

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

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: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Grant, Mary Kate, Files
Subseries: Subject File, 1988-1991

OA/ID Number: 13882
Folder ID Number: 13882-013

Folder Title:
NRSC [National Republican Senatorial Committee], 3/27/90

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	19	2	7	7

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Grant/Nappo
March 26, 1990
Draft seven/A:nrsc

BRIEF REMARKS: SENATORIAL TRUST RECEPTION
STATE FLOOR/THE WHITE HOUSE
TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1990
5:30 p.m.

Dan and Linda Nickles ... members of the Senatorial Trust ... it's a pleasure to have you here at the White House during such exciting times. And it's important to remember that these are also dangerous times. But don't worry. I had the Secret Service do a security sweep before this event. Place was clean. \\ No broccoli. \\

We've all been watching the events in the Soviet Union. Last year, Yevgeni Primakov, the head of the Soviet legislative body, came to the White House to discuss the new political situation in his country. He asked me for advice in how to cope with the structural changes in the Soviet Union. "Mr. Primakov," I said, "if you're looking for advice on what to do about the Congress, you've come to **the wrong guy**. I'm not having too much luck in that department." \\ \\

Sometimes, we don't have too much luck, and I'll tell you why: **because we don't have a majority in the Senate.**

Remember the good old days in the eighties when President Reagan enjoyed a majority in the Senate? Remember Republican committee chairmen, winning party-line votes, **committees acting on our legislative agenda?**

From 1980 to 1986, steady Senate support helped us launch our record peacetime economic recovery -- 88 months and still going strong. It helped us restore America to a position of

THE WHITE HOUSE

2

WASHINGTON

strength and respect in the world -- and it helped us renew the values of faith, family, honest work and opportunity.

But we can accomplish even more if we have a Republican Senate working for America's future. That's what I want to talk about today -- the future. How the 1990s will be the decade the Grand Old Party becomes the **Grand Old majority Party in America.**\\\

A Republican Senate is within reach. I'll tell you why: When the fight is fair -- and the issues clearly defined -- Republicans win elections. We can put the Democrats out of business on the issues if we control the Senate:

We need child care that puts choice in the hands of parents. We need sound environmental legislation that guarantees our commitment to clean air and water, but that is reasonable. We must not -- and will not -- throw Americans out of work by extremist legislation. We need prompt enactment of our tough yet sensible anti-drug strategy. And we need a new transportation policy that gives the states more control while fulfilling our federal responsibility.

Even a small shift can put us back on top. In 1986, 35,000 more Republican votes in the six tightest Senate races would have given us a 51-49 majority. This year, we've got the top candidates in the country -- among them, Lynn Martin in Illinois, Claudine Schneider in Rhode Island, Tom Tauke in Iowa, Hal Daub in Nebraska, Bob Smith in New Hampshire, Hank Brown in Colorado,

THE WHITE HOUSE

3

WASHINGTON

and Bill Cabaniss in Alabama. **Seven great reasons why we're looking to 1990 to be the beginning of the GOP decade.**

But Senate Democrats have also abused their majority status in another way. **Under the Democrats, getting Republicans confirmed can be more than a job -- it's an adventure.**

Give me a few good men -- and women -- in the Senate and you'll see our good men and women get confirmed.

I don't need to tell you how much it means down on my end of Pennsylvania Avenue to have a majority in the Senate. I'll be relying on the Senate to ratify the international agreements that will help shape the post-Cold War world for generations to come.

Your work as members of the Trust has never been more important to help us achieve our goal -- a Senate majority. For your commitment and your dedication in working for a better America, **the Republican Party thanks you -- and I thank you. **

Let's end divided government in America. The mathematics are simple: the magic number is five -- five seats stand between us and a Senate majority. **And make no mistake: together we can put the Senate back in Republican hands.**

Thank you and God bless you.

#

Remarks by Michael J. Boskin
at the City Club Forum
Wednesday, March 7, 1990

Thank you for that kind introduction, Elizabeth. It is indeed a pleasure to be here at the City Club of Cleveland. It's something we've been trying to arrange for a several years. I'm delighted to be here and I thank you for your gracious hospitality. The City Club of Cleveland, as I understand it, has been providing a public speaking forum free speech and expression for more than three quarters of a century. You are to be commended for that impressive achievement, and when I look down the list of people who have spoken here, it is enormously impressive. Among your previous speakers is my boss, the President of the United States, who has spoken here on five separate occasions. Your Director, Alan Davis, tells me that he was not only a classmate of President Bush at Yale, but played on the same baseball team. The only thing I've not managed to learn is what Alan's batting average was at Yale. (comment from the audience--"It was better than the President's") I won't repeat that when I go back to Washington. So it's a pleasure to be here and see some old friends and make some new ones. I have learned a lot about Cleveland. It's the home of the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. It is also the home of a terrific football team which almost made it to the SuperBowl. And I suppose the Denver Broncos wished that the Browns had made it to the SuperBowl.

Let me try to do three separate things that are closely related. First, give you my perspective--as the President's

economic adviser--about where the United States economy is, how it got there, and where it's going. Second, give you some perspective on what the Administration is trying to accomplish--the goals and principles of economic policy to promote an improved standard of living for Americans. And third, let me share with you some experiences, some intellectual excitement and just some plain wonder at the events of the last year, particularly those in Eastern Europe.

Let me begin there. The Berlin Wall is coming down, and freedom is rising up. Eighteen months ago I was a professor teaching principles of economics--the beginning economics course--to freshmen at Stanford University. Now I find myself teaching principles of economics to Prime Ministers and Finance Ministers from Eastern European countries, whose newly emerging societies are trying to make the painful and important steps to market-oriented economies, bringing the hope of a better economic life to their citizens. What has happened is simply extraordinary what has happened--on a personal, societal, and global scale.

But I want to begin by making some very simple statements of fact about the American economy. I wish to do so because we hear an amazing amount of negative news and information, and I think we have to just set the record straight.

First the American economy is the largest, most productive economy in the world. With less than 5 percent of the world's population, we produced well over a quarter of the total output, GNP, in the world.

*already
in
speech*

*must
already in*

Our economy is 2-1/2 times the size of the next largest economy, which is Japan.

The average standard of living of Americans--GNP per capita--is far above that of those in other major industrialized economies--fully one-third higher than that in West Germany or Japan. We start from a position of great strength.

Second, we're in the 87th month of the longest peacetime expansion in the entire history of the United States. (To be a little more accurate, the data only go back to 1854--economic historians tell me it's unlikely we had this long an expansion between 1776 or 1789 and 1854.) Some people say that because an expansion is long, it must end soon. There is no economic theory and no empirical evidence for that view. Economic expansions do not come with a pre-set expiration date. The economy has been growing more slowly starting in late 1989, but we expect it to improve as this year progresses.

In this expansion--which started at the end of 1982--we've created 21.6 million jobs in the United States. That's far more than the jobs created in all the advanced economies of Western Europe, Canada, and Japan combined, despite the fact that they have combined a much larger population than do we.

Personal incomes--after adjusting for inflation and taxes--have risen substantially.

The unemployment rate has fallen substantially. Exports, which were a major problem the earlier part of this decade, have risen. Productivity growth, which had been virtually nonexistent

most already in

in the 1970s has rebounded partway to the robust levels of the 1950s and 60s, especially in manufacturing. And we've set the stage in a long expansion by preventing inflation from accelerating for the first time in any expansion since World War II for better times ahead for continuing this expansion and a better decade in the 1990s.

Let's take a look at 1989, a year in which economic growth slowed to around 2.5 percent from more rapid growth in 1987 and 1988. We added another 2.5 million jobs.

Exports rose to an all time high--\$589 billion. The United States once again became the world's leading exporter.

Real disposable income, income after taxes and inflation, rose 3.6 percent last year.

The unemployment rate averaged for all of 1989 5.3 percent. It also ended the year at that level and is at that level today--a rate we hadn't seen since the early 1970s. And those job opportunities have spread widely. The unemployment rate for blacks is the lowest since the early 1970s; for teenagers, the lowest since the early 1970s; for Hispanics, the lowest since we started keeping separate data for Hispanics in 1980--and undoubtedly for a considerably longer span of time than that. Women have made major economic progress in the last six or seven years. The unemployment rate for women has been no higher than the unemployment rate for men for the first time since World War II. And at a time when many more women entered the labor force,

and were able to find jobs, about a quarter of the pay gap between men and women was eliminated.

Those are impressive achievements. That's a strong economy growing stronger. I'll come back to the short-term and longer-term prospects and what we need to do to keep our economy growing to provide rising living standards for our population in a moment. But I want you all to mull those facts, because somehow in the general discussion of where we are in the United States, they're not getting out there.

We cannot, however, take continued economic growth for granted. We cannot become complacent. The Administration's foremost priority is to sustain the highest possible rate of economic growth. That isn't just an abstraction. Economic growth requires movement on many fronts, but it makes action on many more social and private goals attainable. Economic growth is how we create rising standards of living for the bulk of the population. How we develop the resources to uplift those most in need. How we provide economic and social mobility to our citizens. How we leave a better legacy to our children. And how we maintain America's leadership in the world. Thus, our primary priority is to make sure we achieve the highest possible sustainable rate of growth of the economy's potential output and make sure the economy operates at its potential, not below it. We've establish some principles that we use in the Administration to try to achieve these goals. In our system of checks and balances and divided system of government, it is not just the

Executive Branch that sets economic policy. Congress has a major say in a variety of areas. We have an independent Federal Reserve, and so on. But let me just say a word or two about our principles with some examples. Our principles for monetary, fiscal, trade and regulatory policy are designed to make sure that the private sector of the economy--the engine that drives growth--will continue to create jobs, expand opportunities, increase productivity and provide greater opportunities for Americans.

We support a monetary policy by the Federal Reserve that sustains growth, while predictably controlling inflation.

Our budget policy is directed to turn the tide, to take the Federal Government which for too long now has been a chronic borrower draining the Nation's scarce saving pool, thereby raising interest rates and the cost of capital to our businesses, dampening investment and detracting from economic growth, into a supplier of capital to the U.S. capital market by protecting the integrity of the projected social security surpluses, moving toward a balanced budget outside the social security system, and freeing up resources with those projected social security surpluses to reduce the national debt, lower interest rates, expand investment, spur economic growth and a raise standards of living.

It's not just the size of the deficit that determines the fiscal contribution to economic growth. It's also how we tax, and how wisely and well we spend. And there we have some

principles as well. We believe we need a tax system that gets out of the business of distorting incentives to the private sector of the economy; make sure that we maintain incentives to invest, to innovate, to save and to work. We support the principle of low tax rates on a broad base that was enacted in 1981 and extended in the tax reform of 1986. We see some problems with our tax code, in particular on some of the capital formation issues. We have a research and experimentation tax credit which is renewed every year by the Congress. Research and development is a long-term process and if you're going to get an idea, innovate, develop a product, bring it to market, it's going to take a lot more than one year's tax credit to get you to do that innovation. We want to make that R & D tax credit permanent. We believe that a capital gains rate reduction restoring a differential for capital gains will spur entrepreneurial activity, increase risk-taking, and investment, spur economic growth, create new industries, new jobs, and help revitalize important sectors of our economy. There are those who argue that this is a tax break for the rich. That's a silly way to look at it. This is not a rich/poor issue; it's an America issue. It's investing in the growth of our economy.

We've proposed an innovative new tax incentive for family saving for pre-retirement objectives that respects the need not to worsen the budget deficit.

We also believe in carefully targeted tax incentives to help people in need. For example, in day care. There are those who

propose a vast new middle class bureaucracy-controlled, state-run or mandated day care system with no flexibility or choice for parents. We think that's unwise. We think the role of the Federal Government should be to target those funds to the people at the bottom, those most in need to provide them the opportunity to enter the marketplace successfully, earn a living, get on that ladder of opportunity, and we want to do so in a manner that gives them dignity and choice about how to do it.

On the spending side, its not also just how much the Federal Government spends (and it does spend a lot--\$1-1/4 trillion is what we propose for next year). We're being criticized for not proposing enough. Yet, that's more than the entire GNP of all but a few countries. We're trying to tilt that spending more toward investing in the future. The Federal Government must finance basic research and development because no private firm has an incentive to undertake research which would be broadly applicable, as all the returns would not be privately appropriable. So we propose a record high R & D budget of \$70 billion.

We think we should be spending a lot more on preparing disadvantaged children for effective learning and have proposed a \$500 million expansion of Head Start. We think we should be spending more on improving aviation infrastructure and have so proposed, and I can go on and on.

But we don't think we ought just to spend money on problems. We believe that many national problems do not require Federal

spending, but may require Federal leadership to galvanize the nation. A very good example is our elementary and secondary education systems. This is an immensely important concern for the future of our economy, as well as the simple decency of quality education for our children. We face an increasingly competitive world economy--an economy where in the future our workers are going to need more skills and the ability to learn new skills throughout their lifetimes. And yet we see international comparisons on test after test that the performance of the kids in our elementary and secondary schools is not stacking up. The United States total spending per pupil on K through 12 education is more than any other industrialized country except Switzerland. We are not getting our money's worth. We need to change the focus from how much we spend to what we get out--to the performance of our kids. Now there may be times where spending more is necessary, whether at the Federal level, for example for Head Start to prepare disadvantaged children for effective learning, or at the state and local level, but that should not detract from the more fundamental issue: we need a fundamental restructuring of our education system.

We simply cannot remain a great nation, a growing, vital world leader, with a second-class elementary and secondary education system. So the President--for only the third time in the history of the United States--called the nation's Governors together last September in Charlottesville to work to establish national performance goals for education. And these were

announced last week in Washington by the President and the Nation's Governors. A bipartisan effort--a fiscally Federal effort, the Federal Government and the Nation's Governors, and we are going to turn now to galvanizing the Nation to achieve these goals--every student, every family, every school district, every PTA, every Principal, every teacher, every parent, every school board, every mayor and every Governor, as well as the Federal Government.

In regulatory, legal policy, trade policy and the like, we have similar goals. In regulatory policy, we want to avoid unnecessary regulation, and deregulate where possible, for example, natural gas at the well-head which we did last year. But there are some areas where regulation is necessary--the environment, for example. And there we try to achieve a sensible balance between the need for a healthy environment and the prerequisite of a sound, growing economy. There are those who argue that a healthy environment and a sound economy are incompatible. Extremists on both sides of that equation do not believe that we can reconcile the needs of an improved environment and a strong economy. I reject that notion. It will be costly to clean up the environment. There is no free lunch. But it can be done in a way that is cost-effective, that gives workers and firms flexibility in achieving those improvements, that does not force plants to shut down and workers to lose their jobs because some bureaucrat in Washington sets a silly rule that isn't applicable to a local situation. And we are working very

aggressively with Congress to try to achieve landmark Clean Air legislation that accords to these principles; a strong move toward a healthier environment, but in a way that provides maximum flexibility to firms and workers to minimize economic costs to achieve those standards.

In trade policy, much attention has focussed recently on trade frictions the United States has with various countries, but especially Japan. The world's economic growth--that of the United States, that of Japan, and most importantly, that of the newly developing economies--has benefitted more than anything else from the move toward an open liberalized world trading system since World War II. It would be shortsighted and foolish at best, dangerous at worst, if we don't press forward to open markets everywhere and instead turn to closing them. We cannot become more competitive by choosing not to compete. We need to open markets, not close them. We need to press forward to lead the world to freer and fairer trade, and we ask all other nations to join us in that effort. Our primary objective, through the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, is to bring fifteen areas which are not currently well covered by our rule-based international trade system into that system, to decrease those frictions and open markets world-wide.

Those are our principles. We believe that with those principles, we fashion an important growth agenda. That growth agenda means that we must invest more and more wisely. I've mentioned at some of those kinds of investments, but let me just

summarize. We must invest more in intellectual capital, in research and development. That means more Federal spending, as we have proposed on those basic scientific breakthroughs that no single firm could hope to finance and generate enough return from because the benefits will accrue so widely. It means a better environment for private entrepreneurial and innovative activity with the capital gains tax rate cut and the permanent R & D credit and other legal and regulatory reforms such as a better-balanced system of product liability laws.

We need to invest more in tangible capital--in our factories--in machines--and we must to make sure they are up to date and equip our labor force with the best quality available.

And we need to invest more in our human capital. I've stressed elementary and secondary education. We are also working in innovative ways to try to eliminate adult functional illiteracy.

It is only by attacking all those determinants of our long-term growth that we have the best chance of making sure that our economy continues to grow, providing a rising standard of living for our population, retaining the flexibility and dynamism that are its hallmarks, the foundation to continued economic leadership.

Let me return finally to say a word or two about the remarkable changes in Eastern Europe. We have seen a movement to pluralism and democracy and toward a market-oriented economy in many of the countries of Eastern Europe. Yet there is a lot of

variation among them--some are further along; some have not made many decisions, some are in the process of making them. This is one of the most remarkable events of our time. I said before I had been teaching principles of economics at Stanford. And in that course, it is standard to spend a few days talking about the centrally-planned, so-called command economies of the Soviet-type in which Commisars, bureaucrats centrally plan what is produced, and who works where. Instead of the economy producing what people want, the people get what the central planners want them to have. And in economics courses all throughout the country, our students are taught how that system not only supresses freedom of choice and opportunity, but that it just can't deliver the goods. Well, I admit like everybody else, that I was surprised by how rapidly these changes occurred. I always thought they would, and I am delighted they have. We have made a commitment, in conjunction with our allies, to provide some assistance, some food aid, some financial assistance, some technical assistance, but it's going to be a while before those economies straighten themselves out. Many of those countries haven't decided exactly what model they would like to follow. Whether they want to become as market-oriented as the United States, or far less market-oriented is still being decided. All those economies start after four decades of repressive central planning from very low standards of living, and while the great hope they have is that with the freeing up of resources and the market orientation that they are adopting they can get onto a

highway to prosperity, they are going to be navigating bumpy congested city roads while they get there. And so I think we need to have not only a perspective of hope, optimism and support for the peoples of Eastern Europe, but we also must temper it with a proper sense of perspective. For example if Poland achieves 4 percent real growth, it would take close to a half century to catch up to where the United States is today. So they have a long way to go. They are very bravely beginning to adopt some remarkable changes, but precious few of the citizens of these countries have experience or expertise--at the most fundamental level--about working, producing or consuming in a market-oriented economy. We need by example, by interchange, by good will as well as financial support, to provide them an opportunity to make that difficult transition.

I've laid out some of our principles, some of our policies, some of our perspectives. I hope you will let us know when you think we are doing a good job in achieving them. I hope you will let us know when you disagree with them. And I hope you will a special effort to keep me informed of how things are going here and how you see the kind of job we are doing in Washington to try to guarantee that our economy continues to grow and prosper.

The Reagan Boom — Greatest Ever

By Martin Anderson

A PALO ALTO, Calif. Almost everyone knows that the greatest depression the U.S. ever had was in the 1930's. It was known as the Great Depression, and its infamy merits a separate section in economics textbooks. But what was its counterpart? When did our greatest economic expansion occur?

We just had it. And it is still expanding, setting new records with each passing month.

We don't know whether historians will call it the Great Expansion of the 1980's or Reagan's Great Expansion, but we do know from official economic statistics that the seven year period from 1982 to 1989 was the greatest, consistent burst of economic activity ever seen in the U.S. In fact, it was the greatest economic expansion the world has ever seen — in any country, at any time.

The two key measures that mark a depression or expansion are jobs and production. Let's look at the records that were set.

Creation of jobs.

From November 1982, when President Ronald Reagan's new economic program was beginning to take effect, to November 1989, 18.7 million new jobs were created. It was a world record: Never before had so many jobs been created during a comparable time period. The new jobs covered the entire spectrum of work, and more than half of them paid more than \$20,000 a year. As total employment grew to 119.5 million, the rate of unemployment fell to slightly over 5 percent, the lowest level in 15 years.

Martin Anderson, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, at Stanford University, was an adviser to Ronald Reagan.

'82 to '89 — the largest burst of economic activity the world has seen.

Creation of wealth.

The amount of wealth produced during this seven year period was stupendous — some \$30 trillion worth of goods and services. Again, it was a world record. Never before had so much wealth been produced during a comparable period. According to a recent study, net asset values — including stocks, bonds and real estate — went up by more than \$5 trillion between 1982 and 1989, an increase of roughly 50 percent.

There are other important measures.

Steady economic growth.

As we begin the decade of the 1990's, we are in our 86th straight month of economic growth — a new record for peacetime, five months longer than the wartime growth of World War II and only 23 months short of the wartime record set during the Vietnam War in the 1960's. Most experts now predict that it will last right through 1990, and perhaps beyond.

Lower tax rates, interest rates

President Reagan, top personal income tax rates were lowered dramatically, from 70 percent to 28 percent. This policy change was the

prime force behind the record breaking economic expansion. Interest rates and inflation also fell sharply and, so far, have stayed comfortably low — a further indication of the power and pervasiveness of Mr. Reagan's economic policies.

The stock market.

Perhaps the key indicator of an economy's booms and busts is the stock market, the bottom line economic report card. And here the record has been striking. During the period from 1970 to 1982, the stock market barely moved. The Standard & Poor's index of 500 stocks inched up about 35 percent during that entire period. But starting in late 1982, just as Reaganomics began to work, the stock market took off like a giant skyrocket. Since then, the Standard & Poor's index has soared, reaching a record high of 360, almost triple what it was in 1982.

There were other consequences of the expansion. Annual Federal spending on public housing and welfare, and on Social Security, Medicare and health all increased by billions of dollars. The poverty rate has fallen steadily since 1983.

When you add up the record of the Reagan years, and the first year of President Bush — during which he has faithfully continued Mr. Reagan's economic policies — the conclusion is clear, inescapable and stunning. We have just witnessed America's Great Expansion.

The Reagan economic expansion was not perfect and we will never have one that is. The Federal budget deficits were too high and still are, too many Federal regulations lay unreformed and the trade deficit is worrisome.

In fact, the Reagan expansion may not have been the best economic expansion in history, for every economic expansion must be judged by many criteria. But if we look at the sheer size and immensity of it, at its scope and power, then it cannot

Records:
18.7 million jobs created;
\$30 trillion in goods and services produced.

be denied that it was the greatest.

The full impact of the powerful economic recovery that President Reagan launched during the 1980s is still unfolding.

Mr. Reagan's expansion provided the financial resources to allow the U.S. to build up the combat capability of its defense forces and to begin blazing the new trail for a protective missile system. This, in turn, convinced the Soviet rulers they could never defeat the U.S., and today the Soviet Union and the U.S. are busily engaged in nuclear disarmament as peace breaks out in country after country throughout the world.

Equally important, it proved beyond doubt to all (except perhaps for a handful of left-wing faculty members in our best universities) that capitalism is superior to Socialism and Communism. Our economy is the guiding beacon for all those countries that are ripping apart the ruthless collectivist regimes that ruined the lives of their people for so long.

One thing the Marxists got right: Economics is a powerful determining factor of history. But Marxists never dreamed it would be the economics of Ronald Reagan and all those capitalists that would prevail in the end. □

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 15, 1990

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT DROP-BY BRIEFING
FOR THE NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Room 450
Old Executive Office Building

3:34 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Actually, I just came from a St. Patrick's Day lunch put on by Speaker Foley up in the Capitol. Very good hands-across-the-aisle kind of thing.

Well, welcome. We call this the White House Complex. That's not the "Beltway Syndrome," but this is the White House Complex. And you don't have to show any ID to get out of the place, so I'll put you at ease -- I know it's been a pain coming in.

But I'm just delighted you all were here. I hope you've benefited from some of the briefings you've had here. And I'm delighted to see you all. I want to just say -- we'll go to the questions, but I want to underscore some of the same points that I tried to make this morning to the National Association of Manufacturers' Annual Washington meeting about the economy.

The fact is that the economy remains sound and steady. The facts are these: The Gross National Product -- up; the exports -- up; the personal income -- up. Take a look, then, at the trade deficit -- it's down; the federal deficit -- I'm not happy with it, but down; and the prime rate -- far better than it was several years ago.

And of course, unemployment is down. Last year's rate was the lowest in the past 16 years. So that is good news, but there's a great deal that we have to do to keep this expansion going. The economy at this moment isn't as robust as I'd like to see it. But we've got basically, I think, a sound economy. Now, we've got to do certain things. We've got to create incentive for investment. And I get hit in the political arena on my concept of cutting the capital gains tax, or reestablishing what we call a capital gains differential, some calling it a tax that favors the rich. I think it favors jobs.

And I cited some statistics today that Japan taxes capital gains at five percent; Korea, Germany, Hong Kong, Taiwan tax capital gain at zero -- zero.

Now, you're asking -- you should be saying, "What are you doing to help us be more competitive around the world?" And the capital gains -- one of the reasons I favored it is, is I do think it will help us be much more competitive around the world. I'm also proposing to the Congress incentives to encourage research and development, so that'll keep us competitive.

Of course, the most crucial investment is in the field of education. We know that we can't remain competitive or remain a world-class economy without first-class schools. So we got together with the governors and adopted national goals -- not trying to tell the local schools what kind of curriculum to have, but goals that all the governors agreed with, and now try to go forward and try to meet

MORE

Yevgeniy
those goals such as Head Start, and a literate America, and then passing certain standards as the kids go from fourth grade and eighth grade and twelfth grade level.

And so we've got sound goals, and if these work and if we're successful, not only in the tax end but in the education goals, then we're going to have not a peace dividend but a growth dividend and a return on our investment in expanded opportunity, more jobs and a higher standard of living for Americans.

I made that point this morning, and I will continue to make the point that we need to do certain things to stimulate investment and savings. And that, I think, will help us become very competitive. I've had some fascinating meetings in the last couple of weeks with, first, the Japanese Prime Minister and then just a few days ago with Takeshita, former Prime Minister and very much of a power in Japan. And I did my level best to impress on these very important leaders, these friends of the United States, the need for us to have more access to their markets. So, we'll see where we end up.

But -- no further ado, who wants to go -- yes, sir?

Q I'd like to ask you -- with all the power that's gravitating into the hands of Gorbachev while the Soviet world is collapsing about him, do you see any danger of a dictatorship evolving?

THE PRESIDENT: No, because I think there's much less danger today given what they've done in their parliament or in their congressional side of things. They've come out of the totalitarianism of the past. They give the new President great power. But I don't see it as a threat, and I certainly don't see it as a threat at this juncture in history.

You know, I shifted our support from going more like this: "We support reform and perestroika," to, "we support perestroika and reform," and we want to see Gorbachev succeed. I am convinced that one of the reasons we've had peaceful change in Eastern Europe is because of the approach that Gorbachev himself brought to bear on the problem. And I've consulted with him, had communications from him -- one, for example, on the question of Germany. And I think he's a reasonable man.

So I'm not worried about the constitutional changes because as you look at the total picture inside the Soviet Union, you see an evolution that none of us would have believed possible five years ago -- or three, or two -- in terms of democratic institutions. And I'm talking about the power in their congress. They had a guy named Primakov who is the head of their congress, and he was over here and he came and told me -- he said, well, I'm here to get some suggestions about -- learn from the United States. And I said, "Mr. Primakov, you've come to the wrong guy in telling you what to do about the congress. I'm not having too much luck." (Laughter.)

But the very fact that he was here, you know, and in a spirit of very good will, getting -- and I was only being semi-facetious there -- but it's very different, Jerry, than it used to be. It's amazingly different. I dealt with these guys back in the United Nations, and I can't tell you how different it is in terms of self-criticism on their part or debate -- when you have a difference, you can do it agreeably. It doesn't have to be disagreeable like it was in the heart of the Cold War days. So I am not overly concerned.

Q You said in your national newscast the other day that the media and all the people there would be surprised and fascinated when the hostage situation is resolved. What did you mean by that? Can you expand on it?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I can't really expand, except to say I was addressing myself more to this incident of this phone call that proved to be a hoax, and that, I am not at liberty to discuss. In terms of the hostages, there was a wave of speculation a week or so ago that frankly confused me because we are going down every alley, we are trying every avenue to free the hostages. But there is no negotiation going on with any part of the U.S. government or anything of that nature.

What -- I saw the speculation and I was wondering if it was some private initiatives on the part of lawyers or those representing the families of individuals held hostage, because I wish I could tell you that there was a serious immediate effort that would pay off, but that isn't the case. So when I was talking there, I was really talking about this phone call. And some of you may remember, there were some cartoonists -- I gave them a great deal of opportunity to have some fun at, you know, picking up the phone, "Who is this," you know, and all that. (Laughter.)

But I would do it again because I feel -- I don't know why -- it weighs on me, the burden of Americans held against their will. And I don't mind taking one on the chin if I go the extra mile. I ought to do that as your President, I think. And I made the comment that the next phone call of that nature may have a little more difficulty getting through -- (laughter) -- but I'm glad we tried. So I was talking in that context.

Q More from the spirit of democracy, this good economy -- what can be done to move some of that into the Rust Belt areas -- the pockets like the Ohio Valley Rust Belt?

THE PRESIDENT: Not sure I have a specific idea, but I'll guarantee you that if we are successful in getting the budget deficit down, then you have an economic climate in which new businesses start up. We've had a reasonable success -- and I'm not crowing about it -- in the creation of small businesses that are not identified with one industry. And so I think from the federal standpoint, the best thing we can do is to see that where we do have assistance -- education, and to installations going into places -- that there's fair play. But I really believe for the Ohio Valley or wherever else it is -- that just fundamentally sound fiscal policy is the answer.

I am not in favor -- maybe this will be a disappointment, but I had better level with you all -- in targeting funds, or kind of choosing winners and losers. I don't think that is the role of the federal government -- industrial policy in a broader sense where you say we're going to put our efforts into one industry or another. I don't think that's the role of the federal government. Certainly, I don't think it's the philosophy under which I was elected.

So there are programs. I'm all -- strongly in favor of job retraining -- Job Training Partnership Act. I think we're doing better on that. I hope our whole approach to education pays off. So it's a general response to a very specific question.

Q There's a growing sense of frustration across America that the standard of living in this country may be in decline. We hear the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer. There are always reports that this country is no longer able to provide the standards of education, health care, housing, that other nations in the industrialized world are able to give their people.

THE PRESIDENT: We still have the highest standard of living in the world. I think if we are successful in our battle against narcotics, which is not going to be done by the federal government alone, but certainly I must use the bully pulpit and our National Drug Strategy One, National Strategy Two, to try to set a tone for the rest of the country and what can be done to fight narcotics for a successful education, antidrug fight, and then the

competitiveness legislation that I've referred to -- math and science education, R & D, capital gains -- I believe that we will continue to have the highest living standard.

So I am not that pessimistic, and yet I don't want to stand here with some Pollyannish attitude about the economy. There are some signs that worry me. There are some signs that make me feel that growth will continue and that the economy may be doing better now than it was a month or two ago. But I don't accept the premise that we're a second-class power or that we are in decline. There's a marvelous book that was quoted around here about the decline of the United States.

We've got some problems. But if you want to put it in a broad philosophical sense, we're winning. Our concept of freedom and democracy is winning around the world. And I sometimes wish as President that there were more funds readily available -- read that less of a deficit -- to help the fledgling democracies of Eastern Europe or of our own neighbors to the South, which we must never neglect.

But even then, even without the largesse that we could bestow on others from surplus -- budget surplus or operating in balance, we still can help countries, and we are winning in the ideological battle and the philosophical battle. And if we can make fair markets, help create market incentives and then have fair markets, I really believe we're just on the threshold of a whole age of increased living standards for the United States; but that's our goal.

Q Mr. President, will you encourage the use of Peace Corps volunteers who see that aid actually gets to the poorest villagers to be a substantial part of the aid you're seeking for Nicaragua and Panama?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I'm strongly in favor of the Peace Corps. I've talked to our Peace Corps director. It's not -- you know, it's not quite right there -- let me tell you something that does trouble me, though, in Nicaragua. And this is just -- I've answered the question because I'm a great believer in the Peace Corps. And I'll tell you, the demands for Peace Corps in some of these countries, particularly in Eastern Europe, now Poland and Czechoslovakia, is wonderful. It's a wonderful tribute to the young volunteers that go into the Peace Corps and to the concept of a great nation willing to help emerging democracies.

But I am frustrated a little bit by some of the Americans that have gone down to Nicaragua, been there for two years allegedly to help the people of Nicaragua, and then Nicaragua has a free and fair election, and it turns out these people were interested in helping the Sandinistas, the Sandinismos. And now they're picketing, some of them have been -- I don't know whether they're still there -- in front of the U.S. Embassy, because in their view the wrong people won the election. But that's not the role of the United States. If we want to help the people and there are verifiably, certifiably free elections, they ought to stay down there if they're acting in this philanthropic way and try to help, as the Peace Corps does in Nicaragua.

Consider my spleen vented. (Laughter.)

Q This noon you had lunch with Speaker Foley. In the spirit of Saint Patrick, did you work out a deal on how to reduce defense spending?

THE PRESIDENT: No, that has not been worked out. We've made some proposals, and he, I think, waiting, in fairness to him, for his budget process to work. But I find him very reasonable. We differ philosophically on some of these questions -- I've cited capital gains, for example -- I mean, I just haven't properly sold an

MORE

honorably man like Foley on what it means to create jobs, what it means to be competitive -- I cited for you now the differential between what it is in Japan, what it is in Korea and all of this -- so I've got to do better in communicating with some of those people on the other side.

But on the defense, I think we will -- we must retain a reasoned defense. Colin Powell and Cheney have testified on a different kind of force. I've had strong support, vocal support, from Foley on things like our latest proposal on reducing our force levels in Europe -- the proposal with Gorbachev to both reduce to 195,000 in Central Europe and then 30,000 additional troops that can be deployed under agreement with the Soviets. So we're getting some support there, and I believe we will be able to work out an agreed defense program. I hope we will, because I don't want to have to see defense all caught up in politics. And the rapidity of change is such that I think we are in a good position to negotiate further reductions with the Soviet Union. And that's one of the reasons I'm looking forward to the summit with Mr. Gorbachev.

Q Under what circumstances would the United States begin the process and when would we begin the process of recognizing an independent Lithuania or any other Soviet republic?

THE PRESIDENT: In the first place, we have never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States, which you are talking about -- Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia -- into the Soviet Union. It was never a question of having recognized their incorporation into the Soviet Union.

I think there are standards of control over one's country or control over one's -- in this instance, territory, that guide recognition. But I think that the best role for the United States, having encouraged self-determination, having not been willing to recognize Lithuania being incorporated into the Soviet Union, is to encourage a peaceful evolution from now on.

Lithuania made -- under the right of self-determination, expressed themselves. To the credit of the Soviet leaders, all the way from Ligachev to Gorbachev on over, they have said, we will not use force. We're peaceful. We want to see this resolved peacefully. It is very important to the people in these Baltic States that the evolution be peaceful. And so I am, just as in East Germany when the Berlin Wall started down, some of my political opponents were saying I was unenthusiastic about it. And I told one of our star TV commentators, well, that's the kind of person I am. I mean, some people jump with joy and do cartwheels -- and I've got different genes or something. (Laughter.)

But having said that, another political leader said, well, you ought to go to Berlin, and the President should be seen at the Wall. I had communications from the most respected leaders in East and West -- several of them -- saying, don't do anything silly. I mean, we're concerned now as this evolves.

And sometimes caution and prudence I think are right. And I think in this case, it proved right, because that evolution has moved peacefully, and we did not provoke some kind of outbreak through exhorting the Berlin Wall that could have caused other countries to act differently

I'm very pleased with the way the Lithuanian situation is developing, and we're watching it closely. We will encourage the fundamental principles of self-determination, and we will encourage the concept of peaceful change. And I hope both major parties in that discussion will continue to adhere to peaceful change.

Q It seems to me that the Voice of America has been one of our best tools for exporting the ideas of democracy. And yet, I understand that we want to cut their budget. Don't you think that

MORE

it would be better if we just maintained the budget in order to continue to have this influence in the countries of the Eastern bloc?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm embarrassed to say I don't have the figures, but I am not aware of any cut in the budget. Because, like you, I accept your premise, your hypothesis. And you know why? Because Havel, Vaclav Havel, the playwright President of Czechoslovakia, expressed his not only appreciation for what the Voice of America did in bringing -- keeping the hope of democracy and freedom alive, but also insisted that it's essential that the Voice still go in there.

So I don't think -- can someone -- we don't think that we have recommended cuts in the Voice, but maybe we could get your name. It's a good specific question. And Barry, maybe you could find that and we'll let you know the exact numbers.

But whatever the figures, believe me, there is no philosophical commitment to ratchet down or cut back on the Voice, because I agree with you that it's even more important that that message of freedom continue to be heard, and I accept the word of Havel in the process.

Now, we've got one more and I see an urgent -- I've not been very good about the left side of the room. Yes, sir?

Q Does it bother you at all the proportion of the foreign aid budget going to two nations, Israel and Egypt? Irrespective of any comment on Jerusalem -- (laughter) -- is there some thought of, perhaps, lowering the level of the funds going there in the hope that it might promote peace -- to stop funding both nations on such a large level of our resources?

THE PRESIDENT: I would not favor that. I do favor greater flexibility for the president, which means a weakening of, or an elimination of, earmarking. Because what's happened is, a tremendous percentage, as Don points out, of our foreign aid budget is going to just a handful of countries. And you cited Israel, and I could add Egypt -- well, you added Egypt -- and there's Pakistan and one or two others. And by the time that money is disbursed, there is almost nothing. And I'll give you an example.

In Jamaica, I must confess that when Mr. Manley came in, based on his past record and his proximity to Cuba and his former fraternity with Mr. Castro, I didn't know how it would go. Manley campaigned on a different policy this time. He said, "I'm not going to push our country into the arms of Fidel Castro." And he's been very good. And I salute him. And when I go to try to help the impoverished people of Jamaica, we have very little flexibility.

And so, I don't want to suggest cutting to good friends, but I have asked that we be accorded more flexibility, perhaps a fund that's known as a discretionary fund, for the president to be able to prioritize the interests of this country and go forward with them.

So, that's what -- Bob Dole raised the question, and I saluted him for raising the question, and we will continue to work with the Congress. I think there may be some sentiment for it, but I don't think you'll see it in slashes in the budget to accomplish that end, because there's some strong reasons of friendship for that, and there's some powerful political forces that would argue against that.

Well, listen, thank you all very, very much. A pleasure to be with you. (Applause.)

END

3:59 P.M. EST

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 15, 1989

RECEPTION FOR THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL TRUST

DATE: May 16, 1989
LOCATION: The Residence
TIME: 4:00 p.m.

FROM: James R. Wray *JRW*

I. PURPOSE

To thank the Senatorial Trust members of the National Republican Senatorial Committee for their efforts on behalf of Republican senatorial candidates.

II. BACKGROUND

The National Republican Senatorial Trust is the group of \$10,000 donors to the National Republican Senatorial Committee. This group of distinguished donors helps fund the campaigns of Republican senatorial candidates nationwide. The Trust members are in Washington for discussions and detailed briefings. This event will be the highlight of their visit.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President
Governor John Sununu, Chief of Staff to the President
Senator Don Nickles, Chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, and his wife, Linda
Lee Atwater, Chairman, Republican National Committee
Andy Card, Assistant to the President and Deputy to the Chief of Staff
David Demarest, Assistant to the President for Communications
Fred McClure, Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs
Jim Wray, Deputy Assistant to the President and Director, Office of Political Affairs
Nick Calio, Deputy Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs
David Carney, Special Assistant to the President and Deputy Director, Office of Political Affairs

Approximately 250 members of the National Republican Senatorial Trust.

JN - Here you go! Stopped for tomorrow. MK
(now working on Leaders Mag)

Grant/Nappo
March 21, 1990
Draft three
A:nrsc

BRIEF REMARKS: SENATORIAL TRUST RECEPTION
STATE FLOOR/THE WHITE HOUSE
TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1990
5:30 p.m.

((Acknowledgements))

It's a pleasure to have you here tonight at the White House, during such exciting times, as we face the new world of the 1990s. Over the last few years, we've all seen the grim spectacle: voices struggling to be heard, a minority trampled by unbridled power -- the decades-old fight against oppression. \\\ Yes, I'm talking about Republicans in the Congress. \\\ Well, the tide is turning. Change will come to Capitol Hill. The days of one-party rule are over.\\\

We've all been watching the events in the Soviet Union. Last year, [name and title] Primakov came to the White House to discuss the new political situation in the Soviet Union. In the middle of the meeting, he asked me for advice in how to deal with a legislative body. "Mr. Primakov," I said, "if you're looking for advice on what to do about the Congress, you've come to the wrong guy. I'm not having too much luck either." \\\

Remarks 3/15/90 WVA p 2

PP 10/31/89 p. 1651-2

Soviet Embassy 328-3225

Sometimes, we don't have too much luck, and I'll tell you why: because we don't control the Senate. (55-46)

Pol Almanac li

Remember the good old days in the early eighties when President Reagan and I enjoyed a majority in the Senate?

1980-1986 Almanac

Remember Republican committee chairmanships, winning votes, a legislative agenda that was acted upon in committees?

From 1980 to 1986, steady Senate support helped us launch our record economic recovery -- 89 months and still going strong. It helped us restore America to a position of strength and respect in the world -- and it helped us renew the values of faith, family, honest work and opportunity that have made this the greatest nation on Earth.

Best speech
BABA

Since we lost the Senate, building a better America hasn't been quite as easy. But despite our minority status, we've proven that the policy of peace through strength works; we've brought a stronger commitment to education, the environment and community service in America; and most of all, we've ensured the greatest economic expansion in history. But think how much more we can accomplish with a Republican Senate working for America's future. And that's what I want to talk about this afternoon -- the future. How the 1990s will be the decade that the Grand Old Party becomes the majority party in America.\\ \\

State of Union
Clean Air
Point of Light
BABA

I hope you're optimistic about the next decade -- because I am. The Republican Party is building a foundation for the 1990s -- one that keeps America strong and vibrant as we see democracies and free market economies spring to life all over the world. We're the party with ideas. We're the party with experience. We're the party with solutions. And we stand for the solid values of mainstream America. It's time the Republican Party became the majority party. \\

A Republican Senate is within reach. Even a small shift can put us back on top. In 1986, 35,000 more Republican votes in the

Postal 1990
1. Rem
5 losses

six tightest Senate races would have given us a 51-49 majority. Think about that: that's a fraction of 1 percent of all votes cast. And this time, we're going strong with some of the top challengers in the country -- Lynn Martin in Illinois, Claudine Schneider in Rhode Island, Tom Tauke in Iowa, Hal Daub in Nebraska, Bob Smith in New Hampshire and Hank Brown in Colorado. NRSC
info
Six great reasons why we're looking to 1990 to be the beginning of the GOP decade.\\\

Give me a Republican majority on the floor and you'll see a majority of our bills make it to the floor -- like our capital gains tax cut. With the Democrats in control now, Republican ideas sit and sit in Committee. I'll make a deal: the day I get capital gains tax cut legislation to sign is the day I'll eat a double helping of broccoli.\\\

But Senate Democrats have also abused their majority status in another way. In the last year-and-a-half, too many fine Americans were hounded out of the Senate confirmation process for purely partisan reasons -- excellent candidates for some of this country's toughest jobs, subjected to scrutiny that bordered on harrassment. Under the Democrats, getting confirmed today can be more than a job -- it's an adventure.\\

Give me a few good men -- and women -- in the Senate and you'll see our good men and women get confirmed.

I don't need to tell you how much it means down on my end of Pennsylvania Avenue to have a majority in the Senate. And I can't tell you how important the work of the Trust is in

achieving that goal. For your commitment, your dedication, and your expertise in working to build a better America, the Republican Party thanks you -- and I thank you. \\\

Let's end divided government in America. The mathematics are simple: the magic number is five -- five seats stand between us and a Senate majority. And make no mistake: together we can put the Senate back in Republican hands.\\\

God bless you and God bless America.

#

*Pol Almanac
1990
p 1-11*

National Republican Senatorial Committee

SENATOR DON NICKLES
CHAIRMAN

BOYCE BOESCH
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:

Jeanie Mappo

FROM:

Roger Roth

DATE:

3/19/90

TIME:

5:50

RECEIVER TELECOPIER # _____

TRANSMITTED TELECOPIER # _____

PAGES TO FOLLOW: _____

MEMORANDUM

TO: FRANK MAPPA

FROM: ROYAL ROTH

RE: SENATORIAL TRUST INFORMATION

DATE: MARCH 19, 1990

SENATORIAL TRUST INFORMATION

The National Republican Senatorial Committee is the Party's official national committee whose exclusive chartered responsibility is the election of Republican Senators.

The Senatorial Trust was founded in 1977 by Senator Bob Packwood of Oregon, then Chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee.

The goal of the Senatorial Trust is to elect a Republican Senate majority.

The Senatorial Trust is limited in size to 200 people every year.

In addition to functioning as a vehicle for raising substantial campaign resources, has been designed as an on-going forum for communicating and exchanging ideas between its members, Republican Senators and prominent figures both nationally and internationally.

President Bush should mention the impressive group of Senate challenger candidates for this fall's elections.

They include:

Cong. Lynn Martin of Illinois, Cong. Claudine Schneider of Rhode Island, Cong. Tom Tauke of Iowa, Cong. Hal Daub of Nebraska, Cong. Bob Smith of New Hampshire, Cong. Hank Brown of Colorado, State Senator Bill Cabaniss of Alabama and State Senator Ben Bagert of Louisiana.

He should also mention our outstanding group of Incumbents as well.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

favors and lower rates to his colleagues and constituents. Far from sharing Jimmy Carter's view that the tax code was a disgrace to the human race, he stated openly that it was pretty good as it was. In the first months of 1986, after Dan Rostenkowski's Ways and Means Committee passed its tax reform bill lowering rates and eliminating preferences, Packwood followed his old approach. He announced early on that he would insist on favorable treatment for the timber industry—a maladroit move that gave others leverage over him—and watched as fellow Finance members piled preference after preference into the bill.

By mid-April 1986, enough preferences had been voted to boost the deficit by \$100 billion—and kill the bill. Packwood was being lampooned in the Portland *Oregonian* as “H & R Packwood with another of my 17 versions of tax reform,” and he was facing opposition in the May 20 primary from a charismatic young conservative named Joe Lutz. Packwood had amassed some \$4 million in campaign contributions (not difficult when you're Finance chairman doling out tax preferences), but Lutz was attacking him with style and humor, and was drawing on the anti-Packwood base among registered Republicans that had held him to 62% against weak opposition in the 1980 primary. A fiasco on tax reform would undercut Packwood's greatest strength with Republican primary voters, namely his reputation for competence and his ability as a committee chairman to get things done.

So in late April, Packwood repaired to a Capitol Hill bar with an aide and over a pitcher of beer started pencilling out some figures—and came up with a bill that stripped away far more preferences than the House or Reagan version and which would lower rates far more, to a high of 27%. “I came around full circle to think [Bill] Bradley was right,” Packwood said. “We ought to get the rates as low as we can, [and] let economic efficiency guide decisions.” Packwood's turnaround stunned Washington, which had been writing off tax reform for 18 months, and carried the day in early May on the Finance Committee and in the Senate. There was almost an audible sigh of relief from the politicians at the prospect of getting out of the business of doling out preferences to favored causes and lobbyists.

Packwood was banged around somewhat later by Dan Rostenkowski in the conference committee, where Rostenkowski controlled his House conferees while Packwood didn't control his Senate counterparts. But the bill finally passed into law. In the meantime, Packwood won renomination over Joe Lutz May 20 by the none too huge margin, for a primary, of 58%–42%. That was the contest for him: the Democratic nominee, Representative James Weaver, withdrew from the race in August while he was being investigated by the House Ethics Committee, and the Democrats nominated a young man who had won 14% in their primary. Packwood, with millions left in campaign funds and his reputation for competence and clout restored, won easily.

The loss of the Finance chair left Packwood less powerful but still busy. He is one of the Senate's stronger free traders, backing the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement (but getting changes to help Oregon's plywood industry) and opposing the protectionist textile bill in 1988; the former was passed and Packwood organized enough senators to prevent an override of the veto of the latter. On the Commerce Committee, which he chaired from 1981 to 1985, he is a force for deregulation. He supported the catastrophic health care bill and the Civil Rights Restoration Act and was the first Senate Republican to oppose the nomination of Robert Bork. He is co-sponsoring with Daniel Patrick Moynihan a bill to change the child care tax credit. He worked on the Oregon Wild and Scenic Rivers bill. On campaign finance reform he has partisan expertise from his days as chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee (he lost the post in 1982 after he was critical of Reagan), and he upheld the Republican filibuster against the Democrats' bill; late at night in February 1988, Majority Leader Robert Byrd, frustrated by the lack of a quorum, ordered the sergeant-at-arms to arrest Packwood making him the first Senator ever to be carried into the chamber under arrest.

Packwood has causes as well as committees. In the early 1970s, he was the Senate's leading

55
 SENATE TERMS
 SEAT UP 1990

Democrats (16)

Max Baucus (MT)
 Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (DE)
 David Lyle Boren (OK)
 Bill Bradley (NJ)
 James J. Exon (NE)
 Albert Gore, Jr. (TN)
 Tom Harkin (IA)
 Howell Heflin (AL)
 J. Bennett Johnston, Jr. (LA)
 John F. Kerry (MA)
 Carl Levin (MI)
 Sam Nunn (GA)
 Claiborne Pell (RI)
 David Pryor (AR)
 John D. (Jay) Rockefeller IV (WV)
 Paul Simon (IL)

Democrats (20)

Brock Adams (WA)
 John B. Breaux (LA)
 Dale Bumpers (AR)
 Kent Conrad (ND)
 Alan Cranston (CA)
 Thomas A. Daschle (SD)
 Alan J. Dixon (IL)
 Christopher J. Dodd (CT)
 Wendell H. Ford (KY)
 Wyche Fowler (GA)
 John Glenn (OH)
 Bob Graham (FL)
 Ernest F. Hollings (SC)
 Daniel K. Inouye (HI)
 Patrick J. Leahy (VT)
 Barbara A. Mikulski (MD)
 Harry Reid (NV)
 Terry Sanford (NC)
 Richard C. Shelby (AL)
 Timothy E. Wirth (CO)

Republicans (18)

46
 William L. Armstrong (CO)¹
 Rudy Boschwitz (MN)
 Daniel R. (Dan) Coats (IN)²
 Thad Cochran (MS)
 William S. Cohen (ME)
 Peter V. Domenici (NM)
 Phil Gramm (TX)
 Mark O. Hatfield (OR)
 Jesse A. Helms (NC)
 Gordon J. Humphrey (NH)¹
 Nancy L. Kassebaum (KS)
 James A. McClure (ID)
 Mitch McConnell (KY)
 Larry Pressler (SD)
 Alan K. Simpson (WY)
 Ted Stevens (AK)
 Strom Thurmond (SC)
 John W. Warner (VA)

SEAT UP 1992

Republicans (14)

Christopher S. (Kit) Bond (MO)
 Daniel R. (Dan) Coats (IN)³
 Alfonse D'Amato (NY)
 Robert Dole (KS)
 Edwin J. (Jake) Garn (UT)
 Charles E. Grassley (IA)
 Robert W. Kasten, Jr. (WI)
 John McCain (AZ)
 Frank H. Murkowski (AK)
 Don Nickles (OK)
 Robert W. (Bob) Packwood (OR)
 Warren Rudman (NH)
 Arlen Specter (PA)
 Steven D. Symms (ID)

SENATE TERMS (continued)
 SEAT UP 1994

Democrats (19)

Lloyd Bentsen (TX)
 Jeff Bingaman (NM)
 Richard H. Bryan (NV)
 Quentin N. Burdick (ND)
 Robert C. Byrd (WV)
 Dennis DeConcini (AZ)
 Edward M. Kennedy (MA)
 Robert Kerrey (NE)
 Herbert H. Kohl (WI)
 Frank R. Lautenberg (NJ)
 Joseph I. Lieberman (CT)
 Spark M. Matsunaga (HI)
 Howard Metzenbaum (OH)
 George Mitchell (ME)
 Daniel Patrick Moynihan (NY)
 Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (MI)
 Charles S. (Chuck) Robb (VA)
 Paul S. Sarbanes (MD)
 James R. Sasser (TN)

Republicans (14)

Conrad Burns (MT)
 John H. Chafee (RI)
 John Danforth (MO)
 Dave Durenberger (MN)
 Slade Gordon (WA)
 Orrin G. Hatch (UT)
 H. John Heinz III (PA)
 James M. Jeffords (VT)
 Trent Lott (MS)
 Richard Lugar (IN)
 Connie Mack III (FL)
 William V. Roth, Jr. (DE)
 Malcolm Wallop (WY)
 Pete Wilson (CA)

Senate, for some politicians at least, is not quite the be-all and end-all it was not so many years ago.

One thing the Senate is more of now is partisan. Senators may socialize across party lines, and there are few of the raging feuds that were once a part of Senate life. But there is no Club now that operates across party lines and tries to run things. The Republicans in the early 1980s sought and won their greatest victories as a united party. The Democrats regained control in 1986 as a united party and, in particular, with victories in the South. The southern Democrats elected in 1986—Terry Sanford of North Carolina, Wyche Fowler of Georgia, Richard Shelby of Alabama, Bob Graham of Florida, John Breaux of Louisiana—see themselves as partisan Democrats, threatened by Republicans, interested in controlling their party to make it behave in ways palatable in their home states (they supported George Mitchell strongly) and uninterested in working with their Senate Republican colleagues.

That means that much is at stake in the 1990 elections. The Republicans profess to have little chance to win control; the Democrats profess to have no hope of making gains: do not believe either side. Senate elections, in a country that does not pay much attention to politics, are highly contingent, and it is possible, as both 1980 and 1986 showed, for the lion's share of close contests to go to one party and give it control. The Republicans have slightly more seats at risk, but as the cycle began, neither party seemed to have an overwhelming advantage.

¹ Retiring² Special election to fill the unexpired term of Vice President Dan Quayle.³ Or winner of 1990 special election.

lxii THE SENATE

1986 Senate Elections

State	Senator	Age 1984	Year App'd or Elected	%
Democrats				
EAST				
CT	Christopher Dodd	40	1980	56-43
VT	Patrick Leahy	44	1974	50-49
MIDWEST				
IL	Alan Dixon	57	1980	56-42
MO	Thomas Eagleton*	55	1968	52-48
OH	John Glenn	63	1974	69-28
WEST				
CA	Alan Cranston	70	1968	57-37
CO	Gary Hart	48	1974	50-49
HI	Daniel Inouye	60	1962	78-18
SOUTH				
AR	Dale Bumpers	59	1974	59-41
KY	Wendell Ford	60	1974	65-35
LA	Russell Long*	66	1948	58-39-4
SC	Ernest Hollings	62	1966	70-30
Republicans				
EAST				
MD	Charles Mathias	62	1968	66-34
NH	Warren Rudman	54	1980	52-48
NY	Alfonse D'Amato	47	1980	45-44-11
PA	Arlen Specter	54	1980	50-48
MIDWEST				
IN	Dan Quayle	37	1980	54-46
IA	Charles Grassley	51	1980	53-46
KS	Robert Dole	61	1968	64-36
ND	Mark Andrews	58	1980	70-29
SD	James Abdnor	61	1980	58-39
WI	Robert Kasten	42	1980	50-48
WEST				
AK	Frank Murkowski	51	1980	54-46
AZ	Barry Goldwater*	75	1968	50-49
ID	Steven Symms	46	1980	50-49
NV	Paul Laxalt	62	1974	59-37
OR	Bob Packwood	52	1968	52-44
UT	Jake Garn	52	1974	74-26
WA	Slade Gorton	56	1980	54-46
SOUTH				
AL	Jeremiah Denton	60	1980	50-47
FL	Paula Hawkins	57	1980	52-48
GA	Mack Mattingly	53	1980	51-49
NC	John East	53	1980	50-49
OK	Don Nickles	36	1980	53-44

*Retiring at the end of the term.

er] And John [John
f to the President]
up, who's down,
who's going to be
good strong team
blems. And the
tes and the Secre-
er and Brent and
e been very lucky.
ercised about that
erybody else does

e that he stopped
ine speech.

asn't a hard-line
that. And maybe
tle more of what's
result of what I'm

n, Vice President
hard-line position.

s totally in sync.

uss this with one

ers for the New

who had a feeling

he isn't. Every-

s. And that's fine

think we've been

tion by this: The

and get conflict-

t have to go out

sarray. So, when

hat may sound a

understand run-

I know how this

feel that we are

nd that goes for

he Secretary of

national security

ae being tugged

resident

to put the press?

u've already had

here.

Mediterranean?

thought about

stay?

Q. Mr. President, on the environment, another summit—

The President. That will come up with Mr. Gorbachev.

Q. So I thought.

The President. I think.

U.S. Role in Environmental Issues

Q. You have some people going to The Netherlands next week who, some say, are appearing to go without an agenda. It looks like the United States is not going to play a leadership role in global warming, though you promised that during your campaign.

The President. We will play a leadership role in global warming, and it will be based on the finest, most up-to-date science possible. And we will fulfill that role. And I think most countries, in spite of where they are on some conference, look to the United States for that kind of leadership in science. And we will fulfill it. And you see both our Science Advisor [D. Allan Bromley] and the head of the EPA [William K. Reilly, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency] in sync going over there. I think that's good.

fi Saul?

r Q. Hey.

The President. Did he have one before? I derecognize him. [Laughter]

Okay, back here.

Capital Gains Tax

Q. You are at or near conflict with Congress on capital gains. What are you prepared to do about that? And will you accept a full year of sequestration in lieu of that?

The President. Well, we've indicated that that's the law and we will live by the law. And we're going forward with that mandate because of the way the Congress has moved on this. I don't think I need to repeat my view on capital gains as something that is good for growth, something that is good for investment, something that is good for jobs. And we hear some shrill comments to the contrary. But in my view, that matter was debated fully; my position was made clear, and I plan to continue to fight for my position.

Presidential Legislative Proposals

Q. On minimum wage, is your original proposal still your first and final offer, or

would you be willing even to link it with something like capital gains, which you—

The President. We're not in the posture of trying to tell the Congress how they ought to resolve these difficulties. We sent up clear proposals on the anticrime package, on the minimum wage, on the capital gains. And it has gotten so confusing up there that they ought to move now. But I'm not going to suggest. Why do we need to do that? We've told them what we want. And I wish they'd get some action going on the proposals that I have put forward. I think the American people are entitled to that. I think the American people see that it is this Congress that is frustrating getting the deficit down. And so, they ought to move and move promptly. But I can't sit there and fine-tune for them: Well, if you'll only throw this one issue in with that one, why, you can do your business. I mean, we've tried.

Q. So you're saying package deals are out?

The President. Well, I'm not saying in or out; I'm saying let's get going. We know what the administration position is. I've said it. Send it down the way I said it, and we've got harmony and light. Send it down differently, and I'll take a look at it. Send it down with some things in it that I can't take, and I'll send it right back to you. And I don't know how more frank I can be with the Congress.

Soviet Reforms and Soviet-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. President, as recently as this summer some of your senior advisers, dare I say some in this room, were expressing doubts that Gorbachev would survive all of his internal political difficulties. Did you ever share those views? What has happened to turn you around?

The President. Look, we are looking at everything we can regarding the rapid changes that are taking place not only in Eastern Europe but in the Soviet Union. And we've got very thoughtful people outside the Government that give me their opinions. And I don't think anybody has a corner on all the wisdom, but I can't speculate on that question.

What I can say is we're not basing the foreign policy of the United States on any

individual. We've got to look at broad changes. We've got to look at commitment from all elements of leadership in the Soviet Union, where they come down—fascinating meeting the other day with Mr. Primakov [head of a visiting delegation of Members of the Soviet Parliament] here—and assess all of this and spell out as clearly as you can what's in the interest of the United States and the alliance. And this meeting will help in that regard. But it's not predicated, our whole arms control agenda, on Mr. Gorbachev. Similarly, I don't think they do that on a U.S. President at the time.

Q. But, sir, you wouldn't be meeting them, of course, if you thought he was a goner. [Laughter] Did you at any time have any doubts in that regard?

The President. A goner? No, I don't—[laughter]—that word never entered my mind. [Laughter] You know, you hear a lot of crosscurrents about how successful *perestroika's* going to be. But one thing you get from all the Soviet leaders is, Look, the clock isn't going to be set back, and we—we—are going to go forward with *perestroika*—whether it's Mr. Yeltsin [Deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.] when he was here or Mr. Gorbachev's statements and visits with Shevardnadze, visits with Mr. Primakov and then others meet with other layers of the Soviet bureaucracy. And you get the distinct feeling that the clock is not going to be set back to square one. And then you go forward: Well, here's how this will interact with U.S. policy.

But I'm looking forward to this meeting. I think it's the right thing to be doing. As I say, there was a time when I wasn't sure that it was, but with this rapidity of change, I don't want to miss something. And the way we've got it set so there will be no firm agenda, where we can do it in a setting without a lot of public pressure from other governments, I think it's going to be a productive meeting. And I was very pleased with the reception that it got from the congressional leaders.

As I say, I expect we'll get a strong, positive response. I know I will from the allied leaders. And I really can't think of any country that is going to see objection to this because the fate of a lot of countries are wrapped up in how the United States and

the Soviet Union get along and how the changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are managed. And when I come back from this meeting, I and my top advisers—and we are going to keep our traveling squad down, I say—will be able to have a much clearer perception of motivations behind Mr. Gorbachev's pronouncements. I think it's worthwhile.

Thank you all very much.

Note: The President's 27th news conference began at 10:02 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Remarks to Schoolchildren at the White House Halloween Party October 31, 1989

Thank you all very much. And first, let me thank you guys that gave us the pledge cards. You did a good job on that. And my thanks to Willard Scott, the weatherman who got the weather to hold off for us here.

And Barbara and I want to welcome all of you to the White House Halloween Spectacular. I want to particularly thank Marilyn Quayle, the wife of the Vice President, for being with us right here. And then welcome our daughter-in-law, Margaret, and the Turtle. The Turtle is our grandchild named Marshall, going as a turtle. You see how it is? It's on the back there. You've got to see that.

How many of you guys believe in ghosts? How many? [Applause] You know, they say that there's a ghost in this old house. And the most famous one, you know, is Abraham Lincoln. And Barbara and I haven't seen the ghost of Abraham Lincoln walking the halls, but this is our first Halloween in the White House, so maybe we'll see him tonight.

But Halloween is a time for ghosts and goblins, for haunted houses and scary stories. But right now I want to talk to you just briefly about a scary story that isn't make-believe. And you know what I'm talking about. I'm talking about illegal drugs and how they hurt people and how they hurt families, hurt kids, some of them just like you.

JN - Here you go! Staffed for tomorrow. MK
(now working on Leaders Mag)

Grant/Nappo
March 21, 1990
Draft three
A:nrsc

BRIEF REMARKS: SENATORIAL TRUST RECEPTION
STATE FLOOR/THE WHITE HOUSE
TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1990
5:30 p.m.

((Acknowledgements))

It's a pleasure to have you here tonight at the White House, during such exciting times, as we face the new world of the 1990s. Over the last few years, we've all seen the grim spectacle: voices struggling to be heard, a minority trampled by unbridled power -- the decades-old fight against oppression. \\ Yes, I'm talking about Republicans in the Congress. \\ Well, the tide is turning. Change will come to Capitol Hill. The days of one-party rule are over.\\

We've all been watching the events in the Soviet Union. Last year, [name and title] Primakov came to the White House to discuss the new political situation in the Soviet Union. In the middle of the meeting, he asked me for advice in how to deal with a legislative body. "Mr. Primakov," I said, "if you're looking for advice on what to do about the Congress, you've come to the wrong guy. I'm not having too much luck either." \\

Sometimes, we don't have too much luck, and I'll tell you why: because we don't control the Senate.

Remember the good old days in the early eighties when President Reagan and I enjoyed a majority in the Senate? Remember Republican committee chairmanships, winning votes, a legislative agenda that was acted upon in committees?

From 1980 to 1986, steady Senate support helped us launch our record economic recovery -- 89 months and still going strong. It helped us restore America to a position of strength and respect in the world -- and it helped us renew the values of faith, family, honest work and opportunity that have made this the greatest nation on Earth.

Since we lost the Senate, building a better America hasn't been quite as easy. But despite our minority status, we've proven that the policy of peace through strength works; we've brought a stronger commitment to education, the environment and community service in America; and most of all, we've ensured the greatest economic expansion in history. But think how much more we can accomplish with a Republican Senate working for America's future. And that's what I want to talk about this afternoon -- the future. How the 1990s will be the decade that the Grand Old Party becomes the majority party in America.\\\

I hope you're optimistic about the next decade -- because I am. The Republican Party is building a foundation for the 1990s -- one that keeps America strong and vibrant as we see democracies and free market economies spring to life all over the world. We're the party with ideas. We're the party with experience. We're the party with solutions. And we stand for the solid values of mainstream America. It's time the Republican Party became the majority party. \\
\\

A Republican Senate is within reach. Even a small shift can put us back on top. In 1986, 35,000 more Republican votes in the

six tightest Senate races would have given us a 51-49 majority. Think about that: that's a fraction of 1 percent of all votes cast. And this time, we're going strong with some of the top challengers in the country -- Lynn Martin in Illinois, Claudine Schneider in Rhode Island, Tom Tauke in Iowa, Hal Daub in Nebraska, Bob Smith in New Hampshire and Hank Brown in Colorado. Six great reasons why we're looking to 1990 to be the beginning of the GOP decade.\\\

Give me a Republican majority on the floor and you'll see a majority of our bills make it to the floor -- like our capital gains tax cut. With the Democrats in control now, Republican ideas sit and sit in Committee. I'll make a deal: the day I get capital gains tax cut legislation to sign is the day I'll eat a double helping of broccoli.\\\

But Senate Democrats have also abused their majority status in another way. In the last year-and-a-half, too many fine Americans were hounded out of the Senate confirmation process for purely partisan reasons -- excellent candidates for some of this country's toughest jobs, subjected to scrutiny that bordered on harrassment. Under the Democrats, getting confirmed today can be more than a job -- it's an adventure.\\

Give me a few good men -- and women -- in the Senate and you'll see our good men and women get confirmed.

I don't need to tell you how much it means down on my end of Pennsylvania Avenue to have a majority in the Senate. And I can't tell you how important the work of the Trust is in

Grant/Nappo
March 19, 1990
Draft two
A:nrsc

BRIEF REMARKS: NATIONAL REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL COMMITTEE
CLOSED RECEPTION AND DINNER
STATE FLOOR/THE WHITE HOUSE
TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1990
TIME ?

((Acknowledgements))

Ordinarily, I would stay for the meal, but I came in through the kitchen and, call me overly cautious, but I noticed my food taster was face down in the salad.\\\

I really am sorry I can't stay for dinner. But it was a close call. The Secret Service caught the cook washing my salad with Perrier. \\\ But no, you go ahead and eat, please.\\\

I've come to talk to you tonight about the future of this country, and how we're going to win the United States Senate. I'm reminded of the time [name and title] Primakov came to the White House to discuss the new political situation in the Soviet Union. In the middle of the meeting, he asked me for advice in how to deal with a legislative body. "Mr. Primakov," I said, "if you're looking for advice on what to do about the Congress, you've come to the wrong guy. I'm not having too much luck either." \\\

Sometimes we don't have too much luck, and I'll tell you why: **because we don't control the Senate.**

Remember the good old days in the early eighties when President Reagan and I enjoyed a majority in the Senate? Remember Republican committee chairmanships, winning votes, a legislative agenda that was acted upon in committees?

From 1980 to 1986, steady Senate support helped us launch the economic recovery -- 87 months and still going strong. It helped us restore America to a position of strength and respect in the world -- and it helped us put the values of faith, family, honest work and open opportunity back where they belong: **back in the mainstream of America.**

Since then, it hasn't been easy. Despite our minority status, we've proven that the policy of peace through strength works; we've brought a renewed commitment to education, the environment and volunteerism in America; and most of all, we've ensured the greatest economic expansion in history. But it's the future I want to talk about tonight -- and how the 1990s will be the decade that the Grand Old Party becomes the **majority party in America.**\\\

I hope you're optimistic about the next decade -- because I am. The Republican Party is building an agenda for the 1990s -- one that keeps America strong as democracies and free market economies spring to life all over the world. We're the party with **ideas**. We're the party with **experience**. We're the party with **solutions**. And we stand for the solid values of mainstream America. It's time the **Republican Party became the majority party.** \\

A Republican Senate is within reach. Even a small shift can put us back on top. In 1986, 35,000 more Republican votes in the six tightest senate races would have given us a 51-49 majority. Think about that: that's a fraction of 1 percent of all votes

cast. And this time, we're going strong with some of the top challengers in the country -- Lynn Martin in Illinois, Claudine Schneider in Rhode Island, Tom Tauke in Iowa, Hal Daub in Nebraska, Bob Smith in New Hampshire and Hank Brown in Colorado. **Six great reasons why we're looking to 1990 to be the beginning of the GOP decade.**

Give me a Republican majority on the floor and you'll see a majority of our bills make it to the floor -- like our campaign reform or budget reform proposals. [Line item veto?] With the Democrats in control now, those bills are still sitting in Committee. I'll make a deal: the day I get just one of our bills passed quickly by a Hill Committee is the day I eat broccoli.\\\

Over the last few years, fine Americans were hounded out of the Senate confirmation process for purely partisan reasons -- excellent candidates for the best jobs in their fields, subjected to scrutiny that bordered on harrassment. Give me a few good men -- and women -- in the Senate and you'll see a few of our good men and women get confirmed. Under the Democrats now, getting confirmed can be more than a job -- it's an adventure.\\ For your commitment, your dedication, and your expertise in working to build a better America, the Republican Party thanks you -- and I thank you. I don't need to tell you how much it means down on my end of Pennsylvania Avenue to have a majority in the Senate. And I can't tell you how important the work of the Trust is in achieving that goal. With your help, we'll get politics in America moving again in the right direction. \\\

Let's end divided government in America. The mathematics are simple: the magic number is five -- five seats stand between us and a Senate majority. **And make no mistake: we can put the Senate back in Republican hands.**

Thank you and God bless you.

#

Comments
from Jim
Way for
MK &
Jame

Grant/Nappo
March 19, 1990
Draft two
A:nrsc

V 9004 3/2
Collins

BRIEF REMARKS: NATIONAL REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL COMMITTEE
CLOSED RECEPTION ~~AND DINNER~~
STATE FLOOR/THE WHITE HOUSE
TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1990 5:30 PM.
TIME ?

((Acknowledgements))

Not a dinner.

I really am sorry I can't stay for dinner. But it was a close call. The Secret Service caught the cook washing my salad with Perrier. \\ But no, you go ahead and eat, please. \\

I've come to talk to you ~~tonight~~ ^{this afternoon} about the future of this country, and how we're going to win the United States Senate. I'm reminded of the time [name and title] Primakov came to the White House to discuss the new political situation in the Soviet Union. In the middle of the meeting, he asked me for advice in how to deal with a legislative body. "Mr. Primakov," I said, "if you're looking for advice on what to do about the Congress, you've come to **the wrong guy**. I'm not having too much luck either." \\

Sometimes we don't have too much luck, and I'll tell you why: **because we don't control the Senate.**

Remember the good old days in the early eighties when President Reagan and I enjoyed a majority in the Senate? Remember Republican committee chairmanships, winning votes, a **legislative agenda that was acted upon in committees?**

From 1980 to 1986, steady Senate support helped us launch the economic recovery -- ⁸⁹87 months and still going strong. It helped us restore America to a position of strength and respect in the world -- and it helped us put the values of faith, family, honest work and open opportunity back where they belong: **back in the mainstream of America.**

Since then, it hasn't been easy. Despite our minority status, we've proven that the policy of peace through strength works; we've brought a renewed commitment to education, the environment and volunteerism in America; and most of all, we've ensured the greatest economic expansion in history. But it's the future I want to talk about ^{this afternoon} ~~tonight~~ -- and how the 1990s will be the decade that the Grand Old Party becomes the **majority party in America.**\\\

I hope you're optimistic about the next decade -- because I am. The Republican Party is building an agenda for the 1990s -- one that keeps America strong as democracies and free market economies spring to life all over the world. We're the party with **ideas**. We're the party with **experience**. We're the party with **solutions**. And we stand for the solid values of mainstream America. It's time the **Republican Party became the majority party.** \\\

A Republican Senate is within reach. Even a small shift can put us back on top. In 1986, 35,000 more Republican votes in the six tightest senate races would have given us a 51-49 majority. Think about that: that's a fraction of 1 percent of all votes

cast. And this time, we're going strong with some of the top challengers in the country -- Lynn Martin in Illinois, Claudine Schneider in Rhode Island, Tom Tauke in Iowa, Hal Daub in Nebraska, Bob Smith in New Hampshire and Hank Brown in Colorado. **Six great reasons why we're looking to 1990 to be the beginning of the GOP decade.**

Give me a Republican majority ~~on the floor~~ and you'll see a majority of our bills make it to the floor -- like our campaign reform or budget reform proposals. ^{YES} [Line item veto?] With the Democrats in control now, those bills are still sitting in Committee. I'll make a deal: the day I get just one of our bills passed quickly by a Hill Committee is the day I eat broccoli.\\\

Over the last few years, fine Americans were hounded out of the Senate confirmation process for purely partisan reasons -- excellent candidates for the best jobs in their fields, subjected to scrutiny that bordered on harrassment. Give me a few good men -- and women -- in the Senate and you'll ^{even more} see a few of our good men and women get confirmed. Under the Democrats now, getting confirmed can be more than a job -- it's an adventure.\\ For your commitment, your dedication, and your expertise in working to build a better America, the Republican Party thanks you -- and I thank you. I don't need to tell you how much it ^{will mean} means down on my end of Pennsylvania Avenue to have a majority in the Senate. And I can't tell you how important the work of the Trust is in achieving that goal. With your help, we'll get politics in America moving again in the right direction. \\\

~~Let's end divided government in America.~~ The mathematics are simple: the magic number is five -- five seats stand between us and a Senate majority. **And make no mistake: we can put the Senate back in Republican hands.**

Thank you and God bless you.

#

Consider ~~INSERTING~~

PP I have been out early working hard its campaign for our key challengers in 1989 and so far in '90. The White House and the Senate Committee are coordinating at a ~~level~~ ^{level} never before realized - and its working very well.

Grant/Nappo
March 23, 1990
Draft six/A:nrsc

BRIEF REMARKS: SENATORIAL TRUST RECEPTION
STATE FLOOR/THE WHITE HOUSE
TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1990
5:30 p.m.

Senator and Mrs. Nickles ... members of the Senatorial Trust ... it's a pleasure to have you here at the White House during such exciting times. And it's important to remember that these are also dangerous times. But don't worry. I had the Secret Service do a security sweep before this event. Place was clean. \\ No broccoli. \\

We've all been watching the events in the Soviet Union. Last year, Yevgeni Primakov of the Supreme Soviet came to the White House to discuss the new political situation in his country. He asked me for advice in dealing with a legislative body. "Mr. Primakov," I said, "if you're looking for advice on what to do about the Congress, you've come to **the wrong guy**. I'm not having too much luck either." \\ \\

Sometimes, we don't have too much luck, and I'll tell you why: **because we don't have a majority in the Senate.**

Remember the good old days in the eighties when President Reagan and I enjoyed a majority in the Senate? Remember Republican committee chairmen, winning party-line votes, **committees acting on our legislative agenda?**

From 1980 to 1986, steady Senate support helped us launch our record peacetime economic recovery -- 88 months and still going strong. It helped us restore America to a position of

strength and respect in the world -- and it helped us renew the values of faith, family, honest work and opportunity.

But we can accomplish even more if we have a Republican Senate working for America's future. That's what I want to talk about today -- the future. How the 1990s will be the decade the Grand Old Party becomes the Grand Old majority Party in America.\\\

A Republican Senate is within reach. I'll tell you why: because we can put the Democrats out of business on the issues. When the fight is fair -- and the issues clearly defined -- Republicans win elections. It's when the Democrats monkey with fair representation -- by gerrymandering district lines -- that the other party wins. And believe me, if they could find a way to gerrymander Senate seats, they would. But something tells me the voters wouldn't stand for the Democrats trying to redraw state borders in their favor. I give you my pledge today that I will firmly resist any efforts to make Brookline, Massachusetts the 51st state with two Senators.\\\

Even a small shift can put us back on top. In 1986, 35,000 more Republican votes in the six tightest Senate races would have given us a 51-49 majority. This year, we've got the top candidates in the country -- Lynn Martin in Illinois, Claudine Schneider in Rhode Island, Tom Tauke in Iowa, Hal Daub in Nebraska, Bob Smith in New Hampshire and Hank Brown in Colorado. Six great reasons why we're looking to 1990 to be the beginning of the GOP decade.\\\

But Senate Democrats have also abused their majority status in another way. Under the Democrats, getting Republicans confirmed can be more than a job -- it's an adventure.\\

Give me a few good men -- and women -- in the Senate and you'll see our good men and women get confirmed.\\

I don't need to tell you how much it means down on my end of Pennsylvania Avenue to have a majority in the Senate. I'll be relying on the Senate to ratify the international agreements that will help shape the post-Cold War world for generations to come.

Your work as members of the Trust has never been more important to help us achieve our goal -- a Senate majority. For your commitment and your dedication in working for a better America, the Republican Party thanks you -- and I thank you. \\

Let's end divided government in America. The mathematics are simple: the magic number is five -- five seats stand between us and a Senate majority. And make no mistake: together we can put the Senate back in Republican hands.\\

Thank you and God bless you.

#

1730.



NRSC Dinner + Reception Tuesday 3/27

Closed Press. [Reception, speak and leave.]

Susan Dawson - Political affairs

Trust Reception on State Floor

250 people → remarks in East Room
20 min

Yevgeniy Prutakov 5:30 -

Head of Council of Union of Supreme Soviet

6:15 → Old Exec. Office Bldg →

Indian Treaty Room →

Chairman's Club - corporate donors →
50 people

Rep members of Budget Committee
have been invited

RNC 803-8500 →

national republican senatorial committee →

Senatorial Committee

Doyce Boesch

425 Second St.

615-6000