Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Baker, James A.: Files
Folder Title: White House Staff Memoranda – Legislative Affairs January 1983-June 1983 (2)
Box: 4

To see more digitized collections
visit: https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:
https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing

National Archives Catalogue: https://catalog.archives.gov/

WITHDRAWAL SHEET
Ronald Reagan Library

Collection: Baker, James: Files **Archivist:** jas

File Folder: W.H. Staff Memos - Legislative Affairs 1/83 - 6/83 [2 of 4] Date: 11/24/98

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. Memo	Ogelsby, Scruggs to J. Baker re: Stan Parris (2 p)	5/17/83	P5

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 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.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]
F-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA].
F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
F-3 Release would violate a Federal statue [(b)(3) of the FOIA].
F-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA].
F-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA].
F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

JAB III

For your info.
Newts at it again -- this
time the target is Bob Michel.
Bob's colleagues in the
leadership frankly aren't being
of much help or this either.

Ken D.

NEWT GINGRICH
SIXTH DISTRICT, GEORGIA

COMMITTEES:
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1005 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BLDG.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-4501

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

June 8, 1983

SUITE 5, PHOENIX CENTER
1657 PHOENIX BOULEVARD
COLLEGE PARK, GEORGIA 30349
(404) 221-3854

POST OFFICE BOX 848
GRIFFIN FEDERAL BUILDING
GRIFFIN, GEORGIA 30224
(404) 228-0389

CARROLL COUNTY COURTHOUSE
CARROLLTON, GEORGIA 30117
(404) 834-6390

COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
22 EAST BROAD STREET
NEWNAN, GEORGIA 30263
(404) 253-8355

Hon. Robert Michel
H232 Capitol
Inside Mail

Dear Bob,

I'm taking the liberty of writing you because it is vital that you feel the emotions behind what is happening inside our party. Newer members feel a passionate commitment to improve our cohesion and effectiveness. We are frustrated as we face a future minority status.

The challenge we face is how to encourage and bring into the open a dialogue of energy and passion without splitting the party into little factions. You defended Bill Green's and Matty Rinaldo's vote on constituency grounds. I agree. I am as politically endangered in Georgia as Rinaldo is in New Jersey.

However, the question is how do we build a team out of 167 individuals with separate interests, constituencies, and beliefs. Traditionally we have papered over our disagreements and avoided head-on debate and argument. Frankly, that approach does not build teamwork nor does it encourage energy and commitment. Just the opposite occurs. In order to avoid confronting ourselves, we withdraw, our energy diminishes, and enthusiasm wanes.

Junior members find themselves frustrated and confused. Should they stay quietly in their offices and hide? Should they speak out aggressively? If so, in what forum should they speak? If not in the conference, then where?

You play a critical role in educating and shaping the next generation of Republican Congressmen. If you teach them how to be aggressive and confrontational, you will increase their abilities to fight Democrats on the floor. If you teach them to avoid argument and smother dissent, then they will be crippled on the floor. The same vigor and toughness which we need on the floor we must learn to encourage inside our own councils.

Today's straight-forward talk between Gramm and Conte and the later one between Green and Smith are good for all of us. We grow and learn as we collide with each other in the good fellowship of an aggressive, but friendly Republican Party.

Frankly, outspoken behavior is inappropriate to the traditonal Republican style. We have the habits and demeanor of a minority party. Those habits help keep us in the minority.

What is at stake in this dialogue is more than good fellowship or hurt feelings. The survival of freedom depends on a prosperous, stable, secure America. The liberal Democrats threaten our survival with policies that will produce economic decay and military weakness.

If we fail to reform our party for another generation and the liberals continue to control this House, then we will have failed the Nation. That is why we must learn to be more professional and more effective both as individuals and as a team.

I look forward to working with you to develop a Republican majority in the House.

Your friend,

Newt Gingrich

P.S. Since you talked today about the leadership working together, I am taking the liberty of sharing this letter with other leaders.

cc: Trent Lott
Jack Kemp
Richard Cheney
Jim Martin
Guy Vander Jagt

NEWT GINGRICH
SIXTH DISTRICT, GEORGIA

COMMITTEES:
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1005 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BLDG.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-4501

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

SUITE 9, PHOENIX CENTER
1635 PHOENIX BOULEVARD
COLLEGE PARK, GEORGIA 30349
(404) 221-3854

POST OFFICE BOX 848
GRIFFIN FEDERAL BUILDING
GRIFFIN, GEORGIA 30224
(404) 228-0389

CARROLL COUNTY COURTHOUSE
CARROLLTON, GEORGIA 30117
(404) 834-8998

COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
22 EAST BROAD STREET

June 8, 1983

Dear Republican Colleague,

After my talk in the Conference this morning on the need for fundamental change, a number of members have asked for a copy of my ideas. Here they are.

We Republicans have been a minority for most of the last fifty years. We can see few signs our status may soon change. The 1984 election will likely resemble the 1956 and 1972 elections in which the Republican Presidential candidate received large majorities while the House candidates fared poorly. Such a prospect is unacceptable, and we must change course to avoid it.

Change, by definition, requires action. All too often we talk about changes but then continue doing the same things and wonder why we've failed. So what follows is a proposal for real change.

The Republican Party in the House of Representatives faces two difficult problems. The first problem is how to take control. Our dilemma is more difficult that either the White House's or the Senate's. Our members are more decentralized, there are more relative advantages for Democratic incumbents, and it is harder to win 218 seats than it is to win either 51 Senate seats or one White House seat. That is why, relatively, this has been the least changable American political institution. The second problem is one of management and communications. The process of self-management for 167 independent members, (a process which will become even more difficult with the increased membership of a majority), is the most trying management and communications problem in America. Since we are all independent, we each have our own interest-group problems, constituency concerns, and our own ideas. It is extremely complicated to have a large enough information flow that's fast enough for us to govern ourselves effectively.

There are a number of specific steps we could take which would allow us to function more effectively. Let me suggest that we attempt to apply modern management and communications techniques which have been developed for other institutions. With them we should be able to work as a real team because we'll have real team planning, real team communications and real team leadership. Doing that requires thinking within a time frame of six or eight months ahead rather than our current habit of thinking only a few days ahead. At the minimum, it requires the following specific proposals.

One, a monthly members-only conference to talk among ourselves about fundmental problems, disagreements and confusions that smother our energy. These meetings will allow us to solve our problems without offending each other or fighting in public. We badly need a central meeting place where everyone can bring his hopes and dreams, his grievances and his opportunities. And a monthly meeting will do that.

Two, the Research and the Policy committees should be planning three months ahead on legislative tactics and battles, assigning specific task forces with responsiblities toward developing legislative programs, working with interest-group allies and developing public-relations campaigns over a multi-month period far beyond our current time frame.

Three, the Whip System must speak for the House members to the White House rather than vice versa. In the Constitution, the legislative branch comes first and the executive branch follows. The House comes first within the legislative branch. Only since Franklin Roosevelt has this hierarchy been ignored. No one elected official can know as much as the collective wisdom of 160+ elected officials. That's one reason we've had such a hard time taking control of the domestic side of government---we've relied too much on a solitary figure and his unelected appointees. By having a Whip System which speaks to the White House for our collective concerns, we increase our capacity to influence policy when Republicans control the White House.

Fourth, the Republican Conference should have a staff responsible for publicizing Republican themes and positions. They should also work toward insuring that many Republicans become nationally recognized leaders making them credible spokesmen for our positions during legislative battles.

Fifth, all of our activities should be tied into a National Republican Campaign Committee effort in two zones. A.) A rapid, district-oriented public-relations campaign should hold incumbent Democrats' feet to the fire. And B.) an interest-group network should be built to remind our allies why they should work with us and to encourage them to join us in holding Democratic incumbents' feet to the fire. This has to be coordinated so that information flows rapidly. When a Democrat votes against the interest of his or her constituency, that constituency should know it very fast and then apply presure on that member very fast.

Sixth, we must develop a model of the professional House Republican member. We come from many walks of life, many concerns and many biases. We enter the most complicated business in America---how a free people govern themselves---and we do so with little training or in-depth thought to a code of behavior and responsibility. Under this system, for example, if one of us is recruited to chair a task force, how should he proceed? How can he be effective, what are his responsibilities and whom can he learn from?

Ultimately, the creation of such a model is the keystone on which everything else depends. The Whip System is a system of the team members led by the Whip. It is not a system of one man elected to be the Whip. Similarly, the whole House leadership, Policy Committee, Research Committee and Conference all must depend on the training and skills of a coordinated team of members who make up those committees.

If these proposals seem like radical steps it is because we seek a future radically different from the one current trends are leading to. We want a future in which the Republicans are the majority party in the House and in the country.

Frankly, we are currently whistling in the dark. At our current pace we are likely to be the only conservative party in a western democracy which is not governing in the late 20th century. We can make those needed changes, and today's article by David Broder makes that clear.

Sincerely,

Newt Gingrich

NG/hs

P.S. If you're interested in meeting to discuss possible management and communications reforms, please contact Walter Jones in my office at X5-4501.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 7, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER III

THRU: KENNETH M. DUBERSTEIN KMD.

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR.

SUBJECT: Legislative Strategy on Nicaraguan Issue

As the result of consultations on the issue involving U.S. activity in Nicaragua with ten Congressional Democrats, including Tom Foley of Washington and four Members of the Texas delegation, it is apparent that there is a desire for some modification to the Boland (Democrat of Massachusetts)-Zablocki (Democrat of Wisconsin) amendment to prohibit U.S. covert action in Nicaragua, but an absence of Democratic leadership to bring it about.

To date, negotiations to reach an acceptable compromise between the Administration and Congressman Lee Hamilton of Indiana, second ranking Democrat on the Foreign Affairs Committee and a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, have failed to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

Recently Majority Leader Jim Wright of Texas has indicated an increasingly active interest and hope that an agreement might be reached. In addition to personal concerns about the situation in Nicaragua, which are based in part by his embarrassment in 1980 over his support for U.S. aid to the Sandinista government, Wright is being pressured by moderate Democrats to assume the leadership in achieving a compromise solution. To this time, Wright has deferred to the negotiations with Hamilton.

In view of the action taken today by the House Foreign Affairs Committee to report the foreign aid authorization bill with language to prohibit the use of covert U.S. aid in Nicaragua, it is recommended that you call Jim Wright to suggest that there be a meeting as soon as possible involving the two of you to discuss this issue and to seek to reach a politically viable compromise. Other recommended participation in the meeting are Clem Zablocki, Committee Chairman; Dante Fascell (D-Florida), ranking Committee Democrat who has been pushing Wright to become more active; Lee Hamilton; Dave McCurdy (D-Oklahoma), a member of the Intelligence Committee; Bill Broomfield (R-Michigan), ranking Committee Republican; Bob Lagomarsino (R-California),

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 6, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: JIM BAKER
ED MEESE
DAVE STOCKMAN
DONALD REGAN
MARTIN FELDSTEIN

FROM: KEN DUBERSTEIN KD

SUBJECT: Sustaining Presidential veto

Phil Gramm is circulating the attached draft letter to the President pledging to sustain vetoes of bills which exceed certain ceilings. These ceilings are largely based on our FY84 budget. Phil is trying to get 146 signatures. Will keep you posted.

Attachment

cc: Dick Darman
Dave Gergen
Larry Speakes

The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We, the undersigned, share your alarm concerning the rapid growth of federal spending embodied in the House and Senate versions of the First Concurrent Budget Resolution. We believe that if unchecked, the massive increase in spending will offset our hard-won savings for fiscal years '82 and '83, rekindle the fires of inflation, reverse our progress on interest rates and choke off the economic recovery which promises hope and jobs for our people.

We call upon you, Mr. President, as the chief steward of the public purse, to veto any appropriations or authorization bills that exceed the benchmarks set forth in the attached document. These ceilings are largely based on your FY 1984 budget recommendations, and in combination would amount to a veto-enforced freeze on Federal spending.

We pledge to you that we will vote to sustain a presidential veto of any bill which exceeds these ceilings. Through a joint effort, we can continue to rein in uncontrolled federal spending and assure that our economic recovery is strengthened and sustained.

Your partners in rebuilding the
American economy,

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

R.F. ✓

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 25, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR JIM BAKER
MIKE DEAVER

THRU: KEN DUBERSTEIN Ken D.

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, ~~JR.~~ Bo

SUBJECT: Monday Night Dinner on the MX

For your information, prior to the dinner the 40 Members who attended were being counted as follows:

- 10 Firm Yes
- 11 Leaning For
- 16 Undecided
- 3 Leaning Against

On Tuesday, they voted as follows:

- Of the 10 listed firm yes, 10 voted yes
- Of the 11 listed leaning for, 11 voted yes
- Of the 16 listed undecided, 11 voted yes and 5 voted no
- Of the 3 listed leaning against, 2 voted yes and 1 voted no

Not bad -- 34 out of 40!
Hell of a batting average for the President!

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL FOR JAMES A. BAKER III

TO: Congressman Doug Bereuter (Republican-Nebraska)

DATE: Prior to Saturday, May 20, 1983

RECOMMENDED BY: Kenneth M. Duberstein KMD.
M. B. Oglesby, Jr.

PURPOSE: To ask Doug to support the Resolution of Approval on the MX Peacekeeper missile.

BACKGROUND: Doug Bereuter is a third term Republican from Nebraska's First District (eastern part of state, including Lincoln). He is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Banking Committee. Doug has been a consistent supporter of Administration-backed initiatives; and, most recently, he has been active in support of our Central American policies.

During the 97th Congress, Doug voted for the MX Peacekeeper on the House Floor. However, he has since reversed his position and has made public statements to that effect. In a number of recent conversations with White House staff, Doug has reiterated his opposition to the MX while indicating that he likes other elements of the Scowcroft Commission Report. Virginia Smith's (R-Nebraska) vote in opposition to the MX in the House Appropriations Committee on May 17th may further solidify Bereuter's position.

Bereuter is reported to be seriously considering challenging U. S. Senator James Exon in 1984 and he is reported to be concerned that he not be bracketed with Exon who is reported to be leaning against the MX.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION: See attached.

DATE OF SUBMISSION: Tuesday, May 17, 1983

ACTION: _____

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION FOR

CONGRESSMAN DOUG BEREUTER (REPUBLICAN-NEBRASKA)

-- As you know, the House is scheduled to consider the MX Peacekeeper missile on the Floor very soon. I'm aware of your concerns on this issue; but I'm phoning to ask for your help because we are convinced that full implementation of the Scowcroft Commission recommendations is vital to our national security.

-- The MX Peacekeeper and the new small missile offer a significant opportunity to strengthen the twin goals of deterrence and arms control; and these are inseparable elements of the overall Commission package.

-- If the United States foregoes this package, the Soviet Union will not have any real incentive to agree to arms reductions. Further, our Western European Allies will be reluctant to base new Pershing and cruise missiles if we fail to modernize, and such action would undercut our efforts to negotiate intermediate nuclear missile reductions in Europe. Finally, we must move to complete the third leg of the Triad to enhance our short-term defense posture.

-- As you know, we have been working hard to integrate recent Congressional recommendations into our overall arms control approach, and I'm convinced that the President's recent letter to a number of your House colleagues will enhance the overall effort.

-- You will have a number of opportunities this year to vote on individual aspects of the defense package, as the Fiscal Year 1984 authorization and appropriation bills are considered. We need your help now on the Resolution of Approval for the MX Peacekeeper. Can we count on your support?

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 19, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: JIM BAKER
BILL CLARK

FROM: KEN DUBERSTEIN for D.

SUBJECT: Secretary Weinberger statement on MX

Attached is a "fact sheet" being distributed to all Hill offices by the Council for a Livable World which opposes the MX. Congressman Norm Dicks, one of our leading Democratic supporters in the House, brought it to my attention and underlined how troublesome the comments attributed to the Secretary are.

He recommends that, prior to the House vote on the MX, the President personally reiterate his strong commitment to working with the Congress on serious arms reductions.

Attachment

cc: Bud McFarlane
Dick Darman
Dave Gergen

WEINBERGER CLAIMS PRESIDENT'S LETTER TO GORE-DICKS-COHEN-NUNN REFLECTS NO CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION ARMS CONTROL POLICY

In a Good Morning America interview of May 16, 1983, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger responded to questions by indicating that the letters President Reagan recently wrote to Members of Congress on MX and arms control represent virtually no change of policy:

Question by ABC's Steve Bell: "Mr. Secretary, are we going to see a new bargaining stance on the part of the U.S. now, given the President's written assurances last week?"

Response by Secretary Weinberger: "Well, I don't really understand, and never have understood, what it is additionally that is wanted from the President. The President has been the leading advocate of arms reduction, drastic arms reductions, down to the point of equality and that would be would fully verifiable from the beginning. And he has reiterated that. And that is exactly the position he's always had."

Question by Bell: "So he hasn't changed anything."

Response by Weinberger: "Well, essentially, what's been changed is the fact that the Scowcroft Commission has come in with a recommendation of the new missile [Midgetman] which Senator [Gary] Hart, I think, has given a rather lukewarm endorsement to."

WEINBERGER ALSO STATES MX IS NO BARGAINING CHIP
(Statement in same May 16 Good Morning America interview)

Weinberger: "The question is not whether or not it's [MX] a bargaining chip. Nobody ever suggested that it was a bargaining chip. It's part of our necessary modernization.

"The Soviets have already modernized. They have the SS-18s and the -19s at the intercontinental range, and they are very much more accurate and have a much higher yield than ours do. And so the MX is, and has been for 12 years that it's been debated, a generally recognized needed modernization of our ICBM system."

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 18, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: JAMES A. BAKER, III

THRU: KENNETH M. DUBERSTEIN

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR.

SUBJECT: Recommended Telephone Calls to House Members Regarding MX

Both the House and the Senate are proceeding toward a vote on a Resolution of Approval of the President's Strategic Forces recommendations. The following Members are not yet firm supporters of the Resolution and need to be encouraged to endorse the proposal and actively seek its passage on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Congressman George O'Brien (R-IL) George O'Brien was first elected to the House in 1972 and is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He is the Ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary. Mr. O'Brien voted for the Resolution of Approval in the full Committee, but needs to be encouraged to support and actively seek its passage on the floor of the House.

3635

O'Brien will call.

Congressman Ham Fish (R-NY) Ham Fish was first elected in 1968 and is the Ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee. Never a strong proponent of defense expenditures, Mr. Fish is currently undecided on the Resolution of Approval. The Congressman needs to be assured of the President's commitment to arms control and reductions and the necessity of the MX to achieve those goals.

5441

Congresswoman Olympia Snowe (R-ME) Olympia Snowe was first elected in 1978. She is a member of the Foreign Affairs and Joint Economic Committees. She also serves on the Select Committee on Aging. Ms. Snowe is leaning in support of the MX basing Resolution of Approval. She needs to be encouraged to make a firm commitment to vote for the Resolution and to actively seek the support of her colleagues.

3626

Congressman Vin Weber (R-MN) Vin Weber is a sophomore, serving on the Small Business and Public Works and transportation Committees. Although he has voted for the MX in the past, he has consistently opposed the program in his campaigns. Mr. Weber is leaning against the Resolution of Approval. He needs to be convinced that the President's proposal will result in effective arms control negotiations.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 17, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: JAMES A. BAKER, III

THRU: KENNETH M. DUBERSTEIN Ken D.

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR
JOHN F. SCRUGGS

SUBJECT: Recommended Telephone Call
To Congressman Stan Parris (R-VA)

The Office of Legislative Affairs recently contacted Congressman Stan Parris (R-VA) to discuss his position on the MX basing Resolution of Approval. The Congressman responded that he is "undecided" on the Resolution and has indicated the same to the Republican Whip Organization. Mr. Parris does not, however, have problems with the merits of the issue. Rather, he is attempting to "send a signal" that he is upset about his perceived lack of consideration and fair treatment by the White House.

Stan Parris was first elected to Congress in 1972 and subsequently defeated by Democrat Herb Harris in 1974. In 1980 Congressman Parris defeated Herb Harris by the narrowest of margins. In the 1982 election Stan Parris again defeated Mr. Harris, winning with only 49.7 percent of the vote. To do so, Mr. Parris had to spend $800,000 and only won the 1980 and 1982 elections because a third party candidate drained votes from the Democrat. Because of this political history, Congressman Parris correctly feels that he is permanently vulnerable and is hypersensitive about not being included in political activities taking place in his district or involving his constituents.

During the last few years the First Lady has traveled to his district several times to visit black schools or retarded children and he has not been included. In his opinion, the most recent "slight" took place at the Baseball Month signing ceremony which included participation by a Little League team from his district. Although he did attend, he does not feel that he was invited in a timely fashion. The sum of these events has created a perception by Mr. Parris that the Administration either doesn't know or doesn't care about his political problems.

This telephone call will allow Stan Parris to voice his concerns to a White House decision-maker. He simply needs to be reassured that we are sensitive to his political situation and will make every effort to see that he returns to the House in 1984. With these assurances, the Congressman can be expected to continue his strong support for the President, including a positive vote for the MX basing Resolution of Approval.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

JAB

DONE!

1) Letter was sent -- it worked!

2) IMF will be mentioned at GOP leadership mtg on Tuesday & Bipartisan leadership mtg on Thursday.

Ken D.

WHITE HOUSE SITUATION ROOM

PAGE Ø1 OF Ø5 AIR FORCE ONE ØØØ3 DTG: Ø51652Z MAY 83 PSN: Ø12617
SIT399 ANØØ2126 TOR: 125/1943Z

DISTRIBUTION: COMM BAKE /ØØ2

KD
JAB WANTS TO MAKE SURE
YOU ARE FOLLOWING UP
ON THIS —
5/9
MDT

OP IMMED
DE WTE1 #ØØØ3 1251652
O Ø51652Z MAY 83
FM AIR FORCE ONE

TO WHITE HOUSE SITROOM

UNCLAS E F T O

PASS TO MR. KEN DUBERSTEIN

MAY 4, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM: R. T. MCNAMAR

SUBJECT: LETTER FROM PRESIDENT REAGAN ON IMF
THE HOUSE BANKING COMMITTEE WILL MARK UP THE IMF REQUEST ON MONDAY, MAY 9. THERE IS A PERSISTENT CONCERN ON THE PART OF THE DEMOCRATS THAT THIS ISSUE IS NOT NECESSARY TO FORGE A BIPARTISAN MAJORITY TO PASS THE LEGISLATION.

CHAIRMAN ST GERMAIN HAS WRITTEN TO THE PRESIDENT EXPRESSING THIS CONCERN CLEARLY AND SUCCINCTLY (SEE ATTACHED). OUR OWN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE HILL INDICATE THAT OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM IS INFACT, SOME VOCAL REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION. UNDERSTANDABLY, THE DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP DOESN'T INTEND TO PUSH ITS MEMBERSHIP ON THEIR SWORDS -

ON BEHALF OF A PRESIDENTIAL REQUEAT FOR ASSISTANCE TO AN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTION THAT DOESN'T HAVE SUBSTANTIAL REPUBLICAN SUPPORT. THE TYPICAL DEMOCRATIC QUESTION IS "WHY SHOULD I SUPPORT THIS INTERNATIONAL SPENDING WHEN THE REPUBLICANS ARE TRYING TO CUT DOMESTIC SPENDING>"

AS WE MOVE TOWARD FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE AND FULL COMMITTEE ACTION IN THE HOUSE, AS WELL AS APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION, I BELIEVE IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE PRESIDENT COMMUNICATE TO THE CONGRESS THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS ISSUE AND URGE BIPARTISAN SUPPORT. WE HAVE ALREADY RECOMMENDED PRESIDENTIAL MEETINGS WITH THE SENATE AND HOUSE LEADERSHIP AND KEY COMMITTEE PLAYERS EARLY THE WEEK OF MAY 16 TO ENCOURAGE POSITIVE ACTION PRIOR TO THE WILLIAMSBURG SUMMIT. I REITERATE THAT REQUEST. SECONDLY, I RECOMMEND THAT THE PRESIDENT RESPOND TO CHAIRMAN ST GERMAIN AND THE RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, CHALMERS WYLIE, PRIOR TO THE HOUSE BANKING COMMITTEE MARK UP ON MONDAY, MAY 9, EMPHASIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR THIS LEGISLATION. I HAVE ATTACHED A PROPOSED DRAFT LETTER FOR THE PRESIDENT.

ATTACHMENTS

CC: KENNETH DUBERSTEIN

THE PRESIDENT
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

YOUR ADMINISTRATION HAS GIVEN GENERAL SUPPORT TO A NUMBER OF BILLS INVOLVING INTERNATIONAL FINANCE AND THE EXPENDITURE OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF PUBLIC MONIES. THESE INCLUDE $8.4 BILLION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, $7.5 BILLION FOR THE MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT

BANKS, AND A REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT IMPORT BANK.

IT IS IMPORTANT, MR. PRESIDENT, THAT THE ADMINISTRATION'S SUPPORT BE TRANSLATED INTO DEFINITIVE COMMITMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF YOUR PARTY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IF THIS LEGISLATION IS TO BE SUCCESSFUL. AS YOU ARE AWARE, SOME MEMBERS OF YOUR PARTY HAVE USED A VARIETY OF FORUMS TO ATTACK THE ADMINISTRATION'S LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS TO WHICH THIS COMMITTEE IS ATTEMPTING TO GIVE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION.

WHILE WE HAVE NOT ALWAYS AGREED WITH YOUR POSITIONS, THOSE OF US ON THE DEMOCRATIC SIDE OF THE AISLE HAVE ADMIRED YOUR ABILITY TO IMPOSE THE STRICTEST DISCIPLINE AMONG THE REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE, AND WE TRUST THAT THIS SAME TYPE OF AGGRESSIVE EFFORT WILL BE FORTHCOMING TO SUPPORT THE WORK YOU HAVE REQUESTED FROM THIS COMMITTEE ON THESE INTERNATIONAL BILLS.

IT IS NO SECRET, MR. PRESIDENT, THAT THE WHITE HOUSE AND THE REPUBLICAN POLITICAL MACHINERY HAVE USED VIRTUALLY EVERY SPENDING MEASURE AS A VEHICLE TO ATTACK THE DEMOCRATS IN THE CONGRESS. THESE ATTACKS NOTWITHSTANDING, MANY OF US HAVE FELT IT OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO CONTINUE TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS NECESSARY TO KEEP THE BASIC ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL FABRIC OF THE NATION INTACT. MANY ON OUR SIDE OF THE AISLE WILL FEEL A SIMILAR RESPONSIBILITY TO ASSIST IN STABILIZING INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SITUATIONS, BUT I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT -- IN FACT, ESSENTIAL -- THAT THE REPUBLICANS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MAKE AN EARLY AND SUBSTANTIVE INDICATION OF SUPPORT FOR THESE INTERNATIONAL MEASURES WHICH THEIR OWN PRESIDENT IS SEEKING.

MR. PRESIDENT, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, I DO NOT THINK YOU SHOULD EXPECT THE DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP AND MEMBERS TO CARRY THIS BURDEN ALONE.

SINCERELY,
SIGNED

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN
CHAIRMAN

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN:

AS THE HOUSE BANKING COMMITTEE CONSIDERS THE LEGISLATION I HAVE REQUESTED, AUTHORIZING INCREASED U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS, AND REAUTHORIZING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK, I WANT TO REITERATE THE IMPORTANCE WHICH I ATTACH TO THESE MEASURES. TAKEN TOGETHER, THESE PROPOSALS WILL STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL STABILITY, PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, AND ENHANCE OUR ECONOMIC RECOVERY HERE AT HOME.

THE REQUEST TO PROVIDE AN INCREASE IN THE U.S. QUOTA IN THE IMF AND IN U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE IMF'S GENERAL ARRANGEMENTS TO BORROW IS PART OF AN INTERNATIONALLY-AGREED STRENGTHENING OF THE IMF'S RESOURCES, DESIGNED TO ENABLE THE FUND TO LAY ITS CENTRAL ROLE IN PROMOTING AN ORDERLY, COOPERATIVE RESOLUTION OF CURRENT INTERNATIONAL DEBT AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS. WITH OUR GROWING INTERDEPENDENCE WITH THE WORLD ECONOMY, IT REPRESENTS AN ESSENTIAL PART OF OUR OWN EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC RECOVERY, PRESERVE JOBS IN THIS COUNTRY, AND MAINTAIN A STABLE WORLD ECONOMIC FOUNDATION FOR PURSUIT OF OUR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, FOREIGN POLICY, AND SECURITY INTERESTS ABROAD.

FOR THIS REASON, THE PROPOSED INCREASE IN TPE IMF'S RESOURCES IS OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE TO EVERY AMERICAN CITIZEN,

NO MATTER HOW DISTANT INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL PROBLEMS MAY SEEM. I AM CONFIDENT THAT THIS LEGISLATION SHOULD, AS IT HAS IN THE PAST, WARRANT THE BROADEST BIPARTISAN SUPPORT IN THE CONGRESS.

SIMILARLY THE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS AND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REPRESENT AN INVESTMENT IN ECONOMIC GROWTH, AT HOME AND ABROAD, AND MERIT STRONG SUPPORT BY MEMBERS FROM BOTH SIDES OF THE AISLE.

I WANT ESPECIALLY TO COMMEND YOU FOR YOUR EFFORTS TO ASSURE PROMPT CONSIDERATION OF THE LEGISLATION BY THE COMMITTEE. AND, YOU CAN BE SURE OF MY CONTINUED STRONG AND ACTIVE SUPPORT FOR THESE MEASURES WHICH FORM A CRUCIAL PART OF MY LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.

THE HONORABLE
FERNAND ST GERMAIN

THE HONORABLE
CHALMERS P. WYLIE

R.F.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 12, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR JIM BAKER

THRU: KEN DUBERSTEIN K.D.

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR.
DAVID L. WRIGHT

SUBJECT: H.R. 1983 (Mortgage Foreclosure Bill)

Jim
HUD did an uncommonly good job!
K.D.

On Wednesday, May 11, the House passed H.R. 1983 by a vote of 216 to 196 (41 Democrats voted against the bill and only 6 Republicans voted for it). Earlier in the day the Roemer-Wylie Substitute, which we supported, failed on a 197 to 220 vote (37 Democrats voted for it and only 4 Republicans voted against it).

As you know, we have a veto signal on the bill, and we did not expect to show much more than veto strength on the Floor. The closeness of the actual votes is testimony to what can happen when a Departmental Congressional Relations team (in this case, HUD) goes all out. We recommend that you call HUD Secretary Sam Pierce to commend him and his staff for a job well done.

5/20

MAT

Plz. remind me to do this.

Thanks.

JAB

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 9, 1983

J.A.B. Phone call should be made Tuesday. Thanks for D.

MEMORANDUM FOR JIM BAKER

THRU: KEN DUBERSTEIN

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR.

SUBJECT: Talking Points for Telephone Call to Representative Jim Wright (D-Texas), House Majority Leader

5/10 Call made. Reported to KD.

-- Indicate that we are working hard on the MX vote and want to get his suggestions as to timing and strategy.

-- Tell the Majority Leader we are working closely with Les Aspin (Democrat of Wisconsin and Chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation), Tom Foley (Democrat of Washington and House Majority Whip), and the Dicks-Gore group that sent the letter to the President which seeks certain assurances from us. (A copy of this letter is attached.)

-- Note that we are optimistic that we will be able to respond to Dicks, et. al., in a manner they will approve of.

-- There is a possibility that the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee will meet on Wednesday and we hope to have the votes. It is difficult to determine exactly what Joe Addabbo (Democrat of New York and Chairman of the Defense Subcommittee) will do. We expect the full House Appropriations Committee to vote next week and the vote is very close. Chairman Whitten (Democrat of Mississippi) is not helping.

Will talk to Jamie after subcommittee.

-- Stress how important it is to have the Floor vote prior to the Memorial Day recess. We understand that the House Armed Services Committee does not want the authorization bill to come to the Floor until after the MX resolution - we agree with that timetable.

OK = can do.

-- Ask Jim if he has any suggestions or ideas and volunteer to have B. Oglesby meet with him to discuss vote counts, etc.

Yes - do so.

Will talk w/ Mr. Thornton + Charlie Wilson

May 2, 1983

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Mr. President:

Your endorsement of the Scowcroft Commission report gives us reason for hope that it may be possible to move American policy on nuclear weapons and arms control forward, based on a durable bipartisan consensus.

We believe that the policy which the Report recommended, and which you have made your own, is correct -- in its long-term dimensions. Arms control and force posture decisions should be integrated, and organized around the pursuit of stability. Stability, in turn, requires that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union possess the means to conduct a theoretically advantageous first strike. To achieve this condition requires that both sides reverse the trend toward more highly MIRVed ICBMs, and move toward a less threatening force based on single-warhead missiles, ideally in a program orchestrated through arms control.

The problem is that the Commission report asks us to accept not only its attractive long-term concept, but its immediate recommendation for the deployment of 100 MX. That missile has been mired in controversy for so long, and opposition to it is so entrenched, that its presence in the Commission report seriously endangers the entire enterprise. Some of us have voted against the MX on more than one occasion, but we are prepared to consider new arguments for it on the merits, and we are asking our colleagues to be similarly open-minded. But we must tell you in all candor, that of all the arguments presented in the Scowcroft report, on behalf of MX, only one is both new and of interest: that deploying the MX is a step which is consistent with, and necessary in order to begin, the long-term process towards stable forces.

In our view, the future of the MX turns precisely on whether this asserted connection between it and the process of long-run stabilization can be demonstrated. To do so requires at a minimum, assurances from you on certain key points:

-- that the United States' negotiating position in START will be speedily updated, in order to bring it into line with both the technical recommendations and the long-term objectives of the Scowcroft Commission report;

-- that in doing so, the United States will be able to show <u>how</u> the deployment of a given number of MX fits in with these objectives, in terms of its impact on the force posture of both countries;

-- that, in principle, plans for the deployment of MX, including both numbers and timing, can be influenced by the results of arms control; and,

-- that, a major effort will be promptly undertaken to bring sharper focus to the proposed single-warhead ICBM, and to allay concerns that it cannot be realized in a reasonable period of time, at acceptable cost, in deployment modes that are both technically and polictically realistic.

With the submission of your recommendations on MX basing, the legislative clock has begun to tick; moving towards a decision on flight testing and an acceptable basing mode which must be taken one way or the other, in the next month and a half. In isolation, the proposal to base MX in silos is one which has already been rejected for good reason. What changes the prospects for MX flight testing is the context for MX created by the Scowcroft Commission report. That context, however, is not strong enough as it presently stands to be decisively persuasive. We believe that affirmation and assurances from you on the points we have raised would greatly help, and that we need such assurances before deciding whether or not to support congressional approval of flight testing.

We wish, moreover, to make clear that in our view, a decision to flight test the MX is both legislatively and logically distinct from a decision to procure the missile in any number for actual deployment. The question of deploying the MX should be dealt with only when and if it becomes possible to see: (1) that START has been brought into line with the recommendations and long-term goals of the Commission report; (2) that a case can be made showing in explicit terms how MX would fit into a stable US-Soviet nuclear relationship; and (3) that the Department of Defense is finding sensible answers to engineering and cost questions related to the single-warhead ICBM. A follow-on to the Scowcroft Commission, of bipartisan nature, charged with advising you in the conversion of the Scowcroft panel's recommendations into arms control proposals, would also be highly desirable.

You may feel, with some justice, that the report and your endorsement speak for themselves. Unfortunately, neither the report nor your endorsement clearly answer the questions we think are critical. Meanwhile, statements in the press -- attributed to "high ranking officials" in the Department of Defense and others, have already raised a suspicion that there are some in the Administration who embrace the Scowroft Report not in its entirety, but only as a means to the end of securing Congress' approval for the deployment of the MX.

Mr. President, the effect that MX is likely to have on the Soviet Union will be determined by the effect it has on opinion in this country. We can agree with you that the Soviets are not altruists, and will have little incentive to bargain seriously if we voluntarily solve their problems for them. But if we pursue a decision on MX in a way which destroys, rather than consolidates a national consensus, then the Soviets are best advised to play a waiting game.

We believe achieving a bipartisan consensus is critically important to a successful arms control effort. All our past progress in arms control has been predicated on such a bipartisan approach. A debate limited to MX alone, without explicit clarification of its role in the long-term course recommended by your Commission on Strategic Forces cannot lead to such a bipartisan consensus, and will result in no real winners. We are prepared to make a good faith effort, in which we urge you to take the lead.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 29, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR JIM BAKER
BILL CLARK

THRU: KEN DUBERSTEIN

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR.

The attached "Dear Colleague" from Congressman Tom Tauke (R-Iowa) regarding Trent Lott's (R-Mississippi) amendment to the nuclear freeze resolution is forwarded for your information.

Any thoughts?

→ Jim Baker

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 28, 1983

Ken Duberstein

Subject: Freeze Calls

I have just received the attached list from Michel's office (unsolicited). If, as it implies, we are losing several previous supporters, we should do a round of calls or get word through the leadership that we do not support the resolution now. You can use as talking points, those attached to my earlier memo today (prepared by Sven Kraemer).

Many thanks

Bud

Final Passage Freeze supporters

J. Martin
Chandler
Pritchard
Zschau
Brown
L. Martin
O'Brien
Porter
Pursell
Davis
C. Evans
Leach
Tauke
Gunderson
Williams
Goodling
McDade
Fish
Horton
Boehlert
Green
Forsythe
Rinaldo
Roukema
C. Smith
Conte
Jeffords
Johnson
McKinney
Schneider
McKernan
Snowe

Possible votes for Freeze on final passage

Snyder
Hopkins
Rogers
Whitehurst
T. Lewis
Hammerschmidt
Pashayan
Morrison
Marlenee
Lujan
V. Smith
Whittaker
Winn
Hillis
Frenzel
Petri
Wylie
Gradison
McEwen
Miller
Regula
Clinger
Coughlin
Ridge
Ritter
Gilman
Lent
McGrath
Molinari
Gregg

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 28, 1983

Ken Duberstein

Subuect: Administration Position on the House Freeze Resolution

As you know the House will resume debate on the Zablocki freeze resolution today. I understand from John Dressendorfer that final passage will be delayed until next week.

I am concerned at the intelligence John has picked up to the effect that our guys are tiring and resorting to the rationalization that the delay and the effect of some amendments in effect, muddy the resolution to the point that we should interpret it as a victory and no longer oppose it. I very strongly disagree. There is nothing in the way of perfecting amendments which have in any way altered the requirement that we freeze first and reduce later. This is unacceptable. (Note: Sven Kraemer has done a paper--rough draft attached--which explains why).

This fundamental flaw is well known in the media and thus, no effort on our part to color it otherwise will alter the way it is portrayed.

There will bee additional chances to alter the Zablocki version in debate today and later. For example, Siljander intends to offer a modified version of his earlier amendment ("... freeze and/or reduction...) which has some chance. Our guys should support that. If it were to pass, we could and should interpret it as a victory.

Could I ask you to get the word to Bob Michel, Kemp and whomever you think best that Republicans should be reminded that there has been no fundamental change in Zablocki and thus, it remains unacceptable.

I am willing to meet with whomever you suggest to carry the flag on this. In addition, if you approve of the attached draft, we should get it around to our guys.

Bud McFarlane

cc: Sven Kraemer
Peter Sommer
John Dressendorfer
Ed Meese
Jim Baker
Judge Clark

ROUGH DRAFT

H.J. RES. 13 - THE NUCLEAR FREEZE RESOLUTION

The Administration has previously made clear its serious concerns about the Nuclear Freeze Resolution (Zablocki - H.J. Res. 13) being considered by the House of Representatives.

This resolution, even as amended during last week's House debate, has not been sufficiently improved to make it an acceptable arms control resolution which the Administration can support. Although some potential supporters of the Resolution have argued that the amendments to the Resolution have corrected basic flaws, the Resolution is internally contradictory and inconsistent and it does not solve or address a number of major drawbacks of the freeze proposal as originally presented.

Major flaws include the following:

1. Impact on START and INF Negotiations

   The resolution would require a reversal of the US negotiation positions by insisting on a freeze prior to any reductions. It would thus pull the rug out from under our negotiators and would turn us from negotiating reductions to negotiating freezes involving current high ceilings and imbalances.

2. INF Deployments

   The amendments to the original resolution do not sufficiently protect the INF deployment plans or permit fulfilment of NATO's dual track decision, since the US would be required to propose a freeze on Pershing II and Cruise Missiles to the Soviets.

3. Strategic Modernization

   Amendments are said to protect the essential strategic modernization programs, but even in theory these would be protected only until a treaty is ratified. In practice, the effect of the resolution would be to prevent any modernization of strategic forces except for the minimal upkeep/maintenance of replacing old weapons systems with identical systems on a one for one basis or to allow R&D on safety-related improvements in weapons. The resolution would preclude production of the B-1, MX, Trident D-5, and Cruise Missiles. The clear intention of the resolution, one given priority, is to freeze the production, testing and deployment of any new weapons and their delivery systems.

4. Verification

Although would-be supporters assert that the verification provisions have been substantially improved by a call for on-site inspections, this would require very extensive prior negotiations, and even with on-site inspections would not solve some of the serious verification problems associated with monitoring compliance with some aspects of the agreement e.g. a freeze on production of nuclear weapons, on ASW and Air-Defense improvements and on aspects involving dual-capable aircraft.

5. Unilateral Disarmament

An amendment in the modified resolution rejecting unilateral US disarmament, is contradicted by the serious flaws outlined above. In contrast, the Administrations proposals for far reaching reductions, for effective verification and for new confidence-building measures avoid the pitfals of unilateral disarmament and provide the best means of reducing the risks and the arsenals of war, while increasing stability.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 25, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL DEAVER

FROM: Kenneth M. Duberstein

SUBJECT: Senator Goldwater's Request for White House Reception

Senator Goldwater has forwarded the attached proposal for a White House reception with a personal request that the President give it very serious consideration. Senator Goldwater continues to be a strong supporter of the President, is an important senior member of the Senate, and over the years has been a leader for Indian issues in the Senate.

It should also be noted that the Administration has recently made a major shift of emphasis in dealing with Indian governments and problems. In what could very well be a related development, the Hopi and Navajo tribes have recently announced they will voluntarily begin discussions among themselves, which they are confident will lead to agreement of a nearly century old dispute over settlement on their tribal lands.

Senator Goldwater would like to use the opportunity of the reception for Indian leaders and for Hopi dancers to perform for the President, as further evidence that Indian issues are receiving a renewed respect and attention at the highest levels in the Administration.

cc: Jim Baker
Ed Meese

BARRY GOLDWATER
ARIZONA

COMMITTEES:
INTELLIGENCE, CHAIRMAN
ARMED SERVICES
TACTICAL WARFARE, CHAIRMAN
PREPAREDNESS
STRATEGIC AND THEATRE NUCLEAR FORCES
COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMUNICATIONS, CHAIRMAN
AVIATION
SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SPACE
INDIAN AFFAIRS

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

April 19, 1983

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Very recently, I mailed you a letter that was extremely critical of the way we have treated our Indians. Now, I write you one that could be the means of your expressing your real liking for these people in your desire to help them.

The Hopi Indians, who live in my state, the oldest tribe living on the oldest pueblos in the United States, are anxious to have a reception of national Indian Leaders and tribal chairmen with the President, you, in attendance. I have heard that the White House indicated that this should be done through me. So, I am trying to do it with this letter.

The Hopi leader, Ivan Sidney, would like to bring back a group of Hopi dancers to perform for the President. And if you have never seen them dance, you've really missed some of the most beautiful, ancient tribal cultural expressions that you might see.

I'd like you to consider very seriously having this kind of a reception, probably on the White House lawn, sometime this summer. So, this letter is merely an opening to get you thinking about it, to get your staff on it and we'd certainly want Nancy there. Please, I say this again, please, give this your serious and earnest attention. It would do more to bring our Indian leaders together than anything I can think of.

With respect,

Barry Goldwater

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 23, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: ED MEESE
JIM BAKER
MIKE DEAVER
BILL CLARK

FROM: KEN DUBERSTEIN Ken D.

SUBJECT: Soviet Violation of SALT treaty

Attached for your information is a press release that Senator Jim McClure has issued announcing that he will release detailed documentation of Soviet violation of the SALT treaty at a press conference on Monday.

Thought you should be aware of this.

Attachment

cc: Bud McFarlane
Pam Turner

News Update

SENATE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE
Senator James A. McClure, Chairman

McCLURE TO DISCUSS SOVIET ARMS CONTROL VIOLATIONS AT MONDAY PRESS CONFERENCE

WASHINGTON -- U.S. Senator Jim McClure (R-ID) will release w and detailed documentation of Soviet violations of the SALT Treaty at a press conference on Monday, April 25.

The press conference will be held in Room 124 of the Dirksen nate Office Building, from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m.

McClure will discuss 10 counts of Soviet SALT II violations, ch as rapid reload and refire capability for Soviet tercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), the stockpiling of tra missiles for covert soft launch, and Soviet operational ployment of mobile ICBMs.

McClure, in two letters to President Reagan over the past ur weeks, has raised serious questions over a continuing ttern of Soviet arms control cheating.

For further details on Monday's press conference, or for re information on Senator McClure's documentation of Soviet ALT II violations, contact Charles Goolsby of the Senate epublican Conference at 224-3050, or Bill Livingstone of Senator cClure's office at 224-1010.

# # # #

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 22, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR HELENE VON DAMM
DAVE STOCKMAN

THRU: KEN DUBERSTEIN

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR.

SUBJECT: African Development Foundation

Congressman Bill Gray (D-Pennsylvania), who serves on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, believes that the Administration has failed to live up to previous understandings with regard to appointments and funding of the African Development Foundation.

It is very important that I respond to Gray's concern.

Can we expedite positive information regarding the Administration's commitment to this Foundation?

Guidance, please?

cc: Jim Baker
Bill Clark

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 15, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: JIM BAKER
ED MEESE
DAVE STOCKMAN
DICK DARMAN
CRAIG FULLER

FROM: KEN DUBERSTEIN

SUBJECT: Interest and Dividend Withholding

Attached are the Dear Colleague letter, section-by-section summary, and the amendment that Ted Stevens is likely to offer on interest and dividend withholding.

Thought you would be interested in reviewing it carefully.

cc: M.B. Oglesby
Pam Turner

MARK O. HATFIELD, OREG., CHAIRMAN

TED STEVENS, ALASKA
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., CONN.
JAMES A. MC CLURE, IDAHO
PAUL LAXALT, NEV.
JAKE GARN, UTAH
THAD COCHRAN, MISS.
MARK ANDREWS, N. DAK.
JAMES ABDNOR, S. DAK.
ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR., WIS.
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, N.Y.
MACK MATTINGLY, GA.
WARREN RUDMAN, N.H.
ARLEN SPECTER, PA.
PETE V. DOMENICI, N. MEX.

JOHN C. STENNIS, MISS.
ROBERT C. BYRD, W. VA.
WILLIAM PROXMIRE, WIS.
DANIEL K. INOUYE, HAWAII
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, S.C.
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, MO.
LAWTON CHILES, FLA.
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, LA.
WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, KY.
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, N. DAK.
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VT.
JIM SASSER, TENN.
DENNIS DE CONCINI, ARIZ.
DALE BUMPERS, ARK.

J. KEITH KENNEDY, STAFF DIRECTOR
FRANCIS J. SULLIVAN MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

April 11, 1983

The Honorable Paul S. Trible, Jr.
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Paul:

Over the past weeks I have listened carefully to the opinions of my colleagues here in the Senate and my constituents back home on the matter of interest and dividend withholding.

It's my belief that there is substantial merit to the concerns expressed by those who oppose withholding. I also firmly believe that we must find a way to collect the revenue already owed the government, but being denied to it by tax cheaters. Our alternative is to raise taxes, and frankly we have done enough of that already.

An accommodation on the withholding issue that suits everyone who has an interest in this issue would be impossible to construct. However, our country's political system has always survived because of its ability to make reasonable compromises between divergent interests. It is in that spirit that I ask you to consider the enclosed proposal which I intend to offer when we take up the debate on withholding this month.

It does put the main burden of tax enforcement on the IRS--not the financial services industry. Law-abiding taxpayers are not penalized. Those individuals who do not comply with reporting interest and dividend income would be subjected to withholding. This has been informally labeled the "fallback" withholding concept.

If you wish to join me in pursuing this proposal or have further comments or questions on it, either Mark Barnes of my staff (4-1024) or I am available to discuss this legislation with you.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

TED STEVENS

Enclosures

SENATOR STEVENS PROPOSAL

WITHHOLDING ON INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS

SECTION BY SECTION SUMMARY

Section I: Repeals the provisions of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 relating to the withholding of tax from interest and dividends.

Section II: Amends Section 6049 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to returning regarding payments of interest). This section requires that each individual be given two copies of his or her 1099 (interest or dividend income for that year), and requires that the individual include a copy of the 1099 with his tax form.

SECTION III: Amends subsection(s) of Section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the extension of withholding to certain payments where identifying number not furnished or inaccurate). This section provides that an individual who does not report interest or dividend income or does not provide the required reporting statements with their tax return will, after proper notice and opportunity to respond, be automatically subject to the backup withholding provisions for three years (already provided for in the Code).

Section IV: This section requires that the Treasury establish a program that identifies taxpayers who do not comply with the reporting requirements. The individuals identified by that program will be sent notice to inquire if they had reasonable cause for failing to report their income. If not, then they become subject to the backup withholding provisions for three years.

Section V: This section provides that any person who is required to file 50 returns or more under 6042 or 6049 of the Act (dealing with the reporting requirements of the interest paying institutions) report those returns on magnetic tape.

Section VI: This section amends Section 6676 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the failure to supply identifying numbers) and imposes a $50 penalty on the institutions responsible for reporting 1099's for each return which fails to supply correct TIN or interest and dividend information (with exceptions for excusable mistakes).

Small institution exception - 5 million + under - not required to report on magnetic tape

AMENDMENT NO. ---------- Ex. ---------- Calendar No. ----------

Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal withholding of tax from interest and dividends except in the case of taxpayers failing to file tax returns, to improve compliance, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES— ------- Cong., ------- Sess.

S. ----------

H.R. ---------- (or Treaty ---------- SHORT TITLE)

(title) ----------

( ) Referred to the Committee on ----------
and ordered to be printed

( ) Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

INTENDED to be proposed by Mr. Stevens

Viz:

At the end of the bill insert the following new title:

TITLE -WITHHOLDING OF TAX FROM INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS

SEC. . REPEAL OF WITHHOLDING ON INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS.

(a) Subtitle A of title III of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (relating to withholding of tax from interest and dividends) is hereby repealed.

(b) The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be applied as if such subtitle A (and the amendments made by such subtitle) had not been enacted.

SEC. . REQUIREMENT OF FILING OF DUPLICATE STATEMENTS.

(a) Section 6049 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to returns regarding payments of interest) is amended--

(1) in subsection (a)--

(A) by inserting "or" at the end of paragraph (1),

(B) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (2),

(C) by striking out paragraph (3), and

(D) by striking out "tax deducted and

withheld,'',

(2) in subsection (b) (2)--

(A) by striking out subparagraph (C),

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C), and striking out ''not described in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph'', and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D),

(3) in subsection (b) (3) by striking out ''paragraph 2 (D)'' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof ''paragraph 2 (C)'',

(4) in subsection (c) (1)--

(A) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A),

(B) by striking out '', and'' at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and

(C) by striking out subparagraph (C), and

(5) in subsection (c) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

''(4) Duplicate statement to be included in return of person with respect to whom information is furnished.--A duplicate of the statement required to be furnished to a person under paragraph (1) shall be included with the return of the person receiving such statement for the taxable year which ends with or within the calendar year to which the statement relates.''.

(b) Section 6042 of such Code (relating to returns regarding payments of dividends) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

''(e) Duplicate Statement to be Included in Return of Person With Respect to Whom Information is Furnished.--A duplicate of the statement required to be furnished to a person under subsection (c) shall be included with the return

of the person receiving such statement for the taxable year which ends with or within the calendar year to which the statement relates.''.

(c) Section 6044 of such Code (relating to returns regarding payment of patronage dividends) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

''(f) Duplicate Statement to be Included in Return of Person With Respect to Whom Information is Furnished.--A duplicate of the statement required to be furnished to a person under subsection (e) shall be included with the return of the person receiving such statement for the taxable year which ends with or within the calendar year to which the statement relates.''.

(d) Section 6678 of such Code (relating to failure to furnish certain statements) is amended--

(1) by striking out ''or'' at the end of paragraph (2),

(2) by inserting ''or'' at the end of paragraph (3), and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

''(4) to furnish a statement under section 6042 (c), 6044 (f), or 6049 (c) (4),''.

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns with respect to periods beginning after December 31, 1982.

SEC. . APPLICATION OF BACKUP WITHHOLDING RULES TO INTEREST AND DIVIDEND PAYMENTS.

(a) Subsection (s) of section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to extension of withholding to certain payments where identifying number not furnished or inaccurate) is amended--

(1) in paragraph (1)--

(A) by striking out ''or'' at the end of

subparagraph (A),

(B) by inserting ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (B), and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) the payee fails to include in income for any taxable year any amount of a backup withholding payment described in clause (iii), (iv), or (vi) of paragraph (3) (A) of this subsection,'',

(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) Failure to include in income.--In the case of any failure described in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1), paragraph (1) shall apply to any backup withholding payment made during the period--

''(i) beginning on the 16th day after the day on which the payor was notified by the Secretary of such failure, and

''(ii) ending on the last day of the third taxable year of the payee beginning after the date described in clause (i).'', and

(3) by inserting before the period in the caption of such subsection the following: ''Or Certain Payments Not Reported''.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply to payments made after December 31, 1982.

SEC. . REVERSE MATCHING SYSTEM FOR 1099 REPORTS.

(a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish a program which identifies any taxpayer--

(1) with respect to which the aggregate amount reported as paid to the taxpayer on returns filed under sections 6042, 6044, and 6049 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year exceeds $200, and

(2) who fails to file any return under such Code with

respect to which such interest is required to be included.

(b) Any taxpayer identified under subsection (a) shall be sent a notice advising such taxpayer that, unless the failure to file the return was due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect, the provisions of section 3402 (s) of such Code (requiring withholding on interest and dividends) shall apply.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. . RETURNS ON MAGNETIC TAPE.

Subsection (e) of section 6011 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to regulations requiring returns on magnetic tape, etc.) is amended--

(1) by inserting ''(1) In general.--'' before the first sentence thereof, and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

''(2) Certain returns must be filed on magnetic form.--

''(A) In general.--In the case of any person who is required to file more than 50 returns under section 6042 or 6049 for any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1982, all such returns under the appropriate section shall be on magnetic media.

''(B) Exemption for small institutions.--The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any financial institution described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 3454 (a) (1) for any calendar if the deposit liabilities of such institution did not exceed $5,000,000 for the preceding calendar year.

''(C) Temporary delay.--The Secretary may delay

the requirements of subparagraph (A) in any case in which the Secretary finds immediate compliance an undue burden.''.

SEC. . PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER.

(a) Subsection (a) of section 6676 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to failure to supply identifying numbers) is amended by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3) and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) Additional penalty for failure to supply correct TIN or interest and dividend returns.--

''(A) In general.--If any person--

''(i) is required to include in any return required to be filed under section 6042 or 6049 with respect to another person the taxpayer identification number of such other person, and

''(ii) fails to include such number or includes an incorrect number,

then such person shall pay a penalty of $50 for each such failure. Such penalty shall be in addition to any penalty under paragraph (1).

''(B) No penalty in certain cases.--No penalty shall be imposed under this paragraph--

''(i) if the taxpayer identification number included on the return is the number provided, under oath, by the person with respect to whom such return relates unless, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, such number is obviously incorrect, or

''(ii) for any period during which a person is waiting for receipt of a taxpayer identification number.''.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply to

returns required to be filed for periods after December 31, 1982, except that such amendments shall not apply to any account in existence on December 31, 1982, unless no taxpayer identification number has been furnished with respect to such account on or before December 31, 1982.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 14, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR ED MEESE
JIM BAKER

THRU: KEN DUBERSTEIN

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR.

SUBJECT: FRESHMEN GOP SUPPORT FOR THIRD YEAR TAX CUT AND INDEXING

On Monday, Congressman Connie Mack (R-FL) will be forwarding a letter signed by 21 or 22 of the 24 Freshmen Republicans that expresses their support for retention of the third year and indexing.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 12, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: KEN DUBERSTEIN

FROM: MAX FRIEDERSDORF

SUBJECT: MX

The favorable MX editorial in the Post today, as well as the favorable columns by Commission members John Deutch and Jim Woolsey, would make an excellent package for submission to House and Senate members.

Gergen may have more of these from around the country and they should also be sent to the Hill.

If someone in Communications could monitor the national media for favorable items and get items to the Hill between now and vote time, would be extremely helpful.

Special attention on this effort should be given to getting this material to Tower, Baker, Stevens, Jackson, et al, in the Senate, and Michel, Lott, Cheney, Edwards, Aspin, Gore, Foley, Alexander, Dickinson, et al, in the House.

cc: Dave Gergen
Judge Clark
Bud McFarlane
Jim Baker

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 12, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: KEN DUBERSTEIN

FROM: MAX FRIEDERSDORF

SUBJECT: MX

I talked to 'Scoop' Jackson today on the MX and he is fully supportive, believes he had been consulted adequately and offered to help on the MX issue in any way possible. Scoop has been consulted constantly since January 16 by myself on the MX.

Senator Jackson advises that we concentrate on the House and recommends the President meet with Representative Les Aspin (D-Wisc.) and Representative Tom Foley (D-Wash.) prior to the Presidential announcement next Tuesday.

Jackson has been encouraging Aspin on the MX and believes Aspin's supportive remarks and helpful posture would be further enhanced by a "pat on the back" meeting with the President.

Jackson believes if we solve our problem in the House, the Senate will go along.

He promised to work the Senate and contact me on any needed special Presidential involvement in the Senate.

cc: Bud McFarlane
Judge Clark
Jim Baker

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 12, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: KEN DUBERSTEIN

FROM: MAX FRIEDERSDORF

SUBJECT: MX

Les Aspin wants to sit down with Tom Foley and me to go over the MX strategy for the House Democrats, and we expect to do so this week.

Aspin said that Phil Burton's funeral on Thursday is likely to throw the MX vote over until next week because there will be no votes on Thursday and two days were anticipated for the freeze debate.

I have communicated this possibility to Bud McFarlane and his reaction to delaying the President's submission of MX beyond next week was negative.

As soon as Aspin, Foley and I meet, I will brief you.

cc: Bud McFarlane
Judge Clark
Jim Baker

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

JAB
R.F. P/s.
4/14
MOT

April 12, 1983

TO: JIM BAKER
DICK DARMAN

FROM: KEN DUBERSTEIN

Think you will find the attached of much interest---it's a compilation by our staff of the key votes in the second session of the 97th Congress and the percentage of support for the Administration's position.

1982 SENATE KEY VOTES
97TH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

A.	S 1662	Nuclear Waste Policy Act	4/29/82	(69-9) Passed
B.	S. 1503	Petroleum Allocation Act	3/24/82	(58-36) Veto Override (veto Sustained)
C.	S. 2248	DoD Authorization	5/13/82	(84-8) Passed
D.	A # 941	Glenn-Prohibit MX Funds	5/13/82	(65-29) Tabled
E.	A #943	Moynihan-Maybank	5/13/82	(48-45) Passed
F.		Conference Report	8/17/82	(77-21) Passed
G.	S. 2774	Reconciliation Act	8/5/82	(73-23) Passed
H.		Conference Report	8/18/82	(67-32) Passed
I.	S Con.Res. 92	First Concurrent Budget Res.	5/21/82	(49-43) Passed
J.		Conference Report	6/22/82	(51-45) Passed
K.	A #986	Hawkins-COL increase decrease in defense funds.	5/21/82	(51-42) Tabled
L.	A #992	Dixon-Reduce funds for foreign aid	5/21/82	(60-32) Tabled
M.	H.R.4961	Tax Equity & Fiscal Responsibility	7/22/82	(50-47) Passed
N.		Conference Report	8/19/82	(68-27) Passed
O.	A #1126	Kasten-delete withholding	7/22/82	(47-50) Reject
P.	A #1131	Unemployment benefits by 13 weeks extended	7/22/82	(48-49) Reject
Q.	H.R.6863	Supplemental Appropriations	8/20/82	(60-30) Veto overridden
R.	A #1203	Reduce CBI funding by 177.5 million	8/10/82	(55-40) Tabled
S.	H.R.5922 A #1009	Urgent Supplemental Lugar Housing Bill	5/26/82	(23-70) Table Rejected
T.	H.J.Res. 599	Continuing Appropriations	9/29/82	(72-26) Passed
U.	A #1339	Hollings-limit funds for MX on unapproved basing mode	9/29/82	(50-46) Tabled
V.	S.2222	Immigration Reform and and Control Act	8/17/82	(80-19) Passed
W.	S.J.Res. 58	Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment	8/4/82	(69-31) Passed (2/3 needed)
X.	H.R.4	Intelligence Identities Protection	6/10/82	(96-6) Passed
Y.	H.J.631	Further Continuing	12/19/82	(63-31) Passed
Z.	H.R.6211	Highway Surface Transportation Act (Gas Tax)	12/20/83	(56-34) Passed

+ For Administration
Blank Against
° Not Voting

REPUBLICANS
1982 SENATE KEY VOTES
97TH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

MEMBER	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
ABDNOR (SD)	°		+	+	+	+	+		+	+			+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
ANDREWS (ND)	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+		+	+	+	+	+
ARMSTRONG (CO)	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+		
BAKER (TN)	°	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
BOSCHWITZ (MINN)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
BRADY (NJ)	°		+	+		+		+	+	°	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
CHAFEE (R.I)	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+				+		+		+		+	+	+
COCHRAN (MISS)		°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	
COHEN (MAINE)	+		+	+		+	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+			+	+	
D'AMATO (NY)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
DANFORTH (MS)	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+		+	+	+	+	+
DENTON (ALA)	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	°	°	+	+	+		
DOLE (KS)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
DOMENICI (NM)	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
DURENBERGER(MN)	°		°	+			+		°	+	+	°	+	+	+	+		+		+		+	+	+	+	+
EAST (NC)	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+	+		+		+	+		
GARN (UTAH)	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	
GOLDWATER (AR)	°	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	°	+	°	°	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	°	°
GORTON (WA)	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+		+	+	+
GRASSLEY (IOWA)	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	
HATCH (UTAH)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	°
HATFIELD (OR)	°						+	+	°	+	°	°	+	+	+			+		+		+	+	+	+	°
HAWKINS (FL)	+		°	+		+			+	+		+		+		+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	
HAYAKAWA (CA)	°	+	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+	+		+	+	+	+
HEINZ (PA)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+			+		+		+		+	°	°
HELMS (NC)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+		+			+	+	+					+	+		
HUMPHREY (N.H.)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		
JEPSEN (IOWA)	+		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
KASSEBAUM (KS)	+	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+
KASTEN (WS)	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+		
LAXALT (NV)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+		+
LUGAR (IND)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MATHIAS (MD)	+	+	+				+		+	+		+	+	+	+			°		+		+		°	+	+
MATTINGLY (GA)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
MCCLURE (IDAHO)	+		°	°	°	+	+	+	+	+	+			+		+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
MURKOWSKI (AL)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
NICKLES (OKLA)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+		
PACKWOOD (OR)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+	+	+	+	+			+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
PERCY (ILL)		+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	°	°	°	+	+	+	+	+
PRESSLER (SD)	+		+	+	+		+	+	°	+	°	°	+	+		+		+		+	+	+	+			+

REPUBLICANS
1982 SENATE KEY VOTES
97TH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

MEMBER	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
QUAYLE (IND)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+		+		+	+	+	+	+
ROTH (DELAWARE)	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+		+	+	+	+	+	+
RUDMAN (NH)	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
SCHMITT (NM)	°	+	+	+	+		+	+	°	+	°	°	+	+			°	+		+	+		+	+	+	+
SIMPSON (WYOMING)	+	+	+	+	+	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
SPECTER (PA)	+	+	+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
STAFFORD (VT)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	°	+	+	+	+	°	+	+		+		+		+	+	+	+	+
STEVENS (ALASKA)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	°	+	+	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+
SYMMS (IDAHO)	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+
THURMOND (SC)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
TOWER (TX)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	°	+	°	+	+		+	+	+	+	
WALLOP (WYOMING)	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
WARNER (VA)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	°	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+
WEICKER (CONN)	+		+		+	+						+	°	+	°	°		+		+		+	+	+	+	+

DEMOCRATS
1982 SENATE KEY VOTES
97TH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

MEMBER	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
BAUCUS (MONTANA)	+						+	+				+		+						+		+		+		+
BENTSEN (TEXAS)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+			+		+	°			+	+	+	+	+	+	+
BIDEN (DELAWARE)	°		+	+		+	+	+				+		+								+	+		+	
BOREN (OKLA)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+														+	+	+		
BRADLEY (NJ)	+	+	+			+	+	+				+		+	+							+	+		+	
BUMPERS (ARK)	°		+		+															+		+		+	+	
BURDICK (ND)	+		+			+	+													+		+	+	+	+	+
BYRD, H (VA)	+		+	+	°	+	+	+					+	+		+	+		+			+	+	+		+
BYRD, R (W.VA)	+		+	+		+						+								+	+	+	+	+	+	
CANNON (NEVADA)	+	°	+	°	+	+				°									°	+	+	+	+	°	+	°
CHILES (FL)	°		+	+	+	+	+	°						°						+		+		+	+	+
CRANSTON (CA)	+		+									+		+	+	°									°	°
DECONCINI (AR)	+		+	+		+	+	+	°			°		+				°		+	+		+	+		+
DIXON (ILL)			°	°	°	+		+												+		+	+	+		+
DODD (CONN)	+		+			+	°				+	+		+	+				°			+		+		+
EAGLETON (MO)	°		+			+				°										+		+		+		
EXON (NEBRASKA)	+		+	+	+		+	+			+									+		+	+	+		
FORD (KENTUCKY)	°		+	+		°	+								+					+		°		+	+	
GLENN (OHIO)	+		+			+		÷				+								+		+		+	+	+
HART (CO)	+						+						+		+				+							
HEFLIN (ALA)	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+								+	+		+		+	+		
HOLLINGS (SC)			°	°	°	+	+				+							°				+	+	+	+	°
HUDDLESTON (KY)	°		+	+	+	+	+	+			°	°								+		+	+	+	+	+
INOUYE (HA)	+	°	°									+	°	+	°	°		+		+		+		+		
JACKSON (WA)	+		+			+						+		+	+					+	+	+			°	
JOHNSTON (LA)	+		+		+	+	+	+			+	+		°		+	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	
KENNEDY (MA)	+		°									+		+										+	+	°
LEAHY (VT)			+			+	+	+						+								+		+	+	+
LEVIN (MICH)						+		+						+	+			°				+		+		+
LONG (LA)	°	°	+	+	+		+	+			+			+		+	+			+	+	+	+	°	+	+
MATSUNAGA (HA)	+		+	+								+		+						+		+		+	°	+
MELCHER (MONTANA)	°		+				+		°		°	°							°	+		+	+	+	+	+
METZENBAUM (OH)	+		+		+							+		+	+							+		+	+	
MITCHELL (MAINE)	+		+		+																			+		
MOYNIHAN (NY)	+	°	+		+							+		+								+			+	°
NUNN (GA)	+		+	+	°	+	+	+						+				+		+		+	+	+		+
PELL (RI)	+						+	+				+		+	+							+		+		+
PROXMIRE (WI)					+		+															+	+	+		
PRYOR (ARK)	°		+		+																	+	+	+		
RANDOLPH (W.VA)	+		+																			+		+		+	+

DEMOCRATS
1982 SENATE KEY VOTES
97TH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

MEMBER	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
RIEGLE (MICHIGAN)			+									+						°			°			+	+	
SARBANES (MD)	+		°	°	°	+						+						°		+		+		+	+	
SASSER (TN)	°		+	+		+	+													+	+	+	+	+		
STENNIS (MISS)			+	+	+	+	°	+	+	+	+			+		+	°			+	+	+	+	+	+	+
TSONGAS (MASS)	+			°	°							+		+						+		+		+	+	+
ZORINSKY (NEB)	+		+	+	+	+	+			+	+									+	+		+	+		

REPUBLICANS		DEMOCRATS		
Murkowski	100	Bentsen	72	
Simpson	96	Stennis	71	
Baker	96	Long	65	
Dole	96	Johnston	64	
Thurmond	96	Byrd, H.	60	
Wallop	92	Heflin	54	
Laxalt	92	DeConcini	52	
Warner	92	Nunn	52	
Tower	92	Huddleston	52	
Boschwitz	92	Zorinsky	46	
Domenici	92	Bradley	46	
Hatch	92	Cannon	45	
Lugar	92	Chiles	43	
Stevens	92	Exon	42	
Garn	88	Boren	42	
D'Amato	88	Dodd	42	R. Byrd 42
Packwood	88	Biden	40	
Quayle	88	Inouye	38	
Specter	88	Burdick	38	
Symms	88	Glenn	38	
Cochran	87	Melcher	38	
Hayakawa	87	Sasser	36	
Percy	87	Jackson	36	
Humphrey	85	Matsunaga	36	
Nickles	85	BAucus	35	
Mattingly	85	Metzenbaum	35	
Brady	85	Pell	35	
Goldwater	85	Leahy	35	
Danforth	85	Hollings	33	
Kassebaum	85	Tsongas	33	
Roth	85	Sarbanes	32	
Rudman	85	Dixon	30	
Armstrong	84	Ford	30	
Denton	83	Moynihan	29	
Gorton	83	Levin	28	
Stafford	83	Randolph	23	
Andrews	81	Cranston	22	
Grassley	81	Bumpers	22	
Jepsen	81	Eagleton	21	
McClure	78	Kennedy	21	
Kasten	77	Pryor	20	
East	76	Hart	19	
Cohen	76	Proxmire	19	
Abdnor	76	Riegle	17	
Schmitt	76	Mitchell	15	
Heinz	71			
Pressler	69			
Durenberger	68			
Chafee	62			
Helms	61			
Hawkins	60			
Mathias	58			
Hatfield	57			
Weicker	56			

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 11, 1983

TO: ED MEESE
JIM BAKER
MIKE DEAVER
BILL CLARK
DICK DARMAN
BUD MCFARLANE

FROM: KEN DUBERSTEIN

Attached - for your information.

JAB -
In Reading File Please -
4/11
MDT

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, D.C. 20515

April 8, 1983

President Ronald Reagan
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

It is our view that, if it is to receive the support of the House, a new ICBM program must meet the following requirements:

(1) It must do significantly more to deter a Soviet first strike than to incite one.

(2) It must offer positive deterrent value not merely against the present Soviet threat, but against threats which could plausibly be deployed during the lifetime of the program.

(3) The duration of the ICBM program's deterrent value must be commensurate with its cost.

We send this letter because we understand that the Scowcroft Commission may submit its report to you on Monday with a recommendation for a basing mode for the MX missile and, perhaps, other weapons systems.

Then, of course, the debate will resume. We certainly will not prejudge the Commission or your own decision on such an enormously important issue. But the debate should not be on the future of any weapons system per se; rather, it should center on the security goals we all seek. The criteria set forth above are essential to this.

You have our best wishes in the coming days as you approach a decision on the Commission's findings.

Sincerely,

Joseph P. Addabbo, M.C.

Les AuCoin, M.C.

Buddy Roemer, M.C.

William H. Natcher, M.C.

Berkley Bedell, M.C.

Robert Carr, M.C.

Thomas Downey, M.C.

James Leach, M.C.

Mike Lowry, M.C.

Stan Lundine, M.C.

Nicholas Mavroules, M.C.

George Miller, M.C.

Martin Sabo, M.C.

Tim Wirth, M.C.

Thomas M. Foglietta

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 11, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III

THRU: KENNETH M. DUBERSTEIN

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR.
DAVID L. WRIGHT

SUBJECT: Farm Credit Issue

Initial inidications have proven accurate, as Congressmen are returning from the Easter Recess, that the seventeen state short-fall on Farmers Home Administration funds is causing an uproar in affected areas. It is likely that a supplemental appropriation will move quickly through the House, and that this measure will be supported by leaders on both sides of the Aisle (including Bob Michel (R-Illinois) and Trent Lott (R-Mississippi)). In view of the broad interpretation on the Hill accorded statements made by the President in the State of the Union address earlier this year, we are losing the farm credit issue on both substantive and political grounds.

Despite efforts to the contrary by Ed Madigan (R-Illinois), the Ranking Republican Member of the House Agriculture Committee, the farm credit bail-out bill (H.R. 1190) still is on a fast track in the House. In our judgement, this bill will continue to move even if the Administration comes out in favor of the FmHA supplemental.

Absent unforeseen events or circumstances, we do not feel a veto can be sustained on either bill in the House.

FYI.