

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Legislative Affairs

Series/Staff Member: Patrick Griffin

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 4749

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Brady Bill [2]

Stack:

S

Row:

26

Section:

6

Shelf:

7

Position:

3

103D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S.414

H.R.1025

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

and

IN THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A BILL

To amend title 18, United States Code, to require a waiting
period before the purchase of a handgun.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the “Brady Handgun Vio-
5 lence Prevention Act.”

1 SEC. 2. FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSEE REQUIRED TO CON-
2 DUCT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK BE-
3 FORE TRANSFER OF FIREARM TO
4 NONLICENSEE.

5 (a) INTERIM PROVISION.—

6 (1) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18,
7 United States Code, is amended by adding at the
8 end the following:

9 “(s)(1) Beginning on the date that is ninety days
10 after the date of enactment of this subsection and ending
11 on the day before the date that the Attorney General cer-
12 tifies under section 3 of the Brady Handgun Violence Pre-
13 vention Act that the national instant criminal background
14 check system is established (except as provided in para-
15 graphs (2) and (3) of such section), it shall be unlawful
16 for any licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or li-
17 censed dealer to sell, deliver, or transfer a handgun to an
18 individual who is not licensed under section 923, unless—

19 “(A) after the most recent proposal of such
20 transfer by the transferee—

21 “(i) the transferor has—

22 “(I) received from the transferee a
23 statement of the transferee containing the
24 information described in paragraph (3);

1 “(II) verified the identity of the trans-
2 feree by examining the identification docu-
3 ment presented;

4 “(III) within one day after the trans-
5 feree furnishes the statement, provided no-
6 tice of the contents of the statement to the
7 chief law enforcement officer of the place
8 of residence of the transferee; and

9 “(IV) within one day after the trans-
10 feree furnishes the statement, transmitted
11 a copy of the statement to the chief law
12 enforcement officer of the place of resi-
13 dence of the transferee; and

14 “(ii)(I) five business days (as defined by
15 days in which State offices are open) have
16 elapsed from the date the transferor furnished
17 notice of the contents of the statement to the
18 chief law enforcement officer, during which pe-
19 riod the transferor has not received information
20 from the chief law enforcement officer that re-
21 ceipt or possession of the handgun by the trans-
22 feree would be in violation of Federal, State, or
23 local law; or

24 “(II) the transferor has received notice
25 from the chief law enforcement officer that the

1 officer has no information indicating that re-
2 ceipt or possession of the handgun by the trans-
3 feree would violate Federal, State, or local law;

4 “(B) the transferee has presented to the trans-
5 feror a written statement, issued by the chief law en-
6 forcement officer of the place of residence of the
7 transferee during the ten-day period ending on the
8 date of the most recent proposal of such transfer by
9 the transferee, stating that the transferee requires
10 access to a handgun because of a threat to the life
11 of the transferee or of any member of the household
12 of the transferee;

13 “(C)(i) the transferee has presented to the
14 transferor a permit that—

15 “(I) allows the transferee to possess a
16 handgun; and

17 “(II) was issued not more than five years
18 earlier by the State in which the transfer is to
19 take place; and

20 “(ii) the law of the State provides that such a
21 permit is to be issued only after an authorized gov-
22 ernment official has verified that the information
23 available to such official does not indicate that pos-
24 session of a handgun by the transferee would be in
25 violation of the law;

1 “(D) the law of the State requires that, before
2 any licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or li-
3 censed dealer completes the transfer of a handgun to
4 an individual who is not licensed under section 923,
5 an authorized government official verify that the in-
6 formation available to such official does not indicate
7 that possession of a handgun by the transferee
8 would be in violation of law, except that this sub-
9 paragraph shall not apply to a State that, on the
10 date of certification pursuant to section 3 of the
11 Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, is not in
12 compliance with the timetable established pursuant
13 to section 3 of such Act;

14 “(E) the Secretary has approved the transfer
15 under section 5812 of the Internal Revenue Code of
16 1986; or

17 “(F) on application of the transferor, the Sec-
18 retary has certified that compliance with subpara-
19 graph (A)(i)(III) is impracticable because—

20 “(i) the ratio of the number of law enforce-
21 ment officers of the State in which the transfer
22 is to occur to the number of square miles of
23 land area of the State does not exceed 0.0025;

24 “(ii) the business premises of the trans-
25 feror at which the transfer is to occur are ex-

1 tremely remote in relation to the chief law en-
2 forcement officer; and

3 “(iii) there is an absence of telecommuni-
4 cations facilities in the geographical area in
5 which the business premises are located.

6 “(2) A chief law enforcement officer to whom a trans-
7 feror has provided notice pursuant to paragraph
8 (1)(A)(i)(III) shall make a reasonable effort to ascertain
9 within five business days whether the transferee has a
10 criminal record or whether there is any other legal impedi-
11 ment to the transferee’s receiving a handgun, including
12 research in whatever State and local recordkeeping sys-
13 tems are available and in a national system designated by
14 the Attorney General.

15 “(3) The statement referred to in paragraph
16 (1)(A)(i)(I) shall contain only—

17 “(A) the name, address, and date of birth ap-
18 pearing on a valid identification document (as de-
19 fined in section 1028(d)(1)) of the transferee con-
20 taining a photograph of the transferee and a de-
21 scription of the identification used;

22 “(B) a statement that transferee—

23 “(i) is not under indictment for, and has
24 not been convicted in any court of, a crime pun-

1 ishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding
2 one year;

3 “(ii) is not a fugitive from justice;

4 “(iii) is not an unlawful user of or addicted
5 to any controlled substance (as defined in sec-
6 tion 102 of the Controlled Substances Act);

7 “(iv) has not been adjudicated as a mental
8 defective or been committed to a mental institu-
9 tion;

10 “(v) is not an alien who is illegally or un-
11 lawfully in the United States;

12 “(vi) has not been discharged from the
13 Armed Forces under dishonorable conditions;
14 and

15 “(vii) is not a person who, having been a
16 citizen of the United States, has renounced
17 such citizenship;

18 “(C) the date the statement is made; and

19 “(D) notice that the transferee intends to ob-
20 tain a handgun from the transferor.

21 “(4) Any transferor of a handgun who, after such
22 transfer, receives a report from a chief law enforcement
23 officer containing information that receipt or possession
24 of the handgun by the transferee violates Federal, State,
25 or local law shall immediately communicate all information

1 the transferor has about the transfer and the transferee
2 to—

3 “(A) the chief law enforcement officer of the
4 place of business of the transferor; and

5 “(B) the chief law enforcement officer of the
6 place of residence of the transferee.

7 “(5) Any transferor who receives information, not
8 otherwise available to the public, in a report under this
9 subsection shall not disclose such information except to
10 the transferee, to law enforcement authorities, or pursuant
11 to the direction of a court of law.

12 “(6)(A) Any transferor who sells, delivers, or other-
13 wise transfers a handgun to a transferee shall retain the
14 copy of the statement of the transferee with respect to
15 the handgun transaction, and shall retain evidence that
16 the transferor has complied with subclauses (III) and (IV)
17 of paragraph (1)(A)(i) with respect to the statement.

18 “(B) Unless the chief law enforcement officer to
19 whom a statement is transmitted under paragraph
20 (1)(A)(i)(IV) determines that a transaction would violate
21 Federal, State, or local law—

22 “(i) the officer shall, within twenty business
23 days after the date the transferee made the state-
24 ment on the basis of which the notice was provided,

1 destroy the statement and any record containing in-
2 formation derived from the statement;

3 “(ii) the information contained in the statement
4 shall not be conveyed to any person except a person
5 who has a need to know in order to carry out this
6 subsection; and

7 “(iii) the information contained in the state-
8 ment shall not be used for any purpose other than
9 to carry out this subsection.

10 “(7) A chief law enforcement officer or other person
11 responsible for providing criminal history background in-
12 formation pursuant to this subsection shall not be liable
13 in an action at law for damages—

14 “(A) for failure to prevent the sale or transfer
15 of a handgun to a person whose receipt or posses-
16 sion of the handgun is unlawful under this section;
17 or

18 “(B) for preventing such a sale or transfer to
19 a person who may lawfully receive or possess a
20 handgun.

21 “(8) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘chief
22 law enforcement officer’ means the chief of police, the
23 sheriff, or an equivalent officer or the designee of any such
24 individual.

1 “(9) The Secretary shall take necessary actions to en-
2 sure that the provisions of this subsection are published
3 and disseminated to licensed dealers, law enforcement offi-
4 cials, and the public.”.

5 (2) HANDGUN DEFINED.—Section 921(a) of
6 such title is amended by adding at the end the fol-
7 lowing:

8 “(29) The term ‘handgun’ means—

9 “(A) a firearm which has a short stock and is
10 designed to be held and fired by the use of a single
11 hand; and

12 “(B) any combination of parts from which a
13 firearm described in subparagraph (A) can be as-
14 sembled.”.

15 (b) PERMANENT PROVISION.—Section 922 of title
16 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(1)
17 of this section, is amended by adding at the end the follow-
18 ing:

19 “(t)(1) Beginning on the date that the Attorney Gen-
20 eral certifies under section 3 of the Brady Handgun Vio-
21 lence Prevention Act that the national instant criminal
22 background check system is established (except as pro-
23 vided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of such section), a li-
24 censed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer

1 shall not transfer a firearm to any other person who is
2 not such a licensee, unless—

3 “(A) before the completion of the transfer, the
4 licensee contacts the national instant criminal back-
5 ground check system established under section 3 of
6 such Act;

7 “(B) the system notifies the licensee that the
8 system has not located any record that demonstrates
9 that the receipt of a firearm by such other person
10 would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section or
11 any State or local law; and

12 “(C) the transferor has verified the identity of
13 the transferee by examining a valid identification
14 document (as defined in section 1028(d)(1) of this
15 title) of the transferee containing a photograph of
16 the transferee.

17 “(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a firearm
18 transfer between a licensee and another person if—

19 “(A)(i) such other person has presented to the
20 licensee a permit that—

21 “(I) allows such other person to possess a
22 firearm; and

23 “(II) was issued not more than five years
24 earlier by the State in which the transfer is to
25 take place; and

1 “(ii) the law of the State provides that such a
2 permit is to be issued only after an authorized gov-
3 ernment official has verified that the information
4 available to such official does not indicate that pos-
5 session of a firearm by such other person would be
6 in violation of law;

7 “(B) the Secretary has approved the transfer
8 under section 5812 of the Internal Revenue Code of
9 1986; or

10 “(C) on application of the transferor, the Sec-
11 retary has certified that compliance with paragraph
12 (1)(A) is impracticable because—

13 “(i) the ratio of the number of law enforce-
14 ment officers of the State in which the transfer
15 is to occur to the number of square miles of
16 land area of the State does not exceed 0.0025;

17 “(ii) the business premises of the licensee
18 at which the transfer is to occur are extremely
19 remote in relation to the chief law enforcement
20 officer (as defined in subsection (s)(8)); and

21 “(iii) there is an absence of telecommuni-
22 cations facilities in the geographical area in
23 which the business premises are located.

24 “(3) If the national instant criminal background
25 check system notifies the licensee that the information

1 available to the system does not demonstrate that the re-
2 ceipt of a firearm by such other person would violate sub-
3 section (g) or (n), and the licensee transfers a firearm to
4 such other person, the licensee shall include in the record
5 of the transfer the unique identification number provided
6 by the system with respect to the transfer.

7 “(4) In addition to the authority provided under sec-
8 tion 923(e), if the licensee knowingly transfers a firearm
9 to such other person and knowingly fails to comply with
10 paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to the trans-
11 fer and, at the time such other person most recently pro-
12 posed the transfer, the national instant criminal back-
13 ground check system was operating and information was
14 available to the system demonstrating that receipt of a
15 firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g)
16 or (n) of this section, the Secretary may, after notice and
17 opportunity for a hearing, suspend for not more than six
18 months or revoke any license issued to the licensee under
19 section 923, and may impose on the licensee a civil fine
20 of not more than \$5,000.

21 “(5) Neither a local government nor an employee of
22 the Federal Government or of any State or local govern-
23 ment, responsible for providing information to the national
24 instant criminal background check system shall be liable
25 in an action at law for damages—

1 “(A) for failure to prevent the sale or transfer
2 of a handgun to a person whose receipt or posses-
3 sion of the handgun is unlawful under this section;
4 or

5 “(B) for preventing such a sale or transfer to
6 a person who may lawfully receive or possess a
7 handgun.”.

8 (c) PENALTY.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United
9 States Code, is amended—

10 (1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph
11 (2) or (3) of”; and

12 (2) by adding at the end the following:

13 “(5) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (s) or (t)
14 of section 922 shall be fined not more than \$1,000, impris-
15 oned for not more than 1 year, or both.”.

16 **SEC. 3. NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND**
17 **CHECK SYSTEM.**

18 (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF SYSTEM.—The Attorney
19 General of the United States shall establish a national in-
20 stant criminal background check system that any licensee
21 may contact for information on whether receipt of a fire-
22 arm by a prospective transferee thereof would violate sub-
23 section (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States
24 Code, or any State or local law.

1 (b) EXPEDITED ACTION BY THE ATTORNEY GEN-
2 ERAL.—The Attorney General shall expedite—

3 (1) the upgrading and indexing of State crimi-
4 nal history records in the Federal criminal records
5 system maintained by the Federal Bureau of Inves-
6 tigation;

7 (2) the development of hardware and software
8 systems to link State criminal history check systems
9 into the national instant criminal background check
10 system established by the Attorney General pursuant
11 to this section; and

12 (3) the current revitalization initiatives by the
13 Federal Bureau of Investigation for technologically
14 advanced fingerprint and criminal records identifica-
15 tion.

16 (c) PROVISION OF STATE CRIMINAL RECORDS TO
17 THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK
18 SYSTEM.—(1) Not later than six months after the date
19 of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

20 (A) determine the type of computer hardware
21 and software that will be used to operate the na-
22 tional instant criminal background check system and
23 the means by which State criminal records systems
24 will communicate with the national system;

1 (B) investigate the criminal records system of
2 each State and determine for each State a timetable
3 by which the State should be able to provide criminal
4 records on an on line capacity basis to the national
5 system;

6 (C) notify each State of the determinations
7 made pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B).

8 (2) The Attorney General shall require as a part of
9 the State timetable that the State achieve, by the end of
10 five years after the date of enactment of this Act, at least
11 80 percent currency of case dispositions in computerized
12 criminal history files for all cases in which there has been
13 an event of activity within the last five years and continue
14 to maintain such a system.

15 (d) NATIONAL SYSTEM CERTIFICATION.—(1) On the
16 date that is thirty months after the date of enactment of
17 this Act, and at any time thereafter, the Attorney General
18 shall determine whether—

19 (A) the national system has achieved at least
20 80 percent currency of case dispositions in computerized
21 criminal history files for all cases in which
22 there has been an event of activity within the last
23 five years on a national average basis; and

24 (B) the States are in compliance with the timetable
25 established pursuant to subsection (c),

1 and, if so, shall certify that the national system is estab-
2 lished.

3 (2) If, on the date of certification in paragraph (1)
4 of this subsection, a State is not in compliance with the
5 timetable established pursuant to subsection (c) of this
6 section, section 922(s) of title 18, United States Code,
7 shall remain in effect in such State and section 922(t) of
8 such title shall not apply to the State. The Attorney Gen-
9 eral shall certify if a State subject to the provisions of
10 section 922(s) under the preceding sentence achieves com-
11 pliance with its timetable after the date of certification
12 in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and section 922(s) of
13 title 18, United States Code, shall not apply to such State
14 and section 922(t) of such title shall apply to the State.

15 (3) Six years after the date of enactment of this Act,
16 the Attorney General shall certify whether or not a State
17 is in compliance with subsection (c)(2) of this section and
18 if the State is not in compliance, section 922(s) of title
19 18, United States Code, shall apply to the State and sec-
20 tion 922(t) of such title shall not apply to the State. The
21 Attorney General shall certify if a State subject to the pro-
22 visions of section 922(s) under the preceding sentence
23 achieves compliance with the standards in subsection
24 (c)(2) of this section, and section 922(s) of title 18, United

1 States Code, shall not apply to the State and section
2 922(t) of such title shall apply to the State.

3 (e) NOTIFICATION OF LICENSEES.—On establish-
4 ment of the system under this section, the Attorney Gen-
5 eral shall notify each licensee and the chief law enforce-
6 ment officer of each State of the existence and purpose
7 of the system and the means to be used to contact the
8 systems

9 (f) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

10 (1) AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN OFFICIAL INFORMA-
11 TION.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Attorney
12 General may secure directly from any department or
13 agency of the United States such information on
14 persons for whom receipt of a firearm would violate
15 subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18,
16 United States Code, or any State or local law, as is
17 necessary to enable the system to operate in accord-
18 ance with this section. On request of the Attorney
19 General, the head of such department or agency
20 shall furnish such information to the system.

21 (2) OTHER AUTHORITY.—The Attorney General
22 shall develop such computer software, design and ob-
23 tain such telecommunications and computer hard-
24 ware, and employ such personnel, as are necessary

1 to establish and operate the system in accordance
2 with this section.

3 (g) CORRECTION OF ERRONEOUS SYSTEM INFORMA-
4 TION.—If the system established under this section in-
5 forms an individual contacting the system that receipt of
6 a firearm by a prospective transferee would violate sub-
7 section (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States
8 Code, or any State or local law, the prospective transferee
9 may request the Attorney General to provide the prospec-
10 tive transferee with the reasons therefor. Upon receipt of
11 such a request, the Attorney General shall immediately
12 comply with the request. The prospective transferee may
13 submit to the Attorney General information that to cor-
14 rect, clarify, or supplement records of the system with re-
15 spect to the prospective transferee. After receipt of such
16 information, the Attorney General shall immediately con-
17 sider the information, investigate the matter further, and
18 correct all erroneous Federal records relating to the pro-
19 spective transferee and give notice of the error to any Fed-
20 eral department or agency or any State that was the
21 source of such erroneous records.

22 (h) REGULATIONS.—After ninety days notice to the
23 public and an opportunity for hearing by interested par-
24 ties, the Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to

1 ensure the privacy and security of the information of the
2 system established under this section.

3 (i) PROHIBITION RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF
4 REGISTRATION SYSTEMS WITH RESPECT TO FIRE-
5 ARMS.—No department, agency, officer, or employee of
6 the United States may—

7 (1) require that any record or portion thereof
8 maintained by the system established under this sec-
9 tion be recorded at or transferred to a facility
10 owned, managed, or controlled by the United States
11 or any State or political subdivision thereof; or

12 (2) use the system established under this sec-
13 tion to establish any system for the registration of
14 firearms, firearm owners, or firearm transactions or
15 dispositions, except with respect to persons, prohib-
16 ited by section 922(g) or (n) of title 18, United
17 States Code, from receiving a firearm.

18 (j) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

19 (1) LICENSEE.—The term “licensee” means a
20 licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed
21 dealer under section 923 of title, 18, United States
22 Code.

23 (2) OTHER TERMS.—The terms “firearm”, “li-
24 censed importer”, “licensed manufacturer”, and “li-
25 censed dealer” have the meanings stated in section

1 921(a) (3), (9), (10), and (11), respectively, of title
2 18, United States Code.

3 **SEC. 4. FUNDING FOR IMPROVEMENT OF CRIMINAL**
4 **RECORDS.**

5 (a) IMPROVEMENTS IN STATE RECORDS.—

6 (1) USE OF FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 509(b)
7 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe
8 Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3759(b)) is
9 amended—

10 (A) in paragraph (2) by striking “and”
11 after the semicolon;

12 (B) in paragraph (3) by striking the period
13 and inserting “; and”; and

14 (C) by adding at the end the following new
15 paragraph:

16 “(4) the improvement of State record systems
17 and the sharing with the Attorney General of all of
18 the records described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)
19 of this subsection and the records required by the
20 Attorney General under section 3 of the Brady
21 Handgun Violence Prevention Act, for the purpose
22 of implementing such Act.”

23 (2) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—

24 (A) GRANTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF
25 CRIMINAL RECORDS.—The Attorney General,

1 through the Bureau of Justice Statistics, shall,
2 subject to appropriations and with preference to
3 States that as of the date of enactment of this
4 Act have the lowest percent currency of case
5 dispositions in computerized criminal history
6 files, make a grant to each State to be used—

7 (i) for the creation of a computerized
8 criminal history record system or improve-
9 ment of an existing system;

10 (ii) to improve accessibility to the na-
11 tional instant criminal background system;
12 and

13 (iii) upon establishment of the na-
14 tional system, to assist the State in the
15 transmittal of criminal records to the na-
16 tional system.

17 (B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIA-
18 TIONS.—There are authorized to be appro-
19 priated for grants under subparagraph (A) a
20 total of \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and
21 all fiscal years thereafter.

22 (b) WITHHOLDING STATE FUNDS.—Effective on the
23 date of enactment of this Act the Attorney General may
24 reduce by up to 50 percent the allocation to a State for
25 a fiscal year under title I of the Omnibus Crime Control

1 and Safe Streets Act of 1968 of a State that is not in
2 compliance with the timetable established for such State
3 under section 3 of this Act.

4 (c) WITHHOLDING OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
5 FUNDS.—If the Attorney General does not certify the na-
6 tional instant criminal background check system pursuant
7 to section 3(d)(1) by—

8 (1) thirty months after the date of enactment
9 of this Act the general administrative funds appro-
10 priated to the Department of Justice for the fiscal
11 year beginning in the calendar year in which the
12 date that is thirty months after the date of enact-
13 ment of this Act falls shall be reduced by 5 percent
14 on a monthly basis; and

15 (2) forty-two months after the date of enact-
16 ment of this Act the general administrative funds
17 appropriated to the Department of Justice for the
18 fiscal year beginning in the calendar year in which
19 the date that is forty-two months after the date of
20 enactment of this Act falls shall be reduced by 10
21 percent on a monthly basis.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

93 JUN 11 P2:50

June 11, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: HOWARD PASTER *HP*
SUBJECT: BRADY BILL ON HANDGUN PURCHASES

BACKGROUND

Despite your position in support of the Brady bill, we have not asked the Congress to act on the legislation on its own because of the preference of many on Capitol Hill to pass the Brady bill as part of a larger crime bill. However, the Administration has not yet forged a position on the overall crime bill and the call for action on the Brady bill is growing.

DISCUSSION

Last Congress the House passed the Brady bill and the crime bill separately, while the Senate passed them together. The conference agreement merged the two, and it is that conference agreement that died in the face of the Senate filibuster. Many of those who filibustered were in honest disagreement with the habeas provisions; others were acting at the behest of the NRA but raising other issues to justify their votes against cloture.

At this time there is very broad national support for a waiting period for hand gun purchases. Yet the NRA has had Members of Congress who support the Administration on most issues, but who support the NRA on this issue, approach us with suggestions for amendments to last year's version of the Brady bill. We obviously cannot consider weakening this legislation.

The main argument for proceeding with the Brady bill is that the Administration shares the responsibility for the delay in the comprehensive crime bill, and it is increasingly clear there will be an even longer delay in moving that bill. On the other hand, we should not be responsible for the delay in moving Brady and therefore should call on the Congress -- which as a practical matter is a call really aimed at the House -- to move Brady free-standing.

Held by Podesta - 6/18/93
HP
7/18
FLC

The counter argument is that this complicates the lives of Speaker Foley and Chairman Brooks because it forces Democrats to confront the gun lobby very directly. Of those with whom we have to be concerned, Chairman Brooks may be the person least pleased by a free-standing Brady bill since he comes from a pro-gun district and is a constant ally of the NRA. Also, one has to recognize that the Senate Judiciary Committee is closely divided on this issue and Chairman Biden may have to wait to do Brady in the context of a larger crime bill.

RECOMMENDATION

I would like your authority -- subject to rechecking with the Department of Justice and the Domestic Policy Council -- to advise Speaker Foley, Chairman Brooks and Chairman Biden that it is the Administration's preference to move quickly on the Brady bill rather than wait for the crime bill. Unless there are especially strong objections from any of the three -- at which point you may be asked to make a phone call -- we would then proceed quickly to prepare a message for you to send to the Congress. (Obviously we would withhold any action deemed to be counter to our reconciliation efforts.)

DECISION

_____ Approve _____ Approve as amended _____ Reject _____ No Action

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 21, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Howard Paster *HP*

SUBJECT: Brady bill and crime legislation

Mindful of your desire to move more quickly on the Brady bill, I have spoken with a number of people about this. Word got to Chairman Brooks that I was exploring this possibility and he called me last week to make clear he has not changed his position that Brady must be done within the context of an overall crime bill.

I indicated to the Chairman that we might not agree on this, and asked to see him for a more thorough discussion. Our meeting was quite pointed -- he said we could have Brady now and no crime bill, or we could have a crime bill with Brady. The Chairman placed the responsibility for the delay in moving a crime bill, including Brady, on the Administration and indicated his willingness to move promptly on a crime bill. (I should add he still harbors the hope of making "minor" changes in Brady and this could require some further discussion since I do not believe we can accept changes from last year's compromise unless they are negotiated with the police groups.)

There have been meetings on crime legislation involving Bruce Reed, the Department of Justice and staff for Chairmen Brooks and Biden. It is my sense it may require your personal direction to expedite the process because of Justice Department interest in making substantial changes in controversial portions of last year's crime bill.

In any event, I felt it necessary to advise you that while I prefer a different course it probably is not practical to move independently on Brady at this time.

HANDGUN CONTROL

MILLION STRONG . . . working to
handguns out of the wrong hands.

FAX COVER SHEET

DATE:

6/24/93

TOTAL PAGES (including this sheet):

7

SENT TO (fax number):

456-6220

PLEASE DELIVER TO:

Howard Paster

ORGANIZATION:

From:

➡ Richard Aborn

➡ Jane Ryan

NOTES/COMMENTS:

HANDGUN CONTROL

**ONE MILLION STRONG . . . working to
keep handguns out of the wrong hands.**

MEMORANDUM

To: Howard Paster

From: Richard Aborn

Date: June 24, 1993

Re: Administration taking the lead on the Brady Bill

I thought it might be useful for you if we wrote out our arguments in favor of moving the Brady Bill as a separate measure. Perhaps you can share the following with doubters in the White House and on the Hill.

* * * * *

We have been discussing the question of whether the Brady Bill should be pushed through Congress as a separate measure, or whether it should be part of an omnibus crime bill. We urge the Administration to publicly support, and work for, passage of Brady as a separate bill, beginning with a vote in the House of Representatives during the month of July.

As you know, we have repeatedly made the argument that Brady can and will pass. Ironically, opponents of our strategy are trying to use the Brady Bill's popularity against us. They want Brady in an omnibus crime bill because, they assert, it will propel habeas corpus and the death penalty.

The purpose of this memorandum is to explain why it would be most advantageous to both the Administration and the Democratic Party to move Brady separate from the crime bill, and move it now.

1. The Brady Bill is much more popular than any crime bill.

(a) Public opinion. It is long-established that about 90% of the American people favor the Brady Bill. (See, e.g., national poll by Louis Harris, April 3-12,

1993.) The Brady Bill is unique. No other major piece of legislation *exists* which has this kind of name recognition and support. If the President takes the lead on Brady, his own poll numbers will go up.

Put another way, a Brady Bill campaign by the President will increase his political capital, putting him in a stronger position to pass other legislation in Congress. Governor Wilder benefitted heavily from his one-gun-a-month legislative campaign. Governor Florio, frankly, would have no chance for re-election if not for his legislative battles over assault weapons. And neither of these proposals are nearly as popular as the Brady Bill!

In contrast, an omnibus crime bill will end up with a mixed level of popularity. Opponents of the death penalty will hate the bill, and proponents of the death penalty will probably be unsatisfied by the final product. Most Americans will never even understand what's in the crime bill. Even if it contains the Brady Bill, passage of such omnibus legislation will require the President to expend a lot of political capital, and it won't improve the President's poll ratings. Simply, the work and aggravation will not be appreciated or rewarded.

Look at the 1992 election. George Bush made a big deal of supporting an omnibus crime bill. Bill Clinton made a big deal of supporting the Brady Bill. Don't we all agree that it was the Democrats who got the most mileage out of this issue?

(b) The media. The media has no enthusiasm for any omnibus crime bill. A majority of the influential national commentators, columnists, and editorial writers oppose the death penalty. Most of the rest have no passion for the death penalty. As a general rule, the media thinks that omnibus crime bills are enacted as political gimmicks rather than as solutions to crime.

In contrast, the media *adores* the Brady Bill. Brady events receive tremendous news coverage and the issue is a favorite for editorial commentators of all kinds -- even right-wingers like William Buckley and George Will support the Brady Bill. This extraordinary media attention comes, in part, because the issue is considered "controversial" and it involves a David versus Goliath battle.

Just look at news and editorial coverage from last year. The 1991-92 crime bill got little news coverage and virtually no editorial support, even though that bill contained Brady and came up for a cloture vote in the Senate three times. The principal Biden/law enforcement press conference on the omnibus crime bill received no attention at all.

Don't make last year's mistake! Don't kill the media benefits of Brady by putting it in a crime bill with the death penalty. Let the President play the part of David, who slays the evil gun lobby Goliath. This is a unique opportunity for the Administration -- please don't blow it.

(c) Constituency groups. We have dozens and dozens of major national groups which support the Brady Bill, and which will actively lobby by our side (see attached list). Obviously, their lobbying makes the bill easier to pass. And it would be useful for the Administration to please these groups by doing something they support.

Except for the police groups, none of the other national organizations can or will support any omnibus crime bill which contains the death penalty. In other words, by linking Brady to a crime bill, you dismember your own lobbying coalition. That is terrible politics.

2. The Brady Bill will put Republicans on the defensive, while the crime bill will not.

(a) Brady puts Bob Dole on the spot. Bob Dole has been getting a free ride on the Brady Bill. Right now, his private posture is against Brady -- but in public no one knows it.

As the co-author of the current Brady Bill, Dole will look absolutely terrible to the media and the public if he leads the fight against Brady. To be specific, we will organize editorials, columns and press conferences against Dole if he publicly opposes Brady -- or tries to amend Brady with portions of a Republican crime bill. He'll be hounded every time he steps onto the stage of a Sunday morning interview show.

Further, youth gangs from California have invaded Kansas, turning Wichita into a battleground. The media and public in Dole's home state are ready to denounce him if he stands in the way of Brady.

But Dole cannot be pressured unless the Brady Bill is moving. Otherwise, it's simply not an issue. How can Dole be blamed when the Democrats aren't even bringing the bill up for consideration?

If Brady starts to move and Dole obstructs it, he will start a political hemorrhaging. If he gives in on Brady, the Democrats will get the glory. It's a win-win situation.

In contrast, Dole will not be hurt by consideration of an omnibus crime bill. In fact, he'll love it. A crime bill allows Dole to go on the offensive. No matter what you say or do, Republicans will be perceived as being more committed to "law-and-order" than Democrats. Dole can look good either obstructing or pushing a crime bill. It's a lose-lose situation for the Democrats.

(b) Brady puts other Republicans on the spot. Republicans all over the Hill could be put on the defensive by raising the Brady Bill issue. According to the latest national poll, 88% of all Republicans support the Brady Bill. Ronald Reagan vocally and publicly supports Brady.

Again, in contrast, a crime bill plays to the Republicans' strengths. Don't give them the home-field advantage! Bring up a crime bill later, when the Administration holds a stronger hand.

3. Speed is important to the Brady Bill, and not important to the crime bill.

(a) To get credit, Clinton has to move it. Pretty soon, the media is going to lose patience over the Brady Bill. The media and all the constituency groups will clamor for the bill. If the Administration waits until then to move Brady, it will be perceived as caving in to pressure.

No one outside the Beltway is going to clamor for the crime bill. No one will care if that bill doesn't move until 1994. Aside from the fact that it contained Brady, did anybody outside the Beltway even care that the crime bill died last year?

(b) Visible results in 90 days. The Brady Bill can show visible results faster than almost any other major legislation. 90 days after enactment, firearms dealers must begin using the mandatory waiting period and background check. The day after Virginia began its background check program in 1989, police caught a fugitive murder suspect attempting to buy a handgun. It is likely that the Brady law will produce similar success stories.

4. The crime bill will pass or fail on its own, and Brady will have nothing to do with it.

(a) Crime bills have always passed without Brady. The 1991 Senate crime bill passed with Brady in it but, at the time, no one seriously believed that Brady added a single vote to final passage.

The 1991 House crime bill passed without Brady -- the Brady bill had previously passed the House as a separate measure. Further, every other crime bill in history which has passed either the House or Senate has done so without Brady. Opponents of the death penalty will not change their votes on final passage because of Brady. The key is not Brady, but habeas corpus.

(b) The House vote on the 1991 conference bill is irrelevant. Comparisons with the late-1991 House vote on the conference crime bill are totally irrelevant. It is a red herring. That was a nearly-total party line vote, caused by the Democrats who openly and intentionally excluded the Republicans from negotiations in the House-Senate conference committee. Republicans voted for the original House-passed crime bill, and they will vote for a crime bill again, just as they have done for years and years.

5. **Putting Brady in a crime bill gives the impression that the Administration has no commitment to enact gun control.**

(a) Makes Clinton look like Bush. If Clinton puts the Brady Bill in an omnibus crime bill, the media cannot help but compare his action to that of George Bush. It is well known that Bush took the position that he would accept the Brady Bill only as part of an omnibus crime bill. This was perceived, correctly, as an attempt to divert attention from Brady, and ultimately kill it. Last fall, we succeeded in having the media place the blame for Brady's demise squarely upon George Bush's shoulders, precisely because he insisted that Brady remain in a crime bill.

When the press asks President Clinton why he put Brady in the crime bill, any answer he gives will invite comparisons with Bush. He will be perceived as backing down on a key campaign promise.

(b) Makes it difficult to enact any other gun control during this Congress, and the press will know it. There are a lot of other gun control battles to fight, including a ban on semiautomatic assault weapons and large-capacity magazines, which the President promised to support. Our best chance to pass anything other than Brady is to enact Brady separately and then tack other gun-related provisions onto a crime bill a few months later. We know this, the National Rifle Association (NRA) knows this, and savvy folks in the media know this. Intentional or not, if Brady is in the crime bill it be exactly what the NRA wants.

SUPPORTERS OF WAITING PERIODS

Every major law enforcement organization in the nation supports the Brady Bill, including:

Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA)
Fraternal Order of Police (FOP)
International Brotherhood of Police Officers (IBPO)
International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)
Major Cities Chief Administrators
National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO)
National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE)
National Sheriffs Association (NSA)
National Troopers Coalition
Police Executive Research Forum (PERF)
Police Foundation

Other major national organizations supporting a waiting period for handgun purchasers include:

AFL-CIO	International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union
A.F.S.C.M.E.	League of Women Voters of the U.S.
African Methodist Episcopal Church	Mennonite Central Committee, Washington Office
Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union	National Association for the
American Academy of Pediatrics	Advancement of Colored People
American Academy of Physical Medicine	National Association of Children's Hospitals
and Rehabilitation	and Related Institutions, Inc.
American Association of Retired Persons	National Association of Counties
American Bar Association	National Association of Social Workers
American College of Emergency Physicians	National Congress of Parents and Teachers
American College of Surgeons,	National Council of Jewish Women
Southern California Chapter	National Criminal Justice Associati
American Federation of Teachers	National Education Association
American Jewish Committee	National League of Cities
American Jewish Congress	National Rainbow Coalition, Inc.
American Medical Association	National Urban League
American Medical Student Association	Southern Christian Leadership Conference
American Nurses Association	U. S. Conference of Mayors
American Psychiatric Association	Union of American Hebrew Congregations,
American Public Health Association	Religious Action Center
Americans for Democratic Action	Unitarian Universalist Association,
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith	Washington Office
B'nai B'rith International	United Church of Christ,
B'nai B'rith Women	Office for Church in Society
Children's Defense Fund	United Methodist Church,
Emergency Nurses Association	General Board of Church and Society
Episcopal Church, Washington Office	United States Catholic Conference
General Federation of Women's Clubs	Woman's National Democratic Club

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

DATE: 6/22

NOTE FOR: *Howard, George, MARCIA*
Carol KASCO

The President has reviewed the attached, and it is forwarded to you
for your:

Information ☐

Action ☒

Thank you.

JOHN D. PODESTA
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary
(x2702)

cc:

6.22.93

WASHINGTON

93 JUN 21 P2: 27

June 21, 1993

FROM: Howard Paster

SUBJECT: Brady bill and crime legislation

I indicated to the Chairman that we might not agree on this, and asked to see him for a more thorough discussion. Our meeting was quite pointed -- he said we could have Brady now and no crime bill, or we could have a crime bill with Brady. The Chairman placed the responsibility for the delay in moving a crime bill, including Brady, on the Administration and indicated his willingness to move promptly on a crime bill. (I should add he still harbors the hope of making "minor" changes in Brady and this could require some further discussion since I do not believe we can accept changes from last year's compromise unless they are negotiated with the police groups.)

There have been meetings on crime legislation involving Bruce Reed, the Department of Justice and staff for Chairmen Brooks and Biden. It is my sense it may require your personal direction to expedite the process because of Justice Department interest in making substantial changes in controversial portions of last year's crime bill.

In any event, I felt it necessary to advise you that while I prefer a different course it probably is not practical to move independently on Brady at this time.

cc George

FROM
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

U-FILE
IN BLUE
BANK
BLUE
FILE

HP - Santa Anthony called.
Peno has no objection
to doing the Brady
Bill alone. She
had a conversation
recently w/ Biden &
Brooks. She thought
Biden would go along
with this, Brooks
less likely.

SB

File

HP

COPYSET

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 19, 1993

93 JUL 19 P1:25

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
MACK MCLARTY
GEORGE STEPHANOPOLOUS
DAVID GERGEN
MARK GEARAN
CAROL RASCO
✓JOHN PODESTA
BRUCE REED

FROM: HOWARD PASTER *HP*

SUBJECT: WAITING PERIOD FOR GUN PURCHASES

The lack of an agreement on a crime bill, and the difficulty in moving the Brady bill by itself in the face of the objections of Chairman Brooks, has caused some to question the President's commitment to waiting periods for the purchase of guns. To make abundantly clear his unwavering support for this position, and to create momentum for the legislation, I think it would make sense for the President to invite Sarah and Jim Brady for an Oval Office visit as soon as reconciliation is resolved.

Please let me have your views by the close of business Thursday, July 22. The lack of a reply will be taken as a "no objection" response. Thank you.

I'm for it!

John

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 19, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
MACK MCLARTY
GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS
DAVID GERGEN
MARK GEARAN
CAROL RASCO
JOHN PODESTA
BRUCE REED

FROM: HOWARD PASTER 

SUBJECT: WAITING PERIOD FOR GUN PURCHASES

The lack of an agreement on a crime bill, and the difficulty in moving the Brady bill by itself in the face of the objections of Chairman Brooks, has caused some to question the President's commitment to waiting periods for the purchase of guns. To make abundantly clear his unwavering support for this position, and to create momentum for the legislation, I think it would make sense for the President to invite Sarah and Jim Brady for an Oval Office visit as soon as reconciliation is resolved.

Please let me have your views by the close of business Thursday, July 22. The lack of a reply will be taken as a "no objection" response. Thank you.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Howard G. Paster

7/30

Bruce-

THANKS -

EYE, CHUCK
SCHUMER IS
PRESIDENT TO SEE
THE PRESIDENT FOR
10 MINUTES NEXT
WEEK AND I
THINK WE HAVE
TO WANT HIM
NOT COURTESY-

How

July 29, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR HOWARD PASTER

FROM: BRUCE REED

RE: ANOTHER CRIME BILL UPDATE
ALSO: BRADY MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENT

As I understand it, Chairman Brooks and Chairman Biden would prefer to introduce the crime bill next week, but would be willing to hold off announcement of the bill until the following week (the first week of recess) in order to accommodate the President and reconciliation.

David Gergen, George Stephanopoulos, Carol Rasco, and others like the idea of a White House event to announce the crime bill in the first week of the recess. We are trying to reserve a date early in that week. It may be difficult to get many members to stay in town till then, but it would be nice to get the subcommittee chairs and a couple of Republicans.

A meeting with the Bradys that same day (perhaps immediately after the event) seems entirely appropriate. To underscore the President's commitment to fighting gun violence, we have prepared two executive orders he could sign that day to ban the import of assault pistols and reform federal firearms licensing procedures. That won't be enough to please the Bradys, who would rather see the Brady Bill move forward on its own, but obviously they should be invited to the event and singled out for recognition by the President.

I still strongly advise against inviting the Bradys to meet with the President before that date. Doing so could embarrass him and further complicate our efforts to get the crime bill introduced in one piece.

The bill is 98% complete. Despite a week of pleading from all levels of the White House, the Attorney General has still not sent her final decision memos on the Police Corps and semiautomatic weapons. (Justice insists the memos will arrive today.) We will need a Presidential decision, and if necessary a meeting, to dispense with these side issues.

The Attorney General wants the crime bill to include her own version of the Police Corps, which is fine with Brooks (who would be happy to kill the Police Corps altogether) but a problem in the Senate, where Biden is likely to defer to Kennedy (who insists on the original Walinsky version). Sasser and Specter introduced the Walinsky version this week as a stand-alone bill. The President told us weeks ago that he didn't want to make this a big issue, because he believes Walinsky will get what he wants in the end anyway. The A.G. wants him to revisit that decision.

The Attorney General also wants the President to endorse Metzenbaum's semiautomatic assault weapons ban -- and include it in the crime bill. The President supported a ban in the campaign, but never chose between the various proposals (Schumer and DeConcini have less sweeping bills). The Metzenbaum measure raises a few problems for the crime bill. First, Brooks doesn't want to include any assault weapons ban, and would strip it out even if we were able to persuade him to include it in the first place. Second, Biden believes he can't pass the Metzenbaum provision, and prefers DeConcini's less stringent assault weapons measure, which passed by only one vote last time. To complicate matters further, the Senate Judiciary Committee is holding a hearing on assault weapons next Tuesday, August 3 -- in the midst of your efforts to win DeConcini's vote for the economic package. No one from the administration has been invited to testify, but the Attorney General has made known her support for Metzenbaum.

We don't need any more controversial provisions to weigh down this crime bill. We would rather see the President sign the gun-related executive orders, and call on the Attorney General and the Treasury Secretary (who, after all, has jurisdiction over gun bans) to develop the administration's own ambitious strategy to deal with assault weapons and gun violence. We're going to need new legislation on guns down the road anyway, to deal not only with semiautomatic weapons but also with armor-piercing bullets and the emerging problem of military surplus guns being dumped on the U.S. market from China and the former Soviet Union.

Moreover, we think it's important that Brooks and Biden introduce the same bill. That might make the long wait for a crime bill worth something.

We'll keep you posted.

July 25, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

FROM: Howard Paster *HP*

SUBJECT: Invitation to Sarah and Jim Brady

I am happy to wait until after introduction of the crime bill to invite the Bradys to visit the President, IF the crime bill is actually introduced prior to the August recess. Otherwise we make a major error by waiting until the fall.

Of the people I contacted about the Bradys you were the only one who expressed any reservations.

I would like either to recommend we extend an invitation for August 9 or 10 with your concurrence, or to make a recommendation that notes your reservation. Please let me know ASAP your preference.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 22, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR HOWARD PASTER

FROM: BRUCE REED

SUBJECT: CRIME BILL UPDATE AND RESPONSE TO YOUR MEMO ON A
POSSIBLE BRADY VISIT WITH THE PRESIDENT

We would like to sit down with you and/or Lorraine this week to talk about the crime bill.

Biden, Brooks, and Justice have reached agreement with the DA's and state attorneys general on good habeas provisions. We have resolved our differences with Justice on 100,000 cops. The one outstanding issue -- the nature of the Police Corps -- is relatively minor, and should be resolved this week. That means the crime bill can be ready for introduction anytime after next week.

The President told Carol Rasco and George Stephanopoulos Tuesday that he would like to see the crime bill introduced before the August recess, as Chairmen Biden and Brooks have urged. We will be working with Justice and other interested parties in the White House to make sure that happens -- either immediately before Congress goes home or in the first week of recess, depending on what happens with reconciliation.

Under the circumstances, I believe that any Oval Office meeting with the Bradys should be postponed until after the crime bill is introduced. Inviting them in earlier would be a nice gesture to the Bradys, but could embarrass the President -- and Handgun Control and other Brady bill partisans might use it to beat us up for taking so long.

When he found out that he had a meeting with police groups a few weeks ago, the President got very angry and said he didn't want any more events or meetings on crime issues until we've introduced a crime bill. I imagine his reaction to a meeting with the Bradys would be the same.

A meeting with the Bradys after the crime bill is introduced would be an excellent idea. We have talked with Handgun Control about gun-related executive orders to emphasize the President's commitment to this issue.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

DATE: 11/05/93

NOTE FOR: HOWARD PASTER

The President has reviewed the attached, and it is forwarded to you
for your:

Information ☒

Action ☐

Thank you.

JOHN D. PODESTA
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary
(x2702)

cc:

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 19, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
MACK McLARTY
✓ GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS
DAVID GERGEN
MARK GEARAN
CAROL RASCO
JOHN PODESTA
BRUCE REED

FROM: HOWARD PASTER

SUBJECT: WAITING PERIOD FOR GUN PURCHASES

The lack of an agreement on a crime bill, and the difficulty in moving the Brady bill by itself in the face of the objections of Chairman Brooks, has caused some to question the President's commitment to waiting periods for the purchase of guns. To make abundantly clear his unwavering support for this position, and to create momentum for the legislation, I think it would make sense for the President to invite Sarah and Jim Brady for an Oval Office visit as soon as reconciliation is resolved.

Please let me have your views by the close of business Thursday, July 22. The lack of a reply will be taken as a "no objection" response. Thank you.

To: Howard

GS

I'm for it

(GS)

File

HP

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

11-593

November 1, 1993

RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL

TO: Chairman Jack Brooks

DATE: November 1, 1993

RECOMMENDED BY: Howard Paster, Legislative Affairs

PRUPOSE: To push the chairman to mark-up the Brady Bill this week.

BACKGROUND: As you know, Brooks was concerned the crime bill would not pass this year if the House had to deal with habeas corpus and the death penalty. Therefore, he broke the crime bill into pieces in order to pass some of the more pressing issues in the bill: cops on the beat, boot camps, drug treatment, safe schools and anti-gang violence. The Brady Bill was not one of the provisions that was marked up.

There has been some concern that Brooks, who is not a supporter of Brady, is resisting marking up this bill. According to the Judiciary staff, Brooks is looking at marking up Brady Thursday or Friday of this week -- after the five crime provisions have passed the House. Speaker Foley spoke with Brooks over the weekend and is concerned Brooks may try to delay the mark up until next week, which would make it unlikely Brady could be brought up for a vote before adjournment. Foley feels a phone call from you would help ensure a mark-up this week.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION:

1. The importance of Brady to you, personally.
2. The need to have a vote in the House before adjournment.
3. Ask that he mark-up this bill by Thursday, November 4, or Friday, November 5 so this bill can be voted on in the House before the Veterans Day break November 11 and then move to the Senate for a possible vote there before the adjournment.

CONTACT PERSON AND
TELEPHONE NUMBER(S):

Jack Brooks will be in his office after
10:00 a.m. today: 225-6565
703-356-7681 - home, VA

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

November 1, 1993

CRIME BILL VOTING REPORT

Year:	9 4	9 4	9 4	9 4		
	R	R	R	P	PERCENT	
	U	U	E	A	SUPPORT	
	L	L	C	S	When	All
	E	E	O	S	Voting	Votes
			M	A		
			M	G		
			I	E		
			T			
SUPPORT Position:	+	+	+	+		
Alabama						
1 Callahan S (R)	-	?	?	?	0	0
2 Everett T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Browder G (D)	-	-	-	+	25	25
4 Bevill T (D)	+	+	-	-	50	50
5 Cramer R (D)	+	+	-	+	75	75
6 Bachus S (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Hilliard E (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
Alaska						
AL Young D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
Arizona						
1 Coppersmith S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Pastor E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Stump B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Kyl J (R)	-	-	-	+	25	25
5 Kolbe J (R)	-	-	-	+	25	25
6 English K (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
Arkansas						
1 Lambert B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Thornton R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Hutchinson T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Dickey J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
California						
1 Hamburg D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Herger W (R)	-	-	?	-	0	0
3 Fazio V (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Doolittle J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Matsui R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Woolsey L (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
7 Miller G (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
8 Pelosi N (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
9 Dellums R (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75

10 Baker B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
11 Pombo R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
12 Lantos T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
13 Stark P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
14 Eshoo A (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
15 Mineta N (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
16 Edwards D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
17 Farr S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
18 Condit G (D)	+	+	-	+	75	75
19 Lehman R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
20 Dooley C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
21 Thomas B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
22 Huffington M (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
23 Gallegly E (R)	-	-	-	+	25	25
24 Beilenson A (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
25 McKeon H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
26 Berman H (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
27 Moorhead C (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
28 Dreier D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
29 Waxman H (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
30 Becerra X (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
31 Martinez M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
32 Dixon J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
33 Roybal-Allard L (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
34 Torres E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
35 Waters M (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
36 Harman J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
37 Tucker W (D)	+	?	?	?	100	25
38 Horn S (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
39 Royce E (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
40 Lewis J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
41 Kim J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
42 Brown G (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
43 Calvert K (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
44 McCandless A (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
45 Rohrabacher D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
46 Dornan R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
47 Cox C (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
48 Packard R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
49 Schenk L (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
50 Filner B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
51 Cunningham R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
52 Hunter D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Colorado

1 Schroeder P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Skaggs D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 McInnis S (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Allard W (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Hefley J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6 Schaefer D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Connecticut

1 Kennelly B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
------------------	---	---	---	---	-----	-----

2 Gejdenson S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 DeLauro R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Shays C (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5 Franks G (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
6 Johnson N (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Delaware

AL Castle M (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
-----------------	---	---	---	---	----	----

Florida

1 Hutto E (D)	+	-	-	-	25	25
2 Peterson P (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Brown C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Fowler T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Thurman K (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6 Stearns C (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Mica J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
8 McCollum B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
9 Bilirakis M (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
10 Young C (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
11 Gibbons S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
12 Canady C (R)	-	-	-	+	25	25
13 Miller D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
14 Goss P (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
15 Bacchus J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
16 Lewis T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
17 Meek C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
18 Ros-Lehtinen I (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
19 Johnston H (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
20 Deutsch P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
21 Diaz-Balart L (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
22 Shaw E (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
23 Hastings A (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Georgia

1 Kingston J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Bishop S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Collins M (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Linder J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	25
5 Lewis J (D)	-	+	+	-	50	50
6 Gingrich N (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Darden G (D)	+	+	-	+	75	75
8 Rowland J (D)	+	?	?	?	100	25
9 Deal N (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
10 Johnson D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
11 McKinney C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Hawaii

1 Abercrombie N (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Mink P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Idaho

1 LaRocco L (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Crapo M (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Illinois

1	Rush B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2	Reynolds M (D)	+	?	+	+	100	75
3	Lipinski W (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4	Gutierrez L (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5	Rostenkowski D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6	Hyde H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7	Collins C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
8	Crane P (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
9	Yates S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
10	Porter J (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
11	Sangmeister G (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
12	Costello J (D)	-	-	+	+	50	50
13	Fawell H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
14	Hastert D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
15	Ewing T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
16	Manzullo D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
17	Evans L (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
18	Michel R (R)	-	+	-	-	25	25
19	Poshard G (D)	-	-	+	+	50	50
20	Durbin R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Indiana

1	Visclosky P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2	Sharp P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3	Roemer T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4	Long J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5	Buyer S (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6	Burton D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7	Myers J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
8	McCloskey F (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
9	Hamilton L (D)	-	-	-	+	25	25
10	Jacobs A (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Iowa

1	Leach J (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
2	Nussle J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3	Lightfoot J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4	Smith N (D)	-	+	+	+	75	75
5	Grandy F (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Kansas

1	Roberts P (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2	Slattery J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3	Meyers J (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4	Glickman D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Kentucky

1	Barlow T (D)	+	+	-	-	50	50
2	Lewis R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3	Mazzoli R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4	Bunning J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5	Rogers H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6	Baesler S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Louisiana

1 Livingston R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Jefferson W (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Tauzin W (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Fields C (D)	-	+	+	-	50	50
5 McCrery J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6 Baker R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Hayes J (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Maine

1 Andrews T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Snowe O (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50

Maryland

1 Gilchrest W (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
2 Bentley H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Cardin B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Wynn A (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5 Hoyer S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Bartlett R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Mfume K (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
8 Morella C (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Massachusetts

1 Olver J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Neal R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Blute P (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Frank B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5 Meehan M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Torkildsen P (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
7 Markey E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
8 Kennedy J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
9 Moakley J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
10 Studds G (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Michigan

1 Stupak B (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Hoekstra P (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Ehlers V (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Camp D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Barcia J (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6 Upton F (R)	-	-	-	+	25	25
7 Smith N (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
8 Carr B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
9 Kildee D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
10 Bonior D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
11 Knollenberg J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
12 Levin S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
13 Ford W (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
14 Conyers J (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75
15 Collins B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
16 Dingell J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Minnesota

1 Penny T (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75
2 Minge D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Ramstad J (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Vento B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5 Sabo M (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75
6 Grams R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Peterson C (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
8 Oberstar J (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75

Mississippi

1 Whitten J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Thompson B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Montgomery G (D)	+	+	-	-	50	50
4 Parker M (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Taylor G (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Missouri

1 Clay W (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
2 Talent J (R)	-	-	-	+	25	25
3 Gephardt R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Skelton I (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Wheat A (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Danner P (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Hancock M (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
8 Emerson B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
9 Volkmer H (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Montana

AL Williams P (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
-------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----

Nebraska

1 Bereuter D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Hoagland P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Barrett B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Nevada

1 Bilbray J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Vucanovich B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0

New Hampshire

1 Zeff B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Swett D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

New Jersey

1 Andrews R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Hughes W (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Saxton H (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
4 Smith C (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
5 Roukema M (R)	+	+	+	+	75	75
6 Pallone F (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
7 Franks B (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
8 Klein H (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
9 Torricelli R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
10 Payne D (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75

11 Gallo D (R)	-	?	-	-	0	0
12 Zimmer D (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
13 Menendez R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

New Mexico

1 Schiff S (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Skeen J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Richardson B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

New York

1 Hochbrueckner G (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Lazio R (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
3 King P (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
4 Levy D (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
5 Ackerman G (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Flake F (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
7 Manton T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
8 Nadler J (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75
9 Schumer C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
10 Towns E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
11 Owens M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
12 Velazquez N (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
13 Molinari S (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
14 Maloney C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
15 Rangel C (D)	-	+	+	-	50	50
16 Serrano J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
17 Engel E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
18 Lowey N (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
19 Fish H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
20 Gilman B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
21 McNulty M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
22 Solomon G (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
23 Boehlert S (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100
24 McHugh J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
25 Walsh J (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
26 Hinchey M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
27 Paxon B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
28 Slaughter L (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
29 LaFalce J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
30 Quinn J (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100
31 Houghton A (R)	+	+	+	+	100	100

North Carolina

1 Clayton E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Valentine T (D)	+	?	?	?	100	25
3 Lancaster H (D)	-	-	+	+	50	50
4 Price D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5 Neal S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Coble H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Rose C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
8 Hefner W (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
9 McMillan A (R)	-	+	-	-	25	25
10 Ballenger C (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
11 Taylor C (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0

12 Watt M (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
---------------	---	---	---	---	----	----

North Dakota

AL Pomeroy E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
------------------	---	---	---	---	-----	-----

Ohio

1 Mann D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Portman R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Hall T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Oxley M (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Gillmor P (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6 Strickland T (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Hobson D (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
8 Boehner J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
9 Kaptur M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
10 Hoke M (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
11 Stokes L (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
12 Kasich J (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
13 Brown S (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
14 Sawyer T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
15 Pryce D (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
16 Regula R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
17 Traficant J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
18 Applegate D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
19 Fingerhut E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	75 75

Oklahoma

1 Inhofe J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Synar M (D)	+	-	+	-	50	50
3 Brewster B (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 McCurdy D (D)	-	+	-	+	50	50
5 Istook E (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6 Lucas F (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Oregon

1 Furse E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Smith B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Wyden R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 DeFazio P (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
5 Kopetski M (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75

Pennsylvania

1 Foglietta T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Blackwell L (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Borski R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Klink R (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Clinger W (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6 Holden T (D)	-	-	-	+	25	25
7 Weldon C (R)	-	+	-	+	50	50
8 Greenwood J (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
9 Shuster B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
10 McDade J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
11 Kanjorski P (D)	+	+	+	-	75	75
12 Murtha J (D)	+	+	-	-	50	50

13 Margolies-Mezv M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
14 Coyne W (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
15 McHale P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
16 Walker R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
17 Gekas G (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
18 Santorum R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
19 Goodling B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
20 Murphy A (D)	+	-	-	-	25	25
21 Ridge T (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75

Rhode Island

1 Machtley R (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75
2 Reed J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

South Carolina

1 Ravenel A (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Spence F (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Derrick B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Inglis B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Spratt J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Clyburn J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

South Dakota

AL Johnson T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
------------------	---	---	---	---	-----	-----

Tennessee

1 Quillen J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Duncan J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Lloyd M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
4 Cooper J (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Clement B (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Gordon B (D)	+	+	-	+	75	75
7 Sundquist D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
8 Tanner J (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
9 Ford H (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Texas

1 Chapman J (D)	-	-	-	+	25	25
2 Wilson C (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Johnson S (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Hall R (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Bryant J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Barton J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Archer B (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
8 Fields J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
9 Brooks J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
10 Pickle J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
11 Edwards C (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
12 Geren P (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
13 Sarpalius B (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
14 Laughlin G (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
15 de la Garza E (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
16 Coleman R (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
17 Stenholm C (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0

18 Washington C (D)	-	?	?	?	0	0
19 Combest L (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
20 Gonzalez H (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
21 Smith L (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
22 DeLay T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
23 Bonilla H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
24 Frost M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
25 Andrews M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
26 Arney D (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
27 Ortiz S (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
28 Tejeda F (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
29 Green G (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
30 Johnson E (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Utah

1 Hansen J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Shepherd K (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Orton B (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Vermont

AL Sanders B (I)	+	+	+	+	100	100
------------------	---	---	---	---	-----	-----

Virginia

1 Bateman H (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Pickett O (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Scott R (D)	-	-	+	-	25	25
4 Sisisky N (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
5 Payne L (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
6 Goodlatte R (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Bliley T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
8 Moran J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
9 Boucher R (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
10 Wolf F (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
11 Byrne L (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

Washington

1 Cantwell M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Swift A (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
3 Unsoeld J (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Inslee J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5 Foley T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Dicks N (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
7 McDermott J (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
8 Dunn J (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
9 Kreidler M (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100

West Virginia

1 Mollohan A (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
2 Wise B (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0
3 Rahall N (D)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Wisconsin

1 Barca P (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
2 Klug S (R)	-	+	+	+	75	75

3 Gunderson S (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
4 Kleczka G (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
5 Barrett T (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
6 Petri T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
7 Obey D (D)	+	+	+	+	100	100
8 Roth T (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
9 Sensenbrenner F (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0

Wyoming

AL Thomas C (R)	-	-	-	-	0	0
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

KEY --

P VOTED PRESENT
 C VOTED PRESENT TO AVOID
 POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST
 S SPEAKER EXERCISED DISCRETION NOT TO VOTE
 ? DID NOT VOTE
 I NOT ELIGIBLE MEMBER

1 of 4 items

CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 08/26/94

**** 1994 CQ HOUSE VOTE 394 ** HR3355. Omnibus Crime Bill -**

Rule. Adoption of the rule (HRes517) to waive points of order against and provide for House floor consideration of the \$33 billion crime conference report to help hire 100,000 new police officers through an \$8.8 billion community policing program, build state and local prisons through an \$8.7 billion state grant program, provide \$7.6 billion for crime prevention programs such as after-school sports leagues and job training programs, create a crime trust fund directing \$30.2 billion over six years to combat crime, ban 19 specific assault weapons and expand the death penalty to dozens of federal crimes. Rejected 210-225: R 11-167; D 198-58 (ND 148-25, SD 50-33); I 1-0, Aug. 11, 1994. A "yea" was a vote in support of the president's position. (Story, 1994 Weekly Report p. 2340)
 Item Key: 9679

2 of 4 items

CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 08/26/94

**** 1994 CQ HOUSE VOTE 414 ** Omnibus Crime Bill - Rule.**

Adoption of the rule (HRes526) to waive points of order and provide for House floor consideration of the conference report to cut \$3.3 billion from an original conference report that had

proposed spending \$33.5 billion over six years and incorporate other changes, including a requirement that all spending authorized by the bill come from a six year \$30.2 billion crime trust fund realized from eliminating 270,000 federal jobs, reducing by \$2 billion the amount for crime prevention programs such as after school sports leagues and job training programs, provide for increased community notification of violent sex offenders, allow prior sex offenses to be admitted in federal trials, limit provisions that allow the early release of non-violent drug offenders, and eliminate a \$10 million authorization for a criminal research center at Lamar University in Texas. The bill also contains provisions to hire 100,000 new police officers through a \$8.8 billion community policing program, build state and local prisons through a \$7.9 billion state grant program with a ten percent increase over the original conference report to states who meet "truth in sentencing" guidelines through requiring repeat violent offenders to serve 85 percent of their sentence, ban 19 specific assault weapons with minor changes from the original conference report, expand the death penalty to dozens of new federal crimes, and mandate life imprisonment for three time violent felons. Adopted 239-189: R 42-134; D 196-94 (ND 147-24, SD 49-31); I 1-0, Aug. 21, 1994. (Previously, the House had rejected a rule (HRes517) providing for consideration of an original conference report on Aug. 11 (See Vote 394).
Item Key: 9714

3 of 4 items

CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 08/26/94

**** 1994 CQ HOUSE VOTE 415 ** HR3355. Omnibus Crime Bill - Recommit.** McCollum, R-Fla., motion to recommit the conference report to conference with instructions to report it back after prioritizing the authorizations to maximize programs for public safety and policing, prison construction, and border patrol after eliminating the crime prevention programs in the bill as outlined in a proposal made by Brewster, R-Okla., and Hunter, R-Calif. Motion rejected 197-232: R 146-30; D 51-201 (ND 19-153, SD 32-48); I 0-1, Aug. 21, 1994.
Item Key: 9715

**** CQ HOUSE VOTE 416 ** HR3355. Omnibus Crime Bill -**

Conference Report. Adoption of the conference report to cut \$3.3 billion from an original conference report that had proposed spending \$33.5 billion over six years and incorporate other changes, including a requirement that all spending authorized by the bill come from a six year \$30.2 billion crime trust fund realized from eliminating 270,000 federal jobs, reducing by \$2 billion the amount for crime prevention programs such as after school sports leagues and job training programs with some of the money distributed through a block grant program, provide for increased community notification of violent sex offenders, allow prior sex offenses to be admitted in federal trials, require HIV testing when requested in rape trials, limit provisions that allow the early release of non-violent drug offenders, and eliminate a \$10 million authorization for a criminal research center at Lamar University in Texas. The bill also contains provisions to hire 100,000 new police officers through a \$8.8 billion community policing program, build state and local prisons through a \$7.9 billion state grant program with a ten percent increase over the original conference report to states who meet "truth in sentencing" guidelines through requiring repeat violent offenders to serve 85 percent of their sentence, ban 19 specific assault weapons with minor changes from the original conference report, expand the death penalty to dozens of new federal crimes, mandate life imprisonment for three time violent felons without parole, and reimburse states \$1.8 billion over six years for the cost of incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. Adopted (thus cleared for Senate action) 235-195: R 46-131; D 188-64 (ND 141-31, SD 47-33); I 1-0, Aug. 21, 1994.

Item Key: 9716