Every month since February 1987 the Olympia Fellowship of Reconciliation has produced one-hour TV programs on issues related to peace, social justice, economics, the environment, and nonviolent social change. We especially provide opportunities for the public to hear voices and viewpoints that are rarely heard in mainstream media.

The Olympia FOR’s program airs several times every week (currently every Monday at 1:30 pm, every Wednesday at 5:00 pm, and every Thursday at 9:00 pm) for the entire month on Thurston Community Television (TCTV), channel 22 for Thurston County’s cable TV subscribers. You can see TCTV’s current schedule at [**www.tctv.net**](http://www.tctv.net).

You can also watch the program described below (**and more than 160 of our previous monthly interview programs and also many special programs** at the Olympia FOR’s website, [**www.olympiafor.org**](http://www.olympiafor.org). Simply click the **“TV programs”** link, scroll down, and click the program you want to watch. Many of our website’s TV program listings also include links to documents summarizing the program in Word and/or .pdf format.

**November 2009**

**“Voter-Owned Elections: Replace Special Interests’ Big-Money Financing.”**

**This is necessary in order to really solve our nation’s health care crisis.**

**🡪 This interview occurred BEFORE Obama’s ACA passed in 2010. We discuss the issues, not the ACA.**

🡪 The thorough summary below includes much relevant information that we did not have time to say during the interview, so this summary is intended to be an information resource rather than a transcript.

🡪 Please invite more people to watch this interview and/or read the thorough summary (which you’re reading now) at the “TV Programs” part of [**www.olympiafor.org**](http://www.olympiafor.org).

🡪 See sources of information near the end of this document.

by Glen Anderson, this TV series’ producer and host

**Our November 2009 program focuses on how big money has corrupted our elections, so we need to empower voters to replace the “special interests” that fund our elections.**

**As a case study about this, we pay special attention to our grossly inadequate health care system. Universal Single-Payer would be a much better alternative to our current system, but insurance and pharmaceutical companies pay big money to political candidates in order to prevent the government from replacing our current bad system with a great alternative.**

Americans pay **twice as much** per capita for health care as the average in other modern industrial nations, but the World Health Organization ranks us **only 37th** in health outcomes. Our life expectancy is **only 42nd**.

**Why the disparity between cost and results?**

**Other nations designed their health care systems to produce good health. The US system is designed to produce big profits for insurance, pharmaceutical and hospital companies.**

“Single-payer” – essentially “Medicare for everybody” – would replace health insurance companies with a streamlined solution. Medicare’s administrative overhead costs only about 3% but private insurance companies waste about 25% on administrative overhead. **Single-payer’s savings would be enough to provide health care for everyone who lacks it now.**

But insurance companies have been bribing Congress through many millions of dollars in campaign contributions, so Congress is more responsive to big business than to the American people.

Therefore, the bills moving through both the House and Senate offer only weak protections for public health but strong profits for insurance companies.

The insurance companies’ massive donations to politicians make the health care crisis is **a “teachable moment”** for **why we need campaign finance reform**.

**The Olympia Fellowship of Reconciliation’s November 2009 TV interview explores the relationships between health care reform and campaign finance reform.**

**The problems are closely linked.**

**And so are the solutions.**

**If we would reform our corrupt and inefficient campaign financing system, we could reform our unjust and inefficient health care system.**

Two guests shared their knowledge and insights with us:

* **Craig Salins** is very active with Washington Public Campaigns, which works to strengthen democracy through public financing of electoral campaigns. (We taped this program in 2009. In 2014 this organization changed its name to Fix Democracy First, [**www.fixdemocracyfirst.org**](http://www.fixdemocracyfirst.org)).
* **Dr. David Baughan** is very active with Health Care for All – Washington, a savvy statewide organization working for universal single-payer health care. See [**www.healthcareforallwa.org**](http://www.healthcareforallwa.org).

**We started the interview by discussing some problems with our current way of privately
financing election campaigns.**

Craig said our current system costs all of us because it skews public policy decisions on such items as the cost of energy, and banking regulation, and health care reform. Looking at the big picture, the power and undue influence of Wall Street has brought about deregulation of the financial sector, which arguably led to the current national economic malaise, with rising unemployment, millions of jobs lost, and then the banking bailouts.

The costs of corrupt election financing get passed along to all of us.

Instead, public financing of campaigns is actually a good deal from the point of view of cost: Over the long haul, we'd save money by curtailing the influence of special interests, who otherwise skew public policy at the expense of Main Street voters and taxpayers.)

In Maine, where now 83% of the state legislators have run and been elected through that state's Clean Elections program, the legislature was one of the first in the nation to stare down the pharmaceutical lobby, to lower the cost of prescription drugs for all residents of Maine. They also enacted tough laws to discourage teenage smoking, and closed other tax loopholes that had been costing taxpayers in Maine a lot of money.

David said that he has met with Congressman Jim McDermott, who has criticized the two-year campaign cycle. As soon as Congress members get elected they need to start raising money for the next election two years away. McDermott and others would rather devote their time and energies to solving public problems rather than raising money for the next election. The continuous fundraising chores distract politicians from their real work because it focuses on short-term fundraising rather than long-term problem-solving.

Glen mentioned that a winning campaign for US Senate costs nearly $10 million. A successful candidate must raise more than $27,000 every day of the campaign year. He asked, “Why isn’t a big contribution to a politician’s campaign not considered a bribe?”

**We discussed a great solution: public financing of “clean elections.”**

In contrast with financing election campaigns with private money – including huge contributions from special interests – many people are calling for an option of prohibiting private financing and replacing it with public funding so election campaigns will be “clean.” People are calling the public option “clean elections” or “voter-owned elections.” Craig discussed (1) The principles of clean elections; (2) Why we need clean elections; (3) How public funding is working in other places.

Craig has worked for several years with the statewide non-profit organization WashClean - Washington Public Campaigns. He explained other aspects of how public financing could allow for “Clean Elections” – “Voter-Owned Elections.”

**We discussed Big Money’s role in our current health care mess – and how publicly funded elections could help solve the problem.**

David has studied the role of big money in our health care mess. **Much of the money we spend for health care does not really buy us any health care services. Instead, our money is going to:**

- Health insurance administration: $300 billion

- Denial management: $20 billion

- Drug company marketing: $30 billion

- Lobbying by drug and insurance companies: $2.2 billion

- Drug companies’ campaign contributions: $19 million (2006)

- Executive incomes (versus lowest-paid employees): 2000:1 in the private insurance system versus 15:1 in the Medicare system

David said 30% of insurance claims are denied the first submission.  The insurance companies – and subsequently the providers – must pay personnel, train them in seminars, and buy software to play a game of “deny-and-appeal-the-denial.”

He said 35% of drug companies’ budgets go to marketing, more than twice the 14% that goes to Research & Development (R&D). The marketing is successful in selling more expensive drugs that don't work better than less expensive drugs.

He said the huge lobbying and contributions figures are from 2006, BEFORE the current health initiatives had been introduced in congress.  There are reports of $1.4 million dollars a day spent by insurance companies on lobbying and political advertising.   The lobbying and campaign contributions are successful in protecting the income and the profits.

The ratio between the highest income and the lowest income in a for-profit insurance company is 2000:1.  In the Medicare system 15:1.  Are the skills and experience that much different?

David and Glen each showed graphs. David’s showed where the money goes that doesn’t go into health care. Glen’s showed the “Top 10 CEO Salaries (Health Care Companies).”

**How much are we paying for health care? And where is the money coming from?**

- $2.4 TRILLION PER YEAR

- 16.6% OF Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the total amount of the U.S.’s economic activity

- 60% ALREADY PAID BY PUBLIC FUNDS (Medicare, Medicaid, Veterans Administration, etc.)

- 20% OUT-OF-POCKET

- 20% EMPLOYERS

**We are already paying more per capita from public funds than most countries with national health plans spend.**

David pointed out that because public funds are paying for the most expensive patients (elderly, disabled and poor) in a fee-for-service manner, they exert no cost controls.  The government does not negotiate with drug companies.  They set fees for hospitals for each service but not for a global budget to care for predictable health expenses.

For example, Olympia’s privately owned for-profit hospital, the Capital Medical Center, wants to start doing coronary by-pass surgery.  Olympia’s other hospital, St. Peter’s, already does that. Having two hospitals doing these procedures in a town the size of Olympia will not drive down the cost of the procedure. Instead, it will drive up the pressure to do more procedures in marginal cases.  Two cardiac suites and Intensive Care Units (ICUs) will be more expensive than one.  We know by epidemiological data how many will need to be done in this area.  If we had a global budget, we could spend the money more carefully to achieve that goal.  Just like in campaign finance reform, if we created a global budget for the cost of informing the public about the candidates, we would spend much less than in the open-ended system we have now.  Imagine how much money we could spend on improving health care if we didn't spend so much on elections!

**We discussed other problems in our current health care mess, some solutions, and what Congress is doing.**

Nowadays there is more discussion now about how to finance health care differently instead of just “fee for service” or “procedure-by-procedure.” The “for-profit” HMO model was so bad that the “capitation” system got a bad name. Medicare is doing some work on risk adjustment that uses quality markers to reimburse doctors better for better quality care and efficiency. This is better than traditional indemnity insurance plans. The reimbursement mechanism needs to shift away from the assembly-line model. A new quality model will help to economize and finance it. The insurance industry has not been fostering it.

Some people in Congress have been proposing good solutions; others have been proposing legislation that would make things worse.

**The real solution is Universal Single-Payer health care. It would solve the problems.**

A step in the right direction would be to move toward prospective health care on regional basis, rather than cottage industry geared toward generating revenue for itself. A public system could do this.

David explained why **the single-payer solution** is better than what President Obama called for on September 9, 2009, and better than what is emerging now from Congress. He explained how those proposals fall short, and he explained how the single-payer solution would solve the problems in our current health care mess. We might think of it as “Medicare for everyone.” Perhaps Congress could simply reduce the age for eligibility for Medicare – and also include children first.

**We rebutted the arguments against single-payer.**

Some people have raised arguments against a single-payer solution. We noted some objections that people have raised, and we pointed out how those objections are not valid.

Sometimes people complain about “long waiting lines” in single-payer systems, but actually URGENT things (heart attacks, injuries, etc.) are treated immediately. Some things that can wait might need to wait a few weeks, as happens now with our current system. Also, single-payer is fair to everyone, whereas now people who do not have insurance do not get adequate health care.

Other countries deal with the issue of how to pay for chronic care when people age. No country has solved the problem entirely. In the US the insurance companies make people wait.

Glen mentioned a friend who earned very little money on her job and had no health insurance, so she had to wait more than a year to get help with a molar that needed dental surgery.

“Government takeover” is a fear slogan.

Why blame government for solving health problems? Big corporations – including insurance companies – screw up a lot. Actually, Medicare has a good track record. In the past 20 years the Veterans Administration has improved quality very much to become better than private health care providers.

Think about accountability. Who sets drug prices? In our current system, are the insurance companies or drug companies really accountable to you? How much better it would be to have elected officials accountable at the ballot box!

In the US people get hung up on philosophy about “free market” ideology, but in other countries people approach the health care issue with practical, “can-do” approaches, which the US used to do (“Yankee ingenuity”). Other countries do social experiments very well. We should look at the evidence of actual health care results, not just the political ideology in the abstract.

**Health care reform is the “poster child” crying for campaign finance reform.**

We “connected the dots” in the relationship between the two problems we’ve been talking about – health care reform and campaign finance reform.

The health care mess – and Congress’s feeble attempts to grapple with it – is the “poster child” for how big campaign money prevents Congress from serving the public. Big campaign donations are twisting Congress to support special interests instead of the broad public interest.

**Big money corrupts elections and interferes with creating a good health care system.**

David provided more information about how big money is a problem in our health care system. He shared information about the huge amounts of money the health care industry and related special interests spend to influence Congress to shape “health care reform” bills to suit their financial interests rather than the broad public interest. In the first half of 2009, insurance companies and HMOs spent $126,430,438 on lobbying and campaign donations for Congress.

Glen showed a graphic: “Health Care Industry Influence in Congress -- Contributions and Lobbying in 2008.”

In 2008 health industry corporations spent more than $550 million no campaign donations and lobbying. $200 of this was by insurance companies. In mid-September 2009 the Public Campaign Action Fund reported that insurance and HMO companies had spent $126,430,438 in lobbying and campaign expenses in the first half of 2009.

The health care conversation gets skewed by the same money that funds campaigns. They try to frighten people about long waiting lines, etc.

The US House committees released their proposed legislation before the Senate Finance Committee did. Many people were disappointed by what the Finance Committee produced. We briefly discussed the role that health care industry money played in designing the legislation.

Big health care and pharmaceutical companies are watering down the health care legislation from something that would really help a lot of people for a fair price. What is emerging instead is something full of loopholes to push people into the arms of insurance companies with loopholes to protect those businesses at the expense of ordinary people and taxpayers.

Without the scary “fear” ads about health care reform, other countries enjoyed a mix of public health care system and private coverage for additional kinds of services. Those countries were proud of providing fair and competent coverage for everyone. Everyone had their choice of doctor.

David said the health care reform process shows powerfully why we need single-payer health care and public financing of election campaigns. When companies give doctors gifts, doctors are more likely to use that product – even if evidence-based studies show that those products are no more effective than other products. This is how the system functions. Likewise, the insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies fund the politicians. Again, this is how the system functions. Now that he works at Group Health (whose procedures prevent such corporate abuse) he sees the difference and is more likely to use generics than the heavily promoted brands.

**In the U.S. the “Fair Elections Now Act” would help.**

Craig explained the federal legislation that would allow for “clean elections” – the Fair Elections Now Act of 2009. This is S. 752 and H.R. 1826. This would allow clean elections. Congressman Adam Smith is a co-sponsor, but Brian Baird is not, as of mid-October 2009.

Craig summarized the bill and explained how it would work. He said we need to get more of our federal lawmakers to sign on as co-sponsors of the bill. In Congress, lawmakers can add their names as co-sponsors of a bill, anytime; there is no cutoff date, unlike the state legislature in Olympia, where there is a short time frame after a bill has been introduced, for members to add their co-sponsorship.

As of mid-October 2009, the only U.S. House members from Washington State who have signed on as co-sponsors of the Fair Elections Now Act are Representatives Jim McDermott and Adam Smith. Representative Brian Baird spoke favorably about it, at a recent town hall meeting he held on health care reform. But to date, he has not become an official co-sponsor of the bill. Local voters need to call his office or write him as soon as they hear about this, and ask him to co-sponsor the Fair Elections Now Act bill in the House – and ask him why he has not done so, so far, since he had spoken favorably about the concept in recent public meetings.

Congress should pass the Fair Elections Now Act. It has 90 co-sponsors, but it is very much an uphill climb. It can pass ONLY IF enough grassroots people apply enough political pressure.

**Big money tried to buy an election for Washington State Supreme Court Justices.**

Washington State had a bad experience in the 2006 election for Washington State’s Supreme Court Justices. Certain special interests tried to buy the election by pumping $1.46 million directly into the campaigns for certain candidates, and they spent an additional $2.73 million on other efforts to influence voters.

Craig and others responded at that time by saying “Justice should NOT be for sale!”

Courts make important decisions, so courts must be clean with no bias and no appearance of favoritism.

We discussed state legislation called the “Supreme Court Fair Elections” bill. It would enact a law for public funding of State Supreme Court elections. Craig summarized it. HB 1738 has 33 co-sponsors, and SB 5912 has 9 co-sponsors. It was introduced in the 2009 session and will still be alive in the 2010 session. We need to promote this bill when the Legislature convenes again in January 2010.

In West Virginia a state judge was elected after the owner of a mining company spent $3 million to help that candidate’s campaign. When that candidate was elected judge, he voted in a 3-to-2 decision, to absolve the mining company of a $50 million judgment that had been awarded by a lower-court jury, and appealed to this judge’s court. What corruption!

Over a 14-year period Louisiana’s Supreme Court justices ruled in favor of litigants who had contributed to their campaigns. Research showed that the size of the campaign contributions affected some judges’ decisions.

Clean judicial elections have occurred in North Carolina since 2002, and also in New Mexico.

**The “Local Option Law” in Washington State would be one good remedy.**

Another reform is called the “Local Option.” In 2008 Washington Public Campaigns led the way in persuading the Washington State legislature to pass the Local Option Law. Craig explained it.

Seattle is considering a Voter-Owned Elections program to strengthen democracy there, so people can reclaim their City Council elections from the extremely wealthy people who finance some campaigns now. It would enable people to run for City Council even if they are not rich and don’t have rich friends.

**Other localities, states and nations want to enjoy “clean” elections with public financing.**

The March 2007 TV program of the Olympia Fellowship of Reconciliation was all about clean elections. At that time we focused on two states – Maine and Arizona – that were successfully using public financing for statewide election campaigns. Now about seven states are using various kinds of public financing. We discussed progress in these and other states. About seven states currently have some kind of public financing. When we did our program 2 ½ years ago, only two states had it.

Maine and Arizona have been using public financing for a number of years. More recently New Jersey, Connecticut and other states have been using it.

Clean judicial elections have occurred in North Carolina since 2002, and also in New Mexico.

Many other nations have shorter election campaign seasons and much smaller spending for election campaigns, so they do not need to rely on corporations’ deep pockets.

Other countries with better public funding for health care, they did not get misled by the scary “fear” ads that frighten and confuse Americans about health care reform. Other nations cover everyone’s health care needs and allow additional private spending if people want health services that are not really necessary. Those nations are proud to provide fair and competent coverage for everyone. Everyone had their choice of doctor.

Change often happens at local and state level before national level politicians will consider it. This is a smart way to move toward reforming health care (states first before Congress and a president would take it seriously) and reforming campaign funding at the city, county and state levels first.

**We rebutted the arguments against public funding for campaigns.**

Some people have raised arguments against public funding of campaigns. We provided solid answers that rebut those arguments.

While some people are concerned about increasing governmental spending, actually taxpayers would SAVE when governments adopt laws and policies free from the corruption and waste that occur when big donors have undue influence over governments. Unnecessary tax breaks, pork-barrel spending, and other abuses cost taxpayers more than what public campaign financing would cost.

The wealthy entities and individuals want to maintain the current system that enriches them. Money flows in, so favors flow out. So any democratizing influence, transferring influence and power to the general voter, means curtailing the unjust influence by the rich entities and individuals who have it now and exploit the rest of us.

The existing legislators also are used to the system we have now. So even if they don't fully like it or prefer it, it’s a known quantity. They know how to put on fundraisers and how to “dial for dollars.” And further, in some cases, sitting legislators who have a following, and who have financial backers, don't necessarily want to create a system where it would be easier for challengers to mount a competitive campaign against them.

All of this opposition is particularly strong at the federal level, where campaigns are much more expensive, and where “players” – lobbyists and their clients – are concerned to keep the system of access and influence the way it is now. This is true even if many members of Congress don’t really like spending time dialing for dollars, or putting the hand on the arm of lobbyists and their clients. Whether you call it extortion (by lawmakers and candidates for election/re-election), or bribery (by powerful interests, seeking access and influence), it's a dirty business.

**A great non-profit organization is Washington Public Campaigns. (Note: In 2014 they changed their name to Fix Democracy First,** [**www.fixdemocracyfirst.org**](http://www.fixdemocracyfirst.org)**)**

The main organization in Washington State working to reform campaign spending is Washington Public Campaigns. Craig explained what Washington Public Campaigns has accomplished – and what the organization is working on now. A recent accomplishment was passing the Local Options bill in 2008.

When we produced this program in 2009 Washington Public Campaigns was at (206) 784-2522 [**www.washclean.org**](http://www.washclean.org) Now since 2014 the organization has been Fix Democracy First, (206) 395-2678 or toll-Free (877) 677-7475 [**www.fixdemocracyfirst.org**](http://www.fixdemocracyfirst.org)

**Health Care for All – Washington works intelligently and vigorously for Universal Single-Payer health care in Washington State.**

David explained the work of the excellent statewide single-payer organization, Health Care for All – Washington.

We invite people to contact them at (206) 323-3393 or toll-free (877) 903-9723 Their informative website is [**www.healthcareforallwa.org**](http://www.healthcareforallwa.org)

**The strategic alliance of working together for meaningful health care reform and meaningful campaign finance reform**

Many people see the relationship between the uphill struggles to reform BOTH our health care system and our campaign finance system. The organizations that our two TV guests represent have formed a strategic alliance for this purpose. We discussed that.

Health care reform needs single-payer financing in order to stop corruption and improve efficiency. When companies give doctors gifts, doctors are more likely to use that product – even if evidence-based studies show that those products are no more effective than other products. In the same way, insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies fund the politicians and distort the political process too.

In 2008 health industry corporations spent more than $550 million on campaign donations and lobbying. $200 of this was by insurance companies.

The health care crisis and the national conversation about reforming our health care system makes this a TEACHABLE MOMENT for discussing campaign finance reform too.

**Other issues besides health care also need campaign finance reform. Let’s connect those dots and work together.**

Craig has previously stated, “Money trumps good policy every time.” He explained this insight.

The public needs to deal with a number of crucial, urgent issue, including health care, Wall Street, wasteful military weapons, environment, climate, energy issues, and more.

Craig said, “Scratch any issue – energy, health care, environment, decisions about taxes and budgets – and you’ll find that special interest money is calling the shots.” He explained this too.

People want to “trim the fat” from legislation, but actually the “fat” has staying power precisely because big corporations profit from that fat.

Other electoral reforms that would strengthen democracy include proportionate representation and Instant Run-off Voting (also called Ranked-Choice Voting).

Reforming campaign finance is a gateway issue. This is crucial in order to allow us to make progress on many other crucial issues. Whatever our other high priority issues may be, we need to recognize that progress on those issues is blocked by our corrupt, ineffective system of financing electoral campaigns. We must reform election campaign financing in order to make progress on our other high priority issues. Therefore, this needs to share top priority with our other issues.

**U.S. Supreme Court is considering the “*Citizens United*” case about big money donations.**

When we conducted this interview the U.S. Supreme Court had not yet ruled on the pending *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, but the Court seemed very eager to rule on that. We discussed this case.

*Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* could open the floodgates for **unlimited direct spending** by big corporations – overturning 100 years of limitations! Two previous cases had protected some laws regulating campaign financing, but the US Supreme Court invited arguments that seem to suggest that the Supreme Court wants to turn things wide open.

**Where could people get more information?**

When we produced this program in 2009 we featured Washington Public Campaigns. In 2014 the organization changed its name and contact information to **Fix Democracy First**, (206) 395-2678 or toll-free (877) 677-7475 [**www.fixdemocracyfirst.org**](http://www.fixdemocracyfirst.org)

The other great organization we featured is **Health Care for All – Washington**. They are at (206) 323-3393 or toll-free (877) 903-9723 [**www.healthcareforallwa.org**](http://www.healthcareforallwa.org)

**How could people help?**

We discussed some ways that ordinary people could help make meaningful reform for health care and campaign finance reform.

We can get clean elections in Congress by getting local lawmakers to work vigorously for serious reform legislation.

We can urge the Washington State Legislature to support the Judicial bill in 2010.

We can urge people to understand that reforming campaign financing is crucial in order to make progress on the other issues we care about. We can urge people to help the volunteers and organizations working on other issues to make campaign finance reform a strategically smart step toward making progress on their key issues. Let’s help people recognize campaign finance reform as a gateway issue.

**Closing encouragement**

Craig Salins and Dr. David Baughan offered closing thoughts.

Glen Anderson thanked both guests – and thanked the viewers for having watched.

In light of what we have heard during this TV program, it is no surprise that Americans pay **twice as much** per capita for health care as the average in other modern industrial nations, but the World Health Organization ranks us **only 37th** in health outcomes.

Other nations designed their health care systems to produce good health. The US system is designed to produce big profits for insurance, pharmaceutical and hospital companies.

“Single-payer” – essentially “Medicare for everybody” – would replace health insurance companies with a streamlined solution.

But insurance companies have bribed Congress through many millions of dollars in campaign contributions, so Congress is more responsive to big business than to the American people.

Therefore, the bills moving through both the House and Senate offer only weak protections for public health but strong profits for insurance companies.

**Likewise, big business contributions to political candidates are blocking progress on many other crucial issues. Oil companies prevent serious climate protection. Banks prevent serious financial reform. Polluters continue ruining our environment. Agribusiness interfere with food safety and environmentally sustainable farming.**

Big money contributions to candidates are legal bribery. A real solution would be optional public financing for candidates who choose to run “clean” campaigns without big donations from special interests.

The Fair Elections Now Act (HR 1826) would allow clean elections. Congressman Adam Smith is a co-sponsor, but as of mid-October 2009 when we taped this program, Brian Baird is not.

The insurance companies’ massive donations to politicians makes the health care crisis is **a “teachable moment”** for why we need campaign finance reform.

How do we want our elected officials to spend their time? Representing us or raising money from fat cats?

Fortunately, non-profit organizations such as Washington Public Campaigns and Health Care for All – Washington are working hard, and we have volunteers right here in our local community.

Please do what you can to help protect the American people’s health and our democracy.

For information about a variety of issues related to peace, social justice and nonviolence, call the Olympia Fellowship of Reconciliation at (360) 491-9093 or visit **www.olympiafor.org**

We're all one human family, and we all share one planet.

We can create a better world, but we all have to work at it.

The world needs you! You can help!