

BILL TOWNSEND

Our New Voice in Congress

P O L I C Y O V E R V I E W

TAXES & THE REPUBLICANS

If you don't believe and fight for basic principles of fairness, of what it means to be an American, and you can't agree to work with people on both sides of the aisle, to do what is right for the Country, you probably shouldn't be elected into a position to effect change.

In 1960, the marginal tax rate for those earning \$1.5-\$3 million (in today's dollars) was 91%. The top 1% of households earned 9% of all income, and paid 13% of all taxes

Today, the top 1 percent of earners (incomes in excess of \$615,000) are paying nearly half of income taxes: 45.7%, not because they're taxed too high, but because they earn the majority of income, rising from 9% to a current 20%. Nearly 1/5 of every dollar earned in America today now goes to the top 1%.

Two decades ago, when Bill Clinton was elected president, the 400 highest-earning taxpayers in America paid nearly 27 percent of their income in federal taxes, according to I.R.S. data. By 2012, when President Obama was re-elected, that figure had fallen to less than 17 percent. That's a 10% tax cut for the wealthiest while the middle class saw their standard of living fall.

It's more visible when looked at this way:

1960	Eisenhower	91%
1993	Clinton	27%
2012	Obama	17%
2018	Trump	?

In 2018, the Forbes 400 own more wealth than the bottom 61 percent of the country combined, a staggering 194 million people.

Wealth inequality is widening sharply partly because the rate of return on capital has historically outpaced the rate of economic growth, allowing those with the ability to access

capital-the rich-to gain increasing share of a country's wealth.

If the bulk of that money had been paid out as salary or wages, instead of investment income, as it is for the typical American, the tax obligations of those wealthy taxpayers could have more than doubled, providing funding for critical infrastructure, school safety, education, and social network programs.

The Republican tax plan that was recently passed was supposed to provide tax relief for the middle class and below. It does. But it's not permanent and it gave too much away to the wealthy who are the very people who needed the tax cut the least.

As an example: if I sold my companies for what they are currently valued, I would make \$134,000,000 and I'd pay long-term capital gains tax of either 15% or 20% tax to the IRS. I could walk away with \$107 to \$114 million dollars. Payday! Ka-ching! I could retire and spend my time in a casino playing blackjack and slots. But is it fair? I don't believe so. And yes, this is a very UN-Republican thing to say, but it is what I think. Those who receive the most income as a percentage of their standing (households) in the community, should pay more in taxes.

Here's an idea I have long believed in and, as your voice in Congress I will work to introduce and pass: If you make more than \$25 million a year, regardless of how it is earned, you pay a flat 33% tax on that income above \$25 million with no deductions allowed, no means to ship the funds offshore and then have them reinvested, no "carry interest" provisions for lower tax rates for Wall Street money manag-

ers. We keep it simple and thus make it extremely difficult for lawyers and accountants to hide the money: any income over \$25 million, regardless of source, is taxed at 33%.

What would that do to my sale of companies? Instead of paying \$20 to \$26 million in taxes under the new tax law, I'd pay \$44.2 million in taxes, nearly double. Would I care? No! I'd still be taking home nearly \$90,000,000. This is fair. Besides, I believe the Bible verse is correct: **“For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required,”** Luke 12:48 KJV.

Would Bill Gates, Warren Buffett, Jeff Bezos, Abigail Disney, Ben Cohen, or the 200 millionaires who signed the Patriotic Millionaires pledge care? No. They want to pay more, even encouraging Congress to not lower tax rates for millionaires.

Companies are built on the backs of everyday people who commit to work 2,000 hours a year and have to pay more in tax than current long-term capital gains investors do. Why should a single mother of two who lives in Pahrump and makes \$45,000 a year have to pay more as a percentage of her total income than a rich banker from New York City or Los Angeles, San Francisco, or Miami? She shouldn't. Those who can afford to pay more should and this proposal would ensure that occurs.

This proposal would also likely lead to the wealthy investing their income into new businesses or expanding their businesses, a positive move to create more jobs in America.

In addition, since Family Offices, the entities that manage the billions of dollars in family wealth (think Rockefellers, Fords, Mellons, Soros, etc.) are some of the most blatant tax dodgers, all Family Offices should be required to register with the SEC in the same manner Hedge Funds do. Lobbying against this idea was successful in 2009 and it allowed people like George Soros to take his \$24.5 billion hedge fund and take advantage of it, converting to a family office after returning capital to its remaining outside investors. The hedge fund manager Stanley Druckenmiller, a former business partner of Mr. Soros, took the same step. As your voice in Congress, I'll work to close this unfair loophole.

“But Bill,” you say, “that's un-American. That's un-Republican. That's un-fair.” Is it? We don't build companies purely on our own. We are able to grow companies based on what our country has provided: the interstate highway system, utilities, the US Postal Service, the Internet, etc. When someone tells me that asking the more fortunate among us to contribute more to our country is unfair, I politely remind them that without the infrastructure that government provides, much

of the wealth created in America over the past 40 years would have never occurred.

I'm all for lowering corporate income taxes as President Trump promised and delivered on, but I'm also very interested in lowering personal income taxes on those making under \$100,000 a year for singles and \$150,000 for married couples (which would end the disastrous “marriage penalty”), and potentially finding ways to eliminate federal taxes altogether for those making under \$50,000 a year.

I believe in focusing our efforts on putting more money back into the pockets of 93% of Americans. The other 7% can take care of themselves.

The media reports Americans in the middle of the income zone will get an \$840 tax break in 2019, but this shrinks to just \$40 by 2027. One of the President's spokespeople said on Good Morning America, “We have also said that wealthy Americans are not getting the tax cut.” This is simply not true. The top 0.1% will get an average cut of \$62,000 in 2019 increasing to \$182,000 in 2027. Is this fair? No. That's why I plan to address it as your representative in Congress.

My opponents in this race will likely pull this section off my website and scream, “*He wants to raise taxes!*” **but you know the truth.** I am going to stand against any increase in income taxes for those making less than \$100,000 a year. I want those fortunate enough to make more than \$25 million a year to pay more so those making less than \$100,000 a year can pay less. Don't you agree that is a step in the right direction to help middle and lower income families?

Another tax change I'd like to see is a minimum corporate tax. A new analysis of 258 profitable Fortune 500 companies that earned more than \$3.8 trillion in profits showed that although the top corporate rate was 35 percent, hardly any company actually paid that. The report, by the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, found that 100 of them—nearly 40 percent—paid no taxes in at least one year between 2008 and 2015. Eighteen, including General Electric, International Paper, Priceline.com and PG&E, incurred a total federal income tax bill of less than zero over the entire eight-year period: meaning they received rebates. The institute used the companies' own regulatory filings to compute their tax rates.

The answer? Congress should institute a minimum corporate tax of 10% to be paid by every corporation on gross sales and that this minimum tax not be subject to any types of deductions whatsoever. If you set in place a minimum corporate tax, along with the generous cuts in corporate tax rate that the recent Republican bill provides, we can increase revenues

to the Federal government while ensuring all corporations pay some level of taxes on their revenue. For a behemoth like GE, which had \$115 BILLION in revenue in 2015 to have paid zero in corporate taxes is unconscionable. I doubt these corporate tax benefits were available to small businesses in Ely, North Las Vegas, Tonopah, Coaldale, Hawthorne, and Pahrump. Again, this is not un-Republican or un-capitalism, this is about fairness being applied to all corporations operating across the United States.

I've been accused of not being a conservative enough Republican. If making taxes fair to all Americans makes me not conservative enough, then so be it. I believe in doing what is right.

The wealthy can take care of themselves. They will reinvest in their companies or postpone selling so they can earn more. They have the means to figure out how to move assets around to avoid taxes. My plan stops this and makes those whom much is given, step up to the plate and pay their share. George Soros be damned! He can pay more in Federal taxes, just as I could, and he should be happy to do so for the privilege of working in a country that offers him the ability to earn what he does.

Does this make me a bad Republican or someone who is fiscally conservative and socially responsible? I'll let you decide.

This leads me to the second part of this policy position: the Republican Party.

I identify strongly with the Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln which is quite different from the Republican Party of today. As your voice in Congress, I hope to be able to influence the Republicans to return to their roots; to focus on fiscal responsibility; to expect more from every taxpayer dollar spent; to hold government managers, employees and contractors accountable to the American public; and to seek compromise across party lines in order to advance the needs of Nevadans and all Americans. And I hope to convince the Democrats to put the interests of American citizens first, and especially before those who have entered our country illegally or overstayed their visas.

Bipartisanship must be returned to Washington, DC. This doesn't mean you give up your morals and it doesn't mean you are what some call a RINO (Republican In Name Only). It means you are focused on getting results, and isn't that what we all want? Yes, of course it is.

The Republican Party at its founding was the party of business owners. Until the past 30 years, it has continued to be the party that represents the owners of industrial-America's

factories—the people who make things, who build America's infrastructure, who create jobs so all Americans can prosper. As those owners moved their wealth to Wall Street and multinationals, the Republican Party stayed locked to it. I always felt this was wrong. I don't believe Wall Street bankers should be benefiting from special tax programs as they do from pushing paper around. Wall Street does have a place for businesses to be able to access capital and raise money to operate (with very little going to small business startups where the majority of new jobs are created), but other than that, how does it impact what we do day to day? Wall Street doesn't actually build anything and it doesn't create jobs for people living in Clark, Lyon, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Mineral, Nye, and White Pine counties. Wall Street doesn't act in the best interest of you and me. It acts in self-interest. It acts in ways that game the investing world so they earn their fees and get paid millions of dollars. Wall Street's greed is what has led to the past housing mortgage problems, massive drops in the stock market (and your retirement savings plans, although to be fair, most retirement plans have increased in value since President Trump focused on cutting burdensome regulations), and wild speculation that the inside guys make money off.

How can a man or woman in Nevada, working 40 or 60 hours a week, earning perhaps \$40,000 a year, compete with a banker in New York City who has millions of dollars in investment software at his fingertips, connected to millions of dollars in computer hardware and able to execute trades at milliseconds? She can't. On top of this, Congress has given Wall Street bankers who are otherwise known as Hedge Fund managers, a sweetheart tax deal. Their income is taxed at 20% no matter how much they make. That's not fair. This is just one example of where the Republican and Democrat Parties have failed the typical American voter.

On social-issues I am more moderate than some Republicans and more conservative than most Democrats. I'd say I am right where I need to be, much as Abraham Lincoln was. I believe in giving companies a fair playing field in the global economy. I believe in supporting workers rights. I believe in helping those less fortunate with a hand up. I believe in ensuring every child in our country, no matter if their parents make \$250,000 or their single mom makes \$25,000 should have equal opportunities for education, healthy school lunches, and great medical care. I believe, like many of you, that most Americans want the same things.

In the Lincoln days, most industrial activities took place in the Northeastern US. America was still largely an agricultural country. Representing those same interests was radical in 1860 (anti-slavery, defend America's weak industries with

tariffs). Lincoln backed public funding of infrastructure projects, something many Republicans of the past have been against.

The Republican Party at its founding was the party of the hard workers, of social change, of greater acceptance for more people (anti-slavery, women's suffrage).

Let me restate this. The Republican Party of old was focused on:

- Supporting businesses
- Defending America's weak industries from unfair foreign dumping
- Funding infrastructure
- Anti-Slavery
- Pro-women's rights
- Fighting for hardworking Americans

This turned completely around when the Southern Strategy (very much worth Googling), in response to Civil Rights, was introduced. The Democrats were more in favor of Civil Rights at the beginning of the 1960's than the Republicans, though back then the parties were much more mixed than today. The Southern Strategy locked the Republican Party into almost exactly the opposite of its original social position—and is the beginning of a shift in the underlying interests.

The Southern Strategy sorted the Republicans into largely a party built on the demographic of people opposed to Civil Rights, when it was founded on the opposite belief, a belief that All Men Are Created Equal. This is the first time since its founding that voters were really lined up by a social issue, instead of social issues floating on top of a foundation of pro-growth for all Americans. To win elections, the Party's leaders made alliances with anti-Civil Rights, rural, and religious-right groups that were used for votes, but the idea was to not give them any real power. This worked very well through the Reagan years, and broke the Democratic dominance since Franklin Delano Roosevelt. But in today's world, when we need to bridge the divides between parties, race, gender, it is outdated.

The Democrat Party didn't fare much better during the past 50-70 years. They are largely indistinguishable from the party of FDR. The Democrats were the more tradition-minded party. They were also the party focused on keeping taxes low and when it came to promoting commerce, etc., wanted to leave it to the states. Generally speaking, they were the "states' rights" party. An example of how they changed can be seen in the years Senator Harry Reid was head of the Senate.

During that time he could have easily persuaded the Federal government to turn over ownership of tens of millions of acres of Nevada land to the State of Nevada. The Republicans would have voted for it and we'd now be controlling our land instead of it being controlled by Washington, DC. And yet, he didn't do that because the Democrats of the past 30+ years do not believe in state's rights as they once did (for more on this, see "Nevada's Future" in our website's policy section).

While I don't believe this to be completely accurate as I know many moderate and conservative Democrats and Republicans (in fact, I truly believe most people are middle of the road), the Democrats have become known as the "liberals"—in favor of more federal action in general, less power to states, active government that attempts to solve problems or encourage outcomes and the Republicans have become known as "conservatives"—less enthusiastic about federal action in general except for military operations, wants more power given to states, more passive federal government that maintains a minimal footprint in social and economic affairs.

I was at a restaurant the other night and sitting next to me were two brothers, both in their late 50s. As we began talking I explained I was running for Congress and what my 12 Big Ideas for Nevada were. He looked at me and said, "I'm a Democrat, so I can't vote for you in the primary. I'm also a liberal, and I own guns and I support our military, so I can vote for you in the November election." I thanked him and asked if he was really a liberal or more of a Blue Dog Democrat—the kind made famous during Clinton's presidency. He laughed and said, "I was a Blue Dog until nobody cared to use that term so now I'm a liberal, even though maybe I'm not really far left liberal." We both had a good laugh and it speaks volumes to how most people feel about their political party.

The fact remains, both parties lost their focus on doing what is best for the American people because both moved too far from the center. Aren't most of us more aligned with common sense approaches which reside in the center than with far right or far left approaches? Sure, we have our key issues which may be on one side or another, but most problems have solutions that lay somewhere in the middle where compromise is possible.

Immigration is a big issue today and part of the challenge is that Republicans have traditionally wanted to keep immigration unchecked in order to provide low cost—cheap—labor for industrial farms and the corporations that own them. The Democrats welcome illegals because once here they tend to vote for their party. Therefore, why would anyone in Washington, DC be serious about securing our borders and

ensuring that when people do immigrate to America they learn what it means to be a citizen and they melt into the cultural fabric of our nation? They don't. We need to change this with immigration laws that assimilate foreigners to the way of America, belief in our Constitution, belief in our desires to hold jobs, raise families and contribute back to our communities.

Interestingly, (here we go...I can hear some Republican candidates screaming "*He is a Republican in name only...I'm the true conservative...elect me, not him!*") some of the other great Republican presidents are also looked down on by today's Republican Party.

Titans of government like **Teddy Roosevelt** (who broke up companies when they got too big) and **Dwight Eisenhower** (who raised taxes and increased government spending) also have been given short shrift in the Republican Party. A lot of people have noted that **Ronald Reagan** (an advocate for bipartisanship, a willingness to raise taxes when necessary, and a penchant for using military might as a way to avoid wars) would probably be considered too liberal to be the Republican nominee today.

Lincoln explicitly strongly approved of labor unions and "*a wage that allows a laborer to save and go on to start his own business.*" I believe this, as well.

Many people believe Lincoln was a war hawk, but he wasn't. He managed to keep the United States out of many potential conflicts. His view as the leader of the Republican Party was that the United States exhibit its exceptionalism by becoming an example of a democracy not by intervening into the affairs of other nations. This is also what I believe.

You may ask, "*why are you running as a Republican in Nevada, which is a largely Democrat state?*" The answer is simple. I believe our campaign's message appeals to the vast majority of Nevadans, and, as Abraham Lincoln did, that it is important to:

- Operate the Federal government for the benefit of American citizens;
- Spend the taxpayers' money frugally and with results in mind;
- Give power back to the States so local people can make decisions about their communities (and one of the reasons I will push for the Federal government to turn over much of their land in Nevada to Nevadans, with a program along the lines of the Alaska permanent Fund so all Nevadans benefit from OUR land).
- Empower women and push for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment;

- Ensure all Americans are treated equally under the law;
- Ensure American citizens have freedom of speech and religion;
- Protect American interests both foreign and domestic;
- Support the US Constitution and it's road map for American laws;
- Move away from divisiveness and toward bipartisanship; and,
- Bring back what the Founding Fathers intended us to have: public servants—people that work for the public good and do so with the understanding that serving is not meant to be a career, but an honor.

This last point is why I signed the U.S. Term Limits Amendment Pledge to cosponsor legislation to enact term limits for Members of Congress: 3 terms or 6 years for the House and 2 terms or 12 years for the Senate.

If I can't accomplish what I am proposing in my 2-year term, then I should be held accountable by the voters and not be re-elected. I'm smart enough to know that if I can't accomplish what I tell you I will do, perhaps someone else can...or worse, perhaps nobody can...but I will not let myself think that Washington, DC is irretrievably broken.

During an exchange with a Republican in Mesquite, who suggested that Abraham Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Ronald Reagan would no longer be welcome in the Republican party, I realized there is a disconnect between Republicans and Conservatives that actually hurts the Republican Party. Many conservatives really don't understand what the term means. That is why some conservatives accuse non-far right Republicans of being RINOs. The person I was speaking with was treating conservatism as an ideology of a political party; and it's not. They failed to understand that Republican and conservative are not necessarily the same, and that the Republican Party has many members who are committed to the principles of the party, which, if read alone, could be the principles of most every political party that cares about America. These principles include:

We believe in American exceptionalism.

We believe the United States of America is unlike any other nation on earth.

We believe America is exceptional because of our historic role — first as refuge, then as defender, and now as exemplar of liberty for the world to see.

We affirm — as did the Declaration of Independence: that all are created equal, endowed by their Creator with inalienable

rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We believe in the Constitution as our founding document.

We believe the Constitution was written not as a flexible document, but as our enduring covenant.

We believe our constitutional system — limited government, separation of powers, federalism, and the rights of the people — must be preserved uncompromised for future generations.

We believe political freedom and economic freedom are indivisible. When political freedom and economic freedom are separated — both are in peril; when united, they are invincible.

We believe that people are the ultimate resource — and that the people, not the government, are the best stewards of our country's God-given natural resources.

We wish for peace — so we insist on strength. We will make America safe. We seek friendship with all peoples and all nations, but we recognize and are prepared to deal with evil in the world.

Based on these principles, this platform is an invitation and a road map. It invites every American to join us and shows the path to a stronger, safer, and more prosperous America.

This platform is optimistic because the American people are optimistic.

This platform lays out — in clear language — the path to making America great and united again.

These are things all of us want. They're not just Republican ideals, but everybody's ideals.

During our discussion, we talked about how being a Republican means affiliation or membership to the Republican National Committee (RNC). The Republican Party is a private organization. A club or membership organization, if you would. The Party has a platform of issues it supports and not all are conservative in nature. Republicans are generally followers of the RNC's platform, and, like many Democrats, may not believe in all to which the Party stands.

For instance, "*We believe our constitutional system — limited government, separation of powers, federalism, and the rights of the people — must be preserved uncompromised for future generations*" is a popular statement, and well worth fighting for. However, many who consider themselves very conservative don't necessarily believe in the rights of the people and want government to not help those less fortunate or allow women access to contraception (as examples).

A conservative is one who believes and follows the principles of conservatism, usually rooted in their upbringing. Conservatism is not a club or membership. Conservatives espouse traditional values and ideas with opposition to change or innovation. They are often proponents of theologi-

cal conservatism, pushing their understanding of the Bible into their beliefs, and thus, onto others. Conservatives often believe in traditional natural rights and view political policies as intended to preserve order, justice, and freedom. Although Conservative principles can be economic, or social, at its core, it's a way of living.

Democrats and liberals have a similar difficulty in stating who they are. Until the 1980s, the Democratic Party was a coalition of two parties divided by the Mason–Dixon line: liberal Democrats in the North and culturally conservative voters in the South, who though benefiting from many of the New Deal public works projects opposed increasing civil rights initiatives advocated by their northern brethren.

True liberals, such as Senator Bernie Sanders or former Senator Barney Frank, lean toward socialism as a model for governing: a thinking that the government can take care of people better than people can. Moderate Democrats, like Bill Clinton and the late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, tend to focus on government's definition as a Republic and seek ways to strengthen working families and those in need.

Does being a true liberal as opposed to being a more moderate Democrat make you more effective or cause you to not care about the welfare of Americans? No. Does being a Republican or a true conservative make you more likely to shun helping those less fortunate? Not necessarily.

There is an informative website called the **Center for Effective Lawmaking**, supported in part by Vanderbilt University, University of Virginia, and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation (as in Hewlett-Packard). If you search the last year available, 2015-2016, you find the ranking of Nevada's Senators and House Members. In terms of effectiveness, Senator Dean Heller was ranked 17th out of 54 Republicans while Harry Reid was ranked 35th out of 44 Democrats. In the House, Dina Titus was ranked 72nd out of 193 Democrats and Mark Amodei was ranked 52nd, Joseph Heck was ranked 72nd, and Crescent Hardy was ranked 166th out of 250 Republicans.

Their **Legislative Effectiveness Score** is a measure of each person's ability and effectiveness in moving their agenda forward in Congress, from writing a bill to passing it into law. The average score for all members is 1.0, so if you score higher than 1.0 you are considered effective and if you score lower than 1.0 you are considered ineffective. (Actually, I don't like that word, so let's say they are considered not as effective as the average).

In Nevada's House of Representatives congregation, Amodei ranked at the top with a score of 1.956, followed by Heck at 1.647; both above 1.0. Below 1.0 were Hardy at 0.646 and

Titus at 0.579. In the Senate, Heller received a Legislative Effectiveness Score of 1.508 and Reid 0.306.

What does this tell us? Six different individuals with six different views ranging from liberal to moderate to conservative, Democrats and Republicans, ended up with vastly different results. This largely dispels the theory that only arch-conservative Republicans or left leaning liberal Democrats make effective members of Congress.

What it also reveals is that those who can manage the middle, who can create buy-in from others, who can write sound legislation that benefits the great majority of people, tend to be more effective public servants.

“We expect Congress to represent. We expect members to bring into the legislative process the views, needs and interests of their constituents; we expect the Congress as an institution to provide a forum where the interests and demands of all segments of society are expressed. But, while we want Congress to be a forum where the full range of views is expressed, we also want Congress to make decisions to pass laws. Congress should pass laws that reflect the will of the people; that is, Congress should be responsive to popular majorities. Congress should pass laws that deal promptly and effectively with pressing national problems. These two criteria, which can be labeled responsiveness and responsibility, are distinct. Only in a perfect world would what the majority wants always accord with what policy experts deem most likely to be effective.

“What are the skills members need for Congress to legislate effectively and are they the same skills that allow a member to get ahead within Congress? Congress has a large and complex workload; members must be willing to work hard and to develop expertise in some segment of it. Because members must make decisions even in areas in which they do not and cannot have expertise, being a quick study helps. Because decision making is a collective enterprise among relatively equal members who represent districts with different interests and have differing policy preferences, bargaining skills and the ability to work with others are essential (see Sinclair forthcoming). To function well, Congress needs members who understand the need for and have the skill to compromise; who are willing to be team players; who can fight for what they believe in without demonizing their opponents, thus making it possible to work with them on a different issue tomorrow.

“The contemporary Congress rewards smart, energetic, hard-working members with political bargaining skills. Members’ influence is much less dependent on seniority and more dependent on their own efforts than in the past. To

respond to their members’ demands for opportunities to participate actively in the legislative process and their own need to funnel that participation into channels that further party efforts, Democrat and Republican Party leaders have enlarged their whip systems, created task forces and working groups, expanded the leadership circle and activated their caucuses. This provides opportunities for the activist members who have the desire, stamina, and ability to take on many tasks and do them well to make a name for themselves quickly and get things done. Two great examples of this were Dick Gephardt’s work on task forces charged with passing major legislation and Newt Gingrich’s 100-day plan to rework government.

“The job we expect Congress to do is a complex one; it involves many components and tradeoffs. As a result, there are many niches for people with different skills, characteristics and strengths to contribute meaningfully. The committee specialist who develops real substantive expertise is critical to Congress maintaining its power in the political system. The generalist coordinator is just as necessary to make the institution work. Junior and mid-level activists serve a variety of important functions, usually as aides to the party leaders in party maintenance, coalition building and public relations. The issue or coalition leader, who speaks for a group or point of view, performs a significant representational function and may also contribute importantly to responsive lawmaking. The agenda setter, the visionary, even the ideologue have their place as well: they bring new ideas into the system; they give often small but intense constituencies a voice; and they remind their more flexible colleagues that at some point compromise does become selling out and it should be avoided.”

(Source: The Dirksen Congressional Center)

As you can see, whether you are a conservative or a liberal, a moderate or Blue Dog Democrat, doesn’t matter so much as whether you can push your agenda effectively through a chamber made up of 434 other Members, each with their own views on what is important for America and their districts. Therefore, ideas are often more important than ideological leanings; after all, one has to be able to come up with such a great idea that people of all walks of life, Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives, socialists, and independents, will also find the idea valid and want to be attached to it because it solves problems. And that, my friends, is how we can make a difference in Washington, DC.

Like many people I’ve spoken with across our great state, we expect the Federal government to provide a strong military, strong borders, safe schools, affordable health care, world-class education, and the ability for businesses to create good paying jobs.

We don't want our government telling us what we can and can't do with our money, how we raise our children, how we spend our free time.

We expect our government to enforce our laws, whether immigration, sanctuary cities, gun laws, money laundering, embezzlement, selling drugs, or others.

We don't want our government to lie to us.

We don't want it to sit idly by as illegal immigrants who have snuck into America and deported multiple times kill American citizens.

We want our Federal government to be responsive to our needs, frugal with our tax money, focused on improving our own ability to make a living and pursue our hopes for the American Dream.

At the end of the day, it doesn't matter which political party you are affiliated with; if you don't believe and fight for these basic principles of what it means to be an American, and you can't agree to work with people in both major political parties to do what is right for American citizens, you probably shouldn't be elected into a position to effect change to move our government's focus back to the important issues facing our nation.



Bill Townsend is a candidate for United States House of Representatives in Nevada's 4th Congressional District.

E-mail Bill at Bill@TownsendForNevada.com

To learn more about Bill Townsend's policies and our "12 Big Ideas for Nevada, please visit

www.TownsendForNevada.com

To download an Adobe PDF of this policy paper, please visit

www.TownsendForNevada.com/downloads