.

I will direct this to Ms. Fawcett. Can you explain the role of the Presidential library foundation once the facility

has been turned over to the Archives, particularly with regard to the non-library spaces in the complex? Who is in charge? Who is minding the store?

Ms. FAWCETT. Well, you are correct in that the libraries have grown in size, and the largest library is the Ronald Reagan Library. Libraries built since the amendments passed in 1986 that required an endowment come to the Government, in those libraries only a portion of the library is transferred to the Government. Usually 70,000 square feet or less comes to the Government. The rest of the venues in the library are the responsibility of the foundation to operate and maintain those.

Now, what does come to the Government, Congressman, is the museum, the research room, the archival offices, the storage spaces, the education classrooms. What doesn't come to the archives are things like venues to use for conference space, an apartment, sometimes the cafeteria, the museum store. Those venues and those spaces remain with the foundation, and the foundation must continue to raise money to provide support for those venues in addition to supporting the public programming, education programming, and exhibits that are in the library, because the Government does not fund those.

Last year the Presidential libraries cost the taxpayers \$58 million in directly appropriated funds. The foundations

this year will be donating almost \$11 million to various Presidential libraries for their use in programming operations.

In terms of managing those spaces, when we accept a library we have a joint operating agreement with the foundation, and that agreement outlines the responsibilities of both parties. Often, for example, since the spaces are sort of interwoven throughout a building and we have this space and the foundation has that space, we divide up the utility cost and the operational cost, the maintenance cost of the building so that the foundation pays a percentage of those costs to the Government.

Mr. HODES. Now, the foundations are organized under State law as 501(c)(3)s?

Ms. FAWCETT. Yes.

Mr. HODES. Is that correct?

Ms. FAWCETT. Yes.

Mr. HODES. And I suppose that the National Archives does not impose any limitations, therefore, on the way the foundations can use the collateral spaces, if you will, and what purposes they put them to?

Ms. FAWCETT. Well, we do work out in the joint operating agreement some understandings about the spaces. They understand that we try to represent a non-partisan library.

Over time there may be an event that takes place in

foundation space that, you know, a Republican candidate may come, but foundations and libraries generally invite the Democratic candidates to come also, you know. It is not normal for a--

Mr. HODES. I was interested to hear, when the Chairman asked the question about the additional use to which the fund raising was put in that event of the 80th birthday, that there were other charities to whom money was donated. Do any of you on the panel think there is any issue that could arise in the foundation's ability to use those spaces collateral to the library for any purpose whatsoever, even though not related to the joint operating agreement with the National Archives? Any issue there?

Ms. WEXLER. I am not sure that this directly responds. I think that one of our concerns is that if you look at these libraries, you know, Robert Carow said they were America's pyramids erected to the memory of America's rules, and I don't know if I want to go that far, but there is that sense that you do get a lot of hagiography, and that a lot of what happens inside them is not necessarily—the access to the Presidential records is absolutely invaluable and, indeed, helped Mr. Carow write his wonderful series on Lyndon Johnson, but you have that other aspect of these complexes—the tourist sites, the sort of way they pay tribute and emphasize certain aspects of an Administration's

1058 history, that, you know, make you wonder a little about what these are becoming and what the trend is. So I think that is 1059 1060 a concern. 1061

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Hodes.

Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Your time is up.

Mr. Issa, do you wish to be heard?

Mr. ISSA. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

You know, I think there is no question that we are going to need to have a question at some point about the libraries, where they are going and whether or not the Government support of them remains as appropriate as it has been in the past. I think that is beyond the scope perhaps of today's hearing. But because I am so privileged to have the representative of the National Archives, I have to say I would like to not digress, but it is somewhat related. Ms. Fawcett, you are familiar, obviously, with Sandy Berger taking either originals or duplicates of classified documents out of your care. As I understand, Nancy Smith is a direct report to you; is that correct?

Ms. FAWCETT. Yes, she is.

Mr. ISSA. And I guess one of the question is: do you consider that your responsibility is only to make sure that these documents remain available for the future, or do you

have a separate recognition that you have to protect classified documents from being taken out by anybody whatsoever, including Sandy Berger?

Ms. FAWCETT. Well, we feel that we have the responsibility to do both. We are the historical protectors of the records. In the case of Mr. Berger's visit to the National Archives, he came to the National Archives as an official representative of President Clinton. He was reviewing records for the 911 Commission for his testimony and for President Clinton's testimony.

Mr. ISSA. Okay, then, following up on that, why was Sandy Berger allowed to be alone with documents for which there are no duplicates with a briefcase and the ability--we don't know whether he did or he didn't, but he could have simply put them in his briefcase and left.

Ms. FAWCETT. Well--

Mr. ISSA. Was there special treatment, or would you do this for other people that came in representing a former President?

Ms. FAWCETT. As representatives under the Presidential Records Act, we did, indeed, treat people differently. We expected, and from 1989 when the Presidential Records Act first was implemented with Ronald Reagan's departure from the White House, through the time of Sandy Berger, we operated with an attitude of trust in these people. They had

statutory responsibility, statutory authority to view the records. And yes, they were treated with respect. They were not regular researchers and they weren't treated as regular researchers. We expected Mr. Berger to be knowledgeable of the national security requirements. We had never had an issue. But, saying that, national security is ever evolving. I go through airports now and I take my shoes off. I didn't used to.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. So--

Ms. FAWCETT. Now, if a Presidential representative comes to--

Mr. ISSA. Right. Looking forward, not back then, today if--Sandy Berger would be inappropriate, but if anyone from a former Administration came, can we be assured that they would never, never be allowed to be alone with any document and that they would not be given documents for which there were not catalogs and duplicates?

Ms. FAWCETT. Part of your question, they would not be alone with the documents in a production request. But, secondly, would they be given original materials? The answer to that is probably yes, because we have nine billion pieces of paper in the National Archives and we don't make copies of all of them. There would be somebody with them in attendance while they worked with the records, and in many cases they might even be under camera surveillance.

1133 Mr. ISSA. In many cases? So it is safe to say that 1134 Sandy Berger could never again, or someone like him, come in 1135 and take original documents such as e-mails or other desk 1136 copy information that might, in fact, have germaneness to 1137 current or future investigations? That is absolutely 1138 something you have closed? 1139 Ms. FAWCETT. That is absolutely something that we strive 1140 to have not happen again. Mr. ISSA. And do you feel there was any wrongdoing in 1141 1142 the treatment that was allowed Sandy Berger, the special 1143 treatment as you have described it at the time? 1144 Ms. FAWCETT. I think that it was the vigilance of our 1145 staff and their care and their concern that led to Sandy 1146 Berger's being caught with these records, and the Congress 1147 knowing about it, the 911 Commission knowing about it, and 1148 the National Security Council knowing about it. Without our 1149 employees' careful handling of this case, Sandy Berger would 1150 not have been caught. 1151 Mr. ISSA. I thank you for your diligence and I thank you 1152 for the changes that you have implemented. 1153 Ms. FAWCETT. Thank you, Mr. Issa. 1154 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1155 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Braley? Mr. BRALEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1156 1157 Ms. Fawcett, let me start with you. One of my family's

cherished archives is a photograph my mother took on August 1158 1159 10, 1962, very similar to the one I have in my hand--1160 Ms. FAWCETT. Were you at the Hoover Library? 1161 Mr. BRALEY. -- at the dedication of the Herbert Hoover 1162 Presidential Library in West Branch, Iowa. 1163 Ms. FAWCETT. Thank you. 1164 Mr. BRALEY. She held a Brownie Instamatic camera over 1165 her head. 1166 Ms. FAWCETT. Yes. 1167 Mr. BRALEY. She is only 5'4' and she got a picture of 1168 President Hoover and President Truman walking through 1169 thousands of people. 1170 One of the questions that I have for you and for 1171 everyone on the panel is I am concerned about the growing 1172 disparity between what I will call small market and large market Presidential libraries and the fact that we have 1173 1174 talked about this exponential growth in terms of the dollar 1175 value of those libraries and the expanded components 1176 available to people who attend those facilities beyond simply 1177 a repository of Presidential documents and memorabilia. 1178 Have you thought about how we can preserve the original 1179 purpose of these libraries, which is to provide a repository 1180 of information and a museum experience for people from all

across this country to experience a historical perspective of

that Presidency without turning it into a theme park type

1181

1182

environment where there are no limits on the surrounding opportunities available for experiencing that Presidency?

Ms. FAWCETT. Well, I don't view any of the libraries now as a theme park type of environment. I would say that one of the reasons for the expansion of spaces in libraries is to earn the revenue necessary to support the library. The funds that come from the Government, the directly appropriated funds, aren't sufficient for us to provide those educational experiences and the museum experiences to the public. We do not use any direct appropriated funds to pay for museum exhibits. Those are all funded either through revenues gained from admission to the library that are in the library's government-operated trust funds, or through donations of the foundations to the libraries to do that.

Another area of earning revenue is through the rental of spaces in the library, to use the library as a venue for events. That has also assisted the libraries in being able to bring programs such as the Presidential time line, which launched in February. It is a project of all of the Presidential libraries to bring the digitized assets to school children and educators everywhere across the country. There are learning experiences on the web site. There are assets you can search across the time line of the Presidency.

We are striving in the Presidential library system to look at the Presidency as a time line as a whole, because

events don't happen in any stovepipe way. The civil rights, the Vietnam War, the Middle East Conflict, all of these things extend over a period of time. Through the revenues that we gain in these projects, we are able to put together these sort of experiences for the American people, for students everywhere. We don't expect Congress to fund those. If you think it would be better for Congress to fund those, we can certainly accept the money, but that has not been our intent.

Mr. BRALEY. No, but just talking about the earlier discussion of what type of revenues were generated from the Hoover Library and some of the smaller libraries, even if you take a 40 percent endowment requirement for a \$500 million library, you are still talking about \$300 million over and above that amount that is available, and, using another baseball analogy from Iowa, if you build it, they will come.

Ms. FAWCETT. Yes.

Mr. BRALEY. When you have a Presidential library that has a think tank component to it, then what restrictions are there under the current statute that would prevent a theme park from being added as a component to a Presidential library?

Ms. FAWCETT. Well, that wouldn't be brought to the national archives and wouldn't be transferred to national archives. The think tank component of the proposed George W.

1233 Bush Library would not transfer to the Federal Government. That would be part of something that the foundation would be 1234 1235 managing. 1236 Mr. BRALEY. I understand that, but my point is what 1237 prevents us from going to the next step under the current 1238 statute? 1239 Ms. FAWCETT. Under the Presidential Libraries Act 1240 statute? 1241 Mr. BRALEY. Yes. Ms. FAWCETT. Well, there is nothing, but the Government 1242 1243 wouldn't accept that, so, I mean, the fact that the 1244 foundation could build it, yes, there is nothing to prevent the foundation from building whatever they want to build, but 1245 what they can transfer to the Government is codified, and it 1246 1247 is up to Congress to decide whether or not to accept what is 1248 transferred to the Government. We prepare a report that we submit to you some time before the transfer, and it is up to 1249 1250 Congress to make that decision whether this is an appropriate project for the Government to manage. 1251 1252 Mr. BRALEY. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Braley.

I want to thank the three of you for your testimony today. I think we have an excellent record for this Committee to consider legislation.

1257 Thank you.

1253

1254

1255

1256

If there is no other business from any other members,
the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

HG0059.002

PAGE

2

******************* STATEMENTS OF SHARON FAWCETT, ASSISTANT ARCHIVIST FOR PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION; CELIA VIGGO WEXLER, VICE PRESIDENT OF ADVOCACY, COMMON CAUSE; SHEILA KRUMHOLZ, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR RESPONSIVE POLITICS PAGE 12 STATEMENT OF SHARON FAWCETT PAGE 12 STATEMENT OF CELIA WEXLER PAGE 19 STATEMENT OF SHEILA KRUMHOLZ PAGE 24

********************** INDEX OF INSERTS ******************* ******* INSERT ******* PAGE 5 ******* INSERT ******* PAGE 8 ******* INSERT ******* PAGE 10 ******* INSERT ****** PAGE 17 ******* INSERT ******* PAGE 22 ******* INSERT ******* PAGE 28

3