

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
1998-0004-F[1]

FOIA Number:
S

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential
Library Staff.**

Record Group/Collection:	George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin:	Chief of Staff, White House Office of
Series:	Sununu, John, Files
Subseries:	White House Offices Files

OA/ID Number:	29178
Folder ID Number:	29178-009

Folder Title:
Legislative Affairs (McClure) (1990) [1]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	15	25	5	2

Gins

195032

F. McChesney



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20515

NEWT GINGRICH
REPUBLICAN WHIP

11/21/90

To the President of the United States

Dear Mr. President,
Congratulations on the
Selection of Bill Bennett to be
Republican National Committee
Chairman. As a man of courage, intellect,
and articulation Bill has a lot of
Strengths to build on.

As you look toward the 1992
Campaign I would be eager to do
whatever I can to help with the
Party efforts. We have an opportunity
to win a striking victory in 1992
and all of us want to help achieve
that.

Again, congratulations on Bennett.
Your friend

Newt

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01. Memo	From Fred McClure to John Sununu Re: Signing Ceremonies [w/margin notes] (2 pp.)	11/8/90	P-3	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed:	12/14/2004	OA/ID Number:	29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #:	1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:	2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 8, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN SUNUNU

FROM:

FRED MCCLURE

Fm/RP

SUBJECT:

Signing Ceremonies

Per your request this morning, listed below is pending legislation which may merit a signing ceremony:

1. S. 1630

*suggested for
11/14 East Room*

Clean Air Act Amendments - The bill is now expected to arrive at the White House by next Tuesday. Although the President has already announced in California that he will sign the bill, we still think an actual signing ceremony is advisable. We understand that there are two alternatives under discussion (White House or Adirondacks). We believe a good event could be created at either site. It should be kept in mind that if the ceremony takes place at the White House, there are some steps which can be taken to minimize Congressional exposure (Members seated rather than on platform, etc.).

2. S. 566

*suggested
wk of 11/26*

National Affordable Housing Act - Because this legislation contains most of the President's HOPE initiatives, we think it is a good candidate for an event. Secretary Kemp has recommended a signing ceremony and a joint Holiday/McClure scheduling request has been submitted.

3. S. 2830

*no signing ceremony
preferred by
communications*

Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (Farm Bill) - Although the Farm Bill is not especially popular in the agriculture community, it does include substantial subsidy reforms, is perceived as being useful to breaking the farm subsidy deadlock in the GATT round, and would be a nice "thank-you" for Members of the Agriculture Committee. We would recommend a "scaled-down" ceremony. (see Yeutter memo attached)

4. S. 358

*suggested
wk of 26th*

Legal Immigration Bill - Considered a victory for the Administration; may be appropriate to combine with an ethnic event. If there is a choice between the Immigration and the Housing bills the week of November 26, we would recommend the Housing bill.

5. S. 3266

*minor oval
ceremony
preferred*

Crime Control Act of 1990 - As you know, the core of our crime package (habeas corpus, expanded death penalty, and exclusionary rule) was stripped out of the bill. However, the legislation does include some good provisions (S&L enforcement, anti-pornography, etc.) and we could use a signing ceremony as a forum to criticize Congressional Democrats for falling short, and to encourage the Hill to address these issues again early in the 102nd Congress.

6. S. 1430

*suggested
11/16 Rose Garden*

National and Community Service Act - Some have suggested a signing ceremony to highlight the "Point of Light Foundation" funding, etc.

7. S. 3176

*suggested
11/15 within
existing event for
Environmental
Education
Awards*

National Environmental Education Act - We understand Cabinet Affairs recommends a signing ceremony in connection with the Environmental Youth Awards to be held on Wednesday, November 14. We have not yet received this legislation, and may not receive it in time for the Wednesday event.

BOB DOLE
KANSAS

Brent/JS Handed to me at Senate dinner (11-13) by Dole
please discuss at am meeting

United States Senate

OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-7020

November 13, 1990

THE CHIEF of STAFF
has seen

The President
The White House
Washington

Dear Mr. President:

In follow-up to my letter of last Friday and our discussion today, enclosed are some concrete ideas about constructive actions that could be undertaken to make sure you remain clearly "out front" in the Persian Gulf crisis -- both substantively and politically.

I've checked a few of these items that I believe are worth your particular attention. Some of these ideas might be worth considering for tomorrow's Leadership Meeting; others could be follow-on steps for consideration/action down the road. Undoubtedly you and your staff will have many additional ideas.

I look forward to working closely with you, as the crisis in the Gulf unfolds.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE

IDEAS FOR LEADERSHIP MEETING WITH PRESIDENT

Essential strategy is to: (1) seize the PR initiative -- shape the debate; and (2) force the President's critics off the sidelines -- make them "put up, or shut up."

✓ o President invites Congressional leaders to accompany him on Thanksgiving trip to Saudi Arabia. One possibility: issuing the invitation publicly at tomorrow's Leadership meeting (since Foley has privately demurred, there may be merit in making the invitation for the Majority and Minority Leaders).

✓ o President consults with the ex-Presidents; asks for their advice, and explains clearly and frankly the Bush strategy; asks directly for their public support of that clearly articulated strategy. Obviously, Carter is the "wild card" -- but even a Carter turn-down is not without some utility, considering his persistent image as a hand-wringer.

✓ o President makes major address, calling upon people to support his request for expression of public support. One key point: a clear articulation of the economic stakes in the Gulf, which the American people can understand.

NOTE: we have been focused almost exclusively on aggression; two other points that need to be played up more: the involvement of the Saddam Husseins of the world in both terrorism and drugs -- which issues resonate publicly more than aggression.

o President calls for Special Session of Congress, to consider resolution supporting his actions.

o President invites Republican Senators to private White House meeting, to lay down markers on importance of this issue before new Congress/special session convenes. Does same for Republican House members.

o President undertakes series of meetings/events with:

(1) opinion-makers on national security. This should be accompanied by orchestrated effort to have series of supportive articles, op eds, speeches, etc.

NOTE: one subset of this -- conclaves of former Secretaries of State/Defense/Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs.

(2) families of hostages.

(3) soldiers destined for Desert Shield service.

(4) Black community. Because of the disproportionate contribution of American blacks to our military forces, the support of the Black community for our Gulf commitment is essential.

✓ o Special effort is undertaken to gain active campaign in support of President's policies by major domestic interest groups that ought to be supportive but so far have been relatively quiet, or actually hostile:

(1) AIPAC. Take focus off "American Jews-White House at odds on Israel," and put it on "AJ-WH agree on anti-Saddam strategy."

(2) Conservatives. Some of them are not going to listen in any case, but some probably just want to be more actively and visibly involved.

NOTE: I wonder if the President couldn't ask someone like McClure to be an unofficial "special envoy" to conservatives, starting with an outreach to them on this issue?

(3) Veterans. The most predictably reliable supporters we have -- but they have to be modibized.

o President invites Margaret Thatcher (and other Allied leaders who would be supportive of strong action) to the U.S. for consultations.

✓ o President summons major oil executives to Washington, for high-profile jaw-boning. One major element of any strategy to gain/sustain broad support is wiping out the impression of many that this is all for "big oil."

o Administration articulates (perhaps creates task force to develop?) creative long-term energy independence policy -- to make clear that if we stick out this crisis, we will not just be back in the soup with some other Middle East dictator in five or ten years.

President Bush's Vetoes

1989

Bill	Bill Description	Date	Outcome*
HR 2	Minimum Wage Increase	June 13	House sustained, 247-178
S J Res 113	FS-X Plane Codevelopment	July 31	Senate sustained, 66-34
H J Res 390	Thrift-bailout Bill Enrollment Requirements	Aug. 16	No override attempt (pocket-vetoed)
HR 2990	Labor, HHS, Education FY 1990 Appropriations	Oct. 21	House sustained, 231-191
HR 3026	District of Columbia FY 1990 Appropriations	Oct. 27	No override attempt
HR 2939	Foreign Aid FY 1990 Appropriations	Nov. 19	No override attempt
HR 3610	District of Columbia FY 1990 Appropriations	Nov. 20	No override attempt
HR 1231	Eastern Airlines Strike Resolution	Nov. 21	House sustained, 261-160
HR 1487	State Department Authorization	Nov. 21	No override attempt
HR 2712	Chinese Immigrant Status	Nov. 30	House overrode, 390-25 Senate sustained, 62-37

1990

Bill	Bill Description	Date	Outcome*
HR 2364	Amtrak Authorization	May 24	House overrode, 294-123 Senate sustained, 64-36
HR 20	Hatch Act Amendments	June 15	House overrode, 327-93 Senate sustained, 65-35
HR 770	Parental/Medical Leave	June 29	House sustained, 232-195
HR 4328	Textile Import Quotas	Oct. 5	House sustained, 275-152
H J Res 660	Continuing Appropriations	Oct. 6	House sustained, 260-138
S 2104	Civil Rights	Oct. 22	

*Veto overrides require a two-thirds majority vote of both houses.

f- Leg

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

THE CHIEF of STAFF
has seen

October 23, 1990

10:00 a.m.

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN H. SUNUNU

FROM: FREDERICK D. McCLURE 

SUBJECT: Status of Appropriations Bills

<u>Bill</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Outlook</u>
Ag	House adopted CR Senate adopted CR	10-22 10-22	POTUS action required
Commerce, Justice State	CR filed		House flr 10-23
DoD	Conf. completed	10-21	
D.C.	House rejected CR	10-20	New CR w/o abortion
Energy & Water	House adopted CR Senate adopted CR	10-19 10-19	POTUS action required
For. Ops.	House passed bill Senate floor	6-27 10-23	
Interior	House adopted bill Senate floor	10-15 10-23	
Labor/HHS	House adopted CR	10-22	
Leg. Branch	House adopted bill	10-21	
Mil. Con.	House adopted CR	10-19	
DoT	House adopted CR	10-19	
Treasury/Postal	House adopted CR	10-22	
VA, HUD	House adopted CR	10-20	

SUMMARY: The House has adopted 7 of the 13 appropriations bills conference reports. The House has rejected one conference report (D.C.). The Senate has adopted two conference reports -- Energy and Water; Agriculture. These are also the only two conference reports that have been adopted by **both** Houses. Three (3) appropriations bills have not gone to conference -- Foreign Operations, Interior and Legislative Branch.

Today, the House will consider the conference report on Commerce, Justice, State. Today the Senate will continue with consideration of the Foreign Operations and Interior **bills**.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
02. Memo	From Fred McClure to John Sununu Re: Signing Ceremonies (2 pp.)	11/8/90	P-5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed: 12/14/2004	OA/ID Number: 29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 8, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN SUNUNU

FROM: FRED McCLURE *Fm/RP*

SUBJECT: Signing Ceremonies

Per your request this morning, listed below is pending legislation which may merit a signing ceremony:

1. S. 1630 **Clean Air Act Amendments** - The bill is now expected to arrive at the White House by next Tuesday. Although the President has already announced in California that he will sign the bill, we still think an actual signing ceremony is advisable. We understand that there are two alternatives under discussion (White House or Adirondacks). We believe a good event could be created at either site. It should be kept in mind that if the ceremony takes place at the White House, there are some steps which can be taken to minimize Congressional exposure (Members seated rather than on platform, etc.).
2. S. 566 **National Affordable Housing Act** - Because this legislation contains most of the President's HOPE initiatives, we think it is a good candidate for an event. Secretary Kemp has recommended a signing ceremony and a joint Holiday/McClure scheduling request has been submitted.
3. S. 2830 **Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (Farm Bill)** - Although the Farm Bill is not especially popular in the agriculture community, it does include substantial subsidy reforms, is perceived as being useful to breaking the farm subsidy deadlock in the GATT round, and would be a nice "thank-you" for Members of the Agriculture Committee. We would recommend a "scaled-down" ceremony. (see Yeutter memo attached)

4. S. 358 **Legal Immigration Bill** - Considered a victory for the Administration; may be appropriate to combine with an ethnic event. If there is a choice between the Immigration and the Housing bills the week of November 26, we would recommend the Housing bill.
5. S. 3266 **Crime Control Act of 1990** - As you know, the core of our crime package (habeas corpus, expanded death penalty, and exclusionary rule) was stripped out of the bill. However, the legislation does include some good provisions (S&L enforcement, anti-pornography, etc.) and we could use a signing ceremony as a forum to criticize Congressional Democrats for falling short, and to encourage the Hill to address these issues again early in the 102nd Congress.
6. S. 1430 **National and Community Service Act** - Some have suggested a signing ceremony to highlight the "Point of Light Foundation" funding, etc.
7. S. 3176 **National Environmental Education Act** - We understand Cabinet Affairs recommends a signing ceremony in connection with the Environmental Youth Awards to be held on Wednesday, November 14. We have not yet received this legislation, and may not receive it in time for the Wednesday event.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
03. Report	Side-by-side Comparison of Bush and Underlying Crime Legislation (3 pp.)	6/11/90	P5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed:	12/14/2004	OA/ID Number:	29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #:	1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:	2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- (b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

DEATH PENALTY - OK.

? HABEAS — ^{FED CAP}
^{STATE CAP} → only 1 of 4 N.G.
^{R NON-CAP}
^{S NON-CAP}

SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON OF BUSH AND UNDERLYING CRIME LEGISLATION

CORE ISSUES	BUSH ADMINISTRATION	S.1970
General death penalty	Proposes in title II of S.1225 enforceable death penalty for the most serious federal crimes of homicide, treason, and espionage. Similar proposal by Senator Thurmond in title I of S.1971.	Proposes in title I of S.1970 "Racial Justice Act" provisions that would effectively abolish all state and federal capital punishment. <i>ok.</i> STATUS: Racial Justice Act was deleted from S. 1970.
Death Penalty Litigation Procedures	Supports procedures recommended by "Powell Committee" to curb delay and repetitive litigation in capital cases. Introduced by Senator Thurmond as S.1760.	Proposes in title II of S.1970 and in S.1757 death penalty litigation procedures that reject the principal "Powell Committee" recommendations and overturn the existing rules that limit dilatory and obstructive litigation in capital cases. STATUS: Compromise Thurmond/Specter procedures including Teague "retroactivity" repealer were adopted in the Senate. Administration version may be in the House Rep. bill.
2. Habeas Corpus Reform	Proposes in title VI of S.1225 general reforms to curb the abuse of habeas corpus and other collateral remedies by state and federal prisoners. Similar proposal by Senator Thurmond in title II of S.1971.	Specter-Thurmond language adopted. STATUS: Administration proposals have not been considered in Senate but may be included in the House Rep. bill. <i>No Govd.</i>

- 2 -

MAT SE ok.

3. Exclusionary Rule

Proposes in title V of S.1225 general "good faith" exception to exclusionary rule, where conduct of officers was objectively reasonable. Similar proposal by Senator Thurmond in title III of S.1971.

Proposes in title III of S.1970 to narrow existing "good faith" exception to exclusionary rule for cases involving a warrant. Rejects extension of objective reasonableness standard to warrantless searches and seizures. **STATUS:** Tentative Thurmond/Biden deal would drop both provisions. Administration proposal is expected to be introduced in House Republican drug/crime bill.

Firearms generally

DICONCINI

3 for 3 YRS.

Proposes in title I of S.1225 various amendments to strengthen federal firearms laws and penalties. Generally identical proposal by Senator Thurmond in title IV of S.1971.

Proposes amendments in title XI and title XIII of S.1972 that are largely taken from the Administration's proposals. Title XI weakens Administration's proposed expansion of firearm ownership disqualification for violent criminals and drug offenders, and adds ban on domestic assembly for export of weapons banned from importation. **STATUS:** Most have not been considered to date. Non-controversial Admin. provisions are likely to be included in House Republican bill.

Control of Highly Dangerous Weapons

Proposes in title III of S.1225 general ban on gun magazines and clips that enable a firearm to fire more than 15 rounds without re-loading.

Proposes in title IV of S.1970 and title XIII of S.1972 ban on "assault weapons" limited to nine specific categories defined by make and model. No restrictions on firing capacity of other weapons. **STATUS:** Deconcini

4. ENHANCED PENALTIES
FOR CRIME
WITH WEAPON

5. DOMESTIC ASSY.

OK.

NOT
THERE

- 3 -

amendment (3 year ban of 9 specified "assault weapons") adopted by Senate. Administration magazine ban and domestic assembly language not considered and unlikely to be included in House Republican drug/crime bill.

Organization of
Federal Organized
Crime and Drug
Enforcement
Operations
(Justice
Reorganization)

Supports integrating and coordinating organized crime and drug enforcement with general law enforcement operations in Justice Department.

Proposes in title VI of S.1970 and title XV of S.1972 general separation of organized crime and drug enforcement from regular Justice Department operations.

STATUS: Tentative
Biden/Thurmond deal
would delete.

Money Laundering

Proposes money laundering amendments in title II of the "Minor and Technical Criminal Law Amendments" legislation.

Proposes money laundering measures in title XIV of S.1972 including several taken from the Administration's proposals.

STATUS: Under discussion
as part of tentative
Biden/Thurmond deal.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
04. Memo	From Frederick McClure to John Sununu Re: House GOP Whip Meeting (1 pp.)	10/16/90	P5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed:	12/14/2004	OA/ID Number:	29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #:	1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:	2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

October 16, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN H. SUNUNU

FROM: FREDERICK D. McCLURE *fm*

SUBJECT: House GOP Whip Meeting

Approximately 40 individuals participated in today's House GOP Whip meeting. Almost to a person, the sentiment was that the President should not veto a continuing resolution in the face of an unacceptable reconciliation package this weekend. They believe that shutting down the government will result in the President and the GOP "taking the hit," rather than Congress generally or the Democrats.

Representative Joe Barton (R-TX) did offer a contrary view given the President's earlier statements about vetoing the next CR.

Finally, the GOP Whip organization sentiment was that (1) the President should get together with Foley and Mitchell to produce a short (2-3 day) CR and (2) say that he blames Congress for the delay but will not allow the American people to suffer. Next, they suggest that the President indicate that he will continue to sign 2-day CRs until an acceptable reconciliation package is produced and that he will not let Congress go home until the matter is resolved satisfactorily.

Frankly, I believe that this is the beginning of House GOP efforts to avoid being put in the position of sustaining a Presidential veto of a CR that causes a government-wide shutdown.

**Rebuttal to Proponents' Arguments for
the ICC Provision of H.R. 2364**

Proponents of H.R. 2364, the Amtrak reauthorization bill, have asserted certain arguments in favor of the bill's "ICC provision." A review of the major arguments and conclusions finds that they are for the most part misleading and deceptive. The substantive arguments are addressed below.

THERE IS NO FOUNDATION FOR EXPANDING GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT OF THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY.

Myth: The provision closes a loophole in existing law.

It is argued that the provision is necessary to close a so-called "loophole" in the Interstate Commerce Act. Under the existing statute (43 U.S.C. 11343), the types of transactions required for ICC review and approval include:

- (1) consolidation or merger of 2 or more carriers;
- (2) any purchase, lease, or contract to operate a carrier's property by any number of carriers;
- (3) acquisition of control of a carrier by any number of carriers;
- (4) acquisition of control of at least 2 carriers by an entity that is not a carrier;
- (5) acquisition of control of a carrier by an entity that is not a carrier but that controls any number of carriers; and
- (6) acquisition by a rail carrier of trackage rights over, or joint ownership in or joint use of, a railroad line owned and operated by another carrier.

However, under longstanding legal precedent, when an entity which is not a carrier acquires control of a single system, the transaction is not within the purview of the ICC's jurisdiction under Section 11343.

Fact: The provision would involve government in a whole new area of regulation.

The types of transactions listed in Section 11343, for ICC review and approval, are distinguished by the fact that each raises a potential competitive or antitrust concern that warrants government review. No such issue presents itself when a non-carrier acquires a single carrier. Regulating transactions of this type, as provided for in H.R. 2364, goes beyond government's legitimate interest in assuring competition in the rail industry. Such regulation would be tantamount to using the ICC as a forum to determine the competence of non-railroad management to operate railroads. This would be a significant broadening of government's regulatory role and clearly goes beyond the current scope of the Interstate Commerce Act.

SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY EXISTS TO PROTECT RAIL SERVICE AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

Myth: The provision is in the public interest.

It has been argued that because the Class I railroads represent the majority of the country's rail system, employ over two hundred thousand persons and serve thousands of communities, they should be subject to the additional regulatory scrutiny provided in H.R. 2364. There is particular concern about the dislocation that would result if Class I rail carriers were purchased in order to be "cut up and sold off piecemeal."

Fact: The public interest is already protected; rail service could be jeopardized and stockholders could be adversely affected.

Under existing law, rail carriers are already scrutinized more closely than other industries. Adequate authority exists to preserve the public interest in acquisitions of railroads. The only transaction that is currently not subject to ICC review is a simple change in ownership that would result from a non-carrier's purchase of a majority shareholder's interest in a carrier or carrier holding company. Transactions that could affect the public interest would be subject to scrutiny. The ICC has full and complete jurisdiction over sales, transfers, and disposition of rail lines and extensive authority over a carrier's issuance of debt securities, including the assumption of debt. More importantly, however, the ICC does not have any track record in determining whether a financial transaction is in the public interest.

Most other industries (including other transportation providers) are not subject to the kind of review proposed for Class I rail carriers. Financial analysts testified before the Senate Commerce Committee that review of these acquisitions will make it more difficult for railroads to raise capital on terms comparable to those available to other industries.

The assumption that adding new debt to a rail carrier puts transportation service at risk is specious. Instead, it could constitute a desirable but necessary cost to finance a needed expansion of service. The use of leverage in a corporation is a strategic decision the owners make within limits set by the providers of borrowed capital. The ICC is not in a position to determine what an acceptable level of debt is for a particular carrier. To limit arbitrarily the debt a carrier could incur limits management flexibility and would place an artificial constraint on a carrier's ability to raise needed capital. Moreover, there is no measurable relationship between quality of service and level of debt maintained by a railroad. The

appropriate debt-equity ratio of any railroad company is best left to the market. If a rail carrier takes on excessive debt, that will be reflected in the value of its stock.

Further, requiring ICC approval of changes in ownership (where competitive concerns do not exist) and capital structure decisions increase uncertainty in these types of strategic decisions. According to the financial analysts who testified before the Senate Commerce Committee, this added uncertainty would likely increase the railroad industry's cost of capital. In turn, this would make it more difficult to raise needed financing in the financial markets, and thereby put downward pressure on rail stocks. The public interest would certainly not be served by artificially penalizing the holders of rail stocks. Moreover, increasing the cost of capital could jeopardize the financial viability of a railroad and ultimately endanger rail service.

RAIL SERVICE COULD BE PUT AT RISK.

Myth: The provision would preserve the railroad infrastructure.

Railroads are unlike other transportation modes because they must maintain and operate their own rights-of-way. Because the rights-of-way are private, there is a national interest in protecting the rail infrastructure by assuring the preservation of rail service.

Fact: The provision would act as a barrier to capital investment.

The desirability of protecting the rail infrastructure is well established. H.R. 2364, however, does not increase the security of rail infrastructure. It may, in fact, have the opposite effect. The provision would make more difficult the injection of fresh capital for infrastructure renewal or managerial talent into the rail industry. The rail infrastructure is best preserved by enhancing the industry's access to managerial talent and financial resources.

INVESTMENT IN RAILROADS WOULD BE LESS ATTRACTIVE.

Myth: The provision would not preclude investment in Class I railroads.

Proponents assert that the provision in H.R. 2364 would not preclude investment in railroads. The provision, it is argued, merely provides an expeditious (105 day) and "limited 'fitness review'" of the non-carrier, the non-carrier's intentions, and what affect of the transaction would have on the public interest.

Fact: The regulatory uncertainties inherent in H.R. 2364 would discourage the commitment of outside capital in the railroad industry.

The increased delay and uncertainty inherent in acquiring ICC approval of a transaction will raise the cost of such transactions. For example, while the bill limits the ICC's review period to 105 days, any decision rendered would be subject to challenge and review by the U.S. Court of Appeals, where review could take months. Further, the ICC would be authorized to place conditions on transactions prior to granting approval including, but not limited to, the imposition of labor protective arrangements and the continuation of uneconomical rail service. Such conditions could substantially alter the economic feasibility of proposed non-carrier acquisitions of rail carriers. H.R. 2364 fails to provide guidance or standards for use in determining the fitness of the non-carrier, thereby leaving the review process open to further uncertainty, subjective determinations, and protracted litigation.

CONSEQUENCES COULD BE SEVERE.

Myth: The provision is minimal.

Because there are currently only 16 Class I railroads, it is argued, the provision would be invoked only very infrequently, if at all.

Fact: There is no reason for the type of additional government regulation contained in the provision.

Passage of law should be based on substantive merit, not frequency of application. Further, there has been no evidence of significant reductions in rail service or questionable financial actions arising out of recent acquisitions of Class I railroads that justify the burdensome regulation implicit in this provision. Moreover, indirect economic effects of this provision could be substantial if it sets a precedent for reregulation of the railroad industry or mergers and acquisitions in other industries. Congress has expressed interest in restricting higher debt levels in the corporate sector through tax changes and other impediments. Requiring review for restructuring in the railroad industry could lead to similar regulation in other industries. Further, to the extent that the preapproval process impedes foreign investment in U.S. railroads, retaliation is likely. Restrictions on U.S. investment abroad could result.

LEGISLATION IS NOT WANTED BY THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY.

Myth: Railroads do not oppose this provision.

Railroads are not lobbying against this provision.

Fact: Significant portions of the railroad industry and the financial services industry oppose this provision.

On June 22, 1989, the Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing on legislation (S. 1005) similar to H.R. 2364. Santa Fe Southern Pacific testified in opposition to the expanded ICC authority as did several major financial institutions. The Union Pacific and Burlington Northern railroads are opposed to the expanded ICC authority in H.R. 2364.

THIS IS ANTI-INVESTMENT LEGISLATION.

Myth: This is not an anti-LBO provision.

Some say that the bill does not specifically single out LBOs but would apply to any non-carrier acquisition of a Class I railroad without regard to how such a transaction is financed.

Fact: The provision would be a barrier to railroad acquisitions and capital restructurings.

This bill is anti-LBO and anti-every other type of non-carrier acquisition and capital restructuring of a railroad. The types of transactions this bill is designed to regulate are precisely those that involve the issuance of debt to finance the acquisition. The language of the bill explicitly requires a review of the "total fixed charges" that would result from proposed transactions. Further, under existing law the ICC is authorized to review transactions except changes in control (to a non-carrier) that result from a change in stock ownership. LBOs have proved to be one way stockholders have to realize the higher value of assets overall. Placing obstacles to industry restructurings would adversely affect both industry stock prices and the overall equity market.

PROVISION WOULD UNRAVEL BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR DEREGULATION.

Myth: The provision was developed strictly on a bipartisan basis.

House Commerce Committee Republicans and one Senate Commerce Committee Republican supported this measure.

Fact: There is bipartisan support for deregulation of the rail industry.

In the Senate Commerce Committee, eight of the nine Republicans opposed a bill similar in purpose and intent (S. 1005). In any case, this should not be a partisan issue. Republicans and Democrats supported passage of the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 that significantly reduced counterproductive and burdensome government regulation of the rail industry. Only

recently, GAO issued a report, Railroad Regulation: Economic and Financial Impacts of the Staggers Act of 1980, documenting the benefits of that Act including the improved financial health and competitiveness within the industry. Efforts to reimpose intrusive government regulation would have to roll-back bipartisan support for deregulation.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSETS ARE NOT PROTECTED BY THIS LEGISLATION.

Myth: The provision is necessary to protect the Federal investment in major railroads.

The Nation's freight railroads owe the Federal government approximately \$400 million in outstanding (and for the most part unsecured) loans. Thus, it is argued that the proposed review process will allow the ICC to consider the effect of proposed transactions on such debts.

Fact: There are more effective means to protect Federal financial interests in individual railroads.

If the purpose of the legislation is to protect the Federal government's financial interest in individual railroads, there are more efficient, effective, and far less burdensome means to achieve that goal. The Federal Railroad Administration is currently in the process of renegotiating directly with carriers the terms of many of its outstanding loans with precisely the intention of limiting the government's exposure in acquisition and bankruptcy situations. In addition, the FRA is exploring other options that are more direct and far less burdensome than an ICC review to protect financial assets. Also, under current agreements, there is usually a provision that can trigger acceleration of the full balance of the loan if there is a change in corporate ownership. Typically, DOT negotiates with carriers for repayment of outstanding loans.

Finally, the Federal investment in the freight rail industry is best protected by assuring the financial health of the industry. Therefore, its access to capital markets. It would be counterproductive to limit that access.

**Rebuttal to Proponents' Arguments for
the ICC Provision of H.R. 2364**

Proponents of H.R. 2364, the Amtrak reauthorization bill, have asserted certain arguments in favor of the bill's "ICC provision." A review of the major arguments and conclusions finds that they are for the most part misleading and deceptive. The substantive arguments are addressed below.

**THERE IS NO FOUNDATION FOR EXPANDING GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT OF THE
RAILROAD INDUSTRY.**

Myth: The provision closes a loophole in existing law.

It is argued that the provision is necessary to close a so-called "loophole" in the Interstate Commerce Act. Under the existing statute (43 U.S.C. 11343), the types of transactions required for ICC review and approval include:

- (1) consolidation or merger of 2 or more carriers;
- (2) any purchase, lease, or contract to operate a carrier's property by any number of carriers;
- (3) acquisition of control of a carrier by any number of carriers;
- (4) acquisition of control of at least 2 carriers by an entity that is not a carrier;
- (5) acquisition of control of a carrier by an entity that is not a carrier but that controls any number of carriers; and
- (6) acquisition by a rail carrier of trackage rights over, or joint ownership in or joint use of, a railroad line owned and operated by another carrier.

However, under longstanding legal precedent, when an entity which is not a carrier acquires control of a single system, the transaction is not within the purview of the ICC's jurisdiction under Section 11343.

Fact: The provision would involve government in a whole new area of regulation.

The types of transactions listed in Section 11343, for ICC review and approval, are distinguished by the fact that each raises a potential competitive or antitrust concern that warrants government review. No such issue presents itself when a non-carrier acquires a single carrier. Regulating transactions of this type, as provided for in H.R. 2364, goes beyond government's legitimate interest in assuring competition in the rail industry. Such regulation would be tantamount to using the ICC as a forum to determine the competence of non-railroad management to operate railroads. This would be a significant broadening of government's regulatory role and clearly goes beyond the current scope of the Interstate Commerce Act.

SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY EXISTS TO PROTECT RAIL SERVICE AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

Myth: The provision is in the public interest.

It has been argued that because the Class I railroads represent the majority of the country's rail system, employ over two hundred thousand persons and serve thousands of communities, they should be subject to the additional regulatory scrutiny provided in H.R. 2364. There is particular concern about the dislocation that would result if Class I rail carriers were purchased in order to be "cut up and sold off piecemeal."

Fact: The public interest is already protected; rail service could be jeopardized and stockholders could be adversely affected.

Under existing law, rail carriers are already scrutinized more closely than other industries. Adequate authority exists to preserve the public interest in acquisitions of railroads. The only transaction that is currently not subject to ICC review is a simple change in ownership that would result from a non-carrier's purchase of a majority shareholder's interest in a carrier or carrier holding company. Transactions that could affect the public interest would be subject to scrutiny. The ICC has full and complete jurisdiction over sales, transfers, and disposition of rail lines and extensive authority over a carrier's issuance of debt securities, including the assumption of debt. More importantly, however, the ICC does not have any track record in determining whether a financial transaction is in the public interest.

Most other industries (including other transportation providers) are not subject to the kind of review proposed for Class I rail carriers. Financial analysts testified before the Senate Commerce Committee that review of these acquisitions will make it more difficult for railroads to raise capital on terms comparable to those available to other industries.

The assumption that adding new debt to a rail carrier puts transportation service at risk is specious. Instead, it could constitute a desirable but necessary cost to finance a needed expansion of service. The use of leverage in a corporation is a strategic decision the owners make within limits set by the providers of borrowed capital. The ICC is not in a position to determine what an acceptable level of debt is for a particular carrier. To limit arbitrarily the debt a carrier could incur limits management flexibility and would place an artificial constraint on a carrier's ability to raise needed capital. Moreover, there is no measurable relationship between quality of service and level of debt maintained by a railroad. The

appropriate debt-equity ratio of any railroad company is best left to the market. If a rail carrier takes on excessive debt, that will be reflected in the value of its stock.

Further, requiring ICC approval of changes in ownership (where competitive concerns do not exist) and capital structure decisions increase uncertainty in these types of strategic decisions. According to the financial analysts who testified before the Senate Commerce Committee, this added uncertainty would likely increase the railroad industry's cost of capital. In turn, this would make it more difficult to raise needed financing in the financial markets, and thereby put downward pressure on rail stocks. The public interest would certainly not be served by artificially penalizing the holders of rail stocks. Moreover, increasing the cost of capital could jeopardize the financial viability of a railroad and ultimately endanger rail service.

RAIL SERVICE COULD BE PUT AT RISK.

Myth: The provision would preserve the railroad infrastructure.

Railroads are unlike other transportation modes because they must maintain and operate their own rights-of-way. Because the rights-of-way are private, there is a national interest in protecting the rail infrastructure by assuring the preservation of rail service.

Fact: The provision would act as a barrier to capital investment.

The desirability of protecting the rail infrastructure is well established. H.R. 2364, however, does not increase the security of rail infrastructure. It may, in fact, have the opposite effect. The provision would make more difficult the injection of fresh capital for infrastructure renewal or managerial talent into the rail industry. The rail infrastructure is best preserved by enhancing the industry's access to managerial talent and financial resources.

INVESTMENT IN RAILROADS WOULD BE LESS ATTRACTIVE.

Myth: The provision would not preclude investment in Class I railroads.

Proponents assert that the provision in H.R. 2364 would not preclude investment in railroads. The provision, it is argued, merely provides an expeditious (105 day) and "limited 'fitness review'" of the non-carrier, the non-carrier's intentions, and what affect of the transaction would have on the public interest.

Fact: The regulatory uncertainties inherent in H.R. 2364 would discourage the commitment of outside capital in the railroad industry.

The increased delay and uncertainty inherent in acquiring ICC approval of a transaction will raise the cost of such transactions. For example, while the bill limits the ICC's review period to 105 days, any decision rendered would be subject to challenge and review by the U.S. Court of Appeals, where review could take months. Further, the ICC would be authorized to place conditions on transactions prior to granting approval including, but not limited to, the imposition of labor protective arrangements and the continuation of uneconomical rail service. Such conditions could substantially alter the economic feasibility of proposed non-carrier acquisitions of rail carriers. H.R. 2364 fails to provide guidance or standards for use in determining the fitness of the non-carrier, thereby leaving the review process open to further uncertainty, subjective determinations, and protracted litigation.

CONSEQUENCES COULD BE SEVERE.

Myth: The provision is minimal.

Because there are currently only 16 Class I railroads, it is argued, the provision would be invoked only very infrequently, if at all.

Fact: There is no reason for the type of additional government regulation contained in the provision.

Passage of law should be based on substantive merit, not frequency of application. Further, there has been no evidence of significant reductions in rail service or questionable financial actions arising out of recent acquisitions of Class I railroads that justify the burdensome regulation implicit in this provision. Moreover, indirect economic effects of this provision could be substantial if it sets a precedent for reregulation of the railroad industry or mergers and acquisitions in other industries. Congress has expressed interest in restricting higher debt levels in the corporate sector through tax changes and other impediments. Requiring review for restructuring in the railroad industry could lead to similar regulation in other industries. Further, to the extent that the preapproval process impedes foreign investment in U.S. railroads, retaliation is likely. Restrictions on U.S. investment abroad could result.

LEGISLATION IS NOT WANTED BY THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY.

Myth: Railroads do not oppose this provision.

Railroads are not lobbying against this provision.

Fact: significant portions of the railroad industry and the financial services industry oppose this provision.

On June 23, 1989, the Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing on legislation (S. 1005) similar to H.R. 2364. Santa Fe Southern Pacific testified in opposition to the expanded ICC authority as did several major financial institutions. The Union Pacific and Burlington Northern railroads are opposed to the expanded ICC authority in H.R. 2364.

THIS IS ANTI-INVESTMENT LEGISLATION.

Myth: This is not an anti-LBO provision.

Some say that the bill does not specifically single out LBOs but would apply to any non-carrier acquisition of a Class I railroad without regard to how such a transaction is financed.

Fact: The provision would be a barrier to railroad acquisitions and capital restructurings.

This bill is anti-LBO and anti-every other type of non-carrier acquisition and capital restructuring of a railroad. The types of transactions this bill is designed to regulate are precisely those that involve the issuance of debt to finance the acquisition. The language of the bill explicitly requires a review of the "total fixed charges" that would result from proposed transactions. Further, under existing law the ICC is authorized to review transactions except changes in control (to a non-carrier) that result from a change in stock ownership. LBOs have proved to be one way stockholders have to realize the higher value of assets overall. Placing obstacles to industry restructurings would adversely affect both industry stock prices and the overall equity market.

PROVISION WOULD UNRAVEL BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR DEREGULATION.

Myth: The provision was developed strictly on a bipartisan basis.

House Commerce Committee Republicans and one Senate Commerce Committee Republican supported this measure.

Fact: There is bipartisan support for deregulation of the rail industry.

In the Senate Commerce Committee, eight of the nine Republicans opposed a bill similar in purpose and intent (S. 1005). In any case, this should not be a partisan issue. Republicans and Democrats supported passage of the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 that significantly reduced counterproductive and burdensome government regulation of the rail industry. Only

recently, GAO issued a report, Railroad Regulation: Economic and Financial Impacts of the Staggers Act of 1980, documenting the benefits of that Act including the improved financial health and competitiveness within the industry. Efforts to reimpose intrusive government regulation would have to roll-back bipartisan support for deregulation.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSETS ARE NOT PROTECTED BY THIS LEGISLATION.

Myth: The provision is necessary to protect the Federal investment in major railroads.

The Nation's freight railroads owe the Federal government approximately \$400 million in outstanding (and for the most part unsecured) loans. Thus, it is argued that the proposed review process will allow the ICC to consider the effect of proposed transactions on such debts.

Fact: There are more effective means to protect Federal financial interests in individual railroads.

If the purpose of the legislation is to protect the Federal government's financial interest in individual railroads, there are more efficient, effective, and far less burdensome means to achieve that goal. The Federal Railroad Administration is currently in the process of renegotiating directly with carriers the terms of many of its outstanding loans with precisely the intention of limiting the government's exposure in acquisition and bankruptcy situations. In addition, the FRA is exploring other options that are more direct and far less burdensome than an ICC review to protect financial assets. Also, under current agreements, there is usually a provision that can trigger acceleration of the full balance of the loan if there is a change in corporate ownership. Typically, DOT negotiates with carriers for repayment of outstanding loans.

Finally, the Federal investment in the freight rail industry is best protected by assuring the financial health of the industry. Therefore, its access to capital markets. It would be counterproductive to limit that access.

Issue: AMTRAK VETO

2:30 PM

Date: 6 / 5 / 90

	Yes	LnsYes	Undcded	LnsNo	No
ADAMS					
BAUCUS					
BENTSEN					
BIDEN					
BINGAMAN					
→ BORN	✓				
BRADLEY					
BREAUX					
BRYAN					
BUMPERS					
BURDICK					
BYRD					
CONRAD					
CRANSTON					
DASCHLE					
→ DECONCINI			✓		
DIXON					
DODD					
EXON					
FORD					
FOWLER					
GLENN					
GORE					
GRAHAM					
HARKIN					
HEFLIN					
HOLLINGS					
INOUE					
JOHNSTON					
KENNEDY					
RBRT KERREY					
JOHN KERRY					
KOHL					
LAUTENBERG					
LEAHY					
LEVIN					
LIEBERMAN					
MATSUNAGA					
METZENBAUM					
MIKULSKI					
MITCHELL					
MOYNIHAN					
NUNN					
PELL					
PRYOR					
REID					
RIEGLE					
ROBB					
ROCKEFELLER					
SANFORD					
SARBANES					
SASSER					
SHELBY					
SIMON					
WIRTH					

TTLS: Ys ___ LnYs ___ UND ___ LnNo ___ No ___

	Yes	LnsYes	Undcded	LnsNo	No
ARMSTRONG		✓			
BOND	✓				
BOSCHWITZ	✓				
BURNS	✓				
CHAFEE	✓				
COATS	✓				
COCHRAN	✓				
COHEN		✓			
D'AMATO				✓	
DANFORTH	✓				
DOLE	✓				
DOMENICI	✓				
DURENBERGER			✓		
GARN	✓				
GORTON	✓				
GRAMM	✓				
GRASSLEY				✓	
HATCH	✓				
HATFIELD		✓			
HEINZ			✓		
HELMS	✓				
HUMPHREY	✓				
JEFFORDS			✓		
KASSEBAUM				✓	
KASTEN	✓				
LOTT	✓				
LUGAR	✓				
MACK	✓				
MCCAIN	✓				
MCCLEURE	✓				
MCCONNELL	✓				
MURKOWSKI	✓				
NICKLES	✓				
PACKWOOD	✓				
PRESSLER			✓		
ROTH					✓
RUDMAN			✓		
SIMPSON	✓				
SPECTER			✓		
STEVENS	✓				
SYMMS	✓				
THURMOND	✓				
WALLOP	✓				
WARNER					✓
WILSON	✓				

Totals: Yes 31 LnYes 3 Und 7 LnNo 3 No 2

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
05. Memo	From Frederick McClure to John Sununu Re: Recommended phone calls on Amtrack Reauthorization (3 pp.)	6/5/90	P5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed:	12/14/2004	OA/ID Number:	29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #:	1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:	2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 5, 1990

THE CHIEF of STAFF
has seen

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN H. SUNUNU

FROM: FRED MCCLURE *fm*

SUBJECT: Recommended phone calls on Amtrak Reauthorization

Below are the recommended phone calls regarding H.R. 2364, Amtrak Reauthorization.

We recommend you call Senators Rudman, ~~Hatfield~~, Boschwitz, Grassley and Armstrong. We would recommend that Secretary Skinner call Senators Cohen, Durenberger and Pressler, and finally, that Secretary Brady call Senator Heinz.

We will proceed to ask Secretaries Skinner and Brady to make these calls unless we hear otherwise from you.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

RECOMMENDED PHONE CALLS BY GOVERNOR SUNUNU

TO: Senator Rudy Boschwitz (R-MN)
Senator Charles Grassley (R-IA)
Senator Warren Rudman (R-NH)
Senator Bill Armstrong (R-CO)

DATE: June 5, 1990

RECOMMENDED BY: Fred McClure *fm*

BACKGROUND: On May 24, the President vetoed H.R. 2364, legislation authorizing \$2 billion to Amtrak over three years. The basis of the veto was a new provision requiring ICC review of proposed acquisitions of railroads by non-railroad companies. The bill had passed the House by a vote of 323-93 and the Senate by voice vote.

DATE OF
SUBMISSION: June 5, 1990

KEY POINTS: See Attachment.

ACTION:

Senator Rudy Boschwitz (R-MN)

Unions in Minnesota have put pressure on him to override. As the former Chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, he may be swayed by the argument that an override helps the candidacies of Senator Exon (D-NE) and Harkin (D-IA). It is Senator Exon's bill and Senator Harkin's ICC provision.

ACTION: _____

Senator Charles Grassley (R-IA)

Senator Grassley told David Sloane that he may be with the President if a 34th vote is needed. He is worried about hurting Congressman Tauke's (R-IA) race against Senator Harkin (D-IA). Since Congressman Tauke is likely to vote for override, however, this should not be a concern.

ACTION: _____

Senator Warren Rudman (R-NH)

Senator Rudman usually supports legislation to curtail LBOs. He is concerned that the veto message only addresses the ICC provision. Senator Rudman is opposed to funding for Amtrak.

ACTION: _____

Senator William Armstrong (R-CO)

Senator Armstrong opposes the ICC provision, but is more opposed to Amtrak funding. He may be swayed by the argument that if the veto is not sustained, we will be stuck with both the Amtrak funding and the ICC provision. In any event, Amtrak funding is determined by the Appropriations Committees.

ACTION: _____

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
06. Memo	From Frederick McClure to John Sununu Re: Senate Republican Policy Luncheon on Tuesday (2 pp.)	9/24/90	P-5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed:	12/14/2004	OA/ID Number:	29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #:	1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:	2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 24, 1990

OFFICE of STAFF

MEMORANDUM FOR GOVERNOR SUNUNU

FROM:

Fred McClure *fm*

SUBJECT:

Senate Republican Policy Luncheon on Tuesday

You are scheduled to address Senate Republicans at their policy luncheon tomorrow at 12:45 p.m. in Room S-211. The Senate will vote to invoke cloture this week on three bills on which there are senior advisors vetoes: S. 1224, the CAFE bill (Tuesday at 2:15 p.m.); S. 110, the Family Planning bill (Wednesday); and S. 874, the Motor Voter bill (Wednesday). Each bill will be killed if cloture is not invoked.

S. 1224, CAFE

We are very close to getting the votes necessary to beat cloture. To be safe, we need to find 41 votes; although fewer may be needed if there are absentees.

Talking Points:

* S. 1224, the bill to raise the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards by 40% by the year 2001 on all cars and light trucks sold in the U.S. would have an adverse impact on the U.S. economy. This bill would put unreasonable burdens on the consumers and the automakers. The bill will increase the estimated cost of the average new American auto in the year 2001 by \$1,500 (in 1990 dollars) and cost an estimated 60,000 U.S. auto manufacturing jobs. Total costs of the CAFE bill translate to more than \$70 for each barrel of oil saved.

* The only real way to increase CAFE is to downsize the car or truck. Department of Transportation studies conclude that S.1224 would result in an increase of up to 1,400 fatalities a year to meet downsizing requirements. It is ironic that this increase in fatalities would wipe out the projected lives that would be saved under the air toxics title of the Clear Air Bill--while costing the economy more money.

* S. 1224 does not address the short-term problem of the Iraq/Kuwait oil embargo. This bill has no effect on consumption before 1995.

S. 110, the Family Planning Bill

At some time on Wednesday, the Senate will vote to invoke cloture on S. 110. Debate on the bill begins on Tuesday. There is a senior advisors' veto threat on the bill because language in the Committee report and in the bill's preamble effectively encourage abortion counseling, which runs counter to regulations issued by HHS. (The Supreme Court is expected to rule on these regulations in November.) Senator Chafee will offer an amendment to strike these HHS regulations outright. We do not have enough votes to stop cloture, though the expected passage of the Chafee amendment may improve our chances. Senator Humphrey is expected to extend debate as long as he is able.

Talking Points

- * The President supports family planning, but cannot support a program that includes abortion counseling.
- * In its current form, the bill is likely to be interpreted to allow the promotion of abortion as an option for family planning.
- * The bill is not needed; there has been no family planning authorization bill since 1985. The program has been funded through the appropriations process.
- * The President would support funding for the Family Planning program through the appropriations bill, or through an authorization bill, as long as abortion language was not attached.

S. 874, the Motor Voter bill

Cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 874 is also expected on Wednesday. This is a more partisan issue that makes defeating cloture a better possibility. Senator Dole has a substitute which the Administration supports.

Talking Points:

- * This bill greatly increases the potential for voter fraud.
- * It also imposes mandatory Federal procedures on states, which have been historically unconstrained in governing the electoral process. As part of these mandatory procedures, it also imposes unnecessary and burdensome administrative cost on states.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
07. Memo	From Frederick McClure to John Sununu Re: CAFÉ Standards Vote in the Senate (3 pp.)	9/19/90	P5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed: 12/14/2004	OA/ID Number: 29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 19, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR GOVERNOR SUNUNU

FROM: Fred McClure 
SUBJECT: CAFE Standards Vote in the Senate

Last Friday the Senate voted 68 to 28 to stop debate on the **motion to proceed** to S. 1224, the Motor Vehicle Fuel Efficiency Act of 1990. The cloture vote on the bill is scheduled for next Tuesday at 2:15 p.m.

Twenty-three (23) Republicans voted against the Administration. However, some of these Republicans are with us on the merits and may be willing to vote against invoking cloture on the bill. Below is a selected list of Senators who we believe fall into this category. Please call these six Senators sometime before close of business Monday. Proposed talking points are attached. Please let me know any feedback you receive.

Senator D'Amato 4-6542
Senator Domenici 4-7090
Senator Kassebaum 4-4774
Senator Murkowski 4-6665
Senator Packwood 4-5244
Senator Warner 4-2023

Other Republicans who voted for cloture on the motion to proceed are Boschwitz, Chafee, Cohen, Durenberger, Gorton, Hatfield, Heinz, Jeffords, McCain, Rudman, Pressler, Danforth, Grassley, Humphrey, Roth, Specter and Stevens (the latter seven may be with us).

Of the four Senators who did not vote on the first cloture motion, three are expected to vote against cloture (Garn, Johnston, and Simpson) and one (Wilson) for.

One Democrat, Senator Sasser, is expected to vote against the next cloture vote (he switched his vote to support cloture just prior to the close of the vote).

With the 28 votes we got last Friday, plus the 3 absentees and Sasser, we still need 9 votes to obtain the 41 votes to stop cloture.

Attachment

cc: Boyden Gray
Michael Boskin

TALKING POINTS

- * S. 1224, the bill to raise the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards by 40% by the year 2001 on all cars and light trucks sold in the U.S. would have an adverse impact on the U.S. economy. This bill would put unreasonable burdens on the consumers and the automakers. The bill will increase the estimated cost of the average new American auto in the year 2001 by \$1,500 (in 1990 dollars) and cost an estimated 60,000 U.S. auto manufacturing jobs.
- * The only real way to increase CAFE is to downsize the car or truck. Department of Transportation studies conclude that S.1224 would result an increase of up to 1,400 fatalities a year to meet downsizing requirements. It is ironic that this increase in fatalities would wipe out the projected lives that would be saved under the air toxics title of the Clear Air Bill--while costing the economy more money.
- * S. 1224 does not address the short-term problem of the Iraq/Kuwait oil embargo. This bill has no effect on consumption before 1995.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

THE CHIEF of STAFF
has seen

July 19, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN H. SUNUNU

FROM: Fred McClure *fm*

SUBJECT: Analysis of Key Votes in the 101st Congress,
Second Session

Attached for your review is the recent analysis we provided to the President on Congressional support for the Administration's positions.

Attachment

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
08a. Memo	From Nick Calio to John Sununu Re: Textile Bill (1 pp.)	9/18/90	<u>25</u>	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed: 12/14/2004	OA/ID Number: 29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

6

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM TO GOVERNOR SUNUNU

FROM: Nick Calio

DATE: September 18, 1990

RE: Textile Bill

This afternoon, the House is scheduled to consider the Textile Bill, H.R. 4328. We would appreciate your calling the following Members to let them know the importance of this vote to the President.

Tom Lewis (R-Fla.) - Lewis represents West Palm Beach and serves on the Agriculture and Science and Technology Committees. He has voted against the bill and to sustain vetoes in the past two Congresses. ✓

Barbara Vucanovich (R-Nev.) - Normally a strong supporter of the President and a free-trader, she has voted against Textile Bills in the past. However, she has indicated she may change her vote to send a signal to the Administration that she is not pleased with our current trade policies. She has asked, independently of our conversations on this issue, to meet with you regarding a new U.S. Attorney in Nevada. *Call for vote later*
Justine real prob-
And how to
James was
one

Michael Bilirakis (R-Fla.) - In the 99th Congress, he ~~voted~~ for the bill, but changed his vote in the 100th to vote against. He is getting a lot of pressure from textile lobbyists and is being swayed by conservatives such as Duncan Hunter (R-Cal.) and Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.). Hunter and Gingrich are using the issue of "slave labor" in China to win votes for the bill.

Bob Livingston (R-La.) - Livingston has ~~opposed~~ Textile Bills in the past but has indicated he may change his position. He was visited personally by Roger Milliken, a CEO representing textile interests and a key Republican fundraiser, who has been most persuasive in changing Members' minds.

Jim McCrery (R-La.) - As the only other possible nay vote from the Louisiana delegation, McCrery is genuinely undecided about which way to go. If we can convince Livingston about the harm the bill will cause, McCrery may find it easier to vote against the bill.

*Att. now
inclined
to vote*

OK on vote

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
08b. Memo	From Frederick McClure to POTUS Re: Recommended Telephone Call to Richard Stallings (2 pp.)	9/17/90	P5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed:	12/14/2004	OA/ID Number:	29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #:	1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:	2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

FYI

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL BY THE PRESIDENT

TO: Congressman Richard Stallings (D-ID)

DATE: September 17, 1990

RECOMMENDED BY: Fred McClure

PURPOSE: To urge Congressman Stallings to vote against the textile bill on the House floor today.

BACKGROUND: Congressman Richard Stallings (D-ID) has consistently voted against textile legislation. He has voted against two textile bills and voted to sustain two of President Reagan's vetos. His position is wavering, however, (he tells us) because Senator McClure (R-ID) voted for the bill and Congressman Craig (R-ID) is considering supporting it too.

A phone call from you, asking for his help and reminding him of his consistent support for free trade in the past, may be enough to solidify his opposition to the bill.

KEY POINTS: We've got a tough vote today on the textile bill and I need your help.

This bill would seriously restrict textile and footwear imports and violate international trade rules.

We're currently enjoying a huge export boom, the greatest in our nation's history. This bill will place at risk our \$400 billion in exports and the millions of American jobs that depend on trade.

-2-

Furthermore, the timing of this bill is terrible. It sends the wrong signal to the rest of the world when other countries are on the verge of adopting America's model of free enterprise and competition.

It also sends the wrong signal to other countries as we commence this round of the GATT negotiations.

DATE OF SUBMISSION: September 17, 1990

ACTION:

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
08c. Memo	From Frederick McClure to POTUS Re: Recommended Telephone Call to Susan Molinari (2 pp.)	9/17/90	P5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed: 12/14/2004	OA/ID Number: 29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL BY THE PRESIDENT

TO: Congresswoman Susan Molinari (R-NY)

DATE: September 17, 1990

RECOMMENDED BY: Fred McClure

PURPOSE: To urge Congresswoman Molinari to vote against the textile bill on the House floor today.

BACKGROUND: Representative Susan Molinari is facing her first vote on the textile bill today and tells us she is truly undecided. Her father opposed the bill in 1987 and Bill Green (R-NY) is spearheading the effort against it. Therefore she has some good reasons to vote no.

Some feel she committed her vote to Duncan Hunter (R-CA) who is a strong supporter of the bill in exchange for his help last week on the "home porting" issue.

KEY POINTS: We've got a tough vote today on the textile bill and I need your help.

This bill would seriously restrict textile and footwear imports and violate international trade rules.

We're currently enjoying a huge export boom, the greatest in our nation's history. This bill will place at risk our \$400 billion in exports and the millions of American jobs that depend on trade.

Furthermore, the timing of this bill is terrible. It sends the wrong signal to the rest of the world when other countries are on the verge of adopting America's model of free enterprise and competition.

-2-

It also sends the wrong signal to other countries as we commence this round of the GATT negotiations.

DATE OF SUBMISSION: September 17, 1990

ACTION:

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
08d. Memo	From Frederick McClure to POTUS Re: Recommended Telephone Call to Gerald Solomon (2 pp.)	9/17/90	P-3	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed:	12/14/2004	OA/ID Number:	29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #:	1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:	2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL BY THE PRESIDENT

TO: Congressman Gerald Solomon (R-NY)

DATE: September 17, 1990

RECOMMENDED BY: Fred McClure

PURPOSE: To urge Congressman Solomon to vote against the textile bill on the House floor today.

BACKGROUND: Congressman Gerry Solomon (R-NY) has consistently supported textile legislation, but has told our legislative affairs staff and other private sector lobbyists that he may consider switching his position and oppose the bill this year.

A phone call from you asking for his help this time may be the key to his support for our position.

KEY POINTS: We've got a tough vote today on the textile bill and I need your help.

This bill would seriously restrict textile and footwear imports and violate international trade rules.

We're currently enjoying a huge export boom, the greatest in our nation's history. This bill will place at risk our \$400 billion in exports and the millions of American jobs that depend on trade.

-2-

Furthermore, the timing of this bill is terrible. It sends the wrong signal to the rest of the world when other countries are on the verge of adopting America's model of free enterprise and competition.

It also sends the wrong signal to other countries as we commence this round of the GATT negotiations.

DATE OF SUBMISSION: September 17, 1990

ACTION:

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
08e. List	Of Representatives and positions on Textile Bill [FOIA RESTRICTIONS REDACTED] (1 pp.)	9/17/90	P5 , (b)(6)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed:	12/14/2004	OA/ID Number:	29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #:	1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:	2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

Rep. Larry Coughlin (R-PA)

225-6111

Norristown. (215)277-4040

88 Vote Y-N

- o Undecided. Needs to be reminded that this is a crucial vote for the President's trade policy.

Rep. D. French Slaughter, Jr. (R-VA)

225-6561

Charlottesville, (804)295-2106

88 Vote Y-Y

- o Undecided. Needs to be reminded that this is a crucial vote for the President's trade policy.

Rep. Susan Molinari (R-NY)

225-3371

88 Vote (not a member in 88)

(b)(6)

- o Freshman. Leaning for the Bill because of significant pressure from Labor. Ambassador Hills has spoken with -
- still feels she's getting too much pressure from Labor to ignore.

ATTACHMENT A

KEY VOTE ANALYSIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INDEX

List of Key Votes	p. 1
Republican Rankings	p. 4
Democrat Rankings	p. 8

Display of 12 House Votes in Vote File Named 'KEY HOUSE VOTES'

Description: key House votes
-----H.R.2712 by PELOSI(D-CA) -- Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989
(Pocket vetoed 11/30/89)

LOST

01/24/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2004: 390-25 (DEM: 245-0; REP: 145-25)
Favorable Vote: 'NO' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR2712 PASSED OVER VETO(House voted to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712, Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989.)

H.R.2190 by FOLEY (D-WA) -- National Voter Registration Act of 1989

02/06/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2010: 156-265 LOST (DEM: 1-251; REP: 155-14)
Favorable Vote: 'YES' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR2190 REJECTED MOTION(House rejected the Gillmor motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report back forthwith containing an amendment to allow some provision for formal authentication of mail-in registrations; delete provisions that require designated locations to accept and transmit completed registration forms to State election officials; and add to the enforcement provisions penalties for offers of payment for voting, filing false information regarding an election campaign, and using the postal system to perpetrate such fraud.)

H.R.1231 by ANDERSON (D-CA) -- Emergency Board to Investigate the Dispute Between Eastern Airlines and Its Collective Bargaining Units, Establishment (Vetoed 11/21/89)

WON

03/07/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2022: 261-160 (DEM: 236-13; REP: 25-147)
Favorable Vote: 'NO' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR1231 FAILED TO OVERRIDE VETO(House voted to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 1231, to establish a commission to investigate and report respecting the dispute between Eastern Airlines and its collective bargaining units.)
-----H.R.3847 by CONYERS (D-MI) -- Department of Environmental Protection Act
Federal Facilities Compliance Act of 1990

LOST

03/28/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2049: 161-266 (DEM: 25-228; REP: 136-38)
Favorable Vote: 'YES' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR3847 REJECTED AMENDMENT(House rejected the Hastert amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to elevate the EPA to cabinet level, but delete all other provisions of the bill.)
-----H.R.3 by HAWKINS, AUGUSTUS (D-CA) -- Act for Better Child Care Services of 1990
Act for Better Child Care LOST
Child Care and Health Insurance Act of 1989

03/29/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2057: 195-225 (DEM: 38-211; REP: 157-14)
Favorable Vote: 'YES' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR3 REJECTED AMENDMENT

(House rejected the Stenholm amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to increase the funding for the Head Start program, but would permit only 50% of the funds to be used to expand the program to a full-day program; not to authorize funds for a separate program to provide before and after-school care in schools for school-aged children and for pre-school children throughout the day; provide an increase in Title XX block grants to States for child care services; provide expansion of the basic Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and provide for a matching grants child care program for private companies; and entitle individuals over 65 years old who perform child care services to be entitled to an exemption on the earnings from Social Security excess earnings tax.)

H.R.1236 by BROOKS (D-TX) -- Price Fixing Prevention Act of 1989

04/18/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2074: 235-157 **LOST** (DEM: 212-23; REP: 23-134)
Favorable Vote: 'NO' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR1236 PASSED AS AMENDED

(House passed H.R. 1236, to establish evidentiary standards for Federal civil antitrust claims based on resale price fixing.)

H.R.770 by CLAY (D-MO) -- Family and Medical Leave Act of 1990

05/10/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2107: 237-187 **LOST** (DEM: 198-54; REP: 39-133)
Favorable Vote: 'NO' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR770 PASSED AS AMENDED

(House passed H.R. 770, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1990.)

H.R.2273 by COELHO (D-CA) -- Americans With Disabilities Act of 1989

05/22/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2121: 192-227 **LOST** (DEM: 46-203; REP: 146-24)
Favorable Vote: 'YES' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR2273 REJECTED AMENDMENT

(House rejected the Sensenbrenner amendment, as modified, that sought to provide that the victims of job discrimination based on a disability would be entitled only to remedies currently available under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, rather than any future expanded remedies.)

H.R.4636 by FASCELL (D-FL) -- Supplemental Assistance for Emerging Democracies
Act of 1990
Development Fund for Africa Act
Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between North and
South Act of 1990

LOST
05/22/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2126: 175-243 (DEM: 23-225; REP: 152-18)
Favorable Vote: 'YES' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR4636 REJECTED AMENDMENT

(House rejected the Broomfield amendment seeking to provide substitute provisions on El Salvador would have provided the President to determine whether certain specified actions by the Salvadoran Government have occurred which warrant withholding military aid, and permitting funds and programs for the military, the police, a Judicial/Democratization program, and national reconciliation.)

H.R.3030 by DINGELL (D-MI) -- Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990

05/23/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2132: 274-146 **LOST** (DEM: 231-20; REP: 43-126)
Favorable Vote: 'NO' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR3030 AGREED TO AMENDMENT

(House agreed to the Wise amendment that authorizes \$250 million for a "Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance" program to be disbursed over 5-year period, providing those workers who become unemployed or suffer a reduction of hours as a result of the provisions of the bill with two years of retraining and up to six months of unemployment benefits.)

H.R.2364 by LUKEN, THOMAS (D-OH) -- AMTRAK Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 1990 (Vetoed 5/24/90)

LOST
06/07/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2162: 294-123 (DEM: 236-7; REP: 58-116)
Favorable Vote: 'NO' Legend for 'PROFILE': HR2364 PASSED OVER VETO

(House voted to override the President's veto of H.R. 2364, to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act to authorize appropriations for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (two-thirds of those present voting in favor) .)

H.J.R.350 by MICHEL (R-IL) -- Constitution of the United States, Amendment - Desecration of the Flag

LOST
06/21/90 -- HOUSE Vote No. 2192: 254-177 (DEM: 95-160; REP: 159-17)
Favorable Vote: 'YES' Legend for 'PROFILE': HJR350 FAILED OF 2/3 MAJORITY

(House failed to suspend the rules and pass H.J.Res. 350, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.)

Voting Performance by
House Republicans

In Order by Percent 'FOR' (When Voting)

Based on 12 Votes in House Vote File Named 'KEY HOUSE VOTES'
Description: key House votes

	% For (When Voting)	-----% Based on All Votes-----			
		% For	% Against	% Not Voting	% Abstain
BAKER (R-LA)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
COMBEST (R-TX)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DELAY (R-TX)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GEKAS (R-PA)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GOSS (R-FL)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HANSEN (R-UT)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HASTERT (R-IL)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MCCRERY (R-LA)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MICHEL (R-IL)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SENSENBRENNER (R-WI)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SUNDQUIST (R-TN)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HOLLOWAY (R-LA)	100.00	91.67	0.00	8.33	0.00
HAMMERSCHMIDT (R-AR)	100.00	83.33	0.00	16.67	0.00
STUMP (R-AZ)	100.00	75.00	0.00	25.00	0.00
ARCHER (R-TX)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
ARMEY (R-TX)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
BALLENGER (R-NC)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
BARTLETT (R-TX)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
BATEMAN (R-VA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
BEREUTER (R-NE)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
BURTON (R-IN)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
COBLE (R-NC)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
COUGHLIN (R-PA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
COX (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
CRANE (R-IL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
DICKINSON (R-AL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
EDWARDS, MICKEY (R-OK)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
FAWELL (R-IL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
FIELDS (R-TX)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
GALLEGLY (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
GRADISON (R-OH)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
HANCOCK (R-MO)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
HEFLEY (R-CO)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
HILER (R-IN)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
HUNTER (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
IRELAND (R-FL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
KYL (R-AZ)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
LEWIS, TOM (R-FL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
LIVINGSTON (R-LA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
LOWERY, BILL (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
MADIGAN (R-IL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
MCCANDLESS (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
MOORHEAD (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
NIELSON, HOWARD (R-UT)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
PACKARD (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00

PAXON (R-NY)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
QUILLEN (R-TN)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
RHODES, III (R-AZ)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
ROHRABACHER (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
ROTH, TOBY (R-WI)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
SHAW (R-FL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
SHUMWAY (R-CA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
SKEEN (R-NM)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
SPENCE (R-SC)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
STEARNS (R-FL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
THOMAS, CRAIG (R-WY)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
VUCANOVICH (R-NV)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
WALKER (R-PA)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
YOUNG, BILL (R-FL)	91.67	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
BILIRAKIS (R-FL)	90.91	83.33	8.33	8.33	0.00
DORNAN, ROBERT (R-CA)	90.91	83.33	8.33	8.33	0.00
GRANT (R-FL)	90.91	83.33	8.33	8.33	0.00
INHOFE (R-OK)	90.91	83.33	8.33	8.33	0.00
LENT (R-NY)	90.91	83.33	8.33	8.33	0.00
VANDER JAGT (R-MI)	90.91	83.33	8.33	8.33	0.00
KOLBE (R-AZ)	90.00	75.00	8.33	16.67	0.00
SMITH, DENNY (R-OR)	90.00	75.00	8.33	16.67	0.00
LEWIS, JERRY (R-CA)	88.89	66.67	8.33	25.00	0.00
FRENZEL (R-MN)	87.50	58.33	8.33	33.33	0.00
LUKENS, DONALD (R-OH)	87.50	58.33	8.33	33.33	0.00
CRAIG (R-ID)	85.71	50.00	8.33	41.67	0.00
BLILEY (R-VA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
BROOMFIELD (R-MI)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
BROWN, HANK (R-CO)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
BUNNING (R-KY)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
CALLAHAN (R-AL)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
COURTER (R-NJ)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
DANNEMEYER (R-CA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
DOUGLAS (R-NH)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
DREIER, DAVID (R-CA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
DUNCAN, JR. (R-TN)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
GILLMOR (R-OH)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
GUNDERSON (R-WI)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
HERGER (R-CA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
HOPKINS (R-KY)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
JAMES (R-FL)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
KASICH (R-OH)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
LAGOMARSINO (R-CA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
LIGHTFOOT (R-IA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
MARLENEE (R-MT)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
MCCOLLUM (R-FL)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
MCEWEN (R-OH)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
MCMILLAN, ALEX (R-NC)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
MILLER, CLARENCE (R-OH)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
MYERS (R-IN)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
OXLEY (R-OH)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
PETRI (R-WI)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
RITTER (R-PA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
ROBERTS, PAT (R-KS)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
ROGERS (R-KY)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
SCHIFF (R-NM)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
SHUSTER (R-PA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
SLAUGHTER, D. FRENCH (R-VA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
SMITH, LAMAR (R-TX)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
SMITH, VIRGINIA (R-NE)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00

UPTON (R-MI)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
WEBER (R-MN)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
WOLF (R-VA)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
WYLIE (R-OH)	83.33	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
BARTON (R-TX)	81.82	75.00	16.67	8.33	0.00
CHANDLER (R-WA)	81.82	75.00	16.67	8.33	0.00
CLINGER (R-PA)	81.82	75.00	16.67	8.33	0.00
GINGRICH (R-GA)	81.82	75.00	16.67	8.33	0.00
PURSELL (R-MI)	81.82	75.00	16.67	8.33	0.00
SCHULZE (R-PA)	81.82	75.00	16.67	8.33	0.00
YOUNG, DON (R-AK)	81.82	75.00	16.67	8.33	0.00
BUECHNER (R-MO)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
COLEMAN, THOMAS (R-MO)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
GOODLING (R-PA)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
GRANDY (R-IA)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
HYDE (R-IL)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
MEYERS (R-KS)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
MORRISON, SID (R-WA)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
PARRIS (R-VA)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
SMITH, ROBERT C. (R-NH)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
SMITH, ROBERT F. (R-OR)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
STANGELAND (R-MN)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
WHITTAKER (R-KS)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
ROBINSON (R-AR)	75.00	50.00	16.67	33.33	0.00
THOMAS, WILLIAM (R-CA)	75.00	50.00	16.67	33.33	0.00
BENTLEY (R-MD)	72.73	66.67	25.00	8.33	0.00
EMERSON (R-MO)	72.73	66.67	25.00	8.33	0.00
DEWINE (R-OH)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
FISH (R-NY)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
MARTIN, DAVID (R-NY)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
MARTIN, LYNN (R-IL)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
MOLINARI (R-NY)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
REGULA (R-OH)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
SCHUETTE (R-MI)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
GALLO (R-NJ)	63.64	58.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
HOUGHTON (R-NY)	63.64	58.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
MILLER, JOHN (R-WA)	63.64	58.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
PASHAYAN (R-CA)	63.64	58.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
ROS-LEHTINEN (R-FL)	63.64	58.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
SAXTON (R-NJ)	63.64	58.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
SOLOMON (R-NY)	63.64	58.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
CAMPBELL, TOM (R-CA)	63.64	58.33	33.33	0.00	8.33
TAUKE (R-IA)	60.00	50.00	33.33	16.67	0.00
BOEHLERT (R-NY)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
HENRY (R-MI)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
PORTER (R-IL)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
RAVENEL (R-SC)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
RIDGE (R-PA)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
SCHAEFER (R-CO)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
SAIKI (R-HI)	54.55	50.00	41.67	8.33	0.00
MCDADE (R-PA)	45.45	41.67	50.00	8.33	0.00
WELDON (R-PA)	45.45	41.67	50.00	8.33	0.00
DAVIS, ROBERT (R-MI)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
JOHNSON, NANCY (R-CT)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
LEACH, JAMES (R-IA)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
ROWLAND, JOHN (R-CT)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
SNOWE (R-ME)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
MCGRATH (R-NY)	36.36	33.33	58.33	8.33	0.00
ROUKEMA (R-NJ)	36.36	33.33	58.33	8.33	0.00
GREEN (R-NY)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00

MACHTLEY (R-RI)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
SMITH, CHRISTOPHER (R-NJ)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
SMITH, PETER (R-VT)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
WALSH (R-NY)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
GILMAN (R-NY)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
HORTON (R-NY)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
MORELLA (R-MD)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
SHAYS (R-CT)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
RINALDO (R-NJ)	18.18	16.67	75.00	8.33	0.00
SCHNEIDER (R-RI)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
CONTE (R-MA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
BLAZ (R-GUAM)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CHENEY (R-WY)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MOLINARI (R-NY)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SMITH, LARKIN (R-MS)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Do you wish to display a description
of the votes in this vote file?.....

Voting Performance by
 House Democrats

In Order by Percent 'FOR' (When Voting)

Based on 12 Votes in House Vote File Named 'KEY HOUSE VOTES'
 Description: key House votes

	% For (When Voting)	-----% Based on All Votes-----			
		% For	% Against	% Not Voting	% Abstai
MONTGOMERY (D-MS)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
PARKER (D-MS)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
RAY (D-GA)	75.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
HALL, RALPH (D-TX)	72.73	66.67	25.00	8.33	0.00
HUTTO (D-FL)	72.73	66.67	25.00	8.33	0.00
STENHOLM (D-TX)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
LEATH, MARVIN (D-TX)	66.67	50.00	25.00	25.00	0.00
TAUZIN (D-LA)	63.64	58.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
BARNARD (D-GA)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
BYRON (D-MD)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
HUCKABY (D-LA)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
PICKETT (D-VA)	58.33	58.33	41.67	0.00	0.00
SARPALIUS (D-TX)	54.55	50.00	41.67	8.33	0.00
STALLINGS (D-ID)	54.55	50.00	41.67	8.33	0.00
HUBBARD (D-KY)	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
SISISKY (D-VA)	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
HAYES, JAMES A. (D-LA)	50.00	41.67	41.67	16.67	0.00
JENKINS (D-GA)	45.45	41.67	50.00	8.33	0.00
DERRICK (D-SC)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
ENGLISH (D-OK)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
GEREN (D-TX)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
PATTERSON (D-SC)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
ROWLAND, ROY (D-GA)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
SKELTON (D-MO)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
TAYLOR (D-MS)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
THOMAS, ROBERT (D-GA)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
VALENTINE (D-NC)	41.67	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00
WATKINS (D-OK)	37.50	25.00	41.67	33.33	0.00
NEAL, STEPHEN (D-NC)	36.36	33.33	58.33	8.33	0.00
BEVILL (D-AL)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
BROWDER (D-AL)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
CAMPBELL, BEN (D-CO)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
CLARKE (D-NC)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
COOPER (D-TN)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
DARDEN (D-GA)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
HATCHER (D-GA)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
LANCASTER (D-NC)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
LLOYD (D-TN)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
OLIN (D-VA)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
PAYNE, LEWIS (D-VA)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
LAUGHLIN (D-TX)	30.00	25.00	58.33	16.67	0.00
DONNELLY (D-MA)	27.27	25.00	66.67	8.33	0.00
WILSON, CHARLES (D-TX)	27.27	25.00	66.67	8.33	0.00
ANDREWS (D-TX)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
CHAPMAN (D-TX)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00

HARRIS (D-AL)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
HEFNER (D-NC)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
JONES, BEN (D-GA)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
LAFALCE (D-NY)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
LIPINSKI (D-IL)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
ORTIZ (D-TX)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
PICKLE (D-TX)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
TALLON (D-SC)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
VOLKMER (D-MO)	25.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
FLIPPO (D-AL)	25.00	8.33	25.00	66.67	0.00
NELSON, BILL (D-FL)	20.00	8.33	33.33	58.33	0.00
MURPHY (D-PA)	18.18	16.67	75.00	8.33	0.00
TANNER (D-TN)	18.18	16.67	75.00	8.33	0.00
APPLEGATE (D-OH)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
BENNETT (D-FL)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
BUSTAMANTE (D-TX)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
ERDREICH (D-AL)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
LONG (D-IN)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
MARTINEZ (D-CA)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
MCCURDY (D-OK)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
MOLLOHAN (D-WV)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
SLATTERY (D-KS)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
YATRON (D-PA)	16.67	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00
ALEXANDER (D-AR)	11.11	8.33	66.67	25.00	0.00
JONES, WALTER (D-NC)	10.00	8.33	75.00	16.67	0.00
BEILENSEN (D-CA)	9.09	8.33	83.33	8.33	0.00
BROOKS (D-TX)	9.09	8.33	83.33	8.33	0.00
CARR (D-MI)	9.09	8.33	83.33	8.33	0.00
EARLY (D-MA)	9.09	8.33	83.33	8.33	0.00
JOHNSTON, HARRY (D-FL)	9.09	8.33	83.33	8.33	0.00
KOLTER (D-PA)	9.09	8.33	83.33	8.33	0.00
STAGGERS (D-WV)	9.09	8.33	83.33	8.33	0.00
TRAXLER (D-MI)	9.09	8.33	83.33	8.33	0.00
ANNUNZIO (D-IL)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
ANTHONY (D-AR)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
ASPIN (D-WI)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
BILBRAY (D-NV)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
CLEMENT (D-TN)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
CONDIT (D-CA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
COSTELLO (D-IL)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
DE LA GARZA (D-TX)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
DYSON (D-MD)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
ECKART (D-OH)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
GAYDOS (D-PA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
GLICKMAN (D-KS)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
GUARINI (D-NJ)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
HAMILTON (D-IN)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
HOAGLAND (D-NE)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
HOCHBRUECKNER (D-NY)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
JACOBS (D-IN)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
JOHNSON, TIMOTHY P. (D-SD)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
KANJORSKI (D-PA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
LEHMAN, WILLIAM (D-FL)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
LUKEN, THOMAS (D-OH)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
MANTON (D-NY)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
MAZZOLI (D-KY)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
MCMILLEN, TOM (D-MD)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
MCNULTY (D-NY)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
MOAKLEY (D-MA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
MURTHA (D-PA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00

NAGLE (D-IA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
NATCHER (D-KY)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
NEAL, RICHARD (D-MA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
PALLONE (D-NJ)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
PENNY (D-MN)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
PERKINS (D-KY)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
PRICE, DAVID (D-NC)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
RAHALL (D-WV)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
RICHARDSON (D-NM)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
ROE (D-NJ)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
ROSE (D-NC)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
SANGMEISTER (D-IL)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
SHARP (D-IN)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
SMITH, NEAL (D-IA)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
SPRATT (D-SC)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
TRAFICANT (D-OH)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
WHITTEN (D-MS)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
WISE (D-WV)	8.33	8.33	91.67	0.00	0.00
ACKERMAN (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
ANDERSON (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
ATKINS (D-MA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BATES (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BOGGS (D-LA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BORSKI (D-PA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BOSCO (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BOUCHER (D-VA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BRENNAN (D-ME)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BRUCE (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BRYANT, JOHN (D-TX)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
CARDIN (D-MD)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
CARPER (D-DE)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
COYNE, WILLIAM (D-PA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
DE FAZIO (D-OR)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
DELLUMS (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
DICKS (D-WA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
DINGELL (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
DIXON, JULIAN (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
DORGAN, BYRON (D-ND)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
DOWNEY, THOMAS (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
DYMALLY, MERVYN (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
EDWARDS, DON (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
ENGEL (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
ESPY (D-MS)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
EVANS, LANE (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
FASCELL (D-FL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
FAZIO (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
FEIGHAN (D-OH)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
FOGLIETTA (D-PA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
FOLEY (D-WA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
FORD, WILLIAM (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
FROST (D-TX)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
GEJDENSON (D-CT)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
GEPHARDT (D-MO)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
GONZALEZ (D-TX)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
GORDON (D-TN)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
GRAY, WILLIAM (D-PA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
HALL, TONY (D-OH)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
HAYES, CHARLES A. (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
HERTEL (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
HOYER (D-MD)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00

HUGHES (D-NJ)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
JONTZ (D-IN)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
KAPTUR (D-OH)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
KASTENMEIER (D-WI)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
KENNEDY, JOSEPH (D-MA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
KENNELLY (D-CT)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
KILDEE (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
KLECZKA (D-WI)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
KOSTMAYER (D-PA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
LANTOS (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
LEVINE, MEL (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
LEVIN, SANDER (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
LEWIS, JOHN (D-GA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
LOWEY, NITA (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MARKEY (D-MA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MATSUI (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MAVROULES (D-MA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MCCLOSKEY (D-IN)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MCDERMOTT (D-WA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MCHUGH (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MILLER, GEORGE (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MORRISON, BRUCE (D-CT)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
MRAZEK (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
NOWAK (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
OWENS, MAJOR (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
PANETTA (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
PAYNE, DONALD (D-NJ)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
PEASE (D-OH)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
PELOSI (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
POSHARD (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
RUSSO (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SABO (D-MN)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SAVAGE (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SAWYER (D-OH)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SCHEUER (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SCHROEDER (D-CO)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SCHUMER (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SERRANO (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SKAGGS (D-CO)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SLAUGHTER, LOUISE (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SMITH, LAWRENCE (D-FL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SOLARZ (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
STARK (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
STUDDS (D-MA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SWIFT (D-WA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SYNAR (D-OK)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
TORRES (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
TOWNS (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
UDALL (D-AZ)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
UNSOELD (D-WA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
VENTO (D-MN)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
VISCLOSKEY (D-IN)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
WALGREN (D-PA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
WASHINGTON (D-TX)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
WAXMAN (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
WEISS (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
WHEAT (D-MO)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
WOLPE (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
WYDEN (D-OR)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
BERMAN (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00

BONIOR (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
BOXER (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
BROWN, GEORGE (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
COLEMAN, RONALD (D-TX)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
COLLINS (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
CONYERS (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
CROCKETT (D-MI)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
DURBIN (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
DWYER (D-NJ)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
FLAKE (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
FRANK (D-MA)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
GIBBONS (D-FL)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
LEHMAN, RICHARD (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
MFUME (D-MD)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
MINETA (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
OBERSTAR (D-MN)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
OBEY (D-WI)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
RANGEL, CHARLES (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
ROSTENKOWSKI (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
ROYBAL (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
SIKORSKI (D-MN)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
STOKES (D-OH)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
TORRICELLI (D-NJ)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
WILLIAMS, PAT (D-MT)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
YATES (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	91.67	8.33	0.00
AKAKA (D-HI)	0.00	0.00	85.71	14.29	0.00
AUCOIN (D-OR)	0.00	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00
CLAY (D-MO)	0.00	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00
MOODY (D-WI)	0.00	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00
OAKAR (D-OH)	0.00	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00
OWENS, WAYNE (D-UT)	0.00	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00
HAWKINS, AUGUSTUS (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	66.67	33.33	0.00
FORD, HAROLD (D-TN)	0.00	0.00	58.33	41.67	0.00
COELHO (D-CA)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DE LUGO (D-VI)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FALEOMAVAEGA (D-AS)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FAUNTROY (D-DC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FLORIO (D-NJ)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FUSTER (D-PR)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GARCIA (D-NY)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
LELAND (D-TX)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PEPPER (D-FL)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
ROBINSON (D-AR)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WRIGHT (D-TX)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Do you wish to display a description
of the votes in this vote file?.....

ATTACHMENT B

KEY VOTE ANALYSIS

SENATE

INDEX

List of Key Votes	p. 1
Republican Rankings	p. 3
Democrat Rankings	p. 4

ATTACHMENT B

15 Key Votes in the Second Session of the 101st Congress (1990)

<u>OUTCOME</u>	<u>ISSUE</u>
WON	Presidential Veto of Chinese Students Immigration Bill. The veto was sustained 65-37.
WON	Wirth-Wilson Alternative Fuels Amendment to the Clean Air Bill. The amendment would have gutted an Administration backed alternative fuels compromise contained in the Clean Air Bill. The Wirth-Wilson Amendment was defeated 52-46.
WON	Byrd Coal Miners Amendment to the Clean Air Bill. The amendment created a new compensation program for unemployed miners. The Amendment was defeated 49-50.
LOST	Dole-Nickles-Heflin Permitting Amendment to the Clean Air Bill. The amendment established operating permits to facilitate enforcement and to provide a process for implementing new control requirements. The amendment was defeated 49-51.
WON	Final Passage of the Clean Air Act. The bill passed 89-11.
WON	Confirmation of Tim Ryan to be Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision. Confirmed 62-37.
WON	Byrd-Johnston Transfer Amendment to the Supplemental Appropriations Bill. The Amendment would have transferred funds the Administration wanted for Nicaragua and Panama into domestic programs. The amendment was defeated 48-51.
LOST	Abortion-Related Procedural Vote on the Supplemental Appropriations Bill. The appropriations bill for Panama and Nicaragua contained a provision allowing the District of Columbia to use its Medicaid funds for abortion. The President said he would veto the bill if this provision was retained. Republicans attempted to strike the provision on a procedural vote. This tactic failed 45-51. Subsequently, the provision was removed in conference.

LOST	Final Passage of the Hatch Act Amendments. Bill passed 67-30. (See next vote.)
WON	Presidential Veto of the Hatch Act Amendments. Veto sustained 65-35.
LOST	Deconcini Amendment Restricting Manufacture and Sale of Nine Semi-automatic Assault Weapons. Amendment passed 50-48.
WON	Procedural Vote to reconsider Thurmond Habeas Corpus Amendment to the Crime Bill. The amendment to reform habeas corpus was initially defeated by the Senate. A motion was made to reconsider the amendment, and the motion to reconsider passed 52-46. Subsequently, the Thurmond amendment passed by voice vote.
WON	Graham Amendment to strike Kennedy Racial Justice Provisions from the Crime Bill. Department of Justice argued the racial justice language would have prevented the imposition and carrying out of death penalties. The Graham Amendment passed 58-38.
WON	Presidential Veto of the Amtrak Authorization Bill. Veto sustained 65-35.
LOST	Final Passage of the Flag Desecration Constitutional Amendment. The amendment was defeated 58-42. (67 votes were needed to pass the amendment.)

REPUBLICAN SENATORS' PRESIDENTIAL SUPPORT SCORES -- 1990

LEGI-SLATE Report for the 101st Congress

Mon, July 9, 1990 12:42pm (EDT)

Voting Performance by
Senate Republicans

In Order by Percent 'FOR' (When Voting)

Based on 15 Votes in Senate Vote File Named 'KEYVOTES2'
Description: Key votes 101st

	% For (When Voting)	-----% Based on All Votes-----			
		% For	% Against	% Not Voting	% Abstain
DOLE (R-KS)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GRAMM, PHIL (R-TX)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
LUGAR (R-IN)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MACK (R-FL)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MURKOWSKI (R-AK)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SIMPSON (R-WY)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
THURMOND (R-SC)	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BURNS (R-MT)	93.33	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
COATS (R-IN)	93.33	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
COCHRAN (R-MS)	93.33	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
HATCH (R-UT)	93.33	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
HUMPHREY (R-NH)	93.33	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
LOTT (R-MS)	93.33	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
MCCONNELL (R-KY)	93.33	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
NICKLES, DON (R-OK)	93.33	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.00
BOND (R-MO)	92.86	86.67	6.67	6.67	0.00
DOMENICI (R-NM)	92.86	86.67	6.67	6.67	0.00
BOSCHWITZ (R-MN)	86.67	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.00
GARN (R-UT)	86.67	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.00
GRASSLEY (R-IA)	86.67	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.00
ROTH, WILLIAM (R-DE)	86.67	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.00
RUDMAN (R-NH)	86.67	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.00
SYMMS (R-ID)	86.67	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.00
WALLOP (R-WY)	86.67	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.00
ARMSTRONG (R-CO)	85.71	80.00	13.33	6.67	0.00
DANFORTH (R-MO)	80.00	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
GORTON (R-WA)	80.00	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
KASTEN (R-WI)	80.00	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
MCCAIN (R-AZ)	80.00	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
MCCLURE (R-ID)	80.00	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
STEVENS (R-AK)	78.57	73.33	20.00	6.67	0.00
D'AMATO (R-NY)	73.33	73.33	26.67	0.00	0.00
HELMS (R-NC)	73.33	73.33	26.67	0.00	0.00
KASSEBAUM (R-KS)	73.33	73.33	26.67	0.00	0.00
PRESSLER (R-SD)	73.33	73.33	26.67	0.00	0.00
WARNER (R-VA)	73.33	73.33	26.67	0.00	0.00
CHAFEE (R-RI)	69.23	60.00	26.67	13.33	0.00
HEINZ (R-PA)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
SPECTER (R-PA)	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
WILSON, PETE (R-CA)	64.29	60.00	33.33	6.67	0.00
COHEN (R-ME)	60.00	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00
DURENBERGER (R-MN)	60.00	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00
JEFFORDS (R-VT)	46.67	46.67	53.33	0.00	0.00
HATFIELD (R-OR)	40.00	40.00	60.00	0.00	0.00
PACKWOOD (R-OR)	40.00	40.00	60.00	0.00	0.00

DEMOCRATIC SENATORS' PRESIDENTIAL SUPPORT SCORES -- 1990

LEGI-SLATE Report for the 101st Congress

Mon, July 9, 1990 12:53pm (EDT)

Voting Performance by
Senate Democrats

In Order by Percent 'FOR' (When Voting)

Based on 15 Votes in Senate Vote File Named 'KEYVOTES2'
Description: Key votes 101st

	% For (When Voting)	-----% Based on All Votes-----			
		% For	% Against	% Not Voting	% Abstain
BREAUX (D-LA)	64.29	60.00	33.33	6.67	0.00
HEFLIN (D-AL)	60.00	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00
SHELBY (D-AL)	60.00	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00
JOHNSTON, BENNETT (D-LA)	57.14	53.33	40.00	6.67	0.00
BOREN (D-OK)	53.33	53.33	46.67	0.00	0.00
FORD, WENDELL (D-KY)	53.33	53.33	46.67	0.00	0.00
HOLLINGS (D-SC)	53.33	53.33	46.67	0.00	0.00
BAUCUS (D-MT)	46.67	46.67	53.33	0.00	0.00
EXON (D-NE)	46.67	46.67	53.33	0.00	0.00
NUNN (D-GA)	46.67	46.67	53.33	0.00	0.00
ROBB (D-VA)	46.67	46.67	53.33	0.00	0.00
DECONCINI (D-AZ)	35.71	33.33	60.00	0.00	6.67
BENTSEN (D-TX)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
BYRD, ROBERT (D-WV)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
DIXON, ALAN (D-IL)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
FOWLER (D-GA)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
GRAHAM, BOB (D-FL)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
REID (D-NV)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
SANFORD (D-NC)	33.33	33.33	66.67	0.00	0.00
BRYAN, RICHARD (D-NV)	26.67	26.67	73.33	0.00	0.00
CONRAD (D-ND)	26.67	26.67	73.33	0.00	0.00
DODD (D-CT)	26.67	26.67	73.33	0.00	0.00
LIEBERMAN (D-CT)	26.67	26.67	73.33	0.00	0.00
MITCHELL, GEORGE (D-ME)	26.67	26.67	73.33	0.00	0.00
PRYOR (D-AR)	26.67	26.67	73.33	0.00	0.00
MATSUNAGA (D-HI)	25.00	16.67	50.00	33.33	0.00
INOUE (D-HI)	21.43	20.00	73.33	6.67	0.00
RIEGLE (D-MI)	21.43	20.00	73.33	6.67	0.00
BIDEN (D-DE)	20.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
BINGAMAN (D-NM)	20.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
BUMPERS (D-AR)	20.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
BURDICK (D-ND)	20.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
LEVIN, CARL (D-MI)	20.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
ROCKEFELLER (D-WV)	20.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
SARBANES (D-MD)	20.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
METZENBAUM (D-OH)	15.38	13.33	73.33	6.67	6.67
DASCHLE (D-SD)	13.33	13.33	86.67	0.00	0.00
GLENN (D-OH)	13.33	13.33	86.67	0.00	0.00
KERREY, BOB (D-NE)	13.33	13.33	86.67	0.00	0.00
LEAHY (D-VT)	13.33	13.33	86.67	0.00	0.00
MOYNIHAN (D-NY)	13.33	13.33	86.67	0.00	0.00
SASSER (D-TN)	13.33	13.33	86.67	0.00	0.00
ADAMS (D-WA)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00

BRADLEY (D-NJ)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
CRANSTON (D-CA)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
GORJ (D-TN)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
HARKIN (D-IA)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
KENNEDY, EDWARD (D-MA)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
KERRY (D-MA)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
KOHL (D-WI)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
LAUTENBERG (D-NJ)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
MIKULSKI (D-MD)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
PELL (D-RI)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
WIRTH (D-CO)	6.67	6.67	93.33	0.00	0.00
SIMON (D-IL)	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
AKAKA (D-HI)	0.00	0.00	66.67	33.33	0.00

	1	2	3
Alabama			
Heflin	71	29	71
Shelby	68	32	68
Alaska			
Murkowski	85	10	90
Stevens	87	13	87
Arizona			
DeConcini	61	38	62
McCain	91	9	91
Arkansas			
Bumpers	50	50	50
Pryor	53	45	55
California			
Cranston	50	50	50
Wilson	68	22	76
Colorado			
Wirth	56	41	58
Armstrong	83	12	88
Connecticut			
Dodd	54	45	55
Lieberman	56	44	56
Delaware			
Biden	50	48	52
Roth	94	5	95
Florida			
Graham	64	36	64
Mack	86	14	86
Georgia			
Fowler	61	38	62
Nunn	72	28	72
Hawaii			
Inouye	60	37	62
Matsunaga	50	35	59
Idaho			
McClure	88	10	90
Symms	82	14	86
Illinois			
Dixon	72	28	72
Simon	41	58	41
Indiana			
Coats	81	19	81
Lugar	93	2	98

	1	2	3
Iowa			
Harkin	38	58	39
Grassley	79	21	79
Kansas			
Dole	94	4	96
Kassebaum	85	14	86
Kentucky			
Ford	60	39	61
McConnell	82	18	82
Louisiana			
Breaux	71	28	72
Johnston	70	30	70
Maine			
Mitchell	57	43	57
Cohen	74	26	74
Maryland			
Mikulski	41	56	42
Sarbanes	45	53	45
Massachusetts			
Kennedy	48	49	49
Kerry	47	53	47
Michigan			
Levin	50	50	50
Riegle	45	54	45
Minnesota			
Boschwitz	86	10	90
Durenberger	77	18	81
Mississippi			
Cochran	94	6	94
Lott	82	16	84
Missouri			
Bond	86	12	88
Danforth	90	10	90
Montana			
Baucus	48	48	50
Burns	86	12	88
Nebraska			
Exon	65	35	65
Kerrey	51	49	51
Nevada			
Bryan	59	40	60
Reid	63	37	63

	1	2	3
New Hampshire			
Humphrey	76	23	77
Rudman	80	19	81
New Jersey			
Bradley	46	51	47
Lautenberg	49	50	49
New Mexico			
Bingaman	54	46	54
Domenici	90	7	93
New York			
Moynihan	52	45	54
D'Amato	67	32	68
North Carolina			
Sanford	56	40	59
Helms	71	28	72
North Dakota			
Burdick	51	48	52
Conrad	55	45	55
Ohio			
Glenn	59	38	61
Metzenbaum	39	59	39
Oklahoma			
Boren	77	20	80
Nickles	86	11	89
Oregon			
Hatfield	69	30	70
Packwood	79	18	82
Pennsylvania			
Heinz	71	27	73
Specter	66	34	66
Rhode Island			
Pell	49	48	51
Chafee	81	19	81
South Carolina			
Hollings	67	33	67
Thurmond	90	10	90
South Dakota			
Daschle	49	51	49
Pressler	59	41	59
Tennessee			
Gore	56	30	66
Sasser	55	43	57

Democrats Republicans

	1	2	3
Texas			
Bentsen	69	28	71
Gramm	86	12	88
Utah			
Garn	86	11	89
Hatch	81	18	82
Vermont			
Leahy	47	53	47
Jeffords	68	26	73
Virginia			
Robb	73	27	73
Warner	86	13	87
Washington			
Adams	43	56	43
Gorton	89	11	89
West Virginia			
Byrd	54	46	54
Rockefeller	51	49	51
Wisconsin			
Kohl	47	53	47
Kasten	85	15	85
Wyoming			
Simpson	84	10	89
Wallop	78	13	86

ND Northern Democrats SD Southern Democrats

Southern states - Ala., Ark., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N.C., Okla., S.C., Tenn., Texas, Va.

Presidential Support and Opposition: Senate

1. Bush Support Score, 1989. Percentage of 101 recorded votes in 1989 on which President Bush took a position and on which a senator voted "yea" or "nay" *in agreement* with the president's position. Failures to vote lower both support and opposition scores.

2. Bush Opposition Score, 1989. Percentage of 101 recorded votes in 1989 on which President Bush took a position and on which a senator voted "yea" or "nay" *in disagreement* with the president's position. Failures to vote lower both support and opposition scores.

3. Bush Support Score, 1989. Percentage of 101 recorded votes in 1989 on which President Bush took a position and on which a senator was present and voted "yea" or "nay" *in agreement* with the president's position. In this version of the study, absences are not counted; therefore, failures to vote do not lower support or opposition scores. Opposition scores, not listed here, are the inverse of the support score; i.e., the opposition score is equal to 100 percent minus the individual's support score.

Presidential Support, Presidential Opposition: House

1. Bush Support Score, 1989. Percentage of 86 recorded votes in 1989 on which President Bush took a position and on which a representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the president's position. Failures to vote lower both support and opposition scores.

2. Bush Opposition Score, 1989. Percentage of 86 recorded votes in 1989 on which President Bush took a position and on which a representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the president's position. Failures to vote lower both support and opposition scores.

3. Bush Support Score, 1989. Percentage of 86 recorded votes in 1989 on which President Bush took a position and on which a representative was present and voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the president's position. In this version of the study, absences are not counted; therefore, failures to vote do not lower support or opposition scores. Opposition scores, not listed here, are the inverse of the support score; i.e., the opposition score is equal to 100 percent minus the individual's support score.

¹ Rep. Glen Browder, D-Ala., was sworn in April 18, 1989, to succeed Bill Nichols, D, who died Dec. 13, 1988. Browder was eligible for 79 presidential-support votes in 1989. His presidential-support score was 54 percent; opposition score was 44 percent; support score, adjusted for absences, was 55 percent.

² Rep. Gary Condit, D-Calif., was sworn in Sept. 20, 1989, to succeed Tony Coelho, D, who resigned June 15, 1989. Coelho was eligible for only 27 presidential-support votes in 1989. His presidential-support score was 26 percent; opposition score was 63 percent; support score, adjusted for absences, was 29 percent. Condit was eligible for only 37 presidential-support votes in 1989.

³ Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, R-Fla., was sworn in Sept. 6, 1989, to succeed Claude Pepper, D, who died May 30, 1989. Pepper was eligible for only 15 presidential-support votes in 1989. His presidential-support score was 0 percent; opposition score was 7 percent; support score, adjusted for absences, was 0 percent. Ros-Lehtinen was eligible for only 41 presidential-support votes in 1989.

⁴ Rep. Jill Long, D-Ind., was sworn in April 5, 1989, to succeed Daniel R. Coats, R, who was sworn in as senator Jan. 3, 1989. Long was eligible for 82 presidential-support votes in 1989. Her presidential-support score was 33 percent; opposition score was 67 percent. She missed none of the presidential-support votes for which she was eligible.

⁵ Rep. Gene Taylor, D-Miss., was sworn in Oct. 24, 1989, to succeed Larkin Smith, R, who died Aug. 13, 1989. Smith was eligible for 45 presidential-support votes in 1989. His presidential-support score was 76 percent; opposition score was 24 percent. He missed none of the presidential-support votes for which he was eligible. Taylor was eligible for only 22 presidential-support votes in 1989.

⁶ Craig Washington, D-Texas, tentatively will be sworn in Jan. 23, 1990, to succeed Mickey Leland, D, who died Aug. 7, 1989. Leland was eligible for 45 presidential-support votes in 1989. His presidential-support score was 27 percent; opposition score was 62 percent; support score, adjusted for absences, was 30 percent.

⁷ Rep. Pete Geren, D-Texas, was sworn in Sept. 20, 1989, to succeed Jim Wright, D, who resigned June 30, 1989. Wright was eligible for 18 presidential-support votes in 1989. His presidential-support score was 22 percent; opposition score was 28 percent; support score, adjusted for absences, was 44 percent. Geren was eligible for only 37 presidential-support votes in 1989.

⁸ Rep. Craig Thomas, R-Wyo., was sworn in May 2, 1989, to succeed Dick Cheney, R, who became defense secretary March 21, 1989. Cheney was eligible for only one presidential-support vote in 1989. His presidential-support score was 100 percent. Thomas was eligible for 76 presidential-support votes in 1989.

⁹ Rep. Tommy F. Robinson, R-Ark., switched from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party on July 28.

¹⁰ Rep. Bill Grant, R-Fla., switched from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party on Feb. 21.

KEY

† Not eligible for all recorded votes in 1988 (sworn in after Jan. 25) or voted "present" to avoid possible conflict of interest.

Democrats Republicans

	1	2	3
Alabama			
1 Callahan	73	21	78
2 Dickinson	71	16	81
3 Browder†	54	44	55
4 Bevil	52	45	54
5 Flippo	45	45	50
6 Erdreich	49	50	49
7 Harris	52	48	52
Alaska			
AL Young	70	27	72
Arizona			
1 Rhodes	86	13	87
2 Udall	29	60	32
3 Strump	72	27	73
4 Kyl	80	20	80
5 Kolbe	69	28	71
Arkansas			
1 Alexander	34	63	35
2 Robinson*	64	31	67
3 Hammerschmidt	81	15	84
4 Anthony	38	57	40
California			
1 Bosco	34	60	36
2 Herger	76	24	76
3 Matsui	33	66	33
4 Fazio	35	64	35
5 Pelosi	26	70	27
6 Boxer	26	72	26
7 Miller	22	76	23
8 Dellums	23	76	24
9 Stark	24	73	25
10 Edwards	27	69	28
11 Lantos	31	62	34
12 Campbell	56	43	56
13 Mineta	29	64	31
14 Shumway	78	20	80
15 Condit†	35	65	35
16 Panetta	31	67	32
17 Pashayan	64	34	65
18 Lehman	29	63	32
19 Lagomarsino	73	27	73
20 Thomas	72	28	72
21 Gallegly	76	24	76
22 Moorhead	72	24	75
23 Beilenson	33	64	34
24 Waxman	28	63	31
25 Roybal	24	66	27
26 Berman	31	63	33
27 Levine	31	65	33
28 Dixon	29	63	32
29 Hawkins	26	64	29
30 Martinez	34	60	36
31 Dymally	29	63	32
32 Anderson	36	58	38
33 Dreier	76	24	76
34 Torres	29	69	30
35 Lewis	78	21	79
36 Brown	31	55	36
37 McCandless	77	19	80
38 Dornan	70	23	75
39 Dannemeyer	70	26	73
40 Cox	71	26	73
41 Lowery	74	22	77

	1	2	3
42 Rohrabacher	70	29	71
43 Packard	81	15	84
44 Bates	23	77	23
45 Hunter	76	22	77
Colorado			
1 Schroeder	19	79	19
2 Skaggs	35	65	35
3 Campbell	45	50	48
4 Brown	63	35	64
5 Hefley	65	31	67
6 Schaefer	69	29	70
Connecticut			
1 Kenedy	28	67	29
2 Gejdenson	26	74	26
3 Morrison	24	70	26
4 Shays	36	64	36
5 Rowland	51	47	52
6 Johnson	60	38	61
Delaware			
AL Carper	41	58	41
Florida			
1 Hutto	70	29	71
2 Grant**	77	22	78
3 Bennett	43	57	43
4 James	69	30	69
5 McCallum	72	26	74
6 Stearns	78	22	78
7 Gibbons	37	53	41
8 Young	71	26	73
9 Bilirakis	60	36	63
10 Ireland	65	22	75
11 Nelson	42	48	47
12 Lewis	72	28	72
13 Goss	69	31	69
14 Johnston	34	64	35
15 Shaw	77	22	78
16 Smith	34	64	35
17 Lehman	24	71	26
18 Ros-Lehtinen†	66	32	68
19 Foscill	40	59	40
Georgia			
1 Thomas	58	42	58
2 Hatcher	49	45	52
3 Roy	69	28	71
4 Jones	38	59	39
5 Lewis	28	72	28
6 Gingrich	87	9	90
7 Darden	56	42	57
8 Rowland	52	45	54
9 Jenkins	47	47	50
10 Barnard	67	24	73
Hawaii			
1 Saiiki	60	40	60
2 Akaka	35	62	36
Idaho			
1 Craig	78	22	78
2 Stallings	45	51	47
Illinois			
1 Hayes	27	73	27
2 Savage	23	70	25
3 Russo	27	72	27
4 Sangmeister	21	78	21
5 Lipinski	36	51	41
6 Hyde	66	16	80
7 Collins	14	38	27
8 Rostenkowski	36	59	38
9 Yates	27	72	27
10 Porter	65	35	65
11 Annunzio	37	60	38
12 Crane	63	30	68
13 Fawell	60	40	60
14 Hastert	76	23	76
15 Madigan	77	18	81
16 Martin	59	37	61
17 Evans	23	77	23
18 Michel	88	9	90
19 Bruce	33	67	33
20 Durbin	24	76	24
21 Costello	36	63	36
22 Poshard	35	65	35
Indiana			
1 Visclosky	30	67	31
2 Sharp	28	66	30
3 Hiler	81	19	81

ND Northern Democrats SD Southern Democrats

	1	2	3
4 Long†	33	67	33
5 Jantz	22	78	22
6 Burton	60	28	68
7 Myers	73	27	73
8 McCloskey	31	69	31
9 Hamilton	42	58	42
10 Jacobs	27	67	28
Iowa			
1 Leach	45	52	46
2 Taulke	66	30	69
3 Nagle	41	58	41
4 Smith	31	56	36
5 Lightfoot	72	27	73
6 Grandy	74	26	74
Kansas			
1 Roberts	79	21	79
2 Slattery	45	55	45
3 Meyers	69	31	69
4 Glickman	37	60	38
5 Whittaker	76	23	76
Kentucky			
1 Hubbard	49	50	49
2 Natcher	49	51	49
3 Mazzoli	50	50	50
4 Bunning	78	17	82
5 Rogers	80	20	80
6 Hopkins	72	28	72
7 Perkins	37	62	38
Louisiana			
1 Livingston	79	21	79
2 Boggs	50	45	52
3 Touzin	69	29	70
4 McCrery	85	15	85
5 Huckaby	74	22	77
6 Baker	70	27	72
7 Hayes	59	38	61
8 Holloway	66	26	72
Maine			
1 Brennan	27	73	27
2 Snowe	51	48	52
Maryland			
1 Dyson	48	52	48
2 Bentley	51	40	56
3 Cardin	36	63	36
4 McMillen	45	55	45
5 Hoyer	35	63	36
6 Byron	71	29	71
7 Mfume	31	66	32
8 Morella	41	58	41
Massachusetts			
1 Conte	43	53	45
2 Neal	30	64	32
3 Early	23	69	25
4 Frank	27	72	27
5 Atkins	30	67	31
6 Mavroules	37	60	38
7 Markey	28	71	28
8 Kennedy	23	73	24
9 Mookley	31	65	33
10 Studds	27	73	27
11 Donnelly	33	63	34
Michigan			
1 Conyers	14	57	20
2 Pursell	60	37	62
3 Wolpe	28	70	29
4 Upton	74	26	74
5 Henry	66	33	67
6 Carr	30	67	31
7 Kildee	35	65	35
8 Traxler	28	63	31
9 Vander Jagt	78	14	85
10 Schuette	65	28	70
11 Davis	52	30	63
12 Bonior	36	63	36
13 Crockett	22	64	26
14 Hertel	28	67	29
15 Ford	24	73	25
16 Dingell	35	62	36
17 Levin	31	69	31
18 Broomfield	74	20	79
Minnesota			
1 Penny	57	43	57
2 Weber	77	22	78
3 Frenzel	76	22	77
4 Vento	30	69	31

Southern states - Ala., Ark., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N.C., Okla., S.C., Tenn., Texas, Va.
Omitted votes are quorum calls, which CQ does not include in its vote charts.

	1	2	3
5 Sabo	30	69	31
6 Sikorski	30	70	30
7 Stangeland	78	16	83
8 Oberstar	35	64	35
Mississippi			
1 Whitten	52	47	53
2 Espy	35	59	37
3 Montgomery	78	22	78
4 Parker	71	23	75
5 Taylor††	68	32	68
Missouri			
1 Clay	28	62	31
2 Buechner	62	22	74
3 Gephardt	33	63	34
4 Skelton	59	34	64
5 Wheat	27	71	27
6 Coleman	67	30	69
7 Hancock	78	22	78
8 Emerson	78	21	79
9 Volkmer	53	47	53
Montana			
1 Williams	31	60	34
2 Marlenee	70	21	77
Nebraska			
1 Bereuter	69	29	70
2 Hoagland	35	65	35
3 Smith	80	17	82
Nevada			
1 Bilbray	45	53	46
2 Vucanovich	79	19	81
New Hampshire			
1 Smith	62	37	62
2 Douglas	64	34	65
New Jersey			
1 Florio	8	22	27
2 Hughes	30	69	31
3 Pallone	34	65	34
4 Smith	55	44	55
5 Roukema	53	42	56
6 Dwyer	34	63	35
7 Rinaldo	55	42	57
8 Roe	35	48	42
9 Torricelli	34	56	38
10 Payne	24	62	28
11 Gallo	64	34	65
12 Courter	6	10	36
13 Saxton	65	33	67
14 Guarini	34	63	35
New Mexico			
1 Schiff	69	30	69
2 Skeen	86	14	86
3 Richardson	37	58	39
New York			
1 Hochbrueckner	33	64	34
2 Downey	28	72	28
3 Mrazek	31	65	33
4 Lent	76	21	78
5 McGrath	60	36	63
6 Flake	27	67	28
7 Ackerman	27	66	29
8 Scheuer	30	59	34
9 Manton	38	53	42
10 Schumer	26	70	27
11 Towns	19	67	22
12 Owens	21	70	23
13 Solarz	37	63	37
14 Molinari	45	19	71
15 Green	57	37	61
16 Rangel	27	59	31
17 Weiss	28	70	29
18 Garcia	15	36	30
19 Engel	30	65	32
20 Lowey	28	70	29
21 Fish	65	33	67
22 Gilman	44	55	45
23 McNulty	42	57	42
24 Solomon	67	33	67
25 Boehlert	51	47	52
26 Martin	71	22	76
27 Walsh	69	30	69
28 McHugh	35	64	35
29 Harten	50	49	51
30 Slaughter	27	71	27
31 Paxon	73	26	74

	1	2	3
32 LaFalce	34	59	36
33 Nowak	37	60	38
34 Houghton	65	26	72
North Carolina			
1 Jones	36	51	41
2 Valentine	52	47	53
3 Lancaster	45	52	46
4 Price	34	66	34
5 Neal	29	65	31
6 Cable	81	17	82
7 Rose	36	58	38
8 Hefner	41	55	43
9 McMillan	80	17	82
10 Ballenger	79	20	80
11 Clarke	37	60	38
North Dakota			
AL Dorgan	24	74	25
Ohio			
1 Luken	38	51	43
2 Gradison	67	28	71
3 Hall	31	62	34
4 Oxley	80	19	81
5 Gillman	77	22	78
6 McEwen	72	21	78
7 DeWine	71	29	71
8 Lukens	72	23	76
9 Kaptur	33	64	34
10 Miller	76	20	79
11 Eckart	31	69	31
12 Kasich	70	29	71
13 Pease	30	66	31
14 Sawyer	33	67	33
15 Wylie	83	12	88
16 Regula	70	30	70
17 Traficant	29	71	29
18 Applegate	45	52	46
19 Feighan	31	66	32
20 Ooak	33	60	35
21 Stokes	28	70	29
Oklahoma			
1 Inhofe	72	24	75
2 Synar	28	71	28
3 Watkins	48	49	49
4 McCurdy	55	44	55
5 Edwards	81	9	90
6 English	64	35	65
Oregon			
1 AuCoin	26	69	27
2 Smith, R.	79	21	79
3 Wyden	27	69	28
4 Defazio	23	73	24
5 Smith, D.	71	17	80
Pennsylvania			
1 Foglietta	28	63	31
2 Gray	30	63	33
3 Borski	41	59	41
4 Kolter	45	48	49
5 Schulze	69	30	69
6 Yatron	27	47	37
7 Weldon	65	33	67
8 Kostmayer	26	72	26
9 Shuster	76	23	76
10 McDade	66	29	70
11 Kanjorski	36	63	36
12 Murtha	51	47	52
13 Coughlin	69	28	71
14 Coyne	30	70	30
15 Ritter	69	30	69
16 Walker	79	21	79
17 Gekas	69	29	70
18 Walgren	34	65	34
19 Goodling	65	29	69
20 Gaydos	42	56	43
21 Ridge	56	43	56
22 Murphy	34	62	35
23 Clinger	78	22	78
Rhode Island			
1 Machtley	49	50	49
2 Schneider	35	56	38
South Carolina			
1 Ravenel	64	33	66
2 Spence	72	24	75
3 Derrick	43	55	44
4 Patterson	55	45	55
5 Spratt	49	51	49
6 Tallon	56	41	58

South Dakota			
Al Johnson	34	66	34
Tennessee			
1 Quillen	71	21	77
2 Duncan	64	35	65
3 Lloyd	56	38	59
4 Cooper	48	50	49
5 Clement	42	52	44
6 Gordon	35	64	35
7 Sundquist	80	17	82
8 Tanner	47	51	48
9 Ford	21	64	25
Texas			
1 Chapman	49	47	51
2 Wilson	47	38	55
3 Bartlett	80	20	80
4 Hall	69	29	70
5 Bryant	24	43	36
6 Barton	67	27	72
7 Archer	81	16	83
8 Fields	78	20	80
9 Brooks	16	49	25
10 Pickle	47	52	47
11 Leath	60	27	69
12 Ceren††	51	49	51
13 Sarpalius	60	38	61
14 Laughlin	63	30	68
15 de la Garza	43	50	46
16 Coleman	35	62	36
17 Stenholm	71	28	72
18 Vacancy††			
19 Campbell	85	15	85
20 Gonzalez	38	62	38
21 Smith	80	14	85
22 Delay	79	19	81
23 Bustamante	40	56	41
24 Frost	38	58	40
25 Andrews	45	51	47
26 Armey	76	24	76
27 Ortiz	50	47	52
Utah			
1 Hansen	80	17	82
2 Owens	27	63	30
3 Nielson	76	23	76
Vermont			
Al Smith	50	49	51
Virginia			
1 Bateman	74	21	78
2 Pickett	52	47	52
3 Bliley	80	17	82
4 Sisisky	51	47	52
5 Payne	56	43	56
6 Olin	36	62	37
7 Slaughter	77	23	77
8 Parris	69	23	75
9 Boucher	27	67	29
10 Wolf	81	19	81
Washington			
1 Miller	59	36	62
2 Swift	31	65	33
3 Unsoeld	27	73	27
4 Morrison	67	31	68
5 Foley††	27	73	27
6 Dicks	38	57	40
7 McDermott	29	67	30
8 Chandler	62	34	65
West Virginia			
1 Mollohan	55	43	56
2 Staggers	40	59	40
3 Wise	31	60	34
4 Rahall	40	58	40
Wisconsin			
1 Aspin	41	38	51
2 Kastnermeier	28	71	28
3 Gunderson	77	23	77
4 Kleczka	28	66	30
5 Moody	27	73	27
6 Petri	66	34	66
7 Obey	31	67	32
8 Roth	72	27	73
9 Sensenbrenner	66	34	66
Wyoming			

Highest Scorers in Presidential Support...

Highest Scorers — Support

Highest individual scorers in presidential support — those who voted most often for Bush's position in 1989:

Senate



David L. Boren



Bob Dole

Democrats		Republicans	
Boren, Okla.	77%	Cochran, Miss.	94%
Robb, Va.	73	Dole, Kan.	94
Dixon, Ill.	72	Roth, Del.	94
Nunn, Ga.	72	Lugar, Ind.	93
Breaux, La.	71	McCain, Ariz.	91
Heflin, Ala.	71		

House



G. V. "Sonny" Montgomery



Robert H. Michel

Democrats		Republicans	
Montgomery, Miss.	78%	Michel, Ill.	88%
Huckaby, La.	74	Gingrich, Ga.	87
Byron, Md.	71	Rhodes, Ariz.	86
Parker, Miss.	71	Skeen, N.M.	86
Stenholm, Texas	71	Combest, Texas	85
Hutto, Fla.	70	McCrery, La.	85
Hall, Texas	69	Wylie, Ohio	83
Ray, Ga.	69		

Average Scores

Composite presidential support scores for Democrats and Republicans for 1989 and 1988:

	1989		1988	
	Dem.	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.
Support				
Senate	55%	82%	47%	68%
House	36	69	25	57
Opposition				
Senate	43%	16%	45%	25%
House	58	27	66	36

Regional Averages

Support

Regional presidential support scores for 1989. Scores for 1988 are in parentheses:

	East		West		South		Midwest	
Democrats								
Senate	50%	(41)	55%	(46)	65%	(54)	51%	(47)
House	32	(22)	30	(21)	47	(31)	32	(23)
Republicans								
Senate	75%	(57)	83%	(68)	85%	(76)	83%	(72)
House	58	(47)	72	(63)	75	(61)	71	(58)

Opposition

Regional presidential opposition scores for 1989. Scores for 1988 are in parentheses:

	East		West		South		Midwest	
Democrats								
Senate	49%	(48)	42%	(47)	34%	(39)	48%	(47)
House	61	(67)	65	(71)	49	(60)	64	(71)
Republicans								
Senate	23%	(42)	14%	(27)	14%	(26)	15%	(30)
House	36	(45)	25	(29)	22	(29)	26	(34)

(CQ defines regions of the United States as follows: **East:** Conn., Del., Maine, Md., Mass., N.H., N.J., N.Y., Pa., R.I., Vt., W.Va. **West:** Alaska, Ariz., Calif., Colo., Hawaii, Idaho, Mont., Nev., N.M., Ore., Utah, Wash., Wyo. **South:** Ala., Ark., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N.C., Okla., S.C., Tenn., Texas, Va. **Midwest:** Ill., Ind., Iowa, Kan., Mich., Minn., Mo., Neb., N.D., Ohio, S.D., Wis.)

... Include GOP Leaders Dole and Michel

Presidential Success

National Security vs. Domestic Issues

1989 presidential success scores broken down into domestic issues and national security issues, with national security including foreign policy and defense. Scores for 1988 are in parentheses:

	National Security	Domestic	Total
Senate	79% (92)	69% (45)	73% (65)
House	58 (53)	47 (24)	50 (33)
Total	71 (75)	57 (34)	62.6 (47)

Success Rate

Annual percentages of presidential victories since 1953 on congressional votes on which the presidents took a clear position:

Eisenhower	
1953	89.0%
1954	82.8
1955	75.0
1956	70.0
1957	68.0
1958	76.0
1959	52.0
1960	65.0

Kennedy	
1961	81.0%
1962	85.4
1963	87.1

Johnson	
1964	88.0%
1965	93.0
1966	79.0
1967	79.0
1968	75.0

Nixon	
1969	74.0%
1970	77.0
1971	75.0
1972	66.0
1973	50.6
1974	59.6

Ford	
1974	58.2%
1975	61.0
1976	53.8

Carter	
1977	75.4%
1978	78.3
1979	76.8
1980	75.1

Reagan	
1981	82.4%
1982	72.4
1983	67.1
1984	65.8
1985	59.9
1986	56.1
1987	43.5
1988	47.4

Bush	
1989	62.6%

Highest Scorers — Opposition

Highest individual scorers in presidential opposition — those who voted most often against Bush's position:

Senate



Howard M. Metzenbaum



Larry Pressler

Democrats

Metzenbaum, Ohio	59%
Harkin, Iowa	58
Simon, Ill.	58
Adams, Wash.	56
Mikulski, Md.	56
Riegle, Mich.	54
Kerry, Mass.	53
Kohl, Wis.	53
Leahy, Vt.	53
Sarbanes, Md.	53

Republicans

Pressler, S.D.	41%
Specter, Pa.	34
D'Amato, N.Y.	32
Hatfield, Ore.	30
Helms, N.C.	28
Heinz, Pa.	27
Cohen, Maine	26
Jeffords, Vt.	26

House



Patricia Schroeder



Christopher Shays

Democrats

Schroeder, Colo.	79%
Jontz, Ind.	78
Sangmeister, Ill.	78
Bates, Calif.	77
Evans, Ill.	77
Dellums, Calif.	76
Durbin, Ill.	76
Miller, Calif.	76

Republicans

Shays, Conn.	64%
Morella, Md.	58
Schneider, R.I.	56
Gilman, N.Y.	55
Conte, Mass.	53
Leach, Iowa	52
Machtley, R.I.	50

S. 324 -- MAJOR ISSUES

Draft Bill

DOE Proposed Changes

Industry 2/
Proposed Changes

Purpose

Seek to reduce the generation of CO2 and GHG as quickly as feasible.

Consider the contribution of energy use to potential climate change.

Focus Government and private attention on the implications of potential global climate change.

Goals 1/

Stabilize the generation of CO2 and other GHG

No change

Identify strategies to stabilize GHG to meet treaty obligations.

Investigate the feasibility of achieving a 20% reduction of CO2 by 2005

No change

Include all human-induced GHG

Establish an international agreement on climate change by 1992

Modify to "R&D" agreement

Encourage the initiation of a framework convention process

Title I: Energy Policy Initiatives

- Develop least cost energy strategy:
 - o Set priorities to achieve goals to maximum extent feasible
 - o Set targets for energy production and use
 - o Establish 2-year action plan to meet targets
 - o Least cost calculations should include the costs of maintaining access to foreign oil, and give a 10% preference to conservation over fossil fuel
- Establish DOE Director of Climate protection with broad responsibilities

- Change priorities to recommendations, emphasize use of market forces
- Delete targets
- Delete 2-year action plan
- Delete
- Delete entirely

- Delete linkage to goals
- Change targets to estimates
- Delete 2-year action plan
- Delete
- Retain, but limit responsibilities

1/ A substantial amount of language on goals is verbatim from the 1989 Noordwijk Declaration.

2/ Represents an amalgam of comments from several industry groups.

S. 324 -- MAJOR ISSUES

<u>Draft Bill</u>	<u>DOE Proposed Changes</u>	<u>Industry Proposed Changes</u>
- NAS 1-year study of global change causes, effects and mitigation actions; President must report his assessment to Congress 6 months later. - Federal Energy-Environmental Coordination Council	- DOE will review feasibility of requesting a NAS study - Delete. Replace with general language to urge President to assure coordination	- Change NAS to OSTP; expand study scope to include GHG sinks, adaptation measures, and assessment of population growth - Delete
<u>Title II: Energy Efficiency</u>		
- Study and report on policies to decrease energy use per GNP - Establish R&D centers for energy-intensive industries - Energy conservation and alternative clean energy at Federal facilities; Implement all projects with 10-year paybacks by 2000. 25% completed by 1995. Sanctions if not met. All new Federal leases after 1994 must meet new Federal standards - Numerical residential energy efficiency ratings. - Energy efficiency labelling for windows - Expand EIA data collection on end use energy consumption and utility conservation programs	Delete Delete centers; retain provisions on support for R&D energy intensive industries Change to 5-year payback. Make implementation dependent upon availability of funds. Delete alternative clean energy; limit to conservation only. All new construction after 1984 must meet new Federal building standards. No change No change No change	Change from payback period to life cycle cost analysis. Adjust ratings to account for climate differences. Delete pro-renewable bias in ratings No comment Delete; too costly and not needed

S. 324 -- MAJOR ISSUES

<u>Draft Bill</u>	<u>DOE Proposed Changes</u>	<u>Industry Proposed Changes</u>
- Require States to conduct public review of a requirement to permit utilities to earn higher earnings for least cost measures than supply investments. Encourage competitive bidding arrangements. (Least cost measures are defined as conservation and would include consideration of social and environmental costs.	Encourage States to consider guidelines to permit equal earnings. No change to scope of least cost measures (social, environmental costs).	Delete entirely
<u>Title III: Energy R&D</u>		
Establish 7 national priorities	Change "priorities" to add competitiveness to non-inclusive criteria;	Consider anti-trust barriers to private R&D
Prescribes procedures and requirements for energy R&D management plans, including establishment of specific R&D goals.	Delete management plan provisions and references to specific goals	No comment
Program scope includes engine R&D, hydrogen, fusion, coal, natural gas in vehicles (including bus and fleet demonstrations), enhanced natural gas production	Expand scope of vehicle R&D to include all alternative fuels	Consider safety in evaluating vehicles
New Federal Interagency Energy Technology Transfer Council to promote use of conservation and renewable energy in developing countries	Delete new council; assign functions to existing DOE Council	No comment
1-year assessment of methane emissions and control options	Stretch-out; 2-year study of emissions, 3-year study of control options	No comment
<u>Title IV: Natural Resources Policy</u>		
Require studies and assessments of:	No change	Consider adaptation as well as mitigation
- Ecological impact of climate change - National reforestation initiative - Urban forestry initiative		

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
09. Memo	From Frederick McClure to POTUS Re: Analysis of Key Votes in the 101st Congress, Second Session (3 pp.)	7/17/90	P5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JH (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed: 12/14/2004	OA/ID Number: 29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 17, 1990

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Frederick D. McClure, ^{Jm} Assistant to the President
for Legislative Affairs

SUBJECT: Analysis of Key Votes in the 101st Congress,
Second Session

I. INTRODUCTION

Attached is our most recent analysis of Congressional support for the Administration's positions. The ranking is broken down by House and Senate, with Members being listed in order of percentage support for your position on selected votes. We chose votes where there was a clear Presidential position on what the Administration considered to be an important bill. Details about the selected votes are provided below.

II. THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Twelve votes were selected for the House analysis, all of which occurred between January and the Fourth of July recess. ATTACHMENT A provides an explanation of these key votes, as well as the ranking of House Members, Republicans and Democrats respectively.

Keeping in mind that last year's analysis consisted of twice as many votes over an entire calendar year, we have noted a number of interesting trends:

(1) The number of strong Presidential supporters has increased. So far in 1990, fifteen House Republicans have supported your position on every key vote. Last year, eight Members supported you on every key vote. Only Republican Leader Bob Michel has supported you on every key vote taken both last year and this year.

From a broader perspective, 67 House Republicans (38 percent) have voted with you more than 90 percent of the time so far this year. Last year, 50 Republicans did (28 percent).

(2) This good news on GOP support is partially offset by the fact that the relatively small group of Republicans who tend to consistently vote against your position is also growing. Last year, nine Republicans voted against the White House position 50 percent or more of the time. Based on the selected votes to date this year, that number has increased to 21.

(3) The drop in Democratic support is even more stark. In 1989, 53 Democrats had Presidential support scores of 50 percent or higher. So far this year, that group has shrunk to 17.

Of even more concern is the fact that while last year no Democrat voted against your position on every key vote, so far this year, 135 House Democrats have voted against your position on every key vote. The increase in consistent Democratic opposition obviously compounds the increase in consistent Republican defectors.

(4) In the face of this growing partisanship, you won outright on only one of the twelve key votes. However, on each of the five votes where a veto was threatened, veto strength was demonstrated.

(5) Compared to last year's analysis, Republicans registering the largest gain in Presidential support were: Reps. Baker and Sensenbrenner (69 percent to 100 percent); Reps. DeLay, Gekas, and Stump (79 percent to 100 percent); and Rep. Cox (70 percent to 92 percent).

Republican Members showing the sharpest decline were: Rep. Rinaldo (52 percent to 18 percent), Rep. Weldon (78 percent to 45 percent), Rep. Tauke (92 percent to 60 percent), Rep. Chris Smith (62 percent to 33 percent), Rep. McGrath (67 percent to 38 percent), and Rep. Snowe (69 percent to 41 percent).

Among Democrats, the biggest drops were recorded by: Rep. Laughlin (85 percent to 30 percent), Rep. Penny (67 percent to eight percent) and Rep. Murtha (58 percent to eight percent). There were numerous others who dropped from the 50 and 60 percent range to the 0 to 20 percent range.

III. THE SENATE

Fifteen votes were selected from the Second Session for the Senate Analysis, all of which occurred between January and the Fourth of July recess. ATTACHMENT B provides an explanation of these key votes as well as a ranking of Senators, Republicans and Democrats respectively.

From this analysis we have drawn the following conclusions:

(1) You have received very strong support from Senate Republicans so far this year. The average Republican Senate score is 82%. In contrast, the Democratic average is 25%. These Presidential support scores reflect growing partisanship in the Senate. In last year's report, which consisted of 25 key votes, the average GOP score was 75% while the Democrats averaged 35%.

(2) You won outright 10 of the 15 major votes. Of the five votes lost, your position ultimately prevailed on two.

(3) On all 15 votes, your position was supported by large majorities of Republicans. Voting with you 100% of the time were Senators Dole, Gramm, Lugar, Mack, Murkowski, Simpson and Thurmond. The lowest Republican scores were Senators Packwood and Hatfield (40%), Jeffords (46%), and Cohen and Durenberger (60%).

(4) Southerners remain your strongest Democratic supporters. Those supporting your position most often were Senators Breaux (64%), Heflin and Shelby (60%), Johnston (57%), and Boren, Ford, and Hollings (53%).

(5) Compared to last year, the largest declines in Presidential support were by Senator Packwood (84% in 1989 to 40% thus far in 1990), Bentsen (58% to 33%), Gore (48% to 6%) and Inouye (48% to 21%).



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

July 18, 1990
(Senate)

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN COORDINATED BY OMB WITH THE CONCERNED AGENCIES.)

S. 2830 - Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990
(Leahy (D) Vermont)

If S. 2830 were sent to the President prior to the conclusion of the budget summit and does not achieve substantial, multi-year savings from the current (Mid-session) estimate of program costs; and if price and income supports are not made more market-oriented than the Committee version, which is a retrogression from the 1985 Act; then the Secretary of Agriculture and the President's other senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

From a budget perspective, the bill is both premature and inadequate. The Administration expects the budget summit to achieve substantial, multi-year savings from our Mid-session Review baseline. Thus, it would be a mistake for Congress to complete action on a bill that gives producers the wrong impression by sending them inaccurate signals about likely program parameters.

From a policy perspective, S. 2830 includes provisions for commodity subsidies that would reverse the strides toward market orientation made in the 1985 Food Security Act.

- o Raising loan rates (which act as price floors) threatens to undermine U.S. farmers' hard-won gains in recapturing a competitive position in world markets. Congress raised loan rates in the 1981 Farm bill, and the results were devastating. Our exports collapsed and so did U.S. farm income. We must not risk a repeat of that experience.
- o Freezing most program crop target prices at 1990 levels and even raising some others not only fails to achieve savings but also incurs additional costs. High target prices stimulate production and lead to wasteful acreage reduction programs.
- o Mandating marketing loans for wheat and feedgrains represents a vain attempt to avoid market disruptions caused by higher price

supports. The Secretary is required to choose between two complicated and costly new loan programs. One would raise loan rates by 25 percent in the first year alone and, coupled with marketing loans, would increase outlays above the current law baseline over the next five years by about \$1 billion. The other would allow the Secretary to adjust loan rates downwards. However, the Secretary would be compelled to compensate farmers for any reduction through increases in advance deficiency payments at a cost of about \$3 billion over the life of the bill.

- o A new marketing loan subsidy is established for soybeans and five other oilseeds. The program would do little to increase U.S. production and world market share, and would likely cost the taxpayer \$2.4 billion over the next five years. These goals could be accomplished more effectively and at less cost by the Administration's planting flexibility proposal. The creation of a substantial new subsidy for an entire category of crops is indefensible in a time of serious fiscal constraints.
- o The provisions for dairy support establish a program that is much less market-oriented and more onerous to the consumer and taxpayer than the existing one. The bill prohibits the Secretary from reducing the support price below its current level, regardless of the stocks which accumulate in Federal inventories. This encourages farmers to continue to generate surplus milk, which must then be purchased and stored at Federal expense, at absolutely no risk to the producers. Supply controls contained in the bill further insulate the dairy sector from market forces.
- o Failure to enact true planting flexibility for program participants would perpetuate the market distortions that arise when government incentives, not the market, dictate production decisions. In addition, the substantial cost-effective environmental benefits of increased crop rotation would be largely foregone under the partial base protection provisions.
- o The bill fails to reform the wool and mohair, peanut, and honey programs. These programs are

all archaic constructions, no longer suited to modern market and budget realities.

- o By maintaining the sugar price support at its current level, the bill perpetuates the inequity between the treatment of sugar and other program commodities. In addition, the bill necessitates the continued reduction in the volume of sugar imported from Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) and less-developed countries. As a result of the current sugar program, American consumers have paid close to double the world market price for sugar for the last five years, at an annual cost of over \$1.5 billion. In order to begin to relieve this burden, the Administration recommends an immediate ten percent reduction in the sugar price support.
- o The bill would require the Secretary to give bonus payments to farmers if market prices turn out to be higher than forecast at the start of the crop year. This is an anomalous, convoluted "safety net" that could increase outlays by \$1.5 billion in times of high market prices.

The commodity provisions of S. 2830 would cost \$59 billion over the next five years. The bill authorizes another \$25 billion for programs in science and education, conservation, forestry, marketing and inspection, and foreign food assistance. These spending levels exceed the Administration's proposal by \$25 billion and the current law baseline by \$8 billion. Equally important is the fact that the bill would greatly increase the likelihood of budget outlays beyond \$59 billion.

- o This enormous potential for costs far above the current forecast arises mainly from the lack of adequate Secretarial discretion to adjust loan rates and set-asides when market conditions warrant.
- o The bill is also written so that only slight, and quite plausible, changes in market prices could trigger substantial outlays. This is particularly true for the oilseed marketing loan and high-price bonus provisions. Only a slight drop in prices would trigger major Federal expenditures.

Apparently the Committee is attempting to circumvent the discipline of the budget process by not including a nutrition title, with the expectation that a package similar to the House nutrition title will be accepted in conference. The House

expansions are estimated to cost \$543 million in FY 91 and almost \$5.4 billion over five years. This is in addition to the current baseline growth of 16 percent or \$2.5 billion, from FY 90 to FY 91.

Such an expansion is totally inconsistent with the deficit reduction being sought in the ongoing budget summit, and is an example of the type of mandatory cost expansion that has fostered the current crisis. The bill should include a reauthorization of nutrition programs consistent with the Administration's proposals and financed within the parameters of the Senate budget resolution, and any subsequent bipartisan budget agreement.

The Administration also has concerns with a number of provisions in the trade title. With respect to food aid, we strongly object to the attempt to bypass Presidential authority by dictating the Executive branch structure for administering the program. The P.L. 480 program serves multiple legislative objectives and affects a wide variety of domestic and international interests. Therefore, we believe it is imperative that authority to direct, manage, and delegate responsibilities for food aid programs be maintained by the President. With regard to export assistance programs, the Administration opposes the provision allowing foreign agricultural commodities to be exported under Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) guarantee programs, and the provision earmarking \$50 million of CCC funds for promoting oilseed crops. The Administration also opposes the provision requiring spending levels in USDA's Long-Term Agricultural Strategy Reports to be treated as the President's annual budget submission. Finally, the Administration opposes the provision barring foreign financial institutions from receiving assignment of letters of credit issued by CCC.

The Administration also has serious objections to provisions in S. 2830 that are not related to the commodity and food assistance titles.

- o In the conservation title, the water quality incentive and integrated crop management programs are not likely to achieve significant environmental benefits while adding at least \$500 million to costs. Moreover, instituting new subsidies for farmers to reduce pollution would be inconsistent with the long-standing policy of allocating such costs equitably across society instead of providing special treatment for any sector of the economy. This policy was recently reinforced in the Senate-passed Clean Air Bill.
- o In the research title, the Administration objects to the provision to establish an institute providing the private sector with financial

incentives for commercialization of agricultural products. As with other technologies, the appropriate Federal role is support of research and development and rapid transfer of new technology through such mechanisms as cooperative research and licensing arrangements.

* * * * *

(Not to be Distributed Outside Executive Office of the President)

This draft position was prepared by NRD (Offutt) and LRD (Coleman), in consultation with NRD (Gibbons), OIRA (Grove), HIMD (Haskins and Brentlinger), IAD (Speckhard and Dorsey), USDA (Yeutter and Campbell), EPA (Coronado), CEQ (Bear), CEA (Ballenger), USTR (Early), AID (Honold), Treasury (Levy), State (Rappaport), Justice (Pestal), Commerce (Van Hanswyck), and Interior (Hill).

Administration Position to Date

In testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee, Secretary Yeutter and his staff have emphasized the Administration's commitment to maintaining the course toward reliance on market forces that was set by the Food Security Act of 1985. Opposition to practically every action of the Committee on this bill has been registered by the Department of Agriculture during hearings and markups since February. The Secretary also wrote to Chairman Leahy emphasizing the need for the bill to achieve budget savings.

Summary of S. 2830

The Committee report on S. 2830 is not yet available. We have reviewed a summary of the bill and preliminary language, however.

In summary, S. 2830 would:

- Set subsidy provisions for wheat, feedgrains, cotton, and rice. Loan rates, which act as price floors, effectively would be set above current levels and the Secretary's ability to reduce them to avoid surplus accumulation would be severely circumscribed. Legislatively-set target prices (intended to supplement farm income by guaranteeing payments to farmers on a portion of historical production) would be frozen at 1990 levels. This would halt the two-percent rate of annual decline established by the 1985 Act. Acreage reduction programs (ARPs) require participating farmers to set aside a portion of their acreage in return for price and income supports. In the

bill, the Administration's selection of ARP levels must conform to triggers based on stocks-to-use ratios by commodity. Limited flexibility to plant any program crop or oilseeds on 25 percent of base acreage is provided on the condition that supplemental income payments on program crops planted on these acres be foregone.

- Create a marketing loan for oilseeds, including soybeans. A marketing loan allows farmers to repay a nonrecourse commodity loan at the market price. When market prices fall below the original loan rate, the Treasury provides a subsidy by absorbing the loss on the part of the loan not repaid.
- Retain the sugar program and maintain the current 18 cent minimum loan rate.
- Revise the dairy program to establish the current support price (\$10.10 per hundredweight) as the minimum over the five years of the bill. The bill would restrict the Secretary's ability to manage the supply of dairy products by reducing the support price, as current law allows.
- Extend the current wool and mohair program without the reform requested by the Administration to convert it to a target price-deficiency payment scheme comparable to those for other commodities. The peanut program would be extended and the quota loan rate and quota would be increased, further raising costs to consumers. The honey support price would be increased, and the Administration's proposal for reform along the lines of wool and mohair would be rejected.
- Rewrite P.L. 480 food aid authorities. Under current law, multiple objectives of humanitarian assistance, market development, and foreign policy are pursued simultaneously. S. 2830 would separate the program into distinct components. These include one for humanitarian assistance, one for economic development, one for commercial market development, and one to promote democracy. The bill would remove the President's current authority to determine the administrative structure for U.S. foreign food aid programs. (This is an effort to reduce inter-agency coordination and the role of the State Department.) S. 2830 would vest such authority directly with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, rather than with the President.

- Reauthorize export assistance programs, including discretionary authority for the direct-subsidy Export Enhancement Program; continue the guarantee programs at the current level; increase the market promotion program to \$225 million from \$200 million in 1990; and require that \$50 million of CCC funds be used to promote exports of cottonseed and sunflower seed oil. The Administration opposes the special earmark for cottonseed and sunflower oil. The Administration also opposes provisions that would allow less than 100 percent U.S. content in goods exported with Commodity Credit Corporation guarantees, and require that the Foreign Agricultural Service Administrator be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Finally, the Administration opposes the provision stipulating that spending levels recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Long-Term Agricultural Trade Strategy Report be treated as the annual budget submission of the President.
- Authorize various miscellaneous items, including forest health, rural firefighting, and rural diversification grants, and a Forest Legacy Program. The President's Tree Planting initiative is not included, but has been introduced as a separate bill.
- Authorize a minimum enrollment of 40 million acres for the Conservation Reserve Program and give the Secretary discretion to enroll an additional 10 million acres. The bill would also allow the Secretary to enroll land on a continual basis for hardwood trees.
- Authorize a voluntary, paid easement for wetlands. The bill would also establish two new programs in water quality and increase the authorization for the Great Plains Conservation Program by \$300 million above the \$900 million proposed by the Administration.
- Authorize USDA to finance businesses that intend to develop new technologies that utilize agricultural commodities, requiring an independent institute and regional centers for administration. The bill would create numerous new centers and management organizations that would harm the Department's ability to plan and manage its research and extension programs. In addition to these provisions, the research title would also provide for, and greatly exceed, the President's funding request for the National Research Initiative. The Administration requested \$100 million for this Initiative for FY 1991, and proposed increasing this level to \$350 million by FY 1995. S. 2830 would authorize \$500 million annually over the same period.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
10. Memo	From Frederick McClure to John Sununu Re: Friday Meeting w/Senator Lugar (2 pp.)	7/19/90	P 5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By *JP* (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed: 12/14/2004	OA/ID Number: 29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 19, 19902

THE CHIEF of STAFF
has seen

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN H. SUNUNU

THROUGH: Fred McClure *fm*
FROM: Brian Waidmann, *BW* Special Assistant for
Legislative Affairs
SUBJECT: Friday Meeting with Senator Lugar

At your request, you are meeting Friday with Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), Ranking Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee. The meeting is at 10:00 a.m. Although the meeting was set for your office, the meeting needs to be held in the Capitol because Senator Lugar is managing Senate floor debate of the farm bill. Specifically, the meeting will be held in the Vice President's Office, located just outside the Senate chamber. I will meet you outside the Senate steps.

You requested the meeting to discuss the farm bill. Attached is the Statement of the Administration's Position on the farm bill. It will be particularly helpful for you to know the following:

- The bill costs about \$64 billion over the next five years (\$59 billion in commodity subsidies and another \$25 billion for programs in conservation, forestry, marketing and inspection and foreign food assistance.) These spending totals exceed the Administration's request by \$25 billion and the current law baseline by \$8 billion. The accompanying SAP spells out the Administration's policy objections to the bill.

- The bill is under a veto threat.

- There is common agreement that this bill must be reduced. Senator Leahy (D-VT), Committee Chairman, said yesterday that the farm bill must comply with a budget summit agreement if one is reached. The question is whether these cuts should be made as part of the budget summit or as part of this bill. Senator Dole discussed this issue yesterday with committee Republicans and Director Darman. The consensus was that Senator Lugar would ask Senator Leahy if he would allow the necessary budget cuts to be part of the legislation implementing the summit agreement. If he agreed, that would reduce the number of contentious amendments during Senate debate of the farm bill. If he did not, Senator Dole would proceed with a major substitute amendment cutting the bill's cost and deleting objectionable provisions.

- As you know, during the summit, Democrats offered first-year budget cuts in farm programs of \$1 billion from the current baseline. The understanding is that this is an initial offer, and budget cuts in farm programs could be higher. The major issue to be resolved is out-year savings in farm programs. Integral to this is the Administration's effort to reduce agricultural subsidies worldwide as part of the Uruguay Round of trade talks.

-- While Senator Lugar voted for the bill, he personally favors reducing farm programs. He derides the complexity and high cost of farm programs. He agrees with Senator Dole that Congress spends more time writing farm bills than farmers spend farming.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
11. Memo	From Frederick McClure to John Sununu Re: Textile Bill (2 pp.)	7/19/90	P5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the
Series: Sununu, John, Files
Subseries: White House Offices Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Legislative Affairs
(McClure) (1990) [1]

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
By JP (NLGB) on 10/28/05

Date Closed: 12/14/2004	OA/ID Number: 29178-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0004-F[1]	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0426-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

THE CHIEF of STAFF
has seen

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 12, 1990

1990 JUL 12 AM 8:47

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT *fm*

FROM: FREDERICK D. MCCLURE, Assistant to the President
for Legislative Affairs

SUBJECT: Textile Bill

Senator George Mitchell (D-ME) wants the Senate to vote on the Textile Import Quota bill today. The House also intends to consider this matter before the August recess. Noteworthy is that Senate action coincides -- probably purposefully so -- with this week's major textile negotiations that are part of the Uruguay Round.

As you know, this trade protectionist bill limits growth of textile imports to one percent annually. USTR Representative Carla Hills is recommending a veto.

Right now there are insufficient votes in the Senate to show veto strength on final passage of the bill. There may be 34 minimum necessary votes to sustain a veto in the Senate.

At this point, the legislative situation is unclear. Senator Dole wants the bill to pass quickly and by voice vote. Senator Dole says he will support the bill on Senate passage but will vote to sustain a veto. Senator Packwood, who will lead the fight against the bill on the Senate floor, wants to delay the bill as long as possible. Others opposed to the bill are Senators Bradley, Baucus, Cranston, Gorton and Gramm. Although Senators Packwood and Gramm are seriously considering offering a capital gains amendment to the bill as part of their delaying strategy, it is doubtful this will happen because of the budget negotiations.

Here is why we now lack 34 votes on final passage of the bill:

(1) Senators Helms and Thurmond are intensively lobbying the issue. Senator Helms has made an impassioned plea to Republicans that defeat of this legislation could cost him his Senate seat. You probably remember talks we have had with textile quota proponents regarding the 1986 election defeats. Senators otherwise opposed to the bill say they will support Senator Helms, at least for the first vote.

(2) The last Senate vote on this issue was in September 1988 when the bill passed 59-36. (That bill was vetoed by President Reagan and the House sustained the veto by a five-vote margin). Of the 36 Senate opponents, 6 have left the Senate and two others are at best soft in their opposition to the bill. This year's textile bill already has 55 co-sponsors.

(3) Senators opposed to the Uruguay Round may support the amendment as an effective, indirect means to derail the trade negotiations. Some agricultural interests oppose the U. S. effort to end agricultural subsidies as part of the Uruguay Round.

(4) A further complication is that Senator Dole, who has led every major battle for the Administration, will support the bill on final passage. Several Republicans will follow his lead. Senator Dole has said he will support a veto, however.

The Senate debate coincides with a key pressure point in the Uruguay Round talks. This week GATT countries are meeting in Geneva to develop a compromise proposal for completing the textile negotiations in the next six months.

USTR believes that the Geneva negotiations will be undermined if the textile bill gets majority votes in both Houses of Congress. The situation is even worse if we do not show veto-strength on final passage. Our chief textile negotiator, USTR Ambassador Ron Sorini, believes that Senate passage of a textile bill with less than 34 votes seriously harms the Uruguay trade talks, and may bring them to an abrupt end. If so, we may well want to adopt Senator Dole's strategy of letting the bill pass by voice vote, and work to sustain the veto in both the House and Senate.

Ambassador Hills clearly explains what is at stake if this bill is enacted:

"By providing permanent, rigid protection from imports to domestic producers of textiles, apparel and footwear, this legislation would cause tremendous harm to our economy, flagrantly violate our international obligations, and virtually destroy any chance of a successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations."

To get the necessary 34 Senate votes, Ambassador Hills, Secretary Mosbacher and White House officials will continue to lobby Senators. Consumer groups and retail interests will also continue to lobby against the bill.

In light of the importance of the issue, you will be informed on all major developments.